

the standing order on tomorrow, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; that he be followed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs) for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate upon the conclusion of the remarks by Mr. Boggs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 945, THE NO-FAULT INSURANCE BILL, TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, upon the final passage of the military procurement bill, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 945, the national no-fault motor vehicle insurance bill, and that that bill be made the so-called second-track item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 9:45 a.m. The distinguished majority leader will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business,

the military procurement bill. There is a time limitation on that bill and on amendments thereto.

When the unfinished business is laid before the Senate on tomorrow, the time agreement runs as follows: There will be 4 hours of debate on the amendment by Mr. CRANSTON, followed by 2 hours of debate on an amendment by Mr. BROOKE, followed by the recognition of the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) for the purpose of calling up an amendment on which there is a 1-hour limitation. There will be a ye-and-nay vote on the amendment by Mr. AIKEN, and undoubtedly there will be ye-and-nay votes on the amendment by Mr. BROOKE and the amendment by Mr. CRANSTON, as amended, if amended; and other amendments may then be offered.

As I recall, following the disposition of the amendment by Mr. CRANSTON, the distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) may be recognized, if he elects to do so, for the purpose of submitting an amendment, with a time limitation thereon of 1 hour.

A final rollcall vote on passage of the military procurement bill will occur tomorrow at no later than 6 p.m., following which the Chair will lay before the Senate the second-track item, which will remain on the second track daily until disposed of, that being S. 945, a bill to regulate interstate commerce and to provide for the general welfare by requiring certain insurance.

In conformity with the decision of the distinguished majority leader, on Thursday morning the Senate will proceed to the consideration, in executive session, of the SALT treaty. That treaty will re-

main the main track item, or the unfinished business, daily, until it is disposed of; and at some time during each afternoon—this will be discussed later and ordered later—the Senate will return to legislative session, in which the second-track item, no-fault insurance, will be considered until it is disposed of.

After the SALT treaty has been disposed of as the main track item, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the interim agreement, and it will remain the main track item daily until disposed of. Following its disposition, hopefully, the revenue-sharing bill will become the main track item daily.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 7:57 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 2, 1972, at 9:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 1, 1972:

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Damon W. Cooper, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD PRAISED BY COLLEAGUES AND THE PRESS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Members of the Senate are fully aware of the skill and diligence with which the able assistant majority leader carries out his duties.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD's talents have long been recognized by the voters of West Virginia, who have placed their trust in him, and they are recognized by the Senators with whom he is associated daily. Recently, two of his colleagues, the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.), gave public testimony to their respect for the assistant majority leader.

Their comments were incorporated in an editorial published on July 28, 1972, in the Elkins, W. Va., Inter-Mountain. Mr. President, this editorial reflects the feelings for Senator ROBERT C. BYRD that are held both by his colleagues and by the citizens of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAISE FOR BYRD

West Virginia gets kicked around frequently by outside critics so we are pleased when the opportunity presents itself to pass along favorable comment made about one of the state's distinguished citizens and public servants.

United States Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia has risen to the high position of Majority Whip in the Senate and his diligent work there has not gone unnoticed by those who serve with him.

Recently, Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia offered a tribute to the work of our Senator Byrd as acting majority leader over the past busy weeks when long hours and controversial legislation often resulted in tempers becoming frayed.

But as Senator Byrd of Virginia said, "... one member of the Senate has had the responsibility of seeing that the Senate proceeded in an orderly and appropriate way. Throughout the year, and especially during the past three weeks, he has been the first Senator to arrive in the Senate each morning, and he has been the last to leave each night."

Sen. Byrd of Virginia was referring to Sen. Byrd of West Virginia, "a man whose tact and patience and good will were indispensable to the workings of the Senate during the past few hectic weeks."

"I wish," he said, "that every one of the 1,700,000 West Virginians could come to the Capitol and sit in the gallery and watch Senator Robert C. Byrd as he undertakes the

responsibilities and duties of the acting majority leader of this great body. I am sure that every one of those 1,700,000 of his fellow citizens would be as proud of him as we in the Senate are proud of him."

Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah joined in the tribute to Sen. Byrd saying, "He has maintained his rapport with the Senate. He has gone out of his way to accommodate and work with every Senator. No Senator has been denied any of his rights. They have been protected jealously. Yet, the Senator from West Virginia has moved the work along in a very difficult time."

Sen. Moss continued, "The Senate is now so burdened with legislative work that without that kind of attention and effort and diplomacy, we could have been so tangled up that we would not have adjourned for the conventions, much less get through any time this year. I am hopeful now, because of the great work done by the Senator from West Virginia, that we can complete our legislative task this year in time for Senators and others to go home and participate in the election process this fall, with enough time to really be effective."

Hopefully some of the national publications that are quick to criticize Sen. Byrd at times for his courageous and outspoken views on issues and others who seem to delight in downgrading West Virginia will not hesitate now to recognize the important job the Senator is doing for his country. All West Virginians have reason to feel proud of the tribute offered Sen. Byrd for it is the people of this State that have had the wisdom to elect and re-elect this outstanding citizen to the office of the United States Senate.

"AMBASSADORS OF SONG" REACH FINANCIAL GOALS, SET FOR EUROPEAN TRIP

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce that the Frankford High School A Cappella Choir, the Ambassadors of Song, will start its fifth goodwill people-to-people tour on August 7. Frankford High School is located in my northeast Philadelphia congressional district.

Those who have heard the Ambassadors' repertoire agree that no organization better represents this Nation's efforts toward international harmony. On this 22-day tour, the choir will perform in Italy, Australia, and Yugoslavia under the inspirational direction of Mr. David J. M. King. Moreover, the Ambassadors have been granted preliminary permission to perform before Pope Paul VI during their stay in Italy.

It should be noted that these young men and women have worked diligently for this opportunity. Of the \$44,000 needed for the trip, \$41,000 was raised through car washes, stamp drives, cake sales and a fair. The remaining \$3,000 was privately donated and no public funds of any kind are being used.

In 1964, the Ambassadors of Song, a title bestowed upon the choir by the State Department, toured Scandinavia and performed before the Swedish Royal Family. In 1966, the Ambassadors traveled 27,000 miles through the South American continent performing in the capitals of Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Brazil, as well as in the great Opera House in Rio de Janeiro before an audience of 4,000 persons. In 1967, the choir toured the Montreal Expo and sang at the Canadian Folk Festival. Two years later, there was a journey to Japan. The most exciting performance of this tour was a concert for the wounded American servicemen at a military hospital. During the singing of the choir's theme, "Medley America," both those in the audience and members of the choir were moved to tears by the experience.

Mr. Speaker, through their music, the Ambassadors of Song have achieved that for which men through the centuries have strived—the communication of a spirit of friendship and enthusiasm for their fellowmen. In its travels around the globe, the Frankford A. Cappella Choir has truly proven music to be our international language.

I insert into the RECORD an article which appeared in the Mayfair-Northeast News on Thursday, July 27, 1972. I wish these talented young men and women good music and Godspeed on their tour.

The article follows:

"AMBASSADORS OF SONG" REACH FINANCIAL GOALS, SET FOR EUROPEAN TRIP

Choir has preliminary approval to sing for Pope Paul VI.

Frankford High School's A Cappella Choir, called "The Ambassadors of Song" by the United States State Department, will depart on August 7 for a 22-day concert tour of Italy,

Austria and Yugoslavia it was announced today by Principal James A. Killough and Choirmaster David J. M. King.

The choir has been granted preliminary permission to sing for Pope Paul VI at Castel Gandolfo. Final arrangements will be made when the choir arrives in Italy.

Other important concerts will be given at the Official Church Music Festival in Venice, the Church of Santa Suzanna (the American Roman Catholic Church) in Rome, the Basilica of St. Francis of Assisi in Bologna, Italy, and the Tyrolean Festival at Innsbruck, Austria. Arrangements for appearances in Yugoslavia are still being made. Frankford's ensemble will be the first choir from this area to perform in Yugoslavia.

Included in the concerts will be music by Bach, Brahms, Nehybel and Pergolesi plus selected spirituals, folk songs, Gospel songs, madrigals and motets.

Funds for the trip, about \$44,000 to cover expenses for 63 singers and 13 adults, were raised almost entirely by choir members under the direction of the Ambassadors of Song Parents Association. Only about \$3,000 came in as donations while the rest was earned through stamp drives, car washes, cake sales and a fair held during the week of July 3 at Francis Hopkinson Elementary School, "L" and Luzerne sts., Philadelphia. No public funds of any kind are being used.

This will be the choir's fifth international tour since 1964. The Scandinavian countries were visited in 1964, South America in 1966, Canada for Expo '67 in 1967 and Japan in 1969. Future plans, according to Choirmaster King, include a proposed trip to Israel in 1973 to perform during that country's 25th Anniversary.

Sixty-three singers of the 80 member choir will be able to take the trip, including student officers Gary Green, President; Scott Landis, Vice President; Cindy Ferguson, Secretary and Edna St. Sauveur, Secretary-Treasurer. Eight parents will travel as chaperons. In addition to Choirmaster King, other adults include Dr. Michael Glamo, Assistant Director of Music for the Philadelphia Public Schools, Mrs. Glamo, Mr. Wesley A. Day, accompanist and the past dean of the American Guild of Organists, and Sister Mary Seraphim, music teacher at the St. Pius X School in Broomall, Pa.

David King, who holds B.S. and M.E.D. degrees in music from West Chester State Teachers College and has done graduate work in music at Temple University, has been in the Philadelphia School System 11 years, the past two at Frankford. He is a graduate of Northeast High School (now Thomas Edison).

King, leading his first international trip with the choir, is pleased with the progress of his young people. He says that during the school year, and this summer in preparation for the trip, the teenagers have practiced about three hours every day on their own time. He is also pleased that 25 of the choir's 27 black members, including June graduate and Choir President Green, are making the trip.

The choir was formed in 1936 under Miss Frances Snyder. Subsequent directors have been Mr. Forrest Newmyer, Mr. Walter Lamont, Mr. Robert Hamilton and Mr. Jerome Wright. Travel arrangements are by Meridian Travel Group, Wynnewood, Pa.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION OF CHAPMAN COLLEGE

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I thought Senators would be interested in the keen

insights into the role of liberal arts colleges in our Nation today, offered by Dr. W. B. Langsdorf at the inauguration of Dr. Donald Kleckner as president of Chapman College this past April. I believe they will find these remarks to be quite thought provoking.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHALLENGE TO THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

(By Dr. W. B. Langsdorf)

The genius and strength of American higher education lies in its diversity, in the great number and many types of institutions which provide it. Public colleges and public and private universities profess a dedication to liberal education, but concentrate a major share of their resources and energies on preparation for entry into occupations and professions. The true liberal arts college, on the other hand, concentrates its attention on liberal education. It cannot compete efficiently in professional education with the large university, public or private. If it abandons liberal education as its chief purpose, it loses its reason for being.

THE EDUCATION OF A FREE MAN

It is not my intent here to subject you to a scholarly discourse on liberal arts. I think we can all agree that a liberal education is the education of a free man. Its function is to liberate man from both the dogmatism of accepted fact and the gullibility to which he is prey because of the ever more efficient arts of persuasion, to give him breadth of understanding, and perspective, a sense of values, and above all, a commitment to the common good.

I submit that none of these are essential objectives of professional or vocational education, or, to use the present national administration's term, "career education."

Liberal education has been a cornerstone of democratic institutions in this nation from its inception. While it had its European origins in Renaissance education for the elite and in medieval clerical education, it has never in this nation properly been a finishing school for the few. Quite in contrast, liberal education for the many was denounced in England in 1678 as "diverting those whom Nature or Fortune had determin'd to the Plough, the Oar, or other Handicrafts, from their proper design, to the study of Liberal Arts, and even of Divinity itself."

Liberal education has always faced a challenge from those who measure the value of an education solely in terms of material results, immediate entry into a profession, or dollar value. De Tocqueville, in his perceptive *Democracy in America* written almost a century and a half ago, said that in this age "the American mind must be coerced into theoretical studies—it runs of its own accord to practical applications." As education became the chief avenue for upward mobility of middle and lower social and economic classes, and the road to recognition for the sons of immigrants, assurance of immediate entry into a profession took on the greatest importance. Today it appears that the great majority of middle class Americans, and now also those previously disadvantaged, want a college education for their children, not because it will make them educated men and women, but because they believe it will guarantee to their children personal economic opportunity and security, and the status of a profession or white collar job.

The diversification of knowledge, the multiplication of specialized jobs requiring a college education, and the proliferation of courses to provide preparation for them have eroded the core of liberal education to which every college and university is supposedly committed. Some professional pro-

grams and institutions, recognizing the danger, have sought to mandate a substantial amount of liberal arts. Some national professional organizations recommend that professional courses shall comprise not more than one half of undergraduate work. Great science and engineering institutions like the California Institute of Technology require a humanities and social science base. Yet from my own experience, it appears that while a profession of an institution primarily preparing for the professions may be committed to liberal education, the motivation of their students often seems concerned solely with the professional training aspects of the collegiate education provided them.

EDUCATION FOR LEADERSHIP

Liberal education has always faced challenges; yet it has continued, chiefly through liberal arts colleges like Chapman, to turn out a great portion of the leaders in all walks of life. Now it faces a greater challenge than ever. It is being questioned at many levels of government and educational leadership from which should come the greatest commitment to human values as opposed to the accelerating momentum of a production oriented technology.

Just a little over a month ago, Governor James Rhodes of Ohio was installed (in San Diego) as Vice Chairman of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. Speaking at that meeting, Governor Rhodes said, "Today we're teaching a general course in high schools and colleges—and that means we're teaching general unemployment."

The California Legislature in September 1971, apparently out of concern for unemployment passed Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 62, which reads in part:

"Whereas it is important that sound planning for educational output be a continuing part of educational administration to insure that the skills taught are truly useful and marketable—

Be it resolved that the governing boards of (public) higher education report to the 1972 session on their efforts to develop and maintain academic programs that are relevant to the manpower needs of society." To cite this resolution here is not to deny the necessity for appropriate occupations preparation, but to note the apparent absence of legislative concern for anything but career education.

In March, 1971, Chief Justice Burger delivered the Supreme Court opinion in the case of *Willie Griggs vs. the Duke Power Company*. The judgment held that under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, an employer may not require a high school education or passing of a general intelligence test as a condition of employment in, or transfer to, jobs where (a) neither standard is shown to be significantly related to successful job performance; (b) both requirements operate to disqualify Negroes at a substantially higher rate than white applicants; and (c) the jobs in question formerly had been filled only by white employees as part of a long-standing practice of giving preference to whites. Now, surely, none of us would defend race discrimination in employment. However, the lower Federal Court had held, and the Supreme Court agreed, though reversing the Circuit Court, that the Duke Power Company had clearly not been motivated by reasons of racial discrimination. While the decision appears to relate chiefly to civil rights, I believe a careful reading of the opinion can only lead to the conclusion that in the future, unless an employer can demonstrate that a diploma—high school or college—is clear evidence of vocational or professional preparation for a specific job, it cannot be a prerequisite for employment. The implications are ominous for liberal education, and for those employers who in the future seek broadly educated and adaptable persons rather than those with narrow occupational training.

The United States Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland, has only recently announced the slogan, "career education," as the theme for all students from first grade through college. He has designated "career education" as the "major objective of the U.S. Office of Education at this moment and for the foreseeable future." We can readily guess what direction federal funding and support will take.

Nearer at hand, the Los Angeles Public Schools have announced a plan which, by 1973, will sharply curtail academic subjects and assure each and every student a marketable job skill on high school graduation.

Last month, Clark Kerr, in connection with testimony before the Select Committee on the Master Plan, is reported to have predicted disastrous consequences if more students receive college degrees than required by the job market—the assumption that, as in pre-Hitler Germany, mass discontent would result. One could respond that many woman college graduates never enter the job market, that earlier predictions of oversupply have all proven wrong, and that many college graduates may well be satisfied with a job which does not require a college degree, particularly when it may pay more, and provide more leisure than many a professional position. Once, over a campfire, I became acquainted with one of the better-educated men I have known. He was a college graduate, but a cross-country truck driver by occupation and by choice. He said his job gave him a feeling of freedom, the opportunity to exchange ideas with a wide cross section of people, time to think, and far more leisure and pay than most professions he might have followed. He did not feel his college education was wasted.

I would be remiss if I did not add that some of even the strongest advocates of career education at times qualify their insistence that it be the sole objective of higher education. For example, Willard Wertz, after alleging that liberal arts education is a mistaken ideal since, according to him, only a few will ever be able to use it, adds that it would be equally a mistake to concentrate education "too much now on a single set of factors—job opportunities—in what is a rapidly changing concept of what people want their lives to be—and what those lives are probably going to be."

Perhaps he intended by his qualification to make allowances for the rapidity of change which Alvin Toffler so well describes in *Future Shock*. What could be more frustrating to a college graduate, upon first entering the job market—or for that matter even later—than to find his specialized skill no longer needed, the job for which he prepared obsolete or better handled by a machine, and to realize that he is not prepared to adapt to different needs. Concentration solely on narrow career education may bring far more hazards and pitfalls than have yet been officially recognized.

While I hope and believe that public higher education and the private university will be able to resist the mounting pressures to emphasize professional and occupational training to the exclusion of liberal education, it is certain that much of the leadership in the defense of liberal studies must come from the private liberal arts college. This can come both by its support of liberal education generally, through a common front with academic leaders of public education in the accreditation process, and by serving as a model of excellence and living proof, through its students and graduates, of the value and significance of a liberal education.

If the liberal arts college is to serve this function, it cannot be content with much of the so-called liberal education of the past. Liberal education cannot be education purely leisure, or for the dilettante, education for "gentle folk," the finishing school for the so-called "beautiful people," the idle rich who

live lives of sated boredom, ever seeking thrills in new pleasure spas.

It cannot rely on the traditional academic curriculum which at its inception had meaning and relevance long since lost. It has been said that the only thing harder to move than a cemetery is a college curriculum, and now even cemeteries dip their flags to free ways. Much of the frozen curriculum has been called liberal arts. It took a student uprising at Harvard in 1823 to bring change there. Only after one third of the students, including the son of John Quincy Adams, had been expelled without hope of reprieve did the faculty conclude something must be amiss. One result of their soul searching was the introduction of the elective system, which at least gave the student opportunity to escape from some of the crystallized courses. Some years ago, a survey of Harvard graduates twenty-five years after commencement seemed to indicate change was again due. One-third of the respondents said no course taken at Harvard was of any value later. In answer to the question "Which professor influenced you most?", the answer of 41% appeared to be "not a doggone one." Fortunately and wisely, in the intervening years, Harvard had made dramatic changes in its general studies.

In the past few years, students in many colleges and universities, often because of inflexible and unimaginative curriculum and faculty, have demanded relevancy. On occasion, determination of courses and course content has been abdicated to them. As one might expect, this has eventually proved unproductive. Even the most highly motivated exchange of ignorance eventually becomes boring, as the students of at least one California liberal arts college have discovered for themselves.

NEEDED: REDEDICATION TO BASIC COMMITMENTS

If liberal education is to meet the challenge it faces, it must clean its own house, rethink its basic purposes and then consciously plan each course and program to achieve these objectives.

I believe if we are to achieve success in defending liberal education and the liberal arts college, there must be a massive rededication to certain basic commitments.

1. The first of these is commitment to the perfectibility or at least improvableity of man. This is a fundamental tenet of our nation's heritage, taken by our founding fathers from Condorcet's thesis of human progress through man's own efforts. It is basic to a republic, and to democratic institutions, and sets them apart from those of other ideologies. There is no liberal education behind the iron or bamboo curtains. The liberal arts college must be committed to the value and inherent goodness and improvableity of every human being. No one who lacks this faith belongs on the faculty.

2. The second is commitment to make all learning exciting. I wonder what we do to children that changes the eager enthusiasm of the first grader into the bored indifference of the high school senior. Effective liberal education always seems fresh and new. Alfred North Whitehead in an address in 1927 said, to have impact, education must be "either new in itself or invested with some novelty of application to the new world or new times." He went on to say, "Knowledge does not keep any better than fish." At another point, he emphasized the importance of imagination. "Imagination is a contagious disease. It cannot be measured by the year or weighed by the pound. It can only be communicated by a faculty whose members themselves wear their learning with imagination."

Because liberal education must be exciting and challenging, the student himself is often the best judge of faculty effectiveness. I was aware several years ago that Chapman was one of the leaders in instituting student evaluation of all faculty.

3. A third commitment is to develop self-motivated and self-disciplined students.

One of our leading educational philosophers once said that a teacher hasn't taught if the students haven't learned. A major function of the teacher is to provide motivation. When students fail, more often than not the failure is not theirs, but that of the teacher.

Effective liberal education provides the student with a multitude of learning resources and encourages him to use them on his own time and at his own pace. The lecture, except for occasional challenge or synthesis, or for dramatic excitement of which not many faculty are capable, became obsolete as an efficient learning tool with the invention of printing. The faculty in liberal arts should be constantly seeking new and different learning resources and methods of education. Chapman's World Campus Afloat is one most imaginative answer.

Self-motivated learning, and familiarity with a wide variety of learning tools and resources are of special significance to liberal education. If its goals are fully realized, the most important aspect of a college education will be its introduction of the student to a lifetime of learning. The college degree should be in fact as well as in name just the commencement.

4. The fourth commitment is to a design of education as preparation for the future.

Too often liberal arts have been thought of only in terms of understanding our past heritage. If this is all they mean, then they are sterile. Knowledge of the past should be useful for understanding the present and preparing for the future, and this should be a clear purpose of every course. Jefferson, Franklin, Madison and the others who laid the basis for our nation were profound students of the past. They used that knowledge to build this nation and plan for its future. How great is our need now for men and women with similar understanding and foresight. When one reads Alvin Toffler's *Future Shock* one can only wonder whether mankind has created a Frankenstein which he can neither understand nor control, and which will inevitably destroy him.

THE CONCERNS OF FREE MEN

When man can reach the planets or destroy the earth with his power, use chemistry to change personality and intelligence, remodel heredity, and create life itself, the need for men of wisdom, conscience and commitment becomes imperative. With invention and change so dramatic and traumatic, education must prepare men and women to live with change, to speculate continually about it, to anticipate it, and to choose wisely among alternate courses of action. To achieve this, Toffler suggests even science fiction might play a significant part in liberal studies. Imaginative guesses can be proven right by history. In any case, examination of even seemingly impossible alternatives can serve to expand flexibility of mind. We need to find new ways to develop imaginative foresight, in effect, to study the future. This may be one of them.

There are today hopeful signs that liberal education has had productive meaning to many. Widespread concern for our polluted lakes, streams, and oceans, for the exhaustion of our resources, for overpopulation, for the destruction of rare species, for the protection of wilderness areas, for use of the oceans to benefit future generations are not concerns which would normally result from professional or vocational studies. These are the concerns of free men, liberally educated.

While the Harvard study of 25 years after must have been discouraging to many, one reassuring note was that the graduates who believed they had lived a happy life felt this was due not to wealth or power, but because they felt they had achieved something for

mankind. If a liberal education can have only this one result, is it not worthwhile? Of all the characteristics of liberal education, perhaps the most significant is that it inspires commitment to the future.

A college that is dedicated to the improvability of man, creates joy in learning, teaches students self-motivation which will continue their learning life long, and which both prepares them for future changes and inspires them to commitment to mankind, is a liberal arts college in the highest and best sense. I feel certain this is the kind of college Chapman will be, and that as the years pass its graduates will be men and women adequate to the great challenges of the twenty-first century.

THAI DRUG HOAX: ARE WE BEING TAKEN FOR A RIDE?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the flood of heroin from Southeast Asia continues to endanger the life of every American. At a time when there are an estimated 560,000 addicts in this country, I fail to understand how the administration can refuse to carry out the mandate of Congress and to cut off foreign assistance to those nations which are partners in the drug trade.

Section 109 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, signed into law earlier this year, requires the President to suspend economic and military assistance to any country when the President determines that the government involved has failed to take adequate steps to stop the production, processing, and trafficking of narcotics. Related provisions in the laws authorizing U.S. contributions to the International Development Association, the Asian Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank—provisions which I authored—require the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct our executive directors of these organizations to vote against any loan for a country when the President has made such a determination of noncooperation in the fight against drugs.

Despite the clear language of these laws, the President has not taken his responsibility seriously enough to cut off funds to such nations. In fact, the administration has allowed itself to be duped by public relations stunts into thinking that, all of a sudden, corrupt governments, which have long prospered because of opium traffic, have turned around 180 degrees.

Columnist Jack Anderson has reported how the Thai Government, hoping to put a lid on angry American public opinion, set out to purchase opium from the KMT forces still in Thailand in order to "prove" that it is cracking down on the opium trade. The Thai Government did in fact buy what it thought to be 26 tons of opium, but what was in reality only 5 tons of opium and 21 tons of fodder and chemicals. As Anderson wrote:

Either through corruption or stupidity, the Thai officials failed to test the huge

mounds of "opium" before they soaked it with gasoline and put it to the torch. Only as the smell of burning molasses wafted through Chiang Mai did the Thais suspect they had been had. Then, it was too late to do anything but cover up their goof.

The Bangkok propaganda campaign was successful and America's mass media graphically described the burning of the opium. No mention was made of the filler materials, however. In fact, it was not until early this summer that American agencies first learned of the deception.

Our country is still being taken for a ride by the Thai Government and American economic and military assistance continues to flow unhampered to Bangkok.

BUN BENTON BRAY RETIRES
AFTER 30 YEARS

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bun Benton Bray, staff director of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service since its formation in 1957 is retiring from Federal service after 30 years.

Mr. Bray, who came to be known to Federal employees all over the world as "Mr. Manpower," originally came to the subcommittee because of his background in personnel work in the Navy Department, and it was assumed that a good percentage of the work of the subcommittee would involve oversight in the field of personnel practices and procedures in the Department of Defense since it is by far the largest employer of civil personnel in the Federal establishment.

Not content to sit in an office and accept reports on blind faith, Bray traveled all over the world and made on-the-scene investigations, talking with both rank and file employees and management at the ground level.

As a result of his personal investigations and staff-instigated studies, we have been able to bring about some substantial changes in both local and national manpower policies and procedures.

Bray's background as a World War II naval officer and high-level civilian official in the Navy Department did not make of him a promanagement figurehead as might have been expected, but instead he came to be known as an ombudsman for the rank and file.

Although he often clashed with both military and civilian brass in the Pentagon, he was highly respected there and achieved a reputation for toughness and fairness.

He has left a personal imprint on civilian manpower in the Federal service which can be matched by few, if any, public officials in either the executive or legislative branch of the Government. Naval officer, civil service employee, and legislative committee staffer, Bun Bray did an outstanding job and his absence from the active scene will be keenly felt.

THE GREEK CONTRIBUTION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, July marked the golden anniversary of the founding of the Order of Ahepa in this Nation. This fraternal organization for the American-Greek community has performed outstandingly on behalf of its members and the Nation during the past half century. A broad range of accomplishments may be listed to its credit.

It is worth noting, however, that rather than just list its accomplishments, we should place this organization in context within the American frame of reference. Here is an organization that is uniquely American while remaining very much a representative organ of what began as an immigrant community. All the ethnic communities have responded to the American challenge by bringing forth such organizations.

Few, however, have met with the success encountered by the Order of Ahepa. Over its long and illustrious history, it has not only fostered understanding of and loyalty for America, but has also made clear to its members what American citizenship really means.

Without such organizations, the transition from immigrant to American citizen would have been much more difficult, both for the individual and for the Nation.

Such an organization deserves recognition nationally for its worth and compassion as well. For previous crises have witnessed that compassion for those in need or travail transcends ethnic considerations. This organization has constantly reached out to aid those in distress, whether here or abroad. Without their aid, the misery of this world would be that much worse.

So it is fitting for Members of this House to recognize their contribution and wish them long life and success in the years to come. The spirit of Greek ideals transcends all recorded instances of attempts to snuff it out. All the more reason to pay tribute to those sons of that land who are so devoted to those concepts here in America.

MCGOVERN AN EISENHOWER
"DISCIPLE"?

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine recently asked that I insert in the RECORD a most timely article printed in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 2, 1972, in which John Eisenhower, son of our late President, responds to allegations that the position of the new Democratic nominee for President of the United States with regard to our mili-

tary defense posture is like that of the late President.

As I believe the article deserves careful consideration by all who read this RECORD, I insert it at this point:

[From the Washington Post, July 2, 1972]

MCGOVERN, AN EISENHOWER "DISCIPLE"?

(By John Eisenhower)

If Senator George McGovern is indeed a disciple of my father's in his military opinions, then the Boss must be rotating in his grave at the failure of his pupil to learn his lessons.

No matter how much Senator McGovern may claim to have learned from President Eisenhower's defense policies, he seems to have grasped everything except the fundamentals. For a basic premise that the Eisenhower Administration worked on, was that strong military defense—a posture consistent with moral and economic sources of national strength—was of paramount importance.

That single leg of national strength—military strength—could never afford to become the weak leg of the stool. I well remember that statement that the then General Eisenhower made in New York City in June of 1945: "Weakness cannot cooperate with anybody; it can only surrender." This was a fundamental precept with him, much as it pained him to see billions of dollars spent on troops and weaponry that could, under happier conditions, be used for the betterment of mankind.

I would be foolish, moreover, to try to adapt the exact policies that worked for the Eisenhower Administration 12 years ago with the conditions of today. The 34th President was the epitome of flexibility in military thinking. As a young officer, only 5 years out of West Point, he and his friend, George S. Patton, Jr., both came to loggerheads with the Chiefs of their respective branches—Infantry and Cavalry—on the principle of massing of tanks. From those early days, his military thinking evolved with comparative ease to include vast armadas of land, sea and air—and eventually to hitherto-unknown weapons of mass destruction. President Eisenhower would be the last one to say that the policies he followed during the 1950s should be taken line-by-line and followed in the 1970s.

And yet, even considering the vast superiority that the United States held over the Communist world in his time, the figures regarding his force structure for Fiscal Year 1960 were dramatically higher than those in the McGovern proposals for Fiscal Year 1975:

	Eisenhower budget fiscal year 1960	McGovern proposals fiscal year 1975
Total outlays (billions).	75 (approximate 1975 dollars)	54.8 (1975 dollars).
Total active forces.	2.5 millions.	1.7 millions.
Army divisions.	14.	10.
Marine divisions.	3.	2.
Troops in Europe.	379,000.	130,000.
AF fighter/attack squadrons.	61.	54 (approximate).
Navy fighter/attack squadrons.	80.	20 (approximate).
Aircraft carriers.	23 (14 attack carriers).	6 (1).
CONUS air defense:		
SAMS.	4,400.	8 batteries.
Air Force fighter/ interceptor squadrons.	65.	5.
Economic and military aid.	4.0 (approximate 1975 dollars).	.4 (1975 dollars).

President Eisenhower was, to be sure, leery of committing ground forces on a large scale in SE Asia. What he would have done if faced with the situation that confronted President Kennedy in 1963 can be only a matter of conjecture for anyone. But the point is that he retained the flexibility to

apply American military strength whenever and wherever he felt it to his advantage. Witness the swiftness with which he moved 13,000 troops—both Army and Marine—to Lebanon on July 16, 1958. Could Senator McGovern's proposed force structure support such an operation?

It is true, as Senator McGovern says, that on the part of the Communist world, Senator McGovern, from what I read, feels differently. He cites the unilateral suspension of nuclear testing during 1958-1959; but I can assure the reader that this action was taken with great discomfort—and in the realization of the gigantic lead the United States then enjoyed in the quality of its nuclear weaponry. The actual philosophy Eisenhower expressed succinctly:

"Since an acceptable treaty for controlled disarmament was not realized, we continued to build an overpowering military establishment as the only feasible defense against the menace and probings of international Communism and as the indispensable platform from which to continue negotiations for a peaceful world."—*Waging Peace*, p. 483.

This line of thinking has been followed faithfully by the Nixon Administration and has begun to bear fruit.

Perhaps the most dramatic difference in viewpoint between President Eisenhower and Senator McGovern lies in the matter of our worldwide alliances, many of which are maintained by a program of Mutual Security (Foreign Aid). In Fiscal 1960, the administration asked Congress for funds in the amount of approximately \$4 billion (1975 value). Senator McGovern would cut this back to \$1.4 billion. Even while the President was fighting to obtain this sum—which he himself considered inadequate—one of his big opponents was the then Congressman George McGovern. By what stretch of the imagination, in examining this set of facts, can one consider McGovern as a "disciple" of Eisenhower?

These then are the differences. The only similarity in the military philosophy of McGovern and Eisenhower lay in the desire, shared by all, to keep military expenditures to the lowest level possible so that those funds can be used along more constructive channels. But the order of priorities places the two men poles apart.

Senator McGovern has courageously put forward his own views. He is entitled to do so and we should all be grateful that he has. But in listening to these views, let none of us be fooled by any self-serving association between George McGovern and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE IS GOING
MODERN

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on Postal Reorganization found in 1968 that the postal system:

Was not capable of meeting the—service—demands placed on it because of decades of low priorities assigned to modernization and management needs.

Congress responded to the crisis, in 1970, by creating the independent U.S. Postal Corporation, and giving it the mandate to "improve and modernize" the system.

The Postal Service is taking that mandate seriously. It has embarked on an

ambitious research and development program to computerize the crucial job of processing the mails.

Machines are being perfected that can process 43,200 letters an hour—a rate 43 times faster than conventional manual methods. And, of course, speed is of the essence: Our post offices must process some 250,000,000 pieces a day, or about 90 billion a year. Obviously, old methods cannot cope with such a tidal wave of mail.

I am especially pleased that Cincinnati, my hometown, was selected as the site of the prototype electronic post office. I have toured the facility and am encouraged by the great progress that is being made to develop new and better ways to move the Nation's mail.

I commend to you an article from the Cincinnati Enquirer which describes the program in accurate detail.

The article follows:

POSTAL ANNEX "CANCELS" BAG OF PROBLEMS
(By Dennis Doherty)

The U.S. Postal Service has just celebrated its first birthday, but there wasn't much of a party.

Irate postal customers skipped the traditional congratulatory card, and during its first year initiated 30,000 congressional inquiries wondering why a miracle had not occurred with the advent of the new system.

But if there was any celebrating in order, it should have been in Cincinnati where a new automated system, unique throughout the world, each day promises quicker and more accurate deliveries of love letters, legal contracts, valentines, and, of course, bills.

Two years ago Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.), chairman of the House Postal Service Subcommittee, steered postal reform through the House. A new law permitted the service to do what the old Post Office could not do: borrow for modern facilities and equipment, improve management-employee relations, adjust postal rates and appoint local post office officials.

With these new advantages, even Udall did not expect results delivered the same day. Postal customers expected an immediate, business-like postal system, and gave little thought to the fact that restructuring such a mammoth enterprise would be a success if it could show signs of progress within two or three years.

Cincinnati's contribution to that goal is running ahead of schedule.

That contribution functions 24 hours a day at the Postal Service's annex at Liberty and Dalton Sts. and sports the innocuous title, Letter Mail Code Sort System (LMCSS). And the system, which appears as complex as the Space Center during a Moon shot, pivots on one basic principle: the application of a machine-readable code upon the mail piece prior to or during insertion into the mail processing system so that all sorting operations can be performed with automated equipment.

In other words, your mailman can do a better job if he doesn't have to stand in front of those wooden pigeon holes and toss in each piece of mail before he delivers it.

The value of LMCSS is apparent when understood in the context of one of the Postal Service's primary goal—cost reduction. Manual distribution is one of the most costly factors in mailing a letter. In the Cincinnati metropolitan area, more than one billion letters, 129 million flat pieces of mail, 40 million parcels and 119 million assorted other pieces were handled for a total of 1.346 billion pieces of mail. That mail was for

2.235 million persons living in a 7277-mile-square area.

Manual sorting precludes efficiency at that level.

Coding the items so that a machine can sort them speedily and correctly promises efficiency.

At the annex, letters to be processed for the system are stacked in a storage and dispatch unit. In response to an automatic signal from a coding machine, letters are fed in batches via conveyor to one of 24 coding machines where a coding operator applies a special code to the address and keys the extracted code to the computer. The computer translates the extraction code to a pattern object code and causes that code to be printed on the envelope.

Coded letters are then dropped into pre-sort channels which carry the mail into another unit. Depending on the letter destination, the mail piece will be fed directly to a secondary distribution conveyor or to a stacker and sack rack.

The mail which goes to a secondary distribution conveyor is carried to a code reader. The reader scans the pattern code on the envelope and sends a signal to the computer. The computer translates the signal into a bin destination and causes the letter to be deposited into a particular pocket of the Letter Sorting Machine (LSM). The LSM can operate at a rate of 43,200 letters per hour. Manual sorting is rated at 1000 letters per hour.

Another device, an optical character reader, reads the bottom two address lines and encodes the mail. Coded letters are fed into a 30-channel diverter for presorting and those pieces requiring further sorting will be transported to the LSM.

The code placed on each letter represents the complete address information required to perform all subsequent sorting operations within the post office and in other offices. This means that a letter encoded in one city can be sorted in another city by the use of simple code readers.

The ultimate goal of the system is to provide a carrier sequencer operation. This equipment receives mail for local delivery that has been decoded and sorted by the letter sorting machine for the carrier. The sequencer sorts each carrier's mail in the order that he delivers his route.

Despite the preponderance of machinery zipping letters through channels like slot car racers, the system can be speeded up with customer participation. Pre-printing the bar code on envelopes by companies with a large mail volume is one way, according to Joseph Scanlon, Cincinnati Postmaster.

"We have more than 50 Cincinnati firms preprinting their bar code (the small imprint) resembling a pocket comb with broken teeth appearing in the lower right hand corner of the envelope) on the mail, and the results have been gratifying."

Automation of the Cincinnati district's postal facilities started about five years ago and the savings have been great, said Scanlon. Annual labor savings amount to approximately \$5 million under 1967 costs without counting the volume increase which has averaged 2% a year.

Scanlon said the department has not been able to realize the actual \$5 million annual savings because there have been salary increases during the five-year period. Five years ago there were slightly more than 6000 postal employees in the district and this number has been reduced to about 4800.

The sophisticated machinery pays for itself in short order, he said, the larger machines in 1½ to two years and the smaller ones in a year.

Another method of precoding uses a computer and computer-driven printers to prepare addresses. Since the rules employed in determining the code for a particular address

are constant, these rules could be retained in a computer program which generates the binary code whenever an address is printed. Depending upon the individual mailer's software-hardware configuration, bar code generation could be repeated each time an address is to be printed, or on a one-time basis with the codes developed and stored on tape with the addresses.

Scanlon points out that 80% of the mail is generated by business and more and more mailers are using computers in the preparation of mail. It is estimated that more than 50% of the total letter mail may eventually be a candidate for precoding by the customer.

The postal service has allocated a budget of approximately \$80 million for fiscal 1973 for developmental and engineering activities to fund programs designed to improve mechanized postal operations and further develop the LMCSS.

Troops of congressmen and scores of government officials from other countries have visited the annex to check the brightest light in the new business called the U.S. Postal Service.

Scanlon doesn't pretend to understand the technology of the system. "But I understand the value of the system and I can see the results," he says. "The best is yet to come and that should not be too far away."

LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, this body will act on legislation which substantially increases our Nation's commitment to ending the tragedy of lead-based paint poisoning. Passage of this legislation is of the utmost importance, for it extends and broadens the provisions of Public Law 91-695, the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act.

Countless statistical reports have pointed out the cold, hard facts witnessing to the lethal presence of this silent killer: over 2,000,000 children are presently living as "risks" in houses whose construction has deteriorated to the point where it is regarded as a threat to those children's health; approximately 400,000 of these children have abnormally high lead blood contents. A mere fraction of these will be reached in time to receive medical attention, yet thousands will still be left mentally retarded. Of the original sample, 200 will die.

This situation points to the need for unequivocal action. While the House has passed appropriations under Public Law 91-695 for fiscal year 1973 totalling \$12 million, the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported out a figure of \$16 million. Even so, on June 14, the Senate passed S. 3080, which authorizes \$100 million annually for this measure, and the House Committee on Banking and Currency is considering an authorization of \$50 million per year. All the while, New York City's Lead-Poisoning Control Bureau has had to attack lead poisoning without any Federal assistance. The city's 2-year-old program represents a courageous start, but we must also do

our part. Congress enacted legislation to deal with this problem, but the program threatens to serve as nothing more than an empty promise in the absence of adequate funding.

Mr. Speaker, the task we have before us is not as easy as toying with dollar signs. The complexity of the lead-based paint poisoning problem necessitates a close working relationship between the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Housing and Urban Development. Prevention of this disease is a necessary adjunct to any program aimed merely at treating poisoned victims. Consequently, we must dedicate ourselves to eliminating the housing conditions which have allowed this epidemic to spread.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation's role in conquering polio stands out as a landmark achievement in the field of medical science. As indicated in medical records, however, the incidence of childhood lead poisoning is now far more widespread than was polio, even at its peak. What we, as a Nation, did at that time to arrest the spread of a rampaging childhood disease, we must now do once again.

PREPAREDNESS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, during last month's floods, there were many courageous individuals who risked their lives to save the lives and property of others, and I believe everyone living in the Washington, D.C., area owes these people a vote of thanks.

In a recent WMAL editorial, that station paid tribute to these valiant policemen, firemen, rescue workers, and public works employees, and I now insert that editorial in the Record:

PREPAREDNESS

WMAL reporters who covered the chaotic predawn hours of June 22 can attest to the skill, stamina, and frequent bravery with which police, fire-and-rescue crews, and public-works employees battled the pitch-dark swelling of area streams. Police sloshed through the vortex of trouble spots, warning and evacuating slumbering residents. Fire-and-rescue missions saved dozens of people from drowning and electrocution. Public-works crews raced floodwaters to plant life-saving barricades and rescued their share of trapped people themselves. At emergency-operations headquarters, rank-and-file officers calmed a populace that was still shuddering at reports from Rapid City. Command officials—captains and lieutenants at first—risked second-guessing and took a firm stand, advising the evacuation of residents living near threatened dams.

Only one flaw crept into this outstanding preparedness: Little forethought had been given flood-evacuation sites, particularly in lower Montgomery County, where some low-lying schools were at first selected and other locations hustled up with frantic phone calls. A flooded school packed with 1,000 families would have been a tragedy indeed.

That single flaw aside, the men who fought Agnes' drenching rains deserve our undying gratitude.

CXVIII—1658—Part 20

POSTAL SERVICE CAMPAIGNS FOR IMPROVEMENT

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Postal Service is undertaking a campaign of its own in this election year. After 1 year under new, nonpolitical management the U.S. Postal Service is striving to improve service levels. In its "Serving America" campaign, the Postal Service is asking its customers for suggestions, training clerks to better handle inquiries and establishing new service and delivery standards.

The new program has been outlined in a recent article appearing in the Wall Street Journal. I call this to the attention of my colleagues and wish the Postal Service well in its endeavors to improve this country's mail service. Included as a part of my remarks is the article from the July 31, 1972, Wall Street Journal: *POSTAL SERVICE AIMS TO CONVINCE AMERICANS SERVICE HAS IMPROVED*

(By Timothy D. Schellhardt)

WASHINGTON.—The Postal Service is launching its own election-year campaign, complete with catchy slogan, buttons and snappy campaign literature.

Its aim: To win the vote of more than 50 million U.S. families, convincing them that mail service provided by the year-old semi-independent agency has improved from that of its predecessor, the Cabinet-level Post Office Department.

Postal officials concede that their first year in office, which ended June 30, didn't attract many endorsements of the service's claim that mail deliveries are speedier. Indeed, mail pickup and delivery services have deteriorated in several parts of the country.

But that was last year, "It's a new ball game," asserted J. T. Ellington Jr., assistant postmaster general for planning and the chief lieutenant behind the current public relations campaign.

Its theme is "Serving America," a slogan mail users will see a lot of in the coming months. Already it's emblazoned in red, white and blue on thousands of black buttons worn by postal employees. "Serving America" posters are appearing in most of the nation's 32,000 Post Offices and the slogan may even become a central theme for an advertising drive the service is considering.

NO SHORTAGE OF PROMISES

The campaign isn't short of promises, either. Mr. Ellington declares the services will (and already has begun to):

Expand evening mailbox collection services.

Improve air mail delivery performances.

Listen to mail user comments about service through questionnaires and comment cards placed in lobbies and through periodic consumer surveys.

Renovate 6,000 post office lobbies by painting them in bright green, blue or orange colors, and installing central kiosk-type information centers in the larger post offices.

The service also is taking its campaign to its 700,000 employees. A documentary film, currently in preparation, will depict the role employees play in getting mail delivered on time. A special magazine, underscoring the "Serving America" theme, will be sent to each employee home, and merit awards honoring employees achieving specific performance goals will be increased. Performance records show-

ing service and efficiency will be posted frequently at many post offices.

In addition, the service's 58,000 window clerks—renamed "customer representatives"—are completing a special two-day training session to help them better handle inquiries, complaints and telephone requests. The window clerks have been given individual name tags for their uniforms. And their familiar military-type uniforms are expected to be replaced soon with sportier outfits.

SERVICE IS OUR ONLY BUSINESS

The Postal Service, which also has begun a \$500 million cost-reduction program in hopes of avoiding another round of postage increases, "wants to make damn sure that service doesn't deteriorate as our cost-paring drive continues," asserts Mr. Ellington. "This campaign simply will make the message clear: Service is our only business," he adds.

Early in August, the service will mail to more than 50 million families a pamphlet telling them how to get faster mail service. The brochure, for example, indicates that letters traveling more than 150 miles will be delivered faster if they're sent air mail. (September is being designated "Air Mail Month" with the service joining with several airlines to promote mailing by air.)

The pamphlet indirectly admits to mail users that the Postal Service has sharply reduced mail collection service in recent years. It discloses that new mailboxes, labeled "one-star" and "two-star," have been designated since July 1 in most communities. The "one-star" mailbox has a last collection pickup generally at 5 p.m. daily, while the "two-star" boxes have later pickups between 6:30 p.m. and 8 p.m. Only two or three years ago most mailboxes promised such late-night pickups.

Mr. Ellington says the designated star mailboxes will practically assure that local letters mailed by the last pickup will be delivered the next day. The star boxes also will assure mail pickups on Sunday and holidays, a service that has been curtailed at many non-star boxes.

The service will announce other improvement programs in the coming months, Mr. Ellington promises. Included will be service standards for various types of mail, including parcel post.

Those of us who have supported the aims of the Postal Service Corporation are encouraged with this campaign. Mr. Speaker, we applaud their efforts; we champion their endeavors; and we wish to cooperate with them in every possible way to improve the activities of the Postal Service.

HON. BILL FRENZEL'S VOTING RECORD

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of requests from my constituents concerning my voting record in the second session of the 92d Congress. In order to make this information readily available for my constituents, I am submitting for the Record my votes in the second session of the 92d Congress.

A voting record does not tell the entire story of a Congressman's activities in Congress, but, it is a useful guide. I hope it will be of help to interested parties:

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—92D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily record	Description	Member's response	Roll No.	Date	Page in daily record	Description	Member's response
1	Jan. 18, 1972	H 1	Call of the House	Present.	104	do	H 2942	H.R. 13324 (on passage)	Yea.
2	do	H 24	H.R. 8787 (on passage)	Yea.	105	do	H 2950	H.R. 13188 (on passage)	Yea.
3	Jan. 19, 1972	H 85	Call of the House	Present.	106	Apr. 12, 1972	H 2991	H.R. 13336 (on passage)	Yea.
4	do	H 99	S. 382 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	107	Apr. 17, 1972	H 3057	Call of the House	Present.
5	Jan. 25, 1972	H 246	S. Res. 765 (on agree to res.)	Yea.	108	do	H 3086	H. Con. Res. 471 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
6	do	H 251	S. 2819 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	109	do	H 3100	H.R. 13752 (motion to suspend)	Nay.
7	Jan. 26, 1972	H 323	Call of the House	Present.	110	do	H 3105	Call of the House	Present.
8	do	H 338	H.R. 6957 (on passage)	Yea.	111	Apr. 18, 1972	H 3196	do	Do.
9	Jan. 27, 1972	H 372	Call of the House	Present.	112	do	H 3220	H.R. 45 (motion to recommit)	Nay.
10	do	H 380	H.R. 8085 (on passage)	Nay.	113	Apr. 19, 1972	H 3272	Call of the House	Present.
11	Jan. 31, 1972	H 411	Call of the House	Present.	114	do	H 3294	H.R. 10488 (on amendment)	Yea.
12	do	H 420	H.R. 10086 (on passage)	Yea.	115	do	H 3300	H.R. 10488 (on passage)	Yea.
13	Feb. 1, 1972	H 459	H. Res. 786 (on agree to res.)	Yea.	116	Apr. 20, 1972	H 3354	H.R. 14070 (resolve to committee)	Yea.
14	do	H 474	S. 748 (on passage)	Yea.	117	do	H 3355	Call in committee	Present.
15	do	H 480	S. 749 (on passage)	Yea.	118	do	H 3377	do	Do.
16	do	H 487	S. 210 (on amendment)	Not voting.	119	do	H 3388	H.R. 14070 (on passage)	Yea.
17	do	H 489	S. 210 (on passage)	Yea.	120	Apr. 25, 1972	H 3490	Call of the House	Present.
18	Feb. 2, 1972	H 571	H.R. 7987 (on passage)	Yea.	121	do	H 3507	H.R. 14108 (on passage)	Yea.
19	do	H 580	Call in committee	Present.	122	Apr. 26, 1972	H 3542	Call of the House	Present.
20	do	H 584	H.R. 11394 (on amendment)	Nay.	123	do	H 3628	H. Res. 918 (motion to table)	Yea.
21	Feb. 3, 1972	H 676	Call of the House	Present.	124	do	H 3656	H.R. 14582 (on passage)	Yea.
22	do	H 678	do	Do.	125	Apr. 27, 1972	H 3702	Call in committee	Absent.
23	do	H 709	H.R. 12089 (on amendment)	Nay.	126	do	H 3707	do	Do.
24	do	H 711	H.R. 12089 (on passage)	Yea.	127	do	H 3723	H.R. 12202 (on amendment)	Nay.
25	Feb. 7, 1972	H 751	Call of the House	Present.	128	do	H 3724	do	Yea.
26	do	H 758	S. 1857 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	129	do	H 3725	H.R. 12202 (on passage)	Nay.
27	do	H 784	S. 1163 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	130	May 1, 1972	H 3775	S. 2713 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
28	do	H 790	H.R. 7083 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	131	do	H 3784	H.R. 12652 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
29	do	H 797	H.R. 12186 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	132	do	H 3785	H.R. 9676 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
30	do	H 807	H.R. 12741 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	133	do	H 3790	H.R. 13334 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
31	Feb. 8, 1972	H 839	Call of the House	Present.	134	May 3, 1972	H 4013	H.R. 13591 (on passage)	Yea.
32	do	H 855	do	Do.	135	do	H 4023	H.R. 13089 (on passage)	Yea.
33	do	H 864	H. Res. 164 (on agree to res.)	Yea.	136	May 4, 1972	H 4118	H.J. Res. 1174 (on passage)	Yea.
34	do	H 886	H.R. 10243 (on passage)	Nay.	137	May 8, 1972	H 4194	Call of the House	Present.
35	Feb. 9, 1972	H 955	Call of the House	Present.	138	do	H 4211	H.R. 14718 (on passage)	Nay.
36	do	H 969	Call in committee	Do.	139	May 9, 1972	H 4274	H.J. Res. 55 (on passage)	Yea.
37	do	H 986	H.R. 12910 (on passage)	Yea.	140	do	H 4285	H.R. 4383 (on passage)	Yea.
38	do	H 990	Call of the House	Present.	141	May 10, 1972	H 4340	H.R. 9112 (agree to conference report)	Nay.
39	do	H 994	H. Res. 796 (on agree to res.)	Yea.	142	do	H 4354	H. Res. 968 (agree to resolution)	Yea.
40	do	H 1010	H. J. Res. 1925 (on passage)	Yea.	143	May 11, 1972	H 4424	S. 659 (motion to table)	Yea.
41	Feb. 16, 1972	H 1057	Call of the House	Present.	144	do	H 4425	S. 659 (motion to instruct)	Nay.
42	do	H 1066	Call in committee	Do.	145	do	H 4435	H.R. 7130 (on amendment)	Nay.
43	Feb. 17, 1972	H 1205	Call of the House	Do.	146	do	H 4441	do	Nay.
44	do	H 1207	Call in committee	Do.	147	do	H 4444	do	Nay.
45	do	H 1221	H.R. 12350 (on amendment)	Nay.	148	do	H 4454	do	Yea.
46	do	H 1233	H.R. 12350 (on passage)	Yea.	149	do	H 4455	H.R. 7130 (on passage)	Yea.
47	Feb. 22, 1972	H 1296	Call of the House	Present.	150	May 15, 1972	H 4490	Call of the House	Present.
48	Feb. 23, 1972	H 1330	do	Do.	151	do	H 4497	H.R. 7378 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
49	do	H 1353	H.R. 12931 (on amendment)	Yea.	152	do	H 4499	H.J. Res. 812 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
50	Feb. 24, 1972	H 1430	Call of the House	Present.	153	May 16, 1972	H 4563	Call of the House	Present.
51	do	H 1437	H.R. 12067 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	154	do	H 4579	Call in committee	Do.
52	do	H 1440	H.R. 12067 (on amendment)	Yea.	155	May 17, 1972	H 4643	H.R. 14582 (agree to conference report)	Yea.
53	Feb. 29, 1972	H 1499	Call of the House	Present.	156	do	H 4645	H.R. 14582 (motion to concur)	Yea.
54	do	H 1527	Call in committee	Do.	157	do	H 4654	H.R. 14734 (on passage)	Yea.
55	do	H 1539	H.R. 11021 (on passage)	Yea.	158	May 18, 1972	H 4685	Call of the House	Present.
56	Mar. 1, 1972	H 1610	Call of the House	Present.	159	do	H 4685	H.R. 14989 (on amendment)	Yea.
57	do	H 1619	H. Res. 849 (on agree to res.)	Yea.	160	do	H 4701	do	Not voting.
58	do	H 1627	H. Res. 847 (on agree to res.)	Yea.	161	do	H 4708	do	Do.
59	Mar. 2, 1972	H 1684	Call of the House	Present.	162	do	H 4717	H.R. 14989 (on amendment)	Yea.
60	do	H 1692	H.R. 11384 (on passage)	Yea.	163	do	H 4721	do	Nay.
61	Mar. 6, 1972	H 1755	Call of the House	Present.	164	do	H 4722	do	Nay.
62	do	H 1760	H.R. 2589 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	165	May 22, 1972	H 4750	Call of the House	Present.
63	do	H 1779	H.R. 12828 (motion to suspend)	Do.	166	do	H 4771	H.R. 6788 (on passage)	Yea.
64	Mar. 8, 1972	H 1838	Call of the House	Present.	167	do	H 4788	H.R. 11627 (on passage)	Not voting.
65	do	H 1851	S. 659 (motion to table)	Yea.	168	May 23, 1972	H 4831	Call of the House	Present.
66	do	H 1860	S. 659 (motion to recommit)	Nay.	169	do	H 4924	H.R. 15093 (on passage)	Yea.
67	do	H 1870	H.R. 1746 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	170	May 24, 1972	H 4954	H. Res. 991 (on agree to res.)	Yea.
68	do	H 1875	H.R. 11624 (on passage)	Do.	171	do	H 4974	H.R. 15097 (on passage)	Yea.
69	Mar. 9, 1972	H 1899	Call of the House	Present.	172	May 30, 1972	H 5056	Call of the House	Absent.
70	do	H 1931	H.R. 10420 (on passage)	Yea.	173	do	H 5084	H.R. 9669 (on passage)	Nay.
71	Mar. 13, 1972	H 1961	Call of the House	Absent.	174	May 31, 1972	H 5103	Call of the House	Present.
72	do	H 1968	H.R. 12410 (on passage)	Yea.	175	do	H 5112	do	Do.
73	Mar. 14, 1972	H 2007	H.J. Res. 1097 (on passage)	Present.	176	June 1, 1972	H 5141	Call in committee	Do.
74	Mar. 15, 1972	H 2033	Call of the House	Present.	177	do	H 5152	H.R. 13918 (on amendment)	Nay.
75	do	H 2035	do	Do.	178	do	H 5159	do	Nay.
76	do	H 2038	H.R. 12910 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	179	do	H 5162	do	Nay.
77	do	H 2064	H.R. 11417 (on amendment)	Nay.	180	do	H 5165	do	Yea.
78	do	H 2065	H.R. 11417 (on passage)	Yea.	181	do	H 5168	do	Yea.
79	Mar. 16, 1972	H 2112	S. 2097 (agree to conference report)	Do.	182	do	H 5169	H.R. 13918 (on passage)	Yea.
80	Mar. 20, 1972	H 2238	H.R. 8395 (motion to suspend)	Do.	183	do	H 5173	H. Res. 965 (on agree to res.)	Yea.
81	do	H 2240	H.R. 11948 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	184	June 5, 1972	H 5214	Call of the House	Present.
82	Mar. 20, 1972	H 2245	H.R. 4174 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	185	do	H 5219	S. 1736 (agree to conference representatives)	Yea.
83	Mar. 21, 1972	H 2273	Call of the House	Present.	186	do	H 5242	H.R. 12674 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
84	do	H 2295	H.R. 13120 (on passage)	Yea.	187	do	H 5248	H.R. 10310 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
85	Mar. 22, 1972	H 2325	Call of the House	Present.	188	do	H 5250	H.R. 14731 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
86	do	H 2348	Call in committee	Do.	189	do	H 5253	H.R. 14106 (motion to suspend)	Yea.
87	do	H 2349	H.R. 13592 (on passage)	Yea.	190	June 6, 1972	H 5276	Call of the House	Present.
88	Mar. 23, 1972	H 2423	Call of the House	Yea.	191	June 7, 1972	H 5316	Call in committee	Do.
89	do	H 2442	H.R. 13955 (on passage)	Yea.	192	do	H 5324	H.R. 15259 (on passage)	Yea.
90	Mar. 27, 1972	H 2475	Call of the House	Present.	193	do	H 5349	H.R. 14990 (on passage)	Yea.
91	Mar. 28, 1972	H 2583	do	Do.	194	June 8, 1972	H 5393	Call of the House	Present.
92	do	H 2616	H.R. 11896 (on amendment)	Yea.	195	do	H 5446	S. 659 (agree to conference representative)	Yea.
93	do	H 2621	do	Yea.	196	do	H 5463	H. Res. 995 (on agree to res.)	Yea.
94	do	H 2632	do	Nay.	197	June 12, 1972	H 5470	H.R. 10792 (on passage)	Yea.
95	do	H 2637	do	Yea.	198	do	H 5491	H.R. 12846 (on passage)	Yea.
96	Mar. 29, 1972	H 2718	Call of the House	Present.	199	June 13, 1972	H 5537	Call in committee	Present.
97	do	H 2731	H.R. 11896 (on amendment)	Nay.	200	do	H 5551	H.R. 15418 (on passage)	Yea.
98	do	H 2738	do	Yea.	201	June 14, 1972	H 5584	H.R. 15417 (resolve to committee)	Yea.
99	do	H 2741	do	Yea.	202	do	H 5605	Call in committee	Present.
100	do	H 2745	do	Yea.	203	do	H 5667	H.R. 15417 (on amendment)	Nay.
101	do	H 2773	H.R. 11896 (on passage)	Yea.	204	June 15, 1972	H 5669	do	Yea.
102	Apr. 11, 1972	H 2927	Call of the House	Present.					
103	do	H 2936	H.R. 9552 (on passage)	Yea.					

HON. BILL FRENZEL

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily record	Description	Member's response	Roll No.	Date	Page in daily record	Description	Member's response
1205	do	H 5681	H.R. 15417 (on amendment)	Nay.	213	June 21, 1972	H 5864	do	Present.
1206	do	H 5693	do	Not voting.	214	do	H 5876	H. Res. 996 (on previous question)	Yea.
207	do	H 5712	H.R. 15417 (motion to recommit)	Do.	215	do	H 5881	Call in committee	Present.
208	do	H 5713	H.R. 15417 (on passage)	NVF. ²	216	do	H 5883	do	Do.
209	June 19, 1972	H 5743	Call of the House	Present.	217	June 21, 1972	H 5884	do	Do.
210	do	H 5752	H.R. 13694 (motion to suspend)	Yea.	218	June 22, 1972	H 5985	Call of the House	Do.
211	do	H 5767	S. 3343 (motion to suspend)	Do.	219	do	H 5987	H.R. 14370 (motion to recommit)	Nay.
212	June 20, 1972	H 5782	Call of the House	Absent.	220	do	H 5988	H.R. 14370 (on passage)	Yea.

¹ Indicates recorded teller vote.² NVF—Present not voting (paired for).

ORDER OF AHEPA CELEBRATES ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the Order of Ahepa on the occasion of its 50th anniversary and to call to the attention of my colleagues the many contributions this order and its members have made to the betterment of American life.

The word "AHEPA," Mr. Speaker, stands for "American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association." It was founded July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Ga. It is composed of four separate organizations, each with its separate function but all working in harmony toward the order's goals. These four organizations are: The Order of Ahepa, the Daughters of Penelope—senior women's auxiliary, the Sons of Pericles—junior young men's auxiliary, and the Maids of Athena—junior young women's auxiliary.

I take great personal pride in bringing to your attention the record of accomplishments of this organization.

During World War II, AHEPA members sold \$500 million in U.S. war bonds, demonstrating their faith and trust in the wartime cause of this Nation.

When hurricanes struck the Florida coast, destroying homes and devastating whole communities, AHEPA raised money, food, and clothes which were rushed to the victims. And this action was not unique for AHEPA. Wherever natural disaster strikes at home or abroad, AHEPA is there with help: Kansas City flood, Corinth earthquake, Ecuadorian relief, Mississippi flood, Greek war orphans—the list goes on and on, from one humanitarian effort to another throughout the world.

But, while aid to natural and man-made disaster victims is probably the most visible of AHEPA's work, by far the more important effort made by the order is in the field of education.

One of AHEPA's goals is "To champion the cause of education, and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning." How fitting a goal for the race of people who gave us Pericles, Demosthenes, Aristotle, the golden age of poetry, art, music, and sculpture, the wonderful myths, legends, and heroic epics, to say nothing of the lasting architectural beauty of the Acropolis, the Parthenon, and all the

other perfectly proportioned structures of ancient Greece.

For 41 years AHEPA has awarded local, district, and national scholarships to worthy students. At St. Basil's Academy in Garrison, N.Y., stand the AHEPA Hall for Boys and the Ahepa School, both donated by the order. The seven-volume set of the Greek classics is donated by AHEPA chapters to high school and college libraries. More than 40,000 American books have been donated to schools and libraries in Greece by AHEPA, and every year the order offers summer studies in Greece to American students through the Ahepa educational journey to Greece programs.

Mr. James Pavlakos, president of the Albuquerque chapter of AHEPA, informs me that it was the Order of Ahepa that purchased the land in 1944 on which the Greek Community Center now stands—a lasting monument to the work of New Mexico members of the order. AHEPA has been in existence for 43 years in our State, Mr. Speaker, and its members include some of New Mexico's most outstanding and public-spirited citizens.

The local chapters of AHEPA are always active in civic affairs and projects, following the order's program of urging its members to be model citizens through planned civic activity. And, while I am certain that all members of the order are proud of the fact that our great Vice President SPIRO AGNEW is a member of AHEPA, I think all Americans should be proud to have this outstanding organization in our midst, working for all that is fine and good in this great democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and all Americans to rise in salute to this fine order and to congratulate its members on the golden anniversary of AHEPA.

E. E. "RED" COX RETIRES

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a dedicated and able friend, E. E. "Red" Cox, has retired following an exceptional career in the Federal service.

For 20 years, Red Cox was the chief aide to Hon. Albert Rains of Gadsden, Ala., and was involved in many details that went into the planning and enactment of much of the legislation which has advanced this Nation's housing pro-

grams and the regulation of the banking industry.

Red was quick to grasp the problems which were presented and responded clearly with a feasible solution. He rendered valuable service to Representative Rains, the people of Alabama, and the Nation.

His intimate knowledge of the laws relating to banks, the soundness of their management and financial condition has been engaged in the public interest in recent years in his work as special assistant to the Comptroller of the Currency, the position from which he is retiring.

Before his service with Congressman Rains, Red Cox had been associated with the Government in the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency from 1933 to 1937 and in the Federal Housing Administration from 1937 until 1945.

In all of his work, he has demonstrated both industry and excellence. He has dedicated himself to the highest standards of public service.

As he retires, he has my commendation for a job well done and my best wishes for every success in the years ahead.

COLORADO'S POET LAUREATE

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the State of Colorado has the distinction of celebrating the centennial of its admission to the Union in the same year that all Americans will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of the United States of America.

When Colorado became a State on August 1, 1876, it was known as the Centennial State in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the United States.

Now as Colorado nears its own 100th anniversary, the State's Poet Laureate, Mr. Milford E. Shields of Durango, has written two poems, one to mark the U.S. Bicentennial and the other to mark the State's centennial.

The poems follow:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BICENTENNIAL

July 4, 1976

The Jamestown start, the onward years of time,

The virile rhythm and the holy rhyme;

The land of liberty, the country just,

The destiny of peoples and the trust.

The group assembled of the sons of faith,

The issue joined, the pledges upto death
Of lives and fortunes, sacred honor all,
The fields of blood, the country's bugle call.
The symbol of the flag to lead them through,
The spirit of the Red, the White, the Blue
Was written in our Constitution's light,
Our witness and our covenant of right.
The decades that are history are ours,
Dimensions, depths and properties and
pow'rs;
In time's full tide we have progressed and
won

A brighter place in all the nation's sun.
Now we have walked upon the heaven's moon
In full technocracy and moral tune;
Two centuries of God's expanding time
Have made our flag, our nation glow sublime.

COLORADO CENTENNIAL August 1, 1976

One hundred years ago our mountain gold
Was coined into our State bright to behold;
We were Centennial's true offering
To our United States, our golden thing.

Our decades and our issues and our men
Had forged and fashioned solid times again;
Our mountains and our plains formed bul-
warks great
And they were forged into our Four Square
State.

For ten decades we have moved surely on,
Each day has been an even brighter dawn;
We've played our part in honor and in pride,
Our Trust of Statehood has been justified.

One hundred years of dedicated time
Have made our star upon the flag sublime;
Look at our Capitol and there behold
Its dome, our witness, sealed in purest gold.

SUPPORTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I feel the time has come for a statement to be made supporting Members of Congress who, as elections draw closer, are once again feeling the piercing edge of the public sword wielded by those citizens we so diligently serve. This battle casts us as flamboyant ne'er-do-wells who are unresponsive to constituents, too difficult to see, too liberal, too conservative, too stupid, or too smart. As the public eye changes focus, so does our image in that vision.

If the average citizen could spend just 1 week performing the duties of a Congressman, he would be truly amazed. As he attends the never-ending meetings, meets the onslaught of invitations for personal appearance, keeps informed on current legislation and events, and receives the criticism and rare plaudits of his constituency, he would be overjoyed at the prospect of returning to his 5-day 40-hour week. For he would soon learn that once a person accepts the responsibilities of a Member of Congress he is on call from the public 24 hours per day, 7 days a week.

In 1936, Congressman Maury Maverick authored a timely description of the life of a Congressman, the text of which appeared in the August issue of Ameri-

can Heritage. The contents of this article, which follow, could easily have been authored by any of us here today:

WHAT MADE MAURY RUN (By Barbara S. Kraft)

(NOTE.—In December, 1936, Oswald Garrison Villard, longtime liberal editor of The Nation, wrote his friend Representative Maury Maverick (1895-1954), of San Antonio, Texas, that he wanted to inform the public of the congressional burdens caused by the New Deal's economic emphasis. He asked that Maverick's secretary send him a statistical breakdown of a week in the life of a congressman.)

(Deeply devoted to his job, the brash and boisterous Maverick had already, in the first of the two terms he would serve, won a national reputation by ignoring the protocol of silence observed by freshmen in the House. He had no patience with hypocrisy or with official language that obfuscated issues, for which he coined the word gobbledygook. He was intensely proud of his colonial heritage, of his grandfather who had signed the Texas Declaration of Independence; and he saw, as his historic mission, the safeguarding of individuals' rights and the nation's natural resources. This same grandfather, Samuel Maverick, according to a frequently repeated legend, added a word to the English language when, probably through an oversight of his slaves, he failed to brand a small herd of cattle in his possession. Thereafter, "maverick" was the common name for an unbranded animal, and in time the word stood for a politician independent of party control. Maury Maverick, both in Congress and in a term as mayor of San Antonio, from 1939 to 1941, lived up to the name.)

(The secretary's report indicated that Congressman Maverick received 150 letters and forty callers daily, attended up to six weekly committee meetings, and was often at his desk late into the night. During adjournment, there was some surcease, though the office seekers increased and the phone never stopped ringing. But the secretary's simple listing of statistics didn't tell of the "pangs and pains" or the "emotional strain" the congressman endures, so Maverick took pen to paper and did the job himself.)

In the first place, no one ever talks to a Congressman unless they are either unemployed, angry, or in a state of defeat. The "successful" men have no time to talk to a Congressman, and you receive no visits from your friends, because your office is always packed and jammed with unfortunate people demanding immediate attention. You are constantly besieged to make speeches, and you are supposed to make facetious remarks and tell two or three jokes—generally jokes which are wholly outside of the realm of thought—and then to make a very grave speech, complimenting the group you address.

It is impossible for a Congressman to walk down the street, even with his wife and children, or with his best friends or associates. Leaving the Maverick Building and going to the St. Anthony Hotel, which is only two short blocks, I am frequently stopped as many as ten or twenty times. Each person starts out by saying: "Congressman. Can I see you just a minute?" or "You're the hardest man to find in town. I've been trying to get you for six weeks." Or similar approaches. In biting cold weather, and already late, it is necessary to listen to a long story which has no point, with a great mass of irrelevant data—all of which could have been handled as a routine matter by my secretary in the first place.

Point: There is absolutely no time for the average Congressman to study, make research, and improve his mind. His secretarial staff is insufficient for the amount of work.

With large numbers of people calling all the time, the telephone ringing incessantly, and work to be done, the physical part of the task, the simple administrative duties, simply weight the Congressman down. It is perfectly natural, therefore, for Congressmen to break under the impact and give up entirely using their own brains.

Second point: Democracy is likely to break down of its own weight. After great hullabaloo, accusations and counter-accusations, a man is elected to office. Then the people prevent him from doing his duty. Strangely enough, in reference to Congressmen, the people have no respect at all for each other. Attempting to talk to one constituent means nothing to another—he will break in and start talking about his own affairs. I know that this is not the plight of the lawyer, businessman, or average citizen who is "prominent"—because before I was in Congress people talked to me one at a time.

Historical psychological background (in deep confidence): In times past, the royalty had a touch of magic. There is no royalty now, and no one to settle a man's problems. If he is a Catholic, he can go to a priest for confession and, I understand, get some consolation. But if he wants a pension, is out of a job, has been fired, has been given a dishonorable discharge from the Army and wants to get back in, is going to lose his home because he hasn't paid anything on his HOLC loan since he made it some 12 to 16 months before, or wants a job for a "friend," or has anything the matter with him at all, the only person who will even speak to him, or whom he can speak to, is the degraded remnant of royalty—the Congressman. Hence, no Congressman can walk down the streets of his home town naturally. He cannot stop at a shop window, because he will be pinched, slapped on the back, or jerked away and asked questions and told views until he gives up in disgust, calls a taxicab and hides his head so he can get home and get away from it all.

As for Washington, the situation is not quite as bad, but there comes all day long cranks of all kinds who have a "plan" to solve the depression, or a fool-proof "pension system," and most of them are good people who have some hold on you and you have to speak to them. I have an additional burden, and this is true of all Congressmen who are unfortunate enough to have Revolutionary, 1812, Mexican War, and Civil War relatives. Thank God there are no Abolitionists in my family, or I would break under the strain. But there are plenty of others—I think I have you beat by several generations of them.

Then in Washington life, it has a feature which is disgusting. You are invited to a supper, and frequently an important one. It is supposed to start at seven, and it starts at eight. It's supposed to close at nine, but then everyone makes a speech, it is impossible to get away, and sometimes they last until eleven or twelve o'clock. You go home, having eaten too much, smoked too much, and listened too much tiresome bull; you sleep too late; get to your office late. You can't get in on account of the people blocking the door waiting to see you, and you have a mass of correspondence which you probably don't answer in the morning and which is deferred until that night. You get behind further and further.

When any man makes a speech who has some self-respect, he has to make research. This is almost impossible, and so you send to the Library to get your books. You, of course, cannot read a speech, because Congressmen don't listen, anyway, which necessitates an extreme familiarity with your subject if you talk without manuscript. The result is frequently slipshod speeches.

I hand you herewith a typical example of

correspondence which I received this morning—one of my friends, whom I have known for twenty-five years, suggests that I lack sincerity because I disagree with him on the Supreme Court. I have written him a very sharp letter and have told him to mind his own business—but the customary thing for most Congressmen is to write a letter and say they appreciate the suggestion, and so on. I can truthfully state the following, of every Congressman:

Republican, or Democrat, he works harder than any two businessmen.

He is above average, and I do not believe there is a single Member of Congress who would accept a bribe in money in any sum.

He is generally a better representative than his constituents deserve.

His health is bad because of his constant application to work, and statistics show that Congressmen die of acute indigestion, heart trouble of various kinds, such as coronary thrombosis, also arterio-sclerosis, and diseases due to improper diet.

He really wants to learn, study and apply himself, but conditions of being a modern messenger boy simply make it impossible.

Very truly yours,

MAURY MAVERICK,
Member of Congress.

THE AMERICAN CREED

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to read in my Park Cities News that they included the American Creed as a special news item. At the top of page 3 they quoted the American Creed just as it is written.

Ed Wilson, the editor of the Park Cities News, believes the American Creed is news and a story we should reread. The publishers, Clarence Stark and Mike Anderson, have built the Park Cities News based on sound American fundamentals.

Today we have many Americans who do not pause to appreciate how fortunate they are to be Americans. America has a challenge from within, as the people themselves give up more and more of their liberty as they vest more centralized power in Washington.

It is great to have editors like Ed Wilson of the Park Cities News down in Dallas, Tex. We still believe in prayer in schools, and the American Creed in every home.

Here is the American Creed as presented in the Park Cities News:

THE AMERICAN CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect nation, and one inseparable established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; support its Constitution; to obey its laws, to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

CHARLES L. SNYDER HONORED BY RED CROSS

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Frederick County Chapter of the American Red Cross presented Charles L. Snyder its award of Volunteer of the Year. Immediately afterward, the chapter elected him chairman for the next year. These double honors were richly deserved. During the recent floods caused by Hurricane Agnes, Mr. Snyder worked diligently to aid victims of the disaster.

The Frederick News published an editorial on July 31 praising Mr. Snyder's efforts. I would like to add my own personal note of congratulations and to share the editorial with my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

FOR SERVICE ABOVE SELF

It was a fitting honor that the venerable Frederick County Chapter, American Red Cross bestowed upon a relative newcomer at its annual meeting last week in first selecting Charles L. Snyder as its volunteer for the year 1972, and a few moments later electing him to chapter chairmanship.

It was under his direction that the Disaster Services of the Chapter were revitalized during the past year—and just in time to care for the hundreds who were stranded, homeless and helpless from the floods of Tropical storm Agnes.

A brief review of the chapter activities during the Agnes disaster showed that the three shelters set up—at Carroll Manor School, Coblenz Hall at Hood College and the National Guard Armory—served a total of 185 persons.

Five disaster specialists were sent from the National Red Cross to assist the chapter in its rehabilitation work, and assistance centers were established at Point of Rocks, Sagrer Court recreation hall, and West Frederick Junior High School.

The Red Cross expended a total of \$17,436 for disaster relief here during the emergency to the 350 families who suffered loss of some type or other.

Assisting the Red Cross were the Clorox Co. and Frederick Trading Co. for donations of cleaning supplies. Assisting with food for shelters were McDonald's and A&P.

The Red Cross assistance in time of emergency is an outright gift, and \$3,769 was raised locally for the Agnes disaster and the Black Hills flood.

The tribute to newly elected Chairman Snyder in the report of the Chapter reads:

"This nominee for the Volunteer of the Year Award came to the Frederick County Chapter, experienced in Red Cross procedures and philosophy. He had previously held the office of Chapter chairman and Disaster chairman in Ohio. Once the Chapter learned of this 'find', he was invited to become a member of the Board of Directors and in the course of a short time his capabilities were recognized. He was appointed Disaster chairman and vice chairman of the Board.

"He was aware that the Disaster Services in the Chapter were obsolete and no recent planning had been done. His job was to revitalize the plan if Red Cross was to function according to its Congressional Charter. He traveled over the highways and back roads of the County, canvassing motels, small and large, churches and fire halls, explaining the

great need for shelters for travelers stranded in heavy snows. He established a close rapport with the State Police and Civil Defense. He talked with the Board of Education about the need for schools for mass sheltering. Then he put it all together and published the First Disaster Preparedness Handbook for the Frederick Chapter.

"Could he have been clairvoyant? Several weeks later Tropical Storm Agnes struck. Maryland and Frederick County experienced its worst disaster in 40 years. The plan was there and after the first few hours of panic and confusion, everything fell into place.

"This volunteer worked around the clock, gathering up the stranded, bringing them into shelters, transporting food supplies, collecting cleaning kits and working closely with the National Staff. When the central Disaster Assistance Center was created, he supplied certain office equipment for their needs. He assisted the building specialist from the National Red Cross complete an accurate survey of the storm damage in the area. This information was requested not only by Red Cross but the Governor's Office.

"Prior to Agnes, this volunteer completed an inventory of all Chapter equipment which had been recommended by the Department of Defense auditors. He has helped Public Information by publishing programs for special events. In every task this volunteer has accepted, he has seen it through to completion with no procrastination and always leaves a record of his procedures for the next man who might follow.

"The Chapter is fortunate not only in having this nominee, but in knowing that he has the support of his wife who is a Red Cross Nurse who volunteers at the Blood visitations and in the Disaster Shelters. This is truly a Red Cross team and the Chapter appreciates her patience and understanding.

"The Frederick County Chapter is proud to present Mr. Charles L. Snyder as its Volunteer for the Year of 1972."

We add our congratulations.

THE LATE WILLIAM GARRETT

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, a distinguished newsman and dear friend passed away. William Garrett, the dean of Connecticut reporters in Washington, was a sparkling, remarkable journalist whose trademark was excellence, whose fairness was consistent, and whose interest in people, sense of compassion and touch of humor were enduring.

Bill was an inspiration and comfort to all who knew him and to all his avid admirers and readers during his more than 35 years in newspaperwork. His fascinating, informative columns of life and politics in the Nation's Capital were a special pleasure to read and will be sorely missed by the devoted readership of the Bristol Press and the Hartford Times.

While Bill is no longer with us, we will not forget this splendid human being who touched so many lives with warmth and grace. For the interest of my colleagues, a recent editorial and article in the Bristol Press and an article in the

Hartford Times about Bill Garrett follow:

WILLIAM F. GARRETT, TIMES COLUMNIST

SILVER SPRING, Md.—William F. Garrett, a former Hartford Times reporter and 20-year veteran of the Gannett News Service Washington Bureau, died last night at Holy Cross Hospital here after an apparent heart attack. He was 61.

A veteran of more than 35 years in the newspaper business, Garrett is a former Bristol resident. He worked earlier for the New Britain Herald and covered the Bristol area for five years for The Times. After serving on the city staff of The Times, Garrett went to Washington in 1950. He authored a column on the Washington scene, highlighting persons and happenings of particular Connecticut interest.

After retiring from the Gannett News Service bureau in 1970, Garrett still kept active, free-lancing for the bureau and writing periodic columns for The Times.

Born in Troy, N.Y., he lived in Bristol until moving to the Washington area in 1950. He and his wife lived at 11310 Galt Ave., Wheaton, Md., a northerly suburb of Washington.

He is survived by his wife, Calista McEnany Garrett, originally of Terryville.

Once a weekly newspaper editor and for a time an assistant public relations director for General Motors New Departure division in Connecticut, he favored reporting and writing over other areas of the newspaper business.

"Most of my working life has been given to newspaper reporting," Garrett once wrote, when he provided background for a column he started at The Times. "I've done little editing because I've never wanted to be glued to a desk."

When he left The Times for Gannett (The Times is a member of the Gannett group), he took on a new role. During his 20 years' tenure at the news service bureau he became the bureau's resident "expert" on such matters as radio-television, the Federal Communications Commission, federal-state relations and a variety of related subjects such as housing, highways, urban renewal and airport programs.

For a time Garrett was a contributor to the Gannett News Service's "Capitol Memo," a radio program carried by six stations owned by Gannett.

Garrett was active in public life in Connecticut, serving at varying times as Bristol's justice of the peace, as a member of the school board and of the housing authority.

A graduate of Trinity College, Garrett was a former president and a founder of the Eastern Professional Basketball League, a past president of the Southern New England Industrial Editors Association, and former district governor of the Exchange Club.

Garrett was also a member of the National Press Club, Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism fraternity, and the White House Correspondents Association.

Besides his wife, he leaves three daughters, Mrs. Margaret King Jr. of Mt. Holly, N.J., Mrs. Mary Zolly of Rockville, Md., and Mrs. Evelyn Long Jr. of Ellicott City, Md.; a son, William J. of Hyattsville, Md.; a sister, Mrs. Michael Krampitz of Bristol, and seven grandchildren.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete. They are being handled by Collins Funeral Home, Silver Spring, Md.

WILLIAM A. GARRETT

Like any profession, journalism includes among its members all manner of men and women with assorted skills, background, dedication and character. But, they do have one thing in common, a ready ability to recognize among their own a true craftsman whose nose for news, writing ability and character

entitle him to be ranked tops in this field of endeavor.

Bill Garrett was just such a newspaperman and that is why so many in Bristol were shocked Thursday to learn of his passing though it was generally known that his was far from the best of health and even though it had been 22 years since he left this community to become a Washington staffer for the Gannett News Service.

This unusual man apparently kept busy right up to the end because his columns still are appearing in The Press just as they have for the past three years while he was the newspaper's Washington correspondent.

Bill probably spent more hours at a typewriter than any newsman we can recall. He wrote swiftly, using just one finger, a remarkably rapid and agile digit which was the instrument he turned to turn out voluminous, lucid and clean copy. It was always a pleasure to edit a Garrett column because it required a minimum of editing. Although he had little formal education, he wrote with the facility of an English major and told his story with amazing incisiveness. Connecticut has seen few writers like him.

Garrett was also one of Bristol's finest citizens during the many years he lived here. He served in many civic capacities and at one time was one of the most distinguished members of the Board of Education. He also participated in many social and fraternal activities and was in the forefront of the promotion of a host of sports undertakings. Garrett spent a good part of his life in the cause of clean athletics even though it meant little to him in the way of financial reward.

Despite being the busiest of men, Bill Garrett always maintained a friendly attitude for all. We cannot remember a single person who might have had occasion to consider him an enemy. He was above the petty grudge situations in which some newsmen indulge. His policy was to write facts and let them speak for themselves without letting personal feelings color a story in any vein or direction.

Bill was devoted to his wife and four children and to his hundreds of friends both here and in the Washington area. The friend of the great and the near-great, he had the humble nature that dictated his being nice to any person whether he be a Vice President of the United States or some ordinary private citizen.

Our sympathy goes to his family in this dark hour. We at The Press will miss not only his wonderful journalistic contributions to our editorial page but also those friendly visits he would make to our offices whenever he made the long trip back home to Bristol from Maryland.

Although "30" factually has been applied to the Garrett career, the memory of his cheery presence will be with us for a long time to come.

WILLIAM A. GARRETT, 61, VETERAN NEWSMAN, DIES

William A. Garrett, 61, of Wheaton, Md., Washington, D.C. correspondent for The Bristol Press for the past several years and one of Connecticut's best known and most respected newspapermen, died at 4 a.m. today at Holy Cross Hospital in Silver Springs, Md. after suffering a heart attack at his home. He died in the same hospital where Alabama Gov. George Wallace was a patient after the attempt on his life.

Just yesterday two of Garrett's widely read Washington Beat features arrived at The Press. One is being used on the editorial page today and another tomorrow.

Until 22 years ago Garrett made his home in Bristol and was one of the community's most active citizens. At various times he served on the Board of Education and the Housing Authority and was prominent in many sports, civic, church and fraternal activities.

Garrett was born in Troy, N.Y. Sept. 23, 1910, son of Adeler and Delia (Fassett) Garrett and came to Bristol when he was a year old. He attended St. Ann's School here and Trinity College. His first journalistic assignment here was as local correspondent for The New Britain Herald. In 1934 he succeeded Rolfe E. Rowe as Bristol correspondent for the Hartford Times after Rowe had been elected town and city clerk.

During World War II, he was in the Public Relations Department of the New Departure Division of General Motors Corporation. After the war, he rejoined The Hartford Times as a roving correspondent and won several awards for his brilliant coverage of two sensational "mercy killing" cases, the Carol Paignt trial in Stamford and the Doctor Sanders trial in New Haven.

In 1950, Gannett News Service, of which The Hartford Times is a subsidiary, transferred him to its bureau in Washington, D.C. and he served there until his retirement three years ago. He had since been turning out his Washington Beat pieces for The Press at his home at the rate of three or four a week.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete and it is expected that final rites will be in Maryland.

Garrett's survivors include his wife, Mrs. Calista (McEnany) Garrett, formerly of Terryville; a son, William J. Garrett of Hyattsville, Md.; three daughters, Mrs. Mary Zolly of Rockville, Md., Mrs. Margaret King of Mount Holly, N.J., and Mrs. Evelyn Long of Ellicott, Md.; a sister, Mrs. Michael Krampitz of Bristol; 11 grandchildren and a nephew and two nieces.

PROMINENT IN SPORTS

Garrett's illustrious career started at a tender age when he managed the old Blue Jays baseball team. The club was highly successful in the won-lost column and attracted considerable attention throughout the State because of the favorable publicity it had received. Bill was the manager and public relations director.

It was with Ray Casey's Maple End athletic teams that Garrett enjoyed himself immensely. In later years, he would mention the Maple End teams whenever Bristol sports came up for discussion.

He took great pride in the accomplishments of the late George (Big Wrinkle) Alexander and his brother Philip, who was recently honored at a citywide sports testimonial.

Another of Garrett's favorites was Joseph (Sugar) Hugret, one of Bristol's all-time great football players. Hugret played briefly for the Maple Ends after gaining All-America recognition before an injury shortened his promising career.

Another team that was well-publicized, thanks to Garrett's efforts, was the Farmer's Feed & Supply basketball team which won several championships in the City Basketball League in the late '20s and early '30s.

In addition to his sportswriting activities, Garrett also found time to manage several outstanding Maple End baseball and basketball teams, as well as Jack's Captains, a team that brought a great deal of recognition to the city because of its many traveling engagements.

LEAGUE SECRETARY

After World War II, he served as the perennial secretary of the State Basketball League. President of the league was Louis G. Black, veteran Associated Press sportswriter.

Garrett was wrapped up in the league because Bristol was represented by the Bristol Tramps, owned and coached by Julie Larese.

Asked once to compare the old City League and the State League, Garrett said: "That would be too tough. They both were loaded with outstanding players."

Bill also helped publicize world's archery champion Russ Hoogerhyde. As a matter of

fact, he was responsible in featuring the archery kind prior to Jack's Captains games.

The Bristol newspaperman would publicize anything with a Bristol label attached to it. He loved the Maple End-West End Athletic Club football rivalry and often submitted glittering accounts of the Thanksgiving Day battles.

Bill had a fond liking for Rebelle S. Carpenter and Raymond J. Casey, former West End and Maple End club presidents respectively.

When he left Bristol to become associated with the Gannett News Service, Garrett didn't leave Bristol in back of him. Whenever he came upon a Bristol story in the nation's capital, he would send it along for publication in the Bristol Press sports pages.

Garrett was also a charter member of the Bristol Exchange Club and a past grand knight of Palos Council, Knights of Columbus.

THE PERILS OF "UNHATCHING"

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1966-67, I was privileged to serve as a member of the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel which reviewed the Hatch Act and subsequently recommended a number of changes to Congress. In an earlier Congress, I also chaired a Republican task force on the Federal civil service merit system.

Accordingly, I have had particular interest in yesterday's majority opinion authored by U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell that a section of the Hatch Act barring Federal workers from participating in partisan political campaigns is unconstitutional.

It seems to me that the court, in a 2-1 split decision, has unwisely opened up a can of political worms and improperly intruded on the lawmaking powers of Congress.

I share the court's view that the act is overly broad and believe that there should be a realistic clarification of provisions relating to political activities permitted and prohibited so that all Federal employees may have a clearer understanding of the law.

But this is the task of Congress, not the Federal courts. To throw out by judicial fiat main restrictions on political activity is to invite the return of the worst excesses of the old, discredited spoils system. This misguided court decision would eventually crucify the merit system of public service. It would subject employees to greater arm-twisting pressures for political contributions and other favors, irrespective of other provisions of law.

Job protection would become almost impossible for those Federal employees who become deeply embroiled in heated political campaigns, thereby compromising their impartiality.

In order to maintain a completely impartial and effective public service, those involved in such service must owe primary loyalty to the Government by which they are employed and not to a particular individual, party or faction.

I sincerely hope that the Supreme Court will overturn the lower court's decision in this case when it is appealed.

It is unfortunate, of course, that Congress has done so little relative to the clarification of the Hatch Act. While I am not a member of the committee with responsibility in this area, the court decision does renew the focus on the need for revisions and improvements in this important law.

SALUTE TO AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend our former colleague, Ambassador George Bush, for the exceptional job he is producing as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Through his consistent efforts in his role as America's chief diplomat and strategist in the U.N., he has been able to carry out our Nation's policy effectively. I know that all of us join in extending heartfelt wishes for the continued success of his work as our representative in the world body.

As part of my remarks today, I include an article written by Ambassador Bush which appeared in the July 9, 1972, issue of the New York Times:

VIEW FROM THE U.N.: MOST OF THE COUNTRIES AT THE U.N. RECOGNIZE IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY UNDER PRESIDENT NIXON A WILLINGNESS TO INNOVATE

(By George Bush)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—From the vantage point at the United Nations one gets a rather concentrated dose of world opinion.

Right now there are two main points under constant corridor discussion. First, Can the patterns of war give way to a generation of peace? Second, Do the successful visits of President Nixon to Moscow and Peking strengthen or detract from the utility of the United Nations?

On the first point, it is too early to tell whether the patterns of the fifties and sixties can now, in the seventies, be changed. But it is appropriate to say that great progress toward breaking the patterns has been made. President Nixon's landmark journeys to Peking and to Moscow—culminating in the historic agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union limiting nuclear arms for the first time—have established a firm base from which the major international powers can move toward a structure of peace. This structure is realistic and, for the first time, practical. It is a structure of peace based on carefully analyzed enlightened self-interest on the part of all the major powers.

When President Nixon first took office, he correctly perceived that the way the United States was carrying out its commitment to South Vietnam had made both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China suspicious of our motives and dubious of our intentions.

Meanwhile, America's traditional allies suffered an erosion of confidence in the United States' long-run desire, or even ability, to help defend their interest.

Immediately after entering the White House, President Nixon directed that this country re-evaluate its role in world affairs. A new Vietnam policy was put into effect, a policy which will fulfill our responsibilities without seeming to threaten other nations with whom we must negotiate other crucial issues in the international community. Steps were taken to enter into a new China policy. The Soviet Union was approached with a new openness and a new sense of realism on the issues of Berlin, the Middle East and nuclear weapons. Our European allies were reassured of our commitment to them.

President Nixon said, "Listen more and lecture less." Now, three years later, after one of the most intensive periods of international negotiations in this century, the results are beginning to pour forth. Already they can be termed truly extraordinary.

The United States is ending its role in Vietnam without sacrifice of its honor and responsibility. The People's Republic of China has been brought into its proper role in the world community. A cease-fire is in existence in the Middle East. A Berlin agreement has been reached. Negotiations with the Soviet Union have been concluded on such issues as the environment, health, international disputes at sea, trade and, most important, the limitation of strategic nuclear weapons, both offensive and defensive.

I am not about to suggest that all the steps the President has taken have met with the approval of all the countries at the United Nations. I think it is fair to say that most of the countries at the United Nations recognize in our foreign policy under President Nixon a willingness to innovate. They are apt to give credit to the President for his creed of "negotiation over confrontation."

Some home-front critics have suggested that our nation's security has been undermined by the steps the President has taken. Though there is undoubtedly some risk involved in any such agreements, there would have been a far greater risk to us and to much of the world in continuing to base our foreign policy on obsolete considerations that had validity in the past, but had subsequently been overtaken by events.

Our most treasured and respected allies do not feel threatened by the results of the summits at Moscow and Peking.

They are almost unanimous in their view that the trips will lead to a more peaceful world. They are reassured by the President's determination to keep a strong defense, for no matter how enthusiastic they are about the new agreements, they understand that without strength these agreements would have been impossible. Further, that without strength in the future, future agreements will be impossible.

Lastly, on the United Nations itself, some have criticized the President for "not using the United Nations" or for "going around the United Nations."

Arthur Vandenburg talked about "outside the United Nations, but inside the Charter." This phrase could apply to the President's trips. Most of my colleagues recognize that the U.N. will not be fully effective unless the major powers are in agreement.

Thus, any steps that move any of the major powers away from age-old differences and toward agreement, will in the long run benefit the U.N. itself.

The United Nations has never come to grips with the Vietnam question—principally because Peking and Moscow, reflecting North Vietnam's strongly held view, have opposed United Nations action.

The United Nations was unable to stop the killing in the India-Pakistan war because the major powers were in disagreement.

It follows that the more agreement and understanding that exists between the major

powers, the better the chance for effective United Nations action.

It is fair to state that the President's visits had strong support at the United Nations. The members there, with all the diverse ideologies the world possesses, recognized that our President was reaching out as peacemaker to both the U.S.S.R. and Peking.

Differences will continue to divide the states at the United Nations, but when it came to success for the Peking or Moscow meetings, the world was almost as one in its aspirations; for the nations represented there saw a chance for peace and a chance for a stronger United Nations itself.

HE LEAVES A MONUMENT

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, my home community, New York State, and our country have lost a great man. Sid Shapiro as a close personal friend or a dynamic engineer can only be described in superlatives. The Thursday, July 27, 1972 editorial and article in the Islip Town Bulletin help me to do just that:

HE LEAVES A MONUMENT

On any given day you can ride Long Island Parkways and look with awe at his handiwork—his monument, so to speak.

We refer, of course to Sidney M. Shapiro, who died last Thursday.

Mr. Shapiro was for many years the good right-arm of masterbuilder Robert Moses. Together they fashioned the world's most outstanding park and recreation system.

Along with Mr. Moses, he was sometimes called a dreamer. But the world must have dreamers if we are to survive. We shall surely miss him.

SIDNEY M. SHAPIRO, LONG-TIME MOSES AIDE, DIES

Largely attended funeral services were held from Christ Episcopal Church in Babylon Monday afternoon for Sidney M. Shapiro, 68, of Babylon, who retired last April as Chief engineer and general manager of the Long Island State Park Commission. He died last Thursday at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

The Rev. Charles T. Knapp officiated at the rites and burial followed in Pinelawn Memorial Park under direction of the Boyd Funeral Home.

Mr. Shapiro is survived by his widow, Undine; a son, Robert; a daughter, Mrs. Helen Totom; a brother, Theodore; a sister, Mrs. Sylvia Edelstein and four grandchildren.

At the time of his retirement The Bulletin carried the following story on his life and achievements.

When Sidney M. Shapiro, 68, Chief Engineer and General Manager of the Long Island State Park Commission, last of a small group of dedicated men who in the year 1925 launched the Long Island State Park and Parkway Program under the leadership of the then 37-year-old Master Builder, Robert Moses, retires next month, he will have completed 46 years of service with the Commission. One by one the members of the original group of almost half a century ago have gone their way. Bob Moses himself, now 83, retired from the Commission 10 years ago.

In the beginning when Shapiro began engineering surveys for what was to become world renowned Jones Beach State Park, the combined population of Nassau and Suffolk

Counties was little more than the present number of visitors to the park on a single busy day. What was then an inaccessible, uninhabited virtually unheard of barrier reef, inundated constantly by high water of the Atlantic, now provides parking space for 50,000 cars a day, mostly on filled-in land, contains attractive bathhouses, swimming pools, boat basins, fishing piers, a Marine Boardwalk, restaurants, cafeterias and snack bars, four 1000-foot deep water wells, a monumental Water Tower, an 8200-seat Marine Theatre and many other diversified recreational facilities. Last year 15,000,000 people visited the famous park, up from one-half million the year it opened in 1929. Since then some 400,000,000 visits have been paid to this greatest of all state-owned and operated oceanfront resort. Yet, Jones Beach was rejected by the voters when first presented by Robert Moses in 1925, then given a second chance the following year when it squeaked through in a referendum.

ONE SMALL PARK

In the beginning, there was only one state park on Long Island, an isolated 200 acres on Fire Island approachable by a small ferry. Today there are 20 state parks in the system extending from the New York City line to Montauk Point with a combined area of 35,000 acres visited annually by 22,000,000 people. The little park on Fire Island has been transformed into magnificent Robert Moses State Park, 600 acres in size, visited by 3,000,000 people a year.

In the beginning, one causeway was built to Jones Beach, four lanes wide. Today the park is reached by four causeways with a total of 21 lanes. These are the Meadowbrook, Long Beach Loop, Wantagh and Robert Moses causeways.

In the beginning, there were no parkways. The Southern State Parkway was a dream on paper. Last year it carried 43,000,000 cars, highest in the nation for a passenger-car artery. Nor did the Northern exist, with the network of connecting parkways in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Today this entire comprehensive system of landscaped state parkways is traversed by over 100,000,000 cars a year.

In the beginning, there was no Bethpage State Park. Today Bethpage, with its five 18-hole golf courses, is the largest enterprise of its kind in the United States.

In the beginning, there was no land bank or greenbelt. Today Caumsett State Park, the Nissequogue and Connetquot Reservations with parts of Sunken Meadow State Park on the north and Heckscher State Park on the south, form a 9000-acre greenbelt to be used for conservation, ecology studies, nature trails, hiking, fishing, and bird and wildlife sanctuaries, representing one of the largest open-space programs of any metropolitan area in the nation.

As a follower of the prophet Moses, Shapiro saw the whole system, valued today at 550 million dollars, emerge from birth to maturity and world-wide fame, second to none in the park and parkway field. Shapiro himself is a nationally recognized expert on beach, park and parkway development. His advice is frequently sought by municipal authorities both in this nation and abroad.

HELD TOP POSTS

In addition to holding the top executive position with the Commission, Mr. Shapiro is also Chief Engineer and General Manager of the Jones Beach State Parkway Authority and the Bethpage Park Authority. He has served as consultant to the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, to Kennedy International Airport, to Nassau County in its early program of acquisition and development of Mitchell Field. He has been consultant to the New York State Power Authority, the New York World's Fair Corporation, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, the Hoover Commission for the Reorganization

of the United States Government, the Army-Navy War Production Board, to many metropolitan communities including New Orleans, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, San Francisco, San Diego, Portland, Oregon and to cities in Brazil, Venezuela and others.

Shapiro served under seven Governors of New York State: Al Smith, Franklin Roosevelt, Lehman, Poletti, Dewey, Harriman and Nelson Rockefeller; all three Presidents of the Long Island State Park Commission; Bob Moses, Perry Duryea and Holly Patterson; and under Laurence Rockefeller, Chairman of the State Council of Parks.

When Shapiro won the coveted Long Island Press Distinguished Service Award in 1968, Governor Rockefeller commented: "This is an eminently suitable recognition of your splendid services to the State as General Manager and Chief Engineer of the Long Island State Park Commission, as well as your activities for the public good in your community. Your work surely merits appreciation, to which I am happy to add my voice."

When he won the Huttleston Award for State Park Service in 1970, Laurence Rockefeller said: "This award is in recognition of many years of public service, the highest standard of professionalism, concern for people and preservation of public lands."

ENGINEER AWARD

When he won the Metropolitan Civil Engineer Award last year, Robert Moses said: "Sid was one of our top men in all the subsequent Long Island and State developments and made side trips abroad as a consultant to Brazil and other distant parts, helped put on two World's Fairs and otherwise played a distinguished part in the engineering of the metropolis." Holly Patterson said: "In his many years of service to the State of New York and the Long Island community, Sid Shapiro has consistently worked for the public good, exemplified the finest in engineering aspiration and achievement and helped bring national renown to the fine system of parks and parkways on Long Island."

When he won the Suffolk County Engineer Award in 1964, Perry Duryea, then President of the Long Island State Park Commission, said: "In no sector of our recreation and transportation world—public or private—is there a man who has given so much of himself in such an effective way to so many people."

On the educational front, Mr. Shapiro has been a visiting lecturer at Harvard, Yale, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, New York University and other institutions. He is a member of various national and international professional organizations and has had a number of articles published in technical journals. He was educated at the College of the City of New York, lives with his wife Undine, at Belmont Lake State Park, north of Babylon, and has a son Robert, a daughter Helen, and four grandchildren. He has purchased a new home in Babylon bordering the Great South Bay. It faces an engineering handiwork of his, the Robert Moses Bridge over Fire Island Inlet, and will be his headquarters for engagements for consulting work, lecturing and writing, but principally, he says, "for the piscatorial pursuit of the elusive bluefish and striped bass."

RELIEF FOR OUR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for my colleagues'

attention this copy of my testimony before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in favor of my bill, H.R. 14364, which is identical to H.R. 12504, the World War I Pension Act. I sincerely hope that Congress will expeditiously act on this desperately needed legislation:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE C. W. BILL YOUNG, OF FLORIDA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS IN SUPPORT OF HIS BILL, H.R. 14364, JULY 28, 1972

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to express my strong support of my bill, H.R. 14364, which is identical to H.R. 12504, the World War I Pension Act. These bills will provide a long over-due expansion of benefits to all veterans of World War I.

As the Congressman from Florida's Eighth Congressional District, I am honored to represent over 90,000 veterans and, as a result of my close work with these men and women, I have become painfully aware of the many hardships they are facing daily while forced to live on meager incomes in our inflationary economy. The World War I Pension Act would go a long way in relieving these veterans of many of their apprehensions and anxieties.

Mr. Chairman, in a day and time when those who defend our country face so many challenges on the home front, it is indeed heartening to reflect upon the selfless service offered by these brave men and women who fought for freedom and liberty for us and the future of our country. They were there when their country needed them—now they need help from their country. Let's not turn our backs on them in their hour of need. I strongly urge the Committee to act favorably on this legislation so that these men and women may receive the relief they deserve and need.

HELP FOR THE POLICE OFFICER

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to provide a kind of protection to law enforcement officers who are sued in Federal court.

I believe the reason for this legislation is obvious; namely, the increasing number of suits filed against law enforcement officers in which damages are claimed resulting from the performance of the officer's duties. Certainly there is no purpose in this proposal to reduce the incidence of legitimate suits. It does propose to reduce harassment suits or those aimed at delaying criminal prosecutions. This is to be accomplished by requiring that the plaintiff file a bond with the court conditioned on the payment of reasonable costs of investigation and legal fees if the defendant law enforcement officer prevails.

As one law enforcement official from the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana wrote me:

This kind of legislation is necessary to decrease the number of harassment suits filed against law enforcement personnel. These are nuisance suits that serve only to delay honest and necessary police work.

Indeed many law enforcement officials must use their own financial resources

in these cases and communities frequently have found insurance costs to cover their law enforcement officers too costly for the community to bear.

This same bill has had other sponsors and congressional support, however so far no action has taken place. I believe one reason for the delay is the Department of Justice's failure to respond to the House Judiciary Committee's request for a comment on this proposal. I urge both the Department of Justice and the House Judiciary Committee to move forward on this legislation and I hope the other Members of Congress supporting this bill will further encourage these efforts.

YONKERS, N.Y.

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, Oxie Reichler, the very distinguished former editor of the Yonkers Herald Statesman delivered a very interesting and well done speech about the city of Yonkers, N.Y. I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues and have inserted in the RECORD at this point so that people throughout the country will have an opportunity to see it:

[From the Herald Statesman, Yonkers (N.Y.), July 18, 1972]

HISTORY OF YONKERS—COLORFUL AND DRAMATIC

(By Oxie Reichler)

Whenever I pick up a copy of the Herald Statesman, and see one of those bold headlines scattered through the paper—reading Yonkers, 100 Years Old—I say to myself, "Big Deal! I'm nearly as old as that myself!"

Then I realize that Yonkers is not really a century old, but much older—and much younger, too.

For example, Yonkers is only 64 years old as a second-class city (which we became in 1908). How long will it be before we become a first-class city, with a million population?

Yes, Yonkers became a third class city on June 1, 1872, just a century ago.

Is Yonkers really older? Yes, it is. Yonkers was chartered as a village 117 years ago—in 1855. And it's nearly two century ago that Yonkers became a town—on March 7, 1788—when our Country was only 12 years old.

And, as you all know, we were three centuries old in 1946—when our Tercentennial celebration marked the arrival of the White Man in this community. That makes us 326 years old in 1972.

But Yonkers was here for perhaps millions of years before that—and we are told that it was actually occupied by some fine human beings about the time, King Solomon was taking over in ancient Israel from his father, King David. That was 3,000 years ago.

In what is now Yonkers, clusters of Red Men—at least two tribes of Indians—were having a jolly old time. Their community was called Napeckamack, which means rapid waters. On the west side were the Mohicans, in tents along the Hudson, which they called the Shatemuc. On the east side of what is now Yonkers, along the Saw Mill and the Bronx Rivers, were the Weckquaeskecks.

I say they had a jolly old time here, because they were free of many worries and there was no women's lib. The men and boys

hunted and fished—and fought. The squaws and the girls did all the work, inside the tent and outside.

So let's be fair to history. Let us say, beyond and serious argument, that Yonkers is not just 100 years old, but that it is at least 30 times that old. Which lifts my spirits, because I now realize I'm not really nearly as old as Yonkers.

Despite these various dates and years, it is highly proper that we mark our Centennial, and that we celebrate our birthday as a city, as we have been doing since that Chamber of Commerce breakfast on June 1, at which our Yonkers lieutenant governor, Malcolm Wilson, brought us the welcome tidings that the State Arterial at last will be funded again, so Yonkers can grow as it should, especially in the Downtown Yonkers sector.

How should we be celebrating our Centennial? It is appropriate, of course, that we are having an assortment of municipal ceremonies, formal and informal; flag-raising, dedications, concerts and various other events planned or to be planned. These are all to the good. But are they enough?

I hope you will agree with me that our Centennial offers each of us opportunities to do something for Yonkers—a little or a lot—and to do it without fancy ceremonials and at little or no cost.

All we need is a little bit of civic patriotism—and that includes some civic pride. I would suggest that each of us in Yonkers—all the nearly 100,000 men and women and all the children and grandchildren, too—Can do something for Yonkers from now till the end of next May, when our Centennial year runs out. If we do that, we may have established a good habit that will continue for a lifetime.

What can all of us undertake to do?

That's easy. We can recognize and believe that Yonkers is a wonderful city of more than 200,000 souls, with tremendous assets that we should know and appreciate, with a proud history that should cause us to lift our heads, and the prospect of a future that should win our earnest application and support. We should realize further that many another city, town and village would envy Yonkers if they but knew about us. Therefore, let each of us undertake three simple projects:

First, say something nice about Yonkers every day—better yet, several times a day—at home and away from home.

Second, write something nice about Yonkers every day—better yet, several times a day—at home and away from home—to as many people, businesses, institutions and organizations as you can.

And third, do something nice for Yonkers, even though it is something for yourself—like keeping your lawn neat, like growing some flowers, planting a tree, sweeping the sidewalk, painting the house, making your business attractive inside and out, stimulating courtesy and thoughtfulness among associates and staffs—by personal example. Be a volunteer in any good cause. Serve in public office.

It doesn't sound like much, does it? Say, write and do something nice for Yonkers. Give Yonkers the best possible image—and polish that image a little, personally.

Sounds corny? Sure! But it works.

Civic service, kindness and thoughtfulness may be square, but they are a continuing foundation for business, industry and the professions, for society, religion, government, leisure activity and what have you. And these always will be foundation stones.

Experimenting with civic service won't always work, but it will most of the time. Let me give you a recent example—which was not successful.

Miss Norma Quarles of WNBC-TV (that's Channel 4) phoned me one afternoon from

the Hudson River Museum to tell me she was preparing a short series of broadcasts about Yonkers for the Six O'Clock News. Would I participate? I told her I would be glad to help her in any way I could.

"You do believe that Yonkers is deteriorating badly, don't you?" she asked.

"No, no," I answered. "Don't get off on that kick! Yonkers is a wonderful community, with plenty of progress."

She mentioned the troubles police, firemen and teachers were having in getting their salaries pushed higher, and she said she felt strikes were coming. Somebody obviously had been filling her mind with doomsday stuff, intimating to her that Yonkers was going to hell in a basket.

Would I go on camera for her? No, I wouldn't. (She already had scared the life out of me with her pessimistic approach.) But, I told her, I would be glad to help her get information, or participants, or anything at all that might help the City of Yonkers. I suggested some names, officials and civic leaders. Then I told her I could supply her with some optimistic data about Yonkers—would she look at it, if I mailed it to her? She said she would.

I mentioned a brochure on Yonkers history that a group of Yonkers teachers had prepared for publication in The Herald Statesman, which the Peoples Saving Bank later had republished for distribution. It had illustrations that might help her. Would she rifle through this if I supplied her a copy? She said she would.

I was about to mail these, when I had qualms about how long it would take the Postal Service to deliver a Yonkers package to Rockefeller Center, so I took them down myself.

I attended a one-sheet letter, exhorting her to get off the negative kick about Yonkers, to realize we have a lively thriving city. I mentioned how, a few days before, our city manager had been pressured by the City Council to the point of resignation, whereupon our Chamber of Commerce, taxpayer groups and the League of Women Voters—acting with a quick clout in less than 48 hours—got the Council to reverse itself, and the chief executive has remained at the helm.

And then I told her something else—all on that single sheet—in an effort to convince her that Yonkers was NOT going to hell in a basket. I suggested to Miss Quarles that she pick the president of any New York City bank, the bigger the better, and ask him about Yonkers and its future.

I enumerated for her the kinds and quality of banks we have in Yonkers—the National Bank of North America, 23rd largest metropolitan bank with 11 units here and building a 12th; County Trust, with half a dozen units, and the Bank of Commerce. I mentioned Yonkers Savings with four banks, Peoples Savings with four, Yonkers Savings and Loan, Westchester Federal Savings and Loan, and Fourth Federal Savings and Loan.

And I explained how, in recent months, many of the most prestigious financial institutions in the world have been battling for locations in Yonkers.

I told her we now have Chemical Bank in Getty Square and building another in South Yonkers Manufacturers Hanover in Getty Square and South Yonkers, and preparing a third unit on upper North Broadway. And I added that we also have Chase Manhattan, First National City and Marine Midland, with probably more such branches on the way.

Reasoning with her, I observed that these New York institutions sure regard their units as valuable investments in a growing Yonkers, confident that they will profit highly from them in the coming years.

How can one doubt the glowing prospects for the tomorrows in Yonkers, when you see

such positive evidence on the part of the financial giants of America?

Next morning I deposited the bundle on Miss Quarles' desk—the short history, the data on what a nice town Yonkers is and the covering letter. But what happened?

How many here saw these three broadcasts—or any one of them? Were you impressed? I found them sickening. The viewer got the impression Yonkers was dying, that Yonkers is a cluster of slums, that public employee strikes were imminent. While the actual words were not used—that Yonkers was headed for hell in a basket—the pictures tried hard to prove such was the case.

So I failed on that one. But I can tell you that most of my efforts over the years—to say or do something nice about Yonkers—worked out much better. Yet it was worth trying. I do not regret my efforts. Who knows but that something I said or supplied may yet lead WNBC-TV News to present a more accurate picture of our city.

Am so I urge you Rotarians, and you guests, and all with whom you come in contact: Do say, write and do something nice for Yonkers every day. Try it, you'll like it!

I do not suggest that you become an utter bore with your civic pride, but you can be graceful about sharing information about Yonkers with those you know, those you meet, those you correspond with.

When you're having a conversation about Yonkers, cite the fact that our growth in population is in almost exactly the ratio of America the Beautiful. Take the latest figures for the population of the U.S. and you knock off the last three zeros—and you have pretty accurate figures for Yonkers. You cannot do that for many other cities, and I'll tell you why. Yonkers alone, among the larger cities in the Empire State, has been increasing in people during the last quarter century, while most other larger cities have been declining. Yonkers therefore has pushed Syracuse out of fourth place in the state, making the present standing: New York, Buffalo, Rochester, Yonkers.

Does someone mention the trouble New York City is having when it comes to borrowing money at reasonable interest rates? Point out that last week the Yonkers Urban Renewal Agency borrowed \$8 million and got a low rate of 2.84 per cent—with a dozen big banks competing for this investment in Yonkers.

Maybe the cost of Westchester government comes up. Which, among the cities, towns and villages, pays the biggest county tax and gets the least for each tax dollar. You know the answer, of course, it's Yonkers, the county's step-child.

Maybe the conversation—at home or elsewhere—turns to sports. Remember to recall that the first golf game in America was played here in 1888, at North Broadway and Shonnard Place, where St. Andrew's Golf Club then was located.

If it's sports, celebrate the Centennial by weaving in a reference to the Yonkers Sports Hall of Fame at 285 Nepperhan Ave. Share your civic pride in the eminent sports figures Yonkers has enthroned there, with suitable memorabilia. Oh, you know who they are:

Football—Coach Charlie Caldwell and all-American Irwin (King Kong) Klein.

Basketball—Coach Joe Lapchick.

Baseball—Swatter Walter Simpson, the Babe Ruth of the minor leagues.

Tennis—World Champion Vinnie Richards.

Boxing—Junior Lightweight Champion Jack Bernstein.

Swimming—Olympic Whiz Doris O'Mara.

Ice Skating—Champions Lillian and Ruth Corke, sisters.

Track—Saul Mellor, father of our nationally known Yonkers Marathon; Thomas Barden, long-distance runner, and Eulace Peacock, Olympic sprinter.

Canoe-Racing—Steve Macknowski and Steve Lysak, the first Americans to win an Olympics canoe championship.

To celebrate the Centennial, take your family and friends to the Hudson River Museum in Trevor Park and enjoy an exciting visit to the Planetarium, which is one of the finest in the East. Mention the museum in conversations, in letters—even in business letters—and spread the good tidings of this unusual place, with a view of the lordly Palisades worth traveling hours to see.

Mention our colleges—Sarah Lawrence, Elizabeth Seton, Dunwoodie Seminary and Mount St. Vincent. And also our Westchester Community College, for which Yonkers foots a good share of the bill. Mention also our world-famous Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research, which helps many nations to feed their people better.

If you're watching television anywhere—at home, around the country or anywhere in the world—remind those with you that the voice on the TV set is FM, frequency modulation, that comes over static-free—and that this was invented and developed in his North Broadway laboratory by Maj. Edwin H. Armstrong.

And if it's radio you're listening to, don't hesitate to point out that many of the basic patents for radio were developed here in Yonkers by Lee DeForest.

Take cognizance of our dependable city water supply. Mention our effective and progressive organizations, especially our service clubs.

When good government comes up for discussion, recall the good fights carried on by former Mayor Edith P. Welty and her thousands of women cohorts; by James H. Moseley, Col. Oliver J. Troster and John J. Rust, who organized the Committee of 100 that saved Yonkers taxpayers millions of dollars by research, well assisted by many in this room. Remember the battles for decent government when the patronage-hungry party machines tried to destroy Council-Manager government and return to the lush pickings of what went before.

If the subject is parochial schools, mention that one-third of our children attend such schools in Yonkers, and that from Yonkers—from atop Dunwoodie Seminary on Valentine Hill—emanate the television broadcasts by which all the Catholic schools in the Archdiocese of New York are educated.

Civic pride is something wonderful, even more than personal pride, because it is shared so readily and effectively and beneficially.

In any conversation or letter, bring up the millions of dollars about to be invested in Downtown Yonkers—in the merchantile sector and also in the industrial area along the Hudson. Mention Philipse Manor Hall in Larkin Plaza and its priceless collection of paintings. That's the oldest building in Westchester still standing—and it was once our City Hall. Now it's a state museum. And mention also our historic churches, like St. John's in Getty Square, where George Washington often knelt.

Whenever you're riding an elevator or escalator—in Chicago or San Francisco or anywhere else—civic pride will lead you to look for that four letter word meaning Yonkers—Otis—and you can point out to friends or even strangers that the first safe elevator was invented and built in this city.

If you're enjoying a dish of ice cream (any flavor) or sipping a soda—in New Orleans, or Cincinnati, or at home—be sure to remark that probably there's a bit of Yonkers in the delicacy—Flo-Sweet Liquid sugar, produced by Refined Syrups and Sugars.

Whenever and wherever you stop to buy gas or oil, look for the Octane sign, and point out that the Octane Scale, which measures the anti-knock quality of gasoline, was invented on Nepperhan Avenue in Yonkers by

Dr. Graham Edgar of the Ethyl Corp. and that the scale is now used everywhere in the world, including the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

If the conversation turns to the SALT talks, and missiles, refer to 3,000 miles of Yonkers-made cable—strung from Alaska to Hudson's Bay—to make up the Distant Early Warning Line in case any missiles are headed this way. Habirshaw Division of Phelps Dodge made it.

And if you get chatting about World War II, you can bring up how Habirshaw also produced (in great secrecy over months) that 65-mile hollow cable, which was strung across the English Channel and fed a million gallons of gasoline a day to General Eisenhower on D-Day for the invasion of France. And you can mention the miles upon miles of khaki cloth produced by the Alexander Smith Mills, the bomb sights and other instruments fashioned by Otis and the many other products made here, including medicines and K-rations.

If newspapers are being discussed wherever you are, never hesitate to celebrate the Centennial by mentioning The Herald Statesman—praising it, naturally—for you will find that it is one of the few hometown papers that is widely known, even overseas.

Nor should you hesitate, in such conversations about Yonkers' assets, to speak well of your own business—and also being your competitor's operations—favorably, of course.

As in the Biblical injunction about bread cast upon the waters, you're likely to benefit from the backwash of good will from what you'll be saying about Yonkers. Say something nice, too, about our municipal government.

Don't hang up on your next telephone call without deliberately saying something nice about Yonkers and its people—even if the person on the other end of the line is surprised enough to ask why you mentioned that? Tell him or her about the Centennial, and how you're observing it for a year.

Maybe you'll be discussing the news—last week's important treaty between West Germany and East Germany. Celebrate the Centennial by remarking casually that a Yonkers educator, Hans Simons, wrote the Bonn Constitution for West Germany.

Maybe the conversation includes some reference to Judge Tony Cerrato, past president of this club. Mention his fine Park Hill home, once occupied by the actor Richard Bennett and his charming and talented daughters, Constance, Barbara and Joan.

Catch on? It's a sort of Centennial Game you will be playing. Somebody mentions President Nixon's wife Patricia—and you say she has Yonkers cousins, among them Edward O. Sullivan Jr. Or you're at a Rotary assembly or convention and someone mentions the recent world president of Rotary International, Luther H. Hodges—the former U.S. Secretary of Commerce. You break in to say he used to live in Yonkers. If your conversation runs to the opera, you will mention that the golden-voiced Madam Schumann-Heink lived on Sunnyside Drive here and used to give "free concerts" for the pupils at School 3 where her children studied.

Almost any field that is being talked about—music, science, the stage, politics, anything—opens an opportunity for you to mention some of our eminent residents, living or dead.

People like Sid Caesar, Art Carney and Morey Amsterdam the comedians; Ann Bancroft the actress; Ella Fitzgerald the singer; William C. Handy, the father of the blues; Gene Krupa, the drummer; Jerome Kern and Geoffrey O'Hara, the song-writers; Samuel T. Clemens, better known as Mark Twain; Charles P. Steinmetz, the electrical wizard; Leo Baekeland, the inventor of bakelite, the first plastic; Samuel Tilden who ran for President in 1876, General "Vinegar Joe" Stil-

well of World War II, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, former Congressman John E. Andrus, the philanthropist.

Well, you get the idea. I'm trying to show you how easy it is to say something nice about Yonkers, and to write something nice about our community. It's just a little harder to do something for Yonkers, but not if you're looking for things to do.

By the exercise of civic power, you can best celebrate our Centennial—and enhance your citizenship for a lifetime. How do you exercise civic power?

After reading the paper, retell one of the more interesting and constructive news items, reflecting some constructive experience or idea or suggestion. Write letters to your mayor, city manager, councilman, county legislator, to County Executive Michaelian, to Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson and to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. Write your ideas—especially about Yonkers and its needs and merits—to President Nixon, Vice President Agnew, Senators Javits and Buckley, Congressman Biaggi or Peyser.

There's power in them-thar letters. You think such a letter carries little or no weight? You're wrong. I remember sitting alongside a powerful legislator as he glanced at his mail. He picked up one letter and remarked:

"This is interesting. A constituent wants me to vote for a bill that's coming up today. I intended to vote against it. Now I'll vote for it." That letter-writer may never know how his single letter changed a vote in Congress.

I ask each of you to observe the Centennial in the civic service way—speak, write and do—each intended to make Yonkers' image here and elsewhere more attractive. By whatever we do or don't do we affect the vital community image. Our image is polished or splattered by citizens generally, by public employees, by merchants and industrialists and professional people, even by school children—even by thoughtless dog owners!

So it is my opinion and suggestion that each of us can celebrate the Yonkers Centennial well—and do so proudly, eagerly and effectively.

We can say something nice about Yonkers at every opportunity, even making opportunities. We can write favorably about our Yonkers whenever it is feasible. And we can do many things to advance our city's welfare—tiny things, medium things and huge and important contributions of all kinds. Like doing volunteer service.

Such procedures fit right in snugly with Rotary's Four Objects. By applying these, each of us has the personal privilege to be a Yonkers Builder—and to impress children and grandchildren with the need for them to become Yonkers Builders, too.

We need to build well for the tomorrows, and the Centennial provides an excellent time to do this. I am confident that for Yonkers, in this Centennial year, the future is brighter and promising. The best is yet to be. I hope all of you share my optimism, and will act that way.

THE EFFECTS OF MINIMUM WAGES ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF CHANGES IN AGGREGATE EMPLOYMENT

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I read with concern the summary of an article on minimum wage effects which Congress-

man ANDERSON, of Illinois, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 28, 1972. As I read the summary of "The Effects of Minimum Wages on the Distribution of Changes in Aggregate Employment" by Marvin Koters and Finic Welch it makes the case that only through the imposition of a subminimum wage for teenagers can you bring about the substitution of teenagers for adult workers.

This article furnishes additional economic support for those who have testified in the Congress against a youth wage. Opponents of a lower minimum wage for youth have repeatedly charged that a youth wage will not generate additional jobs but rather it will result in the replacement of adult workers by teenagers. The paper in the American Economic Review by Koters and Welch attributes increased stability in adult employment to minimum wage increases. I would not want to quarrel with this conclusion nor would I want to support legislation which would undercut job security for adult workers.

So, I say again, let us get about the business of creating more jobs for all and vote against job substitution as a device to make the unemployment statistics picture look better.

CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION OF ATLANTIC SALMON

HON. CLIFFARD D. CARLSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years I have been fortunate to have the opportunity to spend some time experiencing the great joy of fishing for salmon on the Miramichi River, New Brunswick, Canada. The Atlantic salmon is one of the world's most prized trophies among freshwater anglers. This spectacular game fish may reach a size of 50 pounds. The preferred angling technique is fly fishing and when hooked no other fish can match its tenacity and aerial aerobatics.

These salmon spawn in the clear, unpolluted, fast flowing streams of Norway, Sweden, the British Isles, Spain, France, Ireland, Greenland, eastern Canada, and Maine. Like most salmon, the Atlantic salmon is anadromous, spending much of its life in salt water often hundreds of miles from shore, and then in some mysterious manner returning several times in its life to spawn in the stream of its origin.

Unfortunately today's Atlantic salmon are but remnants of the vast population which existed before the combination of polluted waters and excessive commercial fishing decimated their numbers and destroyed many of their historic spawning streams. Nearly two decades ago, the Atlantic salmon ocean feeding grounds were accidentally discovered off the coast of Greenland. These grounds were found to contain fish from European as well as U.S. rivers. The concentration of fish in this area made them highly vulnerable

to the commercial fisherman of every country with the result that their numbers were even further reduced. Along with other American sports fishermen and conservationists, I am greatly concerned about the protection and conservation of the Atlantic salmon.

The sad plight of this great game fish was first brought to world attention through the International Conference on Atlantic Salmon held in London in April 1969. This conference was attended by delegates from 14 countries. Richard Stroud, executive vice president of the Sport Fishing Institute of the United States was active in the affairs of that conference. A further significant development in the Atlantic salmon story was the drafting of a North Atlantic salmon policy by a number of prominent conservation organizations of national and international standing at a meeting held last September in New York. The resolution adopted at this meeting urged that the Governments of the United States and Canada join in an agreement to consult, plan, and cooperate in research, management, and propagation of Atlantic salmon with the objective of restoring the species to abundance in New England and Canadian waters.

Early in 1971 Canada's Environment Minister, Jack Davis, took courageous steps to restore the Atlantic salmon fisheries. In the face of great pressure from commercial interests, Minister Davis imposed a series of stringent commercial fishery restrictions aimed at protecting the spawning population. He also initiated stronger efforts to reduce pollution in Canadian salmon rivers and pointed to the importance of negotiating with Denmark for the reduction or elimination of their commercial fishery off Greenland. The efforts of Mr. Davis to conserve the salmon are already showing signs of success and American sportsmen who go to New Brunswick can often be assured of catching their daily quota. Let me say that during the recent congressional recess I had an occasion to fish on the Miramichi River and found the fishing to be much better this year than last. We were especially pleased to see so many adult salmon going up the river to spawn. This is particularly significant because in previous years they have apparently been prevented from going in great numbers because of the commercial nets and other factors.

When the hoped for negotiations with Denmark failed to materialize in 1971, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. Pelly) introduced legislation which could ban the importation of fish products from any nation whose fishing activities were endangering the spawning stocks of Atlantic salmon. The passage of this extremely farsighted legislation had the immediate result of bringing the Danes to the conference table. As a result of that conference, the Danes salt water fishery for Atlantic salmon will be phased out gradually and will end in 1975.

Thus, although significant advances have been made in efforts to rebuild the population of the Atlantic salmon, this job is far from completed. In September of this year, an International Atlantic

Salmon Symposium will be held at St. Andrews, New Brunswick. This symposium will provide a forum for the exchange of all available scientific information concerning this great game fish species. Our U.S. Ambassador to Canada, the Honorable Adolph W. Schmidt, will address this session as well as Environment Minister Davis of Canada. As an active sports fisherman concerned about our environment, I would like to congratulate the organizers of this symposium and wish them every possible success. I will be following their progress with great interest.

In closing, once again I would like to commend Canada's Environment Minister, Jack Davis, for his inspirational leadership in saving the Atlantic salmon and to urge support for all necessary steps to restore the species in our own New England rivers. In this connection, I am pleased to note that an item of \$125,000 has been included in the Department of Interior appropriation bill, through the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Conte) and other Members of Congress, for the purpose of advance planning and land acquisition for a new Federal fish hatchery in Bethel, Vt. This modest appropriation is a vital first step in the program to restore the Atlantic salmon in New England waters—and I shall certainly give it my wholehearted support.

GENERAL LAVELLE REVISITED

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the flight of high-ranking military officers to executive positions or high-paying advisory posts with firms doing business with the Pentagon after they leave the Armed Forces has become so common that it is no longer newsworthy. However, the recent appointment of retired Gen. John Lavelle as part-time consultant to Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio, a firm which relies heavily on defense contracts, once again draws attention to the question of whether the punishment that General Lavelle received for carrying out his unauthorized private war with North Vietnam was proper.

I, for one, believe that the token disciplinary action, loss of one star to lieutenant general and early retirement, that the military has taken against General Lavelle for deliberately disobeying orders and deceiving his superiors in reporting the unauthorized bombing raids in North Vietnam, is a travesty of justice, and is illustrative of the double standard that exists in our present system of military justice.

Any private who disobeys orders is court-martialed and usually receives a dishonorable discharge. The stigma that accompanies a dishonorable discharge makes it difficult for him to obtain a civilian job. At the same time officers, particularly colonels and generals, suspected

of a crime are given the option of resigning or retiring rather than face a court-martial. These high-ranking military officers know only too well that when they leave the military, there are usually high-paying positions waiting for them in defense-related industries.

When asked to comment on the Lavelle incident at his press conference last month, President Nixon said the following with regard to the punishment meted out against Lavelle:

But since it did exceed authorization, it was proper for him to be relieved and retired. And I think that it was the proper action to take, and I believe that that will assure that kind of activity may not occur in the future.

I find it difficult to believe that the prospect of retiring from the military with a monthly pension of \$2,500 and a high-salaried position with a firm doing business with the Pentagon is much of a deterrent. Only when generals who disobey orders are made subject to the discipline of military tribunals like all other servicemen rather than given the opportunity to accept a loss of one star and retire early at a high pension will there be any real deterrent to insure that such an activity will not occur in the future.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the July 29 Washington Star which describes General Lavelle's new job with the Battelle Institute.

The article follows:

LAVELLE JOINS ADVISORY FIRM TO PENTAGON
(By Ned Scharff)

Gen. John D. Lavelle, former commander of the Seventh Air Force who was forced to retire after ordering unauthorized attacks on North Vietnam, has landed a job with a private think-tank organization which does extensive work for the Defense Department.

Lavelle, relieved of his command on April 7, now is a part-time consultant to Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio.

Lavelle last night said he only spends "a few hours a week" working for Battelle. He said his work there was in the field of science and technology and that some of it involved defense contracts, but he refused to define the projects he is working on more specifically.

A spokesman for the institute would not say what kind of work Lavelle is doing except that "he is drawing on his research and development-related experience in the Air Force."

Before assuming command in Vietnam, the general was director of the Defense Communications Planning Group in the Pentagon and earlier he had directed several aerospace programs.

The Defense Department said Battelle ranks 67th among the top 500 defense research and development firms in the country.

The institute had \$12 million in Defense Department contracts in 1971, but in the first nine months of this year it's scheduled for only \$6.7 million in contracts, the Pentagon said.

A Pentagon spokesman said there was nothing illegal or uncommon about a retired officer working on projects under government contract.

Lavelle was a four-star general until it was disclosed he had ordered bombing of unauthorized targets in North Vietnam and had ordered falsification of reports to disguise the effort.

He was relieved of his post then retired at three-star rank. As a retired lieutenant general, Lavelle draws a monthly pension of \$2,500.

EASTERN AIR LINES TO INAUGURATE "GROUP 40" TRAVEL PLAN IN SEPTEMBER

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, beginning September 7, Eastern Air Lines will offer "a revolutionary air fare" for groups of 40 or more persons. The "Group 40" plan will enable 40 or more members of an affinity group—clubs, unions, companies, and others—to fly on regularly scheduled flights at nearly half the cost of the basic coach fare.

The "Group 40" rate will make it possible for many persons, members of small organizations, to travel by air perhaps for the first time. In addition, members of local chapters of national organizations will be able to fly to faraway convention sites at this special reduced charter rate.

Mr. Speaker, Larry Birger of the Miami News has written an informative article about Eastern's experimental "Group 40" plan, and I call it to the attention of all Members in the House of Representatives:

EAL HOPES GROUP 40 CHARTERS WILL FILL PLANES IN SLACK SEASON

Business in the trunk airline industry, as any knowledgeable source will tell you, is very cyclical. When it's good, it's generally very good; but when it's bad, it's really sad.

Basically, it's a business of peaks and valleys. International carriers like Pan American Airways and Trans World Airlines enjoy their peak traffic in the summer, when travel to Europe and other vacation spots is at its height. But then in winter, traffic drops off drastically and the red ink flows in buckets.

A domestic carrier like Eastern Air Lines does best in winter, when people rush to Florida or to the Caribbean to escape the snowy North, and in summertime when vacationers seek bargains in Miami Beach, the Caribbean or Mexico.

But then, in fall or spring, traffic slows to a snail's pace by EAL's standards and the airline's execs beat their heads against the wall trying to figure ways to drum up business.

To put it bluntly, it's feast or famine.

And that's the reason why the industry has come up with a multitude of discount fares and other promotions like the weekend excursion from Florida to northern cities to entice the flying public to fill their empty seats.

The latest ploy, just initiated by EAL and approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board on an experimental basis, is one that appears to have more merit than most.

Starting Sept. 7 and running through Dec. 11, the airline will offer what it terms "a revolutionary air fare" which permits groups of 40 or more travelers to fly at charter rates on 600 of its daily flights.

In other words, if you're a member of an affinity group like the Kiwanis Club or B'nai B'rith, or a union member or an employee of a company, you can fly at discounts of up to 47 per cent of the basic coach fare.

The only restriction is that you must travel in a group of 40 or more, hence the "Group 40" nomenclature. Group travel means you fly at nearly half the cost of a regularly-scheduled flight between two cities.

For example, the basic coach fare between New York and Miami is \$102, but the Group 40 price will be \$66; if you're flying between

New York and San Juan, the ticket price will be snipped from \$213 to \$111.

The key word is "charter." Up to now, if a group wanted to travel from one destination to another, it had in most instances to charter an entire airplane—say a DC-8 with 129 seats—and pay for every seat whether it was filled or not.

Under the Eastern scheme, only 40 seats have to be "chartered," and the members of the affinity group travel on regularly scheduled flights. They pay for only the seats they actually fill unless they book more than 40 and have some "no-shows."

B. Craig Raupe, Eastern's division vice president of passenger sales, has been traveling the country trying to get his agents in various cities to push Group 40. He believes the fare could reshape the peaks and valleys encountered in seasonal air traffic patterns.

As noted earlier, the plan will be introduced this fall. But it will also be offered next spring, between April 30 and June 15. And both dates suit Raupe just fine.

That's because they are the times of year when convention groups generally gather and Raupe believes Group 40 offers small units such as clubs, unions and companies the opportunity to travel to faraway destinations when they otherwise would have stayed at home.

Eastern, of course, designates the flights on which those signing up for Group 40 can travel, and has listed 600 of its approximate 1,475 daily flights across the system because they are the least likely to be filled, having a load factor of 30 per cent or lower.

Raupe insists, however, this doesn't mean Group 40 passengers will be asked to fly in the middle of the night or anything like that.

"Obviously, we're not going to put our Group 40 people on our busiest flights, but we're not going to ask them to travel as second-class citizens either," he says.

There's no assurance of instant success, and Raupe and Thomas B. McFadden, senior vice president-marketing, realize the Group 40 scheme could fall flat on its ear.

One of the problems, at least for this fall, is that affinity groups usually make their travel plans well in advance—six months to a year and even more. So it may be difficult to persuade a large number of organizations to take the step between Sept. 7 and Dec. 11.

As Raupe is quick to admit, "We're plowing new ground so we don't know whether we can cut it this fall or not. We've only just received our fall schedules."

But he does feel, based on the initial response from his own sales personnel and from travel agencies who book tour groups, that the airline will sell at least \$2½ million in Group 40 fares during the fall period.

That may seem like an insignificant amount of new business, but Raupe says the sum would at least take up the slack in full plane load charters, based on what Eastern sold last fall but can't this fall because of a shortage of equipment.

He's looking down the road to a time when, through proper promotion and, of course, further approval from the CAB, Group 40 business can be generated by working months ahead with potential customers.

As he says, "We think it will work because, of all the plethora of discount fares, rates and tariffs, this is the first time that an airline has come up with something that, if properly utilized, can be applicable to convention planners or businessmen who want to set up sales meetings."

That's because, as one of the virtues of the "charter" fare, a convention group of, say, 800 members, could fly to a destination from 20 different locations in groups of 40.

"We think we've come up with the perfect plan for groups, large and small, to fly regularly-scheduled flights at charter rates to fill our empty seats rather than to charter

an entire plane which could cost a lot more if it wasn't completely filled."

This, of course, brings up the subject of diversion of traffic—a sore point with a number of competing airlines. They insisted, in opposing the EAL plan, that it would divert large numbers of passengers who normally would pay full fare to travel.

They claimed, in fact, that Eastern's estimate of only a 20 per cent diversion in its presentation to the CAB was far too low and the new discount fare would be self-defeating.

"We don't think so," answers Raupe. "Only time will tell, but we feel we'll generate 80 per cent new business, flying people who otherwise wouldn't have traveled, and this will open up an entirely new area of travel to level Eastern's peaks and valleys."

CRITICS OF AMERICA SHOULD REMEMBER POSTWAR AID

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is popular among many in our country, as well as abroad, to criticize the United States as a world power which has become "aggressive" and "imperialistic."

This has been the approach taken by the new left, and a number of public figures outside of the new left have echoed this view.

Such criticism overlooks totally the role which America has played in the world since the end of World War II. If we were, in fact, "aggressive" and "imperialistic" we would have proceeded in a far different way. We would, for example, not have restored freedom and independence to Germany and Japan, the nations we had just defeated in war. An "aggressive" and "imperialistic" country would have occupied and controlled such former enemies for its own gain. Compare how Germany and Japan were treated by the United States with the manner in which the Soviet Union has treated East Germany, not to mention Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

It has often been said that if you wish to learn the truth about a country the best way to do so is to talk with its former enemies. It is fair to point out that no place in the world do people think more highly of the United States than in Germany and Japan.

An editorial in the important German newspaper, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung recently noted that:

People have completely forgotten the unparalleled generosity and helpfulness of the Americans. British sociologist G. Gorer once wrote that in no other country in the world did the majority of inhabitants give so easily and so willingly, almost without considering the cost.

The editorial continues to point out that:

Americans . . . of all industrial nations . . . take up first place in the amount of aid they offer to developing countries. They also provide much money for the military protection of Europe. It was also the Americans with their Marshall Plan who helped Europe to her feet again after the destruction, famine,

and ravages of the Second World War. Even former enemies—the Germans and Italians—were included in this generous aid programme while the Russians mercilessly plundered the countries they occupied and annexed and tore up whole stretches of railway line in East Germany.

At a time when "young Socialist fanatics refer to the Americans only in terms of abuse and laud the Soviet Union to the skies," states the Frankfurt *Allgemeine Zeitung*:

Fairness and gratitude call for a reminder of the true state of affairs . . . Today's grumblers and fault-finders who make America to be the big bogey-man appear shabby in face of such generosity and willingness to help. The generous American must not be forgotten.

It is important, as well, that Americans not forget their own recent history. I wish to share this article by Hans Roepfer from the June 5, 1972 edition of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung für Deutschland* with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

CRITICS OF AMERICA SHOULD BEAR IN MIND AMERICA'S POSTWAR AID

There is a widespread tendency in all countries to criticize the Americans. Young people above all see the United States as an incarnation of imperialism and as a nation wallowing in brutality, suppressing its coloured population, recklessly chasing after money and exploiting other countries.

The war in Vietnam doubtlessly done a lot to worsen America's reputation but Americans abroad were anything but popular even before this. "Yanks, go home" was always a frequent cry.

Americans themselves may not be completely blameless as regards this aversion but another motive is no less potent—the envy and spite of smaller and weaker nations.

Like all other nations the Americans have their faults and their virtues. Today their weaknesses are attacked though nothing is said about their good points.

People have completely forgotten the unparalleled generosity and helpfulness of the Americans. British sociologist G. Gorer once wrote that in no other country in the world did the majority of inhabitants give so easily and so willingly, almost without considering the cost.

Americans generously donate money to any cause they consider worthy, Gorer stated, and this is not due to affluence alone. In many cases donation involved great personal sacrifice.

Americans have indeed done a lot to counter hardship and misery throughout the world. Of all industrial nations, they take up first place in the amount of aid they offer to developing countries.

They also provide much money for the military protection of Europe. It was also the American with their Marshall plan who helped Europe to her feet again after the destruction, famine and ravages of the Second World War.

Even former enemies—the Germans and Italians—were included in this generous aid programme while the Russians mercilessly plundered the countries they occupied and annexed and tore up whole stretches of railway line in East Germany.

Now that young Socialist fanatics refer to the Americans only in terms of abuse and laud the Soviet Union to the skies, fairness and gratitude call for a reminder of the true state of affairs.

Speaking at Harvard University twenty-five years ago on 5 June 1947, American Secretary of State George C. Marshall first announced the aid programme that was later named after him.

Pointing to the disastrous situation in

Europe, he stated, "It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos. It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this government to draw up unilaterally a programme designed to place Europe on its feet economically. That is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe."

The Americans thus laid the foundation stone for unity, economic cooperation and lastly the Common Market. Delegates from sixteen European countries met in Paris on 12 July 1947 and formed the Committee on European Economic Cooperation which later became the Organization for European Economic Cooperation that finally grew into today's Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

The Soviet Union had also been called upon to attend the conference but Moscow declined and forced other Eastern Bloc countries to refuse American aid they would have liked to have and prevailed on them to stay away from the conference.

The sixteen Western European countries handed the American Foreign Minister their first extensive report on the most urgent measures requiring American aid in September 1947.

Between 1948 and 1952 the Americans raised thirteen thousand million dollars to be used within the framework of the Marshall Plan. Seventy per cent, or over nine thousand million dollars, were written off from the very outset.

This was a real sacrifice even for an affluent country like the United States. Thirteen thousand million dollars made up an average eight per cent of the taxes paid to the American government at that time.

Even before Marshall Aid had begun, the United States granted loans and gifts totalling almost twenty thousand million dollars to other countries between 1945 and 1948.

These included the GARIOA supplies (Government Appropriation for Relief in Occupied Areas), mainly food, seed-corn, medicaments and fuel, that Washington sent to those areas occupied by American troops.

West Germany received GARIOA supplies worth about 1,700 million dollars plus another 1,300 million dollars under Marshall Aid. Altogether this adds up to three thousand million dollars.

Only one thousand million dollars needed to be repaid and this was done in 1961 in advance of the agreed date. The Mark equivalent of the remaining two thousand million dollars formed the West German government's special European Recovery Programme fund.

This is still used today to provide credits for measures calculated to aid the West German economy. Part of West Germany's development aid programme is paid from it and the fund has been a constant source of help to West Berlin's industry. The beneficial effects of the Marshall Plan can still be felt today, twenty-five years after it was first announced.

But the Americans have not only given us the Marshall Plan. They have, as has already been mentioned, contributed to the economic and political unification of Europe.

By actively supporting the European currencies become freely convertible. It was America that provided the main initiative for the establishment of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. All this created the basis for a mighty upsurge in world trade.

America's high balance of payment deficits cause us much annoyance and difficulty to-

day but we should always remember how much the Americans have done for Europe since the Second World War.

Today's grumblers and fault-finders who make out America to be the big bogey-man appear shabby in face of such generosity and willingness to help. The generous American must not be forgotten.

"THE GODFATHER"

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in a democracy founded on the worth and dignity of the individual, every citizen has the right to be judged solely on the basis of his own character and ability irrespective of such extraneous consideration as race, religion, color, or sex. The proud title of American can be claimed equally by all citizens, first generation or 10th, from all the corners of the earth, who make up the rich fabric of our Nation.

Every thoughtful American must accordingly resent and deplore mindless characterizations as villains, knaves, or dolts of ethnic or racial groups in our polyglot society. The most striking current example of this despicable trend is the motion picture "The Godfather" which stereotypes Italian Americans as gangsters and murderers. In this time of alienation and divisiveness in our land, when reconciliation and understanding are so imperative "The Godfather" does a grave injustice not only to Americans of Italian ancestry but to our whole citizenry. Speaking as one whose mother was born in the Province of Avellino, Italy, and whose maternal and paternal grandparents came from that beautiful land, I can vouch for the fact that the characters in "The Godfather" are as alien to the vast majority of Italian Americans as to any other groups. The hard-working, God-fearing, warm-hearted people among whom I was reared bear no resemblance whatsoever to the Italian American portrayed in this infamous motion picture.

The damage done to our fine Americans of Italian ancestry and to the values of our Nation is perceptively described by William V. Shannon in his article in today's New York Times. I hope that the producers will ponder Mr. Shannon's admonition as to the consequences of this revolting film and will abandon their plans for a sequel. I urge all Americans, first generation or 10th, who cherish our principles and our values, to let the film makers know that they agree with Mr. Shannon's estimate of "The Godfather."

The article follows:

"THE GODFATHER"

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—The announcement that production will soon begin on a movie called "The Godfather—Part Two" must surely rank as the most depressing cultural event of 1972.

This revolting film, already a box office success, is apparently to be mined for another thick profit. I can imagine the series now—"Return of the Godfather," "Son of the God-

father," "The Godfather in Las Vegas," "The Godfather in Miami Beach," and so stretching on into profitable infinity.

In one of its aspects, "The Godfather" is part of the growing pornography in violence. Having done about all they can to make sexual intercourse explicit and boring on the widescreen, the movie makers are now in the process of acquainting everyone with the many varieties of violence. Murder by sub-machine gun is still a hardy favorite. "The Godfather" teaches some new lessons in murder such as How to Garrot Your Brother-in-Law. These are in addition to examples of persons being murdered while starting a car, having a massage, paying a causeway toll, going through a revolving door and eating spaghetti.

With startling close-up, vivid death agony sequences and technicolor blood spurting everywhere, these new-style movie murders do manage to hold audience attention. By the end of movie, however, when the new Godfather presides over the murders of the heads of the New York underworld's "Five Families" as well as two or three miscellaneous enemies (I lost count), these deaths are becoming mechanical and meaningless.

A few years of such pictures will succeed in making the most gruesome and vivid murders as tedious as a nudist film. In reaching that impasse, the movie industry will have further degraded the taste and coarsened the sensitivity of millions of people, including the vulnerable young.

Any person of religious sensibility can only find the film's exploitation of a child's Baptism profoundly offensive. To juxtapose the preparation for multiple murders against the words of the Priest claiming the child for Christ is to trivialize the most important of the Christian sacraments.

It is as offensive as the scene in that much overpraised film, "The Graduate," in which the hero uses a crucifix to jam the church door. And in both films, these crude gestures are used to make an artistic point which is already abundantly clear.

In "The Godfather," the exploitation of Catholic rituals and Italian customs—in the wedding and funeral scenes as well as the Baptism—is part of the biggest cultural rip-off that any commercial promoters have gotten away with in years. "The Godfather" stereotypes Italian-Americans as gangsters or as the half-admiring, half-fearful pawns of gangsters. The authentic details of how a bride receives money gifts at a wedding or how spaghetti is cooked only give credibility to that central lie about Italian-Americans.

The film flatters Italian males by stressing their toughness and sexual prowess. But to what purpose? To end with a hero, the young Godfather, who is—by any decent human standard—a monster. Some flattery.

As an American of Irish ancestry, it seems to me that Italian-Americans ought to dislike the picture intensely. There was a time much earlier in this century when the Irish dominated the underworld. In 1931, Warner Brothers started the modern genre of gangster films with "Public Enemy" starring James Cagney as an Irish-American gangster. The Hays Office censorship of those days did not permit murders to be depicted in morbid detail, but Cagney came through quite as tough and nasty as the Corleone Brothers. In one famous scene he slammed a grapefruit into his wife's face at the breakfast table.

When John O'Hara wrote "Butterfield 8" in 1935 he had the hero complain bitterly that Hollywood cast actors like Cagney as the perfect gangster type because the tough young Irishman fit Protestant America's stereotype of an outlaw.

But by that time the Irish were already a dwindling force in organized crime, and the stereotype faded. Indeed, one of the best things that ever happened to the American Irish was that they were muscled out of the

gangs by hungrier, more ruthless competitors. Otherwise, some Irish-American stockbrokers and advertising men who now sedately ride the commuter trains and shake their heads over the morning newspaper at the latest misdeeds of the Mafia might themselves be Gaelic version of Michael Corleone.

No one denies that a few Italian-Americans are gangsters. To that extent, "The Godfather" rests on a substratum of fact. But for the millions of Italian-Americans who are not gangsters, the success of this film raises an enormous cultural obstacle. It retards their efforts to overcome this dark legacy from the past and to establish positive heroes for their children to emulate.

Events have consequences, and the consequences of "The Godfather" cannot be good for Americans of Italian or non-Italian ancestry.

OUR SPACE PROGRAM

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is No. 1 in space. We are the only Nation to land men on the moon. This superb national achievement is in the interest of peace, the good health, prosperity, and happiness of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared this morning in the State, one of the Nation's leading newspapers. I commend this outstanding editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the American people. [From the State (Columbia, S.C.), Aug. 1, 1972]

ALL MANKIND BENEFITS FROM SPACE SPIN-OFF

Critics of the United States space program who advocate other uses for money budgeted for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) would have us believe the taxpayers' dollars are burned up wastefully in probing the heavens.

Not so. The spin-off benefits of the costly research to explore the Moon, orbit working satellites around our Earth, and investigate the outer planets will ultimately pay dividends beyond belief.

And those dividends will benefit all mankind—in knowledge, well-being, health, and comfort.

The impact of space technology in miniaturization of sophisticated electronic circuitry is profound, especially in the field of medicine. If Houston can monitor the pulse and temperature of a man on the Moon, what are the potentials for the sick on Earth?

As a result of NASA's work, there is now commercially produced a gas analyzer to measure the composition of air breathed by patients. It gives prompt information on respiration and metabolism that has been unavailable or too time consuming to obtain.

Used in intensive care units, it immediately signals changes in breathing of acutely ill patients. There is now an alarm device which sounds at a nurse's station when an infant stops breathing in another room.

A "sight switch" developed by NASA research allows an armless and legless patient, by the motion of his eye, to activate a nurse's alarm, turn pages of a book, operate radio and TV sets, and control powered wheelchairs.

Ambulatory heart patients can broadcast their own heart signals to a central monitor-

ing station while walking around; and there is a sleep analyzer that monitors the brain and eyes of a sleeping patient—potentially valuable for diagnosis in rehabilitation of drug addicts.

NASA's acknowledged leadership in computer technology has produced a computer motion picture of a beating heart in a three dimensional image—an obvious aid in locating heart injuries, aneurisms, and other cardiac problems.

The NASA computers have also produced a program to help industrial firms, universities, laboratories, and government agencies solve structural engineering problems of stress in designing bridges, power plants, buildings, and aircraft.

Industrially, the development of battery technology for the space program has led to a line of high energy commercial products for powering chain saws, golf and baggage carts, outboard motor starters, portable electrocardiogram units, toys, and other appliances.

Electrical digital clocks are being produced by a firm at reduced cost because of NASA-developed stepping drive that keeps the clock accurate within a fraction of a second. Fifty companies here and abroad have been licensed to make and market a compound preventing the fogging of lenses and other optic and visual equipment.

The list can go on and on, including fire resistant clothing, paints, fabrics, and at least two new uses for laser beams (surveying terrain despite obstructions and measuring the presence of plankton, that essential of marine animal life and of oxygen production).

The technology of NASA's programs is not at all lost in space. The quality of life here on Earth will be steadily improved because of it.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the shortened August version of my monthly Washington News Notes sent to persons residing in the congressional district I am honored to represent is reproduced below. Its obverse side contains U.S. Government Printing Office Form 1972—O—459-931 bearing the intriguing title: "Publications Available for Distribution by Members of Congress to Homemakers and Residents of Cities and Towns": CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

WILDLIFE REFUGE NEARS REALITY

Congressman Craig Hosmer is predicting that the Senate will act "within the next few weeks" on his bill to create the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. The bill passed the House in June by a 314-0 vote. Once the Senate acts and the bill is signed into law by the President, the fish and wildlife resources of the Anaheim Bay area—including many endangered species—will be protected for all time by Federal law.

BRINGING ORDER TO ELECTORAL CHAOS

Remember the big push four years ago to reform the Electoral College and other facets of our Presidential election process? That was quietly forgotten once the election was passed. This year, attention is focusing on the primary elections.

A single national primary election has been suggested, but Congressman Hosmer doesn't

August 1, 1972

think much of the idea. It would pretty much restrict consideration to those candidates with enough money to wage a national campaign. Dark horse candidates couldn't afford it. Craig says he would prefer the Congress to take a hard look at the entire electoral process not just bits and pieces.

PEACE THROUGH OUTER SPACE?

NASA Administrator James Fletcher says that the planned U.S.-Soviet space venture is more than just a gesture of cooperation. It will help the push for peace. Cooperation in space—a Soviet-American earth orbital lab, a joint manned Moon station and eventually a joint expedition to Mars—hopefully will lead to more cooperation here on Earth.

ABOUT THAT SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

Congressional action to boost Social Security benefits by 20% is good news for today's retired persons. Further improvements in the system are contained in the Welfare Reform bill (H.R. 1), now stalled in the Senate. The challenge facing Congress is to bring the program into line with today's needs without overburdening it a few years from now.

FREE CONSUMER BOOKLETS AVAILABLE

Congressman Hosmer is offering consumer-oriented booklets without charge to residents of the 32nd District. If you find some materials of interest, please check the numbered boxes on the back of this letter, print your name and address on the form below and return this entire page to Craig. Please limit your order to a maximum of five booklets so that the available supply may accommodate as many residents as possible. Mail to: Congressman Craig Hosmer, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXIX

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced the telephone privacy bill on May 10, 1972, with a total of 48 cosponsors.

This bill would give individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option of requiring the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the name of those individuals in the phone book who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates or organizations, and opinion polltakers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individual or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a 27th sampling of these letters into the RECORD, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could, the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

NAPERVILLE, ILL.,
July 19, 1972.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REP. ASPIN: This letter concerns H.R. 14884, the bill to prevent nuisance telephone calls. I've been waiting a long time for such a bill to be adopted. Thank you for your past efforts in writing the bill. I encourage you to continue working to see that it is passed. I think I share the opinion of most people when I say that we don't want such calls and would really appreciate the efforts of those who could make it possible to prevent any such further calls.

Thank you,

NORTHLAKE, ILL.,
July 19, 1972.

U.S. Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: We would like to go on record as being very much in support of the bill HR-14884 to regulate telephone solicitations.

We appreciate your introduction and support of this bill. Personal privacy is becoming a scarce commodity, and what few vestiges of it remain must be jealously protected.

Thank you for whatever you can do to encourage passage of this bill.

Very truly yours,

ROLLING MEADOWS, ILL.,
July 21, 1972.

Re: Bill HR-14884.

U.S. Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Through the Chicago Tribune I learned that there is a bill pending that would "keep nuisances off my phone". This would certainly be a blessing, since there are an unbelievable number of people soliciting in this manner. Yesterday I had two calls regarding land sales. It isn't even 10:30 a.m. and I have just had two more. They are worse than leeches to get rid of. I tell them immediately that I am not interested, but they are most persistent. The time has come for me to stop being polite!

We would certainly appreciate the kind of protection your bill would afford. It isn't fair to have to obtain an unlisted number to avoid these nuisances as I have threatened to do, which would deprive me of hearing from friends who do not have my number.

Thank you for your consideration, and I shall be looking forward to hearing of the passage of your bill.

Yours very truly,

MOUNT PROSPECT, ILL.,
July 23, 1972.

SIR: The Chicago Tribune states that you have introduced a bill, HR 14884, to keep nuisances off the telephone. We are in total agreement with this measure. We have even been insulted by phone solicitors and have gone so far as to have our number removed from the phone book. We still receive all sorts of calls soliciting for numerous business offers as well as for donations. The worst offenders are the ones who make the call sound like long distance. These alarm us because we have a family member in New York who is quite ill.

Please continue to push this measure to inhibit this invasion of our privacy.

Thank you,

MOUNT PROSPECT, ILL.,
July 18, 1972.

Mr. LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: We are so glad you are sponsoring bill HR 14884 and hope very

much that it will be passed. Thank you for trying to get some relief for us from the nuisance telephone calls we are plagued with.

If there is any way we can help to get this bill through, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

OAK PARK, ILL.,
July 25, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN:

Please count me and my family as very much in favor of the passage of bill HR 14884.

Sincerely,

LAKE FOREST, ILL.,
July 14, 1972.

Re. H.R. 14884.

HON. LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I, too, am tired of telephone solicitations.

Please continue your good work on HR 14884.

Respectfully yours,

NATIONAL LEGAL SECRETARIES' COURT OBSERVANCE WEEK

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, since 1946, when the National Association of Legal Secretaries was founded, this fine organization has been dedicated to raising the professional standards of secretaries dealing with all aspects of the law. The association discovered that a frequent gap in their members' education was the opportunity to observe first-hand the type of court proceedings which followed from the efforts they had made in their respective offices. So in 1956 a Day-in-Court program was instituted to satisfy this need, and its effects have proved widely beneficial.

Mrs. Roberta L. Moens, president of the Rock Island County Legal Secretaries Association explained the program to me in this way:

Each October, we observe said program by sponsoring courthouse tours, presenting mock trials, attending special events and observing court procedures to gain a working knowledge of our judicial system. At every available opportunity, we extend invitations to high school and business school students to join our association in its activities.

Mrs. Moens went on to say:

We sincerely believe that through our Annual Day-in-Court program we have created a better understanding of our court system and in some small way, raised the standard of our profession. We further believe that a National Legal Secretaries Court Observance Week would further our cause and help to educate not only legal secretaries and students but the general public as well.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this fine program should be highly commended and encouraged. As a lawyer I can testify to the great responsibility that is placed on many of these individuals in the day-to-day operation of our courts and law

offices. Without their efficient and knowledgeable assistance the wheels of justice would be greatly slowed.

Further, as Mrs. Moens indicated, the National Association of Legal Secretaries is interested not only in gaining knowledge for themselves, but also in sharing that knowledge with others. This I feel, is most important. Regrettably, I have found that Americans know less about our judicial system than any other branch of government, even though their most direct—and often dismaying—experience with our Government come through it. Also, with criticism of our judicial system, and our Nation, continuing to mount, I believe that an expanded Day-in-Court program would provide an important opportunity for Americans to gain an increased understanding of their rights and privileges as American citizens, as well as their obligations to others.

For these reasons, I joined my distinguished colleague from South Carolina (FLOYD SPENCE) in sponsoring a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim the second full week in October of each year as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observation Week" and call upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I would like to commend the House for its passage of this resolution on July 28, 1972.

IS NAVAL PARITY WITH THE U.S.S.R. ENOUGH?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days this Congress has been engaged in debate over the military procurement authorization bill for fiscal year 1973. At issue in the past and still at issue is whether administration proposals for modernizing the U.S. Navy are sufficient to meet the Soviet threat.

The New York Times has now provided an answer of sorts in the statements of the commander of the Soviet Union's Navy on the occasion of Soviet Navy Day.

Admiral of the Fleet Sergei G. Gorshkov alleged in the Soviet Communist Party Newspaper Pravda that the Soviet fleets could detect and destroy an enemy vessel anywhere in the world.

The Times goes on to state in an article datelined Moscow, July 30 that Communist Party leader Leonid J. Brezhnev had indicated that the Russians had reached a state of nuclear equality with the United States and now has every intention of gaining naval parity if not supremacy.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that our potential adversary, the Soviet Union has stripped some of the clouds of rhetoric from our debate and has laid the issue squarely before us. Do we have the will to maintain a naval force sufficient to insure our freedom to use the oceans of

the world, or do we abandon those portions of this globe to the supremacy of the Soviet Union?

I am including the Times article in the RECORD, so that my colleagues can examine the express intentions of the other side, quite clearly stated, and decide on the policy issue of strength or weakness for our naval forces in accordance with their individual judgment.

CHIEF OF SOVIET NAVY SAYS FLEETS CAN REACH ANY Foe

Moscow, July 30.—The commander of the Soviet Union's Navy said today that his fleets, led by a growing number of nuclear submarines, could detect and destroy an enemy vessel anywhere in the world.

Admiral of the Fleet Sergei G. Gorshkov took the occasion of Soviet Navy Day to write in Pravda, the Soviet Communist party newspaper, that the Soviet Navy was a worldwide striking force and "an impressive factor deterring any attempts at sudden aggression against the Soviet Union."

He also stated that the "imperialists have unleashed more than 30 wars and armed conflicts in the postwar years," and, citing Vietnam and the Middle East as current dangers to world peace, he declared:

"It is quite natural that under such conditions our peaceful policy must be substantiated by defensive might."

The admiral added that the Soviet Union's nuclear submarines, "armed with ballistic missiles and long-range torpedoes, and backed by missile-carrying planes and ships, are capable of destroying an enemy in any region of the world's oceans."

Foreign submarines, he said, would fail to withstand a Soviet attack if war broke out. "Submarine, surface and air antisub forces can detect and utterly destroy any submarine in all weather conditions," the admiral wrote.

He did not refer directly to the United States, but his statements were clearly directed at his navy's No. 1 competitor for supremacy on the seas.

The agreements on limitation of strategic arms, signed in Moscow last May by President Nixon and the Communist party leader Leonid I. Brezhnev, indicated that the Russians had reached a state of nuclear equality with the United States and Moscow now has every intention of gaining naval parity, if not supremacy.

Since Admiral Gorshkov took command of the navy, 16 years ago, he has transformed an insignificant coastal defense force into four blue-water fleets that patrol from the Arctic to the Antarctic.

Admiral Gorshkov noted today that his ships had called at more than 60 ports in Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America in the last three years.

The Pacific, Baltic, Arctic and Black Sea fleets have about 408 submarines, 95 of them nuclear-powered; 27 cruisers, two helicopter carriers, 101 destroyers and more than 1,000 smaller but heavily armed craft.

The United States still has superiority in aircraft carriers and destroyers, though it is outnumbered in cruisers and conventional submarines. Western specialists, however, are worried about the rate at which Soviet shipyards are producing nuclear submarines—an average of one every five weeks.

The United States has 101 nuclear submarines and is scheduled to produce only 11 in the 1972-73 programs.

Writing in the latest issue of the authoritative Jane's Fighting Ships, the editor, Raymond V. B. Blackman, said: "It is a sobering thought that no other country in the world in this day and age of sophistication and inflation can possibly build as many submarines as the Soviet Navy has at the present time."

And the Soviet Defense Minister, Andrei A. Grechko, indicated that the current buildup of nuclear submarines and other ships would continue at its present pace. His Order of the Day, published in the Defense Ministry paper, Krasnaya Zvezda, voiced the need for "new successes in creating ships equipped with the most up-to-date equipment and armaments for our navy."

M. LARRY LAWRENCE

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party has been enjoying a spectacular renaissance in San Diego County, thanks in large measure to the efforts of one man, my old friend and confidant, M. Larry Lawrence.

Since Larry took over as southern California chairman of our party, we have taken a sizable lead in registrations in the county and elected one of our own to a State assembly seat previously regarded as the permanent possession of the GOP.

Larry is one of the most quotable, colorful personalities now in political practice anywhere. With his energy and way with words, and his willingness to wither a fellow partisan when he thinks such criticism merited, he has attracted a good deal of attention in the news media in San Diego and throughout California. In this fashion, he has helped stimulate public interest not only in the revival of our party, but in the political process generally.

All our colleagues might not agree with everything Larry says. But all, I am sure, would find his remarks of interest. With that in mind, I include at this point excerpts from a speech delivered by Larry to the San Diego Rotary Club shortly after he returned from service as a delegate at the Democratic National Convention:

SPEECH BY M. LARRY LAWRENCE

Machiavelli once said, "There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things." This is a day of new ideas that bear on your and my lives, in business and the professions as well as politics, and only the most dogmatic will reject its reality!

I have just returned from a convention where everyone was serious and concerned, where everyone worked without sleep for days on end, where even in victory there was little exuberance, and where until the convention was over almost no one I saw took an alcoholic drink.

The delegates—many, but certainly by no means all, young—were exemplary in their manner and dedication, belying all predictions including my own. They went for values and ideals, and if there was one ideal they went for in the most part it was trust! They trust a hard headed, conservative in many ways, Dakota farmer-minister named George McGovern.

Many of the delegates represent the underdogs in this country, and I doubted they trusted anyone much anymore. And as a result, the order of things became turned about.

These delegates have rejected the big union bosses with the same fervor as the big political bosses. They give to Nixon the teamsters, whose recent president was released by Nixon after being jailed by Bobby Kennedy.

They believe of you and I, the biblical quotation, "Who can protest and does not, is an accomplice to the act."

No one who observes the American scene gives George McGovern much chance as of today.

But then again a few months back how many gave him much chance for the nomination?

Clearly his will be a people's campaign. The money, power, and most of the press, is on the side of the administration, and I am not so naive to believe that victory will be easy, though it is possible.

But I saw the rank amateurs of 1968 become better pro's than the pro's in 1972. If they don't pull it off in 1972 there is no way possible for them to lose in 1976. This year is the last year of an establishment presidential possibility. If you look at the figures of voting age requirements, you will note that by 1976 voters over 50 will be outnumbered 10-to-1 by voters under 30. In 1976 this same group will outnumber the voters from 30-50 almost 3-to-1. And that is the same ratio they are registering democratic, even in staid old San Diego. The old democratic coalition is gone, and strangely enough with it will be the old republic coalition.

If the Democratic party had one theme out of Miami, it is that Nixon and the Republican party will overkill, in hate and attack on McGovern's positions, and in the extravagant use of money.

They beg the Republicans to get bitter and mean and nasty. They believe they have met the test of devotion by behaving when things have gone against them.

They are counting on Nixon and his friends to create the climate of hate that will bring about Democratic victory. And you may be surprised to know that George McGovern is just one element of that victory, and some believe not the most important.

If there is an elaboration of the theme that binds the new coalition it was stated almost 20 years ago—and it is the policy that is the guiding inspiration to George McGovern.

I quote:

"Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who are hungry and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

"This world in arms is not spending money alone.

"It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.

"The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities.

"It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population.

"It is two fine, fully equipped hospitals.

"It is some 50 miles of concrete highway.

"We pay for a single fighter plane with a half million bushels of wheat.

"We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

"This, I repeat, is the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking.

"This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

The quotation is from President Dwight D. Eisenhower, April 16, 1953, to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, in Washington, D.C.

"YOUNG EXECUTIVES REPORT"

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, recently 15 young executives of the Department of Agriculture received a great deal of notoriety for recommending the elimination of farm price support programs, even though the Department disclaimed responsibility for the contents of their report.

I have made a careful analysis of the records of the people making the report; when they entered Government service, what their salary was when they were hired, how much they are paid now, and their length of Government service.

It is interesting to see how these people have had their parity pay increases working under the shelter of the Federal Government, while condemning parity for our countryside residents.

I think it is noteworthy to point out that these individuals were appointed to this study because of the positions they held.

I think it is worthy to note that they entered Government service under four different Presidents, but only one of them under the present administration.

Seven of them started to work for the Government under President Kennedy, four under President Johnson, three under President Eisenhower, and one under President Nixon.

I think the public should know these facts. Here is the record:

Gene S. Bergoffen, Forester. Entered Federal service in 1960 at \$4,980. Present salary, \$23,424.

Allan S. Johnson, Assistant to the Administrator, Economic Research Service. Started in 1965 at \$15,866. Present salary \$26,436.

Carol J. Alexander, Administrative Librarian. Started with the Government in 1961 at \$2,950. Present salary, \$21,960.

Karen L. Berke, Public Information Specialist. Entered service in 1963 at \$4,440. Present salary, \$16,395.

John S. Bottum, Deputy Administrator, Rural Development. Started in 1957 at \$3,415. Present salary, \$30,667.

John E. Carson, Deputy Administrator, Administrative Management. Entered Government service in 1961 at \$5,355. Present salary, \$35,583.

Betty L. Dotson, Assistant to the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service. Started in 1960 at \$4,525. Present salary, \$25,583.

Avram E. Guroff, international economist. Started with Government in 1965 at \$11,782. Present salary, \$21,960.

Clarence R. Hanna, Management Analyst. Started in 1964 at \$5,540. Present salary, \$23,424.

James E. Haskell, agricultural economist. Entered Government service in 1966 at \$2.40 per hour. Present salary, \$19,362.

Homer R. Hilner, Soil Conservationist. Started in 1963 at \$3,175. Present salary, \$23,424.

Jerome A. Miles, Director of Budget

and Finance. Entered Government in 1953 at \$4,725. Present salary, \$36,000.

Gerald C. Puppe, Director of Personnel. Started with Government in 1962 at \$4,690. Present salary, \$25,583.

William L. Ruble, Assistant to Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Started in 1968 at \$25,708. Present salary, \$32,645.

Robert P. Shiner, Agricultural Marketing Specialist. Entered service in 1962 at \$4,565. Present salary, \$19,987.

This is the kind of entrenched bureaucracy we must deal with in our efforts to better the economic conditions of our rural people. Thank God, the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, write our laws.

THE LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE—GENESIS AND PROSPECT FOR AGREEMENT IN 1973

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, as one who believes strongly in, and has long fought for, meaningful legislation and programs to protect and enhance our fishery and ocean resources and the establishment of an offshore marine resources conservation zone, I am taking this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very timely and in-depth address which my good friend and colleague, Congressman TOM PELLY of Washington, gave recently before the Lake City Rotary Club in his home community of Seattle.

In his address, Mr. PELLY provides a straightforward and very practical assessment of the overwhelming importance of the upcoming International Law of the Sea Conference to be held in Geneva next year as it relates to our future fishery and ocean resources within the overall context of an international agreement. Having read and analyzed his very timely and important speech, I want to commend Mr. PELLY personally for having made it and, at the same time, recommend it highly to my colleagues. I do so because both the President and many Members of Congress have placed a high priority on this particular international conference.

Several of us in the Congress have recently written the President urging him to name Mr. PELLY as one of our chief negotiators and a member of the U.S. delegation to the International Law of the Sea Conference. Certainly, Tom PELLY is eminently well qualified for this high honor. As the ranking minority member of our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and in view of his outstanding leadership in the marine resources field, he has the unqualified respect and support of the American Federation of Fishermen as well as all the fishermen and fishermen's wives groups in my coastal congressional district of California. Having announced his retirement from the Congress, TOM PELLY will

be in a position to devote all of his time and attention to his most important task.

The address follows:

THE LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE—GENESIS AND PROSPECT FOR AGREEMENT IN 1973

The International Law of the Sea is a highly complex subject—a nightmare of vague, deliberately ill-defined concepts. Unlike, however, most other aspects of international law, the Law of the Sea has profound day-to-day impact upon our lives.

It is a pleasure to be with you today to discuss the current efforts to overhaul the existing Law of the Sea structure, with particular emphasis upon the need for a new Fisheries Convention.

Over fifteen years ago, I introduced in Congress a bill to compensate the engineer of the tuna clipper, ARCTIC MAID, for his injuries following an attack by an Ecuadorian gun boat on the high seas, 23 miles off the coast of Ecuador. At that time, the United States while not recognizing the various territorial claims of Ecuador and other Latin American countries, refused to protect American fishing vessels and their crews from attack. The injustice of this situation was obvious to all but the United States Department of State. The attack upon the ARCTIC MAID and other innocent American fishing boats, together with the growing presence of foreign fishing vessels barely three miles off our shores, prompted me to initiate legislation to extend our jurisdiction seaward to the 12-mile limit and to secure the enactment of legislation to compensate our fishermen for the fines paid and the damages sustained as a result of such unlawful seizures. Always consistent, the State Department opposed to the bitter end these legislative proposals. Fortunately, however, clearer heads prevailed and our contiguous fishery zone was established. The Fishermen's Protective Act, at least provided some measure of compensation, although nothing could really make up for the danger to human life, to say nothing of the downright inconvenience, inherent in any seizure.

The international community had an opportunity at the 1958 and 1960 Geneva Conferences on the Law of the Sea to resolve the twin issues of excessive jurisdictional claims and over-exploitation of fishery resources. Those conferences were held before these issues had reached crisis proportions. Nevertheless, agreement could not be achieved. The various conventions which were adopted simply side-stepped the issue of breadth of territorial seas and failed to agree upon even the most elementary principals of fishery management, most notably the abstention principle.

Thus, by 1966, the United States adopted two stop-gap measures: The nine-mile Contiguous Fisheries Zone and the Fishermen's Protective Act to make up for the deficiencies in existing international law. The prospect for reconsideration of the conventions appeared to be dim. The United States continued to place primary reliance upon regional fishery compacts to resolve the ever-growing problem of over-exploitation.

From an entirely different approach, however, the seeds of agitation for a new Law of the Sea Conference began to germinate. In 1967, Ambassador Pardo of Malta presented a resolution to the United Nations calling for the establishment of an international regime which would be charged with responsibility for exploring and exploiting the mineral resources of the oceans for the benefit of all mankind with particular emphasis upon the needs of the developing nations. He characterized the wealth of the sea-bed as the "Common Heritage of Mankind". In December, 1967, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution establishing an ad hoc committee to study the "Peaceful

Uses of the Sea-bed and Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction". During 1968, this Committee began to consider the scientific, economic and legal aspects of sea-bed exploration and exploitation. In the fall of 1968, the General Assembly established a permanent Committee composed of 42 member states on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-bed. The Committee's mandate was directed exclusively toward promotion of international cooperation for the development of the sea-bed for the benefit of mankind. During 1969, the Committee gradually defined the issues inherent in the establishment of such an international regime. These issues were the nature and geographic extent of national jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf, the deep sea-bed and super-adjacent waters, and the political feasibility of establishing an international regime to regulate sea-bed activities beyond the limit of national jurisdiction.

At this point, in the fall of 1969, it became apparent that the Malta Resolution—the concept of an international sea-bed regime—was inextricably bound to the continuing international dispute over coastal state jurisdiction in adjacent high seas areas. Put very simply, in order to define the jurisdiction of the international sea-bed resource agency, the international community must first decide the seaward limits of national jurisdiction. It was equally clear that one standard for sea-bed mineral resources and another standard for the living resources of the oceans would not be acceptable to the majority of nations. Of course, while the prospect of tapping the unknown riches of the sea-bed was being discussed in the United Nations, the world's fishery problems were steadily intensifying. The seizure of American tuna clippers became more and more frequent and the presence of vast fleets of Russian and other trawlers and factory ships became commonplace off the coast of Oregon and Washington and on the traditional fishing grounds of our New England fishermen.

In 1970, the United Nations approved a resolution calling for an international conference in 1973 on the Law of the Sea, officially bringing together the parallel issues of sea-bed resource development, territorial seas, and fishery jurisdiction. The sea-bed Committee, as it is still known, was expanded to 91 nations, virtually every member of the United Nations with any interest in the work of the Committee.

These developments formed the basis for a new State Department excuse for its failure to support reasonable efforts in the Congress to relieve the pressure on our Continental Shelf fishery resources and to make it unprofitable for the Latin American countries to continue seizing our tuna boats. Instead of saying as before, that bilateral negotiations were on the verge of producing an agreement, the State Department could now say that all of these problems would be resolved at the forthcoming Law of the Sea Conference.

The Sea-bed Committee, during 1971, did virtually nothing: The United States submitted a draft sea-bed convention which the developing countries promptly tore apart. Fishery problems were not even addressed except in the most generalized manner during the meetings of that year.

We now come to 1972 with only a year to go before this much touted Law of the Sea Conference is to begin its work.

The first 1972 session of the Sea-bed Committee was held last March in New York. A Tower of Babel would best describe that five-week meeting as 91 nations attempted to agree upon a draft agenda for the 1973 Conference. While you might think that an agenda would be the easiest topic for agreement—simply what issues the Conference will attempt to resolve—nothing at the

United Nations is quite that simple. Hair splitting is the order of the day. The privilege of drafting a provisional agenda was informally delegated to a working group of Latin American, African and Asian countries. Even they could not agree among themselves however until the remaining members of the Committee appeared on the verge of revolt against this take-over by a handful of have-nots. Finally a draft agenda was tabled as the session closed.

Debate on this agenda covering over 20 major topics will be the first order of business when the Committee meets in Geneva on July 17th for a one-month stand.

Assuming that an agenda can be agreed upon promptly, the work of preparing draft treaty articles for consideration at the Law of the Sea Conference will begin.

With respect to a sea-bed regime, some progress has been made. In addition to the U.S. draft treaty, ten proposals have been submitted of varying complexity. These papers reflect the views of such countries as Russia, the United Kingdom, Japan and a variety of developing nations such as Tanzania working alone or in groups. None, however, come to grips with the basic issue linking the sea-bed and fisheries problems—the seaward limit of coastal state jurisdiction.

In the fisheries area much less has been accomplished. The issues are more emotion-charged and there is no clear cut community of interest among large blocks of nations. The lines of battle are not drawn between developing and industrialized nations. The Latin Americans seem to have a paranoid interest in the activities of the United States Congress and continually address the Committee in the most inflammatory terms, denouncing the efforts of Pelly and Company to protect the legitimate interest of American Fishermen. In such an atmosphere, little progress can be expected.

In September, the United Nations General Assembly will decide whether progress warrants calling a Law of the Sea Conference in 1973. I believe it will decide this question in the affirmative, although by any impartial measure of work accomplished, we will not be ready.

Pressure from the developing countries will, however, override all legitimate concern and the conference will begin in 1973 doing the work which the Sea-bed Committee should have accomplished during the previous two years. With all the brevity that this subject permits, that is where we stand today.

I would like to touch upon the U.S. Law of the Sea position as we enter this final phase of preparatory work and then I will glance quickly into my crystal ball, cloudy as it may be.

The United States is prepared, perhaps resigned is a better term, to accept extension of territorial seas to twelve miles provided the right to free passage through international straits, which would be closed by such an extension, is recognized. In the Law of the Sea we have been accustomed to speaking terms of "innocent passage" through international straits. There is a substantial difference, however, between free and innocent passage.

Thus submarines may navigate submerged under the concept of free passage, whereas they must surface and show their flag under the traditional right of innocent passage. Furthermore, beyond the obvious defense considerations in this age of missile submarines, there are commercial interests involved in this concept of free passage. Pollution is a genuine concern to many people in this age of giant super-tankers. Should such vessels enjoy the right of free transit unhampered by environmental regulations of coastal states or should the nations adjacent to narrow passages have the right to impose environmental safety regulations

upon these ships? While the major powers are concerned with the movement of their submarine fleets and the industrial nations desire the unfettered movement of oil by the most direct route, the majority of U.N. members literally don't give a damn about these issues. Is our straits policy essential from a national defense viewpoint? The Department of State appears to think this issue is negotiable, but the Defense Department appears to be locked into this issue. The fear shared by many observers of our position is that we will refuse to participate in any new Law of the Sea Convention that does not recognize the Defense Department position. I think, however, that in the final analysis, a balance will be struck which reflects our global naval strategy while conceding the right of coastal states to impose reasonable environmental controls on ships which have a high pollution potential in confined straits.

On the breadth of territorial sea, aside from the straits issue, I believe our current position is unreasonable. We are in effect saying that we will recognize what the majority of nations have already done. Twelve miles is simply not enough and should be extended for Conservation purposes.

Whether this is possible will depend upon the mood of the conference; however, I am guardedly optimistic on this point.

The United States' draft treaty on the sea-bed contemplates three levels of jurisdiction. From the shoreline seaward to the point where the water reaches a depth of 200 meters, the coastal states will exercise exclusive jurisdiction over the development of the sea-bed mineral resources as we do now under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. From the 200-meter isobath seaward to the deep sea floor, we have proposed an intermediate zone, the precise seaward limit of which has been left open to future negotiation. The intermediate zone has been termed a trusteeship area where the coastal state will be responsible for development, but a portion of the wealth derived from this area will be turned over to the international community for the benefit of the developing nations. Exploitation of the deep sea-bed will be entirely international in character. This graduated approach from absolute coastal state jurisdiction to the 200-meter isobath and ending with a completely internationalized regime for the deep sea-bed is a rational and logical point of departure for the Law of the Sea Conference. It deserves serious and constructive consideration on the part of the other Committee members.

We are not giving up our Continental Shelf oil reserves which we desperately need to meet our energy demands. We are prepared, however, to participate fully with the international community in the development of deep sea-bed hard mineral resources in keeping with the "Common Heritage of Mankind" theme.

The proposals already tabled by the various developing countries on the other hand reflect a certain unreality which unfortunately pervades much of the United Nations deliberations. While these countries decry the profit motivation of the industrialized nations, they ignore the fact that only the United States, the major European nations and Japan have the capital resources necessary for exploitation of the deep sea-bed. Thus, they would exclude private enterprise entirely and yet fail to consider how and where the United Nations or any specialized agency might raise the millions of dollars required even to begin commercial extraction of sea-bed minerals such as manganese nodules.

Again, however, in the final analysis, I think a sea-bed regime very close to the United States proposal will be agreed upon, but not before we are subjected to a hundred or more anti-capitalist diatribes. Self

interest will prevail after the speeches are over.

Lastly, and deliberately so, we come to the fisheries issue—where it all began.

Our fisheries position has evolved rapidly during the past year from espousing the traditional multilateral and regional approach—so discredited in New England and so inadequate in the case of salmon—to the species approach, which was first formally enunciated before the Sea-bed Committee by Canada.

We now propose that jurisdiction over coastal species, which are dependent upon the relatively shallow waters of the Continental Shelf during their entire life cycle, be delegated to the coastal state, and that foreign fishermen wishing to utilize these stocks observe the conservation measures imposed by the coastal state and contribute financially to these conservation efforts. We likewise propose that jurisdiction over anadromous species be vested in the nation whose inland fresh waters provide the breeding grounds for these stocks and whose domestic water restoration programs make possible their continued regeneration. The pelagic species such as tuna, which spend their entire life in the high seas and migrate vast distances in international waters do not lend themselves to conservation by any one nation, and there the United States has proposed that these species must be the subject of international and regional conservation measures.

Under this proposal, coastal states would regulate the taking of 75 percent of the world ocean fish harvest without regard to arbitrary distance measurements. The authority delegated to coastal states would be subject to international standards, such as those designed to assure conservation and maximum utilization of fisheries and agreed formula for historic fishing rights. Compulsory arbitration of disputes is an essential aspect of our formula.

While I firmly believe that the present United States position is compelling from the biologic standpoint and is fair to all nations truly concerned with balancing yield and sound conservation, I fear that many nations do not share this concern. Our experience in the North Atlantic with the decimation of the haddock and yellow-fin flounder stocks, the fate of halibut and cod in the Bering Sea and North Pacific—all throw serious doubt upon the professed interest of the Russians, the Japanese, and their lesser imitators, in conservation of the world's fisheries. By their actions they are known rather than their words. Callous disregard is the hallmark of their fishing expeditions to this continent over the past twenty years. As each species has been over-fished to the point of commercial extinction, pressure is applied to another.

The countries of the west coast of South America, in the same vein, preach conservation, while engaging in simple piracy. The tuna issue is used to stir emotions against the United States to divert attention from the government's inability to cope with pressing domestic social problems.

Do we, therefore, have any reasonable basis for hope that these concepts of fishery management will be accepted by a majority of nations in 1973? I find it hard to believe. A recent example of this widespread failure to practice even the most elementary principles of conservation involved the Atlantic Salmon.

In 1970, I became aware of the fact that Denmark had for some years been taking ever-increasing numbers of this highly-prized game fish in the waters between Greenland and Baffin Island. This involved only a handful of boats and a few hundred fishermen, yet had the potential for total destruction of the Canadian and American salmon runs. Although the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fish-

eries (ICNAF) voted a total ban on high seas fishing for salmon, Denmark, Norway and West Germany refused to ratify the ban. I, therefore, introduced legislation which I am pleased is now law, to ban the importation of all fishery products from any country which fails to abide by an international fishery conservation program to which the United States is a party. Hardly had the President finished signing this bill into law, before Denmark agreed to phase out its Atlantic Salmon fishery. This, unfortunately, is the only approach which seems to work. Needless to say, the State Department opposed my bill and predicted dire international repercussions if the United States should dare to take such steps against a so-called "friendly NATO ally."

In view of this attitude reflected among most of the major fishing nations, I cannot believe that a rational fishery conservation agreement will be achieved voluntarily in 1973.

The United States, Canada, and other nations with viable Continental Shelf and anadromous fishery resources will be compelled either in groups or alone to declare these resources off-limits to those who will not abide by our standards. This may involve an arbitrary mileage figure for enforcement purposes or it may be coupled with a depth factor. The latter makes more sense from the biologic standpoint. Such unilateral measures will not truly protect the species, but they will hurt the major fishing nations in their pocketbooks; something they all understand. Only when the United States demonstrates, as we did in the Atlantic Salmon case, that we have the backbone to stand up for our legitimate interests, will we be heeded.

I am hopeful that bilateral negotiations with the Latin American countries over tuna will eventually succeed along the lines of our recent shrimp agreement with Brazil. In the meantime, we must continue to support our fishermen under the Protection Act and insure that this blackmail does not result in further physical harm to our citizens.

My pessimism regarding the prospect for a sweeping new fisheries agreement is predicated upon cold hard facts—facts which have been brought home to me time after time over the past twenty years in Congress. No Member of Congress has followed these developments more closely than I.

I would hope, of course, that a spirit of enlightened self-interest would prevail at this conference for the benefit of all men. The issues swept under the table in 1958 regarding territorial seas and the extent of coastal state jurisdiction over mineral resources in the sea-bed are ripe for settlement. Of all the issues, however, fisheries is the most pressing simply because so much of the resource is close to exhaustion.

Success of the conference in all areas will depend largely upon the leadership and determination of the United States. These qualities will be respected and heeded. While we have put forth a number of sound imaginative proposals, we have not exercised leadership in the deliberations thus far. We have permitted the developing nations to dominate the actions of the Sea-bed Committee. We have been timid and overly fearful of offending anyone. These qualities do not engender respect nor do they produce results. If the United States begins to pull its weight and stops engaging in a popularity contest, we just may have a chance.

I have attempted to present a realistic view of these developments so that you will understand more fully the problems we face. I appreciate your patient interest in this overview of the Law of the Sea movement and trust you will follow its progress closely in the months ahead.

The wise use of the wealth of the seas—

living and mineral—is a fascinating challenge to all nations. Let us hope we are all equal to the challenge.

CONGRESSMAN STANTON ANSWERS RALPH NADER QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of the House, I have received and answered a lengthy questionnaire from the Ralph Nader organization. The 96-page document contained, as you know, 633 questions. I must confess that I at first regarded this as an imposition on my time and that of my staff, but my attitude changed when I examined the questionnaire closely. I see it now as affording me an opportunity—a vehicle, if you will—for advancing some ideas that have been taking shape in my mind during my first term as a Member of this body.

I would like to share these ideas with my colleagues here and, in addition, I think these tentative proposals might be of interest to members of the public who have been following the working of Congress. For these reasons, I am inserting here, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my answers to a few of the questions that were asked me on the form. I have selected, as excerpts to be published here, my replies with respect to the seniority system in Congress and some of the ethical questions confronting Members and, also, some suggestions I have made to the Nader organization with respect to restructuring the committee system in Congress. I would be interested in any comments that these suggestions might inspire, either on the part of my colleagues or members of the public.

I would like to add that I have furnished copies of my replies to all 633 questions to members of the press who serve here as correspondents for newspapers in the Cleveland, Ohio, area. Some news stories have appeared as a result. Were it not for the cost involved—I was told by the U.S. Government Printing Office that it would cost the taxpayers \$2,890—I would have submitted for publication in the RECORD the entire questionnaire and all my replies. Since this is not feasible, I would like it to be known that I have copies of the questionnaire and my replies in my office, and I will gladly make them available to anyone who is interested in pursuing this subject in greater detail.

Here are the excerpts that I would like to include in the RECORD at this time:

EXCERPTS OF REPLIES TO RALPH NADER QUESTIONNAIRE

205. Would you favor limiting the length of time a Member of Congress may serve on any one committee (for example, by a system of rotating committee assignments)? A. Yes.

206. Your reasons?

In my opinion, no Member of Congress should serve more than five terms on any one Committee. First, since the concerns of the people of each constituency are pan-

ramic, I don't think it behooves them to have their Congressman become stuck in one area of jurisdiction. Second, a Congressman who becomes a fixture in a given area of responsibility acquires power disproportionate to his position as the representative of a single constituency among 435 others. Third, it's in the nature of things that the longer a Congressman stays in one place, the greater the danger that his vision will narrow and that he might begin identifying himself with the various interests that have matters at stake before the Committee—a factor which would make him less responsive to the people as a whole.

269. What, if any, new methods of oversight and monitoring do you favor establishing, either inside or outside the Congress?

I believe Congress itself is in need—as is any institution—of oversight and monitoring. In my opinion this can be done effectively and reliably only by an entity outside of Congress. I don't regard the General Accounting Office as the appropriate agency for this purpose, since the office considers itself an arm of the legislative branch. I have seen no GAO reports criticizing Congress itself. I would suggest that an agency be set up for this purpose somewhere in the executive branch. While this is a constitutionally delicate matter, I see no reason why difficulties could not be overcome—if there were a will to do so. I think such an arrangement would fit in very well with our systems of checks and balances, and would help to enhance it. Since the President and a Member of Congress share the constituents of each Congressional District, I see no reason why review and oversight should not be mutual. My answers to subsequent questions will indicate some examples of what I have in mind.

270. Your additional comments, if any, on these sections of the questionnaire (committees and oversight):

As in my answer to 269, I obviously regard your questionnaire as a vehicle for putting out ideas for public consideration. I trust it is understood that I am herewith making no formal proposals, since a lot more thought has to be given to these matters, both from the standpoint of desirability and practicality. Be that as it may, I will proceed with some off-the-cuff suggestions about a restructuring of the committee system of Congress. (Please keep in mind that these suggestions ought to be considered in conjunction with my proposal limiting service on committees to five terms.)

I have felt for some time now that Congress ought to organize itself into Committees in a manner paralleling its organization of the Executive Branch into Departments. For example there should be a Transportation Committee, constituted as a counterpart to its creature in the Executive Branch, namely the Department of Transportation. To a certain extent we already have this in Congress, but the pattern is not consistent. If we were to achieve a substantially symmetrical system such as this, I believe it would enhance public understanding of the workings of government, since the voter would have virtually identical points of reference in both the executive and legislative branches. I think this is an important objective to strive toward in these times when the public is becoming progressively more alienated from government, one reason being distrust because it is so difficult to perceive how the government operates and how its different parts mesh.

Another advantage of such a system is that it would assist Congress in exercising oversight in a manner better organized than at present. It would have the further advantage of redistributing the functions and power of the existing Committees along lines that perhaps would help to expedite legislation. I have in mind, for example, the Ways

and Means Committee, where much of the nation's high priority legislation is handled, with a backlog developing as each matter awaits its turn (revenue sharing, tax reform, national health insurance, social security, tariffs—to cite some examples). Under this scheme, a single committee would not have jurisdiction over all these items.

I have another suggestion to make about restructuring Congressional committees. It seems to me that three of the major functions of Congress—legislating, appropriating, and overseeing—could be discharged more efficiently if a single Committee were to carry out all three functions within its area of responsibility. For example, the Transportation Committee would not only legislate new programs for the Transportation Department, and extend or curtail existing programs, but it would also propose appropriations for the programs it establishes and then it would oversee the operations of these programs. To this end, each standing Committee could have, in addition to the Chairman, three Deputy Chairmen—one for legislation, a second for appropriations and a third for oversight. These positions would rotate as "old" members leave the Committee and new ones come in under the five-term limitation rule.

I see several advantages inherent in such a system. First, it would tend to close the gap between promise and fulfillment with respect to new programs where there are generous financial authorizations, followed by meager appropriations. Since the same Congressmen would be dealing both with authorizations and appropriations, one could expect more realistic and responsible legislation to result in both areas. Second, the Congressman dealing with appropriations would have better knowledge of the subject, since they will have helped develop the programs which they are being called on to finance. Similarly, the Congressional "authorizers" would have more intimate knowledge of the Departments to which the programs are being assigned. Third, with respect to oversight, such an arrangement would institutionalize this function on each committee. I think a lot more oversight is needed, and this is one means of providing it. Those exercising the oversight will have already, presumably, had a hand in establishing the programs they are reviewing, and they would have a better notion of what to look for.

In conjunction with this set-up, I see no reason why Congress could not also retain such committees of general oversight as Government Operations and the Joint Economic Committee. To the extent that there would be an increased flow of legislation to the floor, a strengthened Rules Committee also would appear to be desirable.

LOBBYING AND ADVOCACY

322. Are the current laws regulating Congressional lobbying adequate? A. No.

323. If no, what changes in the law should be made? I do not believe we can expect adequate enforcement of whatever antilobbying laws we have if we rely on officials such as the House's own Clerk for enforcement.

349. If you would like to see more incumbents defeated or retiring, how do you favor encouraging this?

I believe a new rule, such as I advocate here, limiting service on any given Committee to five terms automatically would encourage more incumbents to retire. A senior member contemplating the surrender of his Chairmanship and being assigned to lesser status on some other Committee would have less incentive to want to stay in Congress.

370. Do you believe that Members of Congress should have to disclose publicly all aspects of their personal wealth or financial interests? A. No.

371. If no, what public disclosures should they not have to make and why?

I would support resolutions for more complete disclosure, even of "all aspects of . . . personal wealth," on an up-and-down vote in the House. I do not have particularly strong feelings about this one way or the other. However, I believe that moving in this direction, rather than toward achieving stronger enforcement of rules that we already have, would be a mistake. I accept the proposition that public officials have an obligation to assure their constituents they are not involved in conflicts of interests, and also the proposition that public disclosures often might deter some members from becoming involved in a conflict. However, I believe it is naive to expect too much from the disclosures themselves. I doubt that, no matter how tightly the rules are drawn, the forms would be altogether revealing. There are too many ways to conceal assets, and the person who contrives to do so would have no more difficulty in filing a disclosure statement than a Communist spy would have in swearing to a non-Communist affidavit.

TRIBUTE TO DR. KARL TARGOWNIK

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, last month I was privileged to present the Shawnee County, Kans., Law Day Liberty Bell Award to Dr. Karl Targownik of Topeka.

Dr. Targownik was given this honor in recognition of his long and effective years of service at the Kansas State Reception and Diagnostic Center in Topeka. Over and above this, however, Dr. Targownik deserves our consideration and praise because of the adversity he had to overcome in order to achieve his present position.

Of Jewish descent, Dr. Targownik lived in Poland prior to World War II and suffered much because of the Polish biological anti-Semitism of those years.

He survived Polish ghettos and labor camps during the early part of the war, only to be taken to Auschwitz in 1943, where he underwent truly inhuman physical and psychological torture.

Dr. Targownik was freed by the forces of Gen. George Patton. Soon after he began the study of medicine at the University of Heidelberg in 1945. After receiving his degree, he came to the United States.

This new member of the American medical profession adjusted quickly to his adopted homeland. Dr. Targownik secured licenses to practice medicine in the States of Kansas and Ohio. He became board certified in 1956 and a fellow of the American Psychiatric Association in 1963.

Dr. Targownik came to Topeka in 1951, and worked as a resident physician at Topeka State Hospital while attending the Menninger School of Psychiatry. He later served as a section chief at Topeka State and helped organize services at the hospital's Eastman Building, which embodies the most modern concept in psychiatric architecture and modern psychiatric treatment concepts.

In 1962, Dr. Targownik was given his most challenging responsibility, that of

organizing clinical—medical, neurological, and psychiatric—services for the Kansas State Reception and Diagnostic Center. At the time, the center had almost nothing in the way of such services.

Today, after a decade of Dr. Targownik's leadership, the center is nationally recognized for its work in the areas of crime and delinquency.

The center has developed scientific methods for the examination of offenders—last year 800 of them—thus assisting the sentencing courts with the most valuable information about the "why" of a crime. The center's goal is to determine the best method of rehabilitation, taking into consideration both the offender's needs and the community's expectations.

The center has truly marked the beginning of a new era in the treatment of criminal offenders.

Thus Dr. Targownik received the Liberty Bell Award not for one particular act of the past year, but rather for his continuing efforts.

I know that my colleagues join me in extending thanks and best wishes to this man for a past well done and a future yet to come.

SALMON FISHERY ALONG NEW ENGLAND COAST

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as an avid sportsman, I have had the pleasant experience over the years of trying my hand at salmon fishing on the beautiful Miramichi River in New Brunswick, Canada. Few sights are as thrilling to me as watching those salmon battling their way upstream.

Though I have not had the opportunity of late to visit the Miramichi, reports are that salmon fishing there this year is the best in several years. Unfortunately this is not the case in other parts of North America. Indeed, at one time it was feared that this precious natural resource was faced with outright extinction.

In 1967 an international effort was initiated to obtain a total ban on high seas fishing for salmon in the North Atlantic area. The problem is that salmon are anadromous fish. They are hatched in a fresh water stream, migrate to the ocean and return a few years later to spawn in their home stream. As these various stocks mix on the high seas, there is no way to determine which fish being caught belong to which stock. Consequently, it was conceivable that an entire race of Atlantic salmon could be wiped out by the wholesale fishing being pursued in the Atlantic, simply by catching virtually all the fish that spawn in the same home stream.

As part of the effort to confront the dangers posed by the high seas fishery problem, I cosponsored H.R. 3304 and worked vigorously for its enactment. It was ultimately signed into law on Dec-

ember 23, 1971. The new law permits the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the importation into the United States of any fish products from any country which conducts fishing operations in a manner or in such circumstances which diminish the effectiveness of domestic conservation programs.

Perhaps because of the impetus of this legislation, an agreement worked out between the United States and Denmark with regard to the curtailing of salmon fishing off west Greenland was announced in February of this year. Under the terms of this agreement, high seas fishery by Danish-flag vessels will be gradually phased out over a 4-year period, 1972 through 1975. In 1972, the maximum high seas catch will be 800 metric tons—the Danes took about 940 tons in 1971; 600 tons in 1973; 550 tons in 1974; and 500 tons in 1975, with the complete ban in effect in 1976.

In addition, the inshore catch by local Greenland fishermen will be stabilized at 1,100 metric tons—about 1,200 tons were reported for 1971.

The agreement also provides that future meetings to review the status of salmon stocks will be held at the request of either Government, and that the United States will seek to insure that further appropriate conservation measures are undertaken within North American inshore waters.

Though I am cautiously optimistic about this agreement, I share the fear of many scientists and conservationists that already badly depleted salmon stocks will not be able to withstand the further pressure of 4 years of extended fishing, at a rate which reduces only slightly each year from the present maximum level. It may well be necessary to call on the right to "review the status of salmon stocks," that is a part of the agreement. Hopefully Denmark would approach such a reassessment in the same cooperative spirit in which she has acted in recent months.

Indeed, Canada has already taken the honorable action of suspending for 10 years its commercial taking of the dwindling salmon population. Perhaps this move will induce Denmark to follow a similar course.

The survival of the salmon has been of intense concern in my own area of New England. Largely because of dams and pollution, the salmon disappeared from the Connecticut River over 100 years ago. A major program began in 1970, under the Anadromous Fisheries Act, to reintroduce salmon stock into our streams. As part of that program, 35,000 salmon smolts were placed into the Connecticut River. It is still too early to ascertain whether these salmon will return to the Connecticut to spawn, but hopes are high.

To assist in the goal of restoring runs of Atlantic salmon in the Connecticut and other rivers of New England, I worked hard with my colleagues of the New England delegation to include \$125,000 in the fiscal 1973 Interior appropriations bill. These funds will be utilized for planning and acquisition of a salmon hatchery in Bethel, Vt., on the White River.

Through the efforts of concerned Con-

gressmen and conservationists throughout the country—and here I must mention the Committee on the Atlantic Salmon in particular—the preservation of this valuable natural resource has been recognized as of the highest priority. I pledge my continuing support for the achievement of that goal.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REMINDERS OF OUR HERITAGE

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of July 4, people from throughout my congressional district gathered at the Temple Hill Cantonment near Newburgh for the same kind of breakfast General Washington's officers must have had when they were headquartered there in the closing days of the Revolutionary War.

Prof. Harold K. Jonas, professor emeritus of history at Orange County Community College introduced two young historians, Dr. Thomas J. Archdeacon and Dr. Carol Ruth Berkin, who demonstrated how modern scholarship is providing us with new insights into the world and times in which this Nation was born.

Sometimes we forget that our Nation was born under the leadership of men who loved their Nation enough to see what was wrong and, at great personal risk, present profoundly new ideas. To remind progressive legislators that we are heirs of that tradition, I commend to my colleagues the remarks of Dr. Archdeacon and Dr. Berkin which follow below:

REMARKS OF DR. THOMAS J. ARCHDEACON

Today I would like to discuss how recent historians, in contrast to their predecessors, have interpreted the American Revolution. I would also like to suggest some possible shifts in approach to the topic which may occur as we approach the bicentennial year of 1976.

Throughout most of the 19th century, American scholars reflected the nationalistic exuberance of their young nation. George Bancroft was the greatest historian of this era, and according to him, the American Revolution was a straight-forward battle against tyranny. The Americans sought liberty, and the English government frustrated their efforts at every turn until finally the oppressions became unbearable under George II and the Americans were driven to revolt.

Late 19th century historians were the product of a more mature nation faced with different problems. They were trained to study history with the objectivity of scientists and thus found Bancroft's passions irresponsible and misdirected. To them George III was no tyrant, but rather a monarch attempting to administer a worldwide domain. The colonists were no longer patriots, but narrow-minded provincials too enamored of their own interests to recognize the needs of the mother country.

Progressive historians of the early 20th century, aware of the rise of labor organizations and conflicts over the enactment of

social welfare legislation, began to understand the Revolution as an internal political and social struggle as well as an external war for independence. Carl Becker argued that the Americans shed their blood as much to determine who should rule at home as to win home rule. The success of the Revolution consequently produced fundamental social changes.

The Progressive interpretation began to lose its appeal in the aftermath of World War II, a period which was not sympathetic to class-oriented explanations of the Revolution. Bernard Bailyn of Harvard and his student Gordon Wood, now of Brown, broke the ground for a new interpretation during the 1960's.

Bailyn decided that the colonists were sincere in their accusations and determined to discover the reason why the Americans verged so close to a paranoia in their view of the British government. Bailyn came to understand the Revolution as being primarily ideological in origin.

He uncovered unexpected influences shaping the American's thoughts and re-examined their ramifications. One of these influences was the Latin classics, although the colonials' knowledge of them was at times superficial. The Americans also drew from the political and social commentaries of the Enlightenment writers of Europe.

Bailyn's major contribution has been the recognition of the role of yet another group, the reputation theorists of the English Civil War and Commonwealth period. All shared important common attitudes. All were hostile to the phenomena in 18th century English government which increased the potential for corruption. They postulated that government was a constant struggle between power and liberty. Rulers needed power to conduct affairs of state, but power corrupted and tempted its possessors to expand its limits at the expense of liberty.

Of great importance were the changes in the conception of the proper structure of government which the patriots developed. These involved the theories of representation, sovereignty, and constitutionality. In the English conception of representation, the elected officer did not have to answer to his constituents. The responsibility of the elected officeholder was to rule, acting as his own intellect guided him, and not to follow the dictates of his district.

The provincials, however, returned to the medieval attitude that the representative was an attorney, working on behalf of those who sent him to the legislature. They thus had to reject the contention that a delegate was not responsible to his constituents.

The English made Parliament sovereign, but the Americans obviously could not accept the sovereignty of Parliament, and when independence came, they could not agree whether the central government or the states inherited the mantle. Federalists finally devised the solution by making the people rather than the legislature sovereign.

In ensuring popular control of the government, the most important innovation was the redefinition of the world "constitutional" and the use of written constitutions. The English constitution was unwritten, and the terms "constitutional" and "unconstitutional," simply meant "legal" and "illegal."

The Americans came to understand that the primary function of the constitution was to define the boundaries of governmental powers, to limit what the legislature might do. The Constitution was a fundamental law. It designated what "part of their liberty" the people were to sacrifice to the necessity of having government by describing the form of the government and the extent of its powers.

Where will historians go from here? The approaching bicentennial of the War for In-

dependence will surely encourage more study of our Revolutionary heritage. Perhaps the National Historical Publications Commission in the future attempt to make documents available which will allow scholars to examine more thoroughly the experiences of the common man in history. Then we may be able to produce a balanced, pluralistic account of the origins of our nation.

REMARKS OF DR. CAROL RUTH BERKIN

Long after the Revolution was over, John Adams made this judgment: one third the colonial population had enlisted under the banners of liberty and independence; one third had remained loyal to their King; and one third had chosen no side at all in the conflict raging about them. Adams used this over-simplified division of the population to emphasize that the call for revolution had not been unanimous. The founding fathers, in short, had won their contest against indifference and resistance as well as British armies and Parliament.

The indifference requires little explanation. But what of the resistance? It was real enough. Of a population of 2,500,000, estimates now run that 100,000 were active and exiled loyalists. Somewhere between 6 and 15% of the colonial population actively and openly and consistently opposed independence. To this must be added those who, from fear or pressure, did not publicly profess their allegiance to George III.

The colonists were well aware of the nature of this war. In 1780 no one needed to tell General George Washington that this was a civil war. His army at that time numbered 9,000, only a thousand more than the number of loyalists enlisted in the British army against him!

Who were these loyalists? And why did they choose to resist independence? To understand the Tory, we must look at the nature of the revolution itself. The colonials did not divide along class lines, and the revolution was led by the existing colonial leadership: planters, merchants, lawyers, and the political elite.

But in the second struggle to determine who should rule at home, the Tory had no role. His political crisis centered upon independence. It was this question of allegiance which divided colonists in 1775-1776, and that division did not develop along the lines of "haves" and "have nots."

Neither, tragically, was it a sharp ideological gulf which separated the Tory from his neighbor. There was a unity of opposition to the Stamp Act and to the Townshend Acts.

Likewise, the American mercantile world was united in its early opposition to England's restrictive trade measures. The cleavage in the merchants' ranks grew not over political content, but political strategy. Specifically, the radical merchants wanted to move quickly, using extra-legal means and were willing to accept the logical consequences of their escalation—Independence—while those who became Tories balked at measures which lead to rebellion.

It was the price one was willing to pay for the redress of these grievances which separated the Tory from the Whig. Much, in truth, was to be risked. Human society had yet known but three political alternatives: anarchy, tyranny, and the British constitution, the latter representing the highest achievement in human social organization. To withdraw from this political system even for the sake of real issues and real evils, was to invite anarchy and chaos.

Most loyalists doubted from the start that an attempt at independence could succeed. Respect for legal means and for legitimate government, fear of change, a conviction that rebellion was doomed to failure, and an admiration for the British system of government under which the colonies had thus far

prospered—these were important factors in the Tory's decision to remain loyal to the existing authorities. But no examination of motive can end wholly with the psychological or ideological. Let us then look at loyalty in its practical aspects.

A look at the map of the colonial world is helpful. Loyalty literally surrounded the revolution geographically. Trappers, traders, hunters were all anxious that the wave of settlement be held back. The British government had been consistent in its efforts at containment, but an independent American government might easily succumb to the land hunger of its citizens.

To the French Catholics of Canada, the anti-Catholic bias of many revolutionary leaders was well-known: did the Americans have partnership or domination in mind?

The stronghold of the loyalist movement was the maritime city for several reasons. The port cities housed the greatest concentration of government agencies and royal bureaucrats. Men whose livelihood depended directly and wholly upon the royal government's apparatus would be found in these urban and maritime areas—and their decision for loyalty is hardly remarkable.

Many Tories fled the colonies to Britain, where the strangeness of English society soon struck the refugees. They realized that society held no true place for them. For the long years of the war, they alternately cursed and longed for their native land. The New Englanders, in short, remained New Englanders.

Their situation was exacerbated by their dependence on the British government's largesse, for few had any money when they arrived in England. This uprooting, the inactivity, the home-sickness, the poverty, all took their toll upon the New England loyalist.

All of this attests to the American Revolution as a civil war, as a rending apart of the whole.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of America's leading fraternal organizations celebrated its golden anniversary during the month of July. Just 50 years ago, this past July 26, was the founding of the Order of Ahepa in Atlanta, Ga. Over the years, this organization has expanded to include 430 local chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia.

I wish to commend the members for their fine work and congratulate them on their successes and accomplishments. The Order of Ahepa has championed the cause of education. It encourages loyalty to the United States of America and promotes greater understanding of the principles of our Government. It has made countless contributions to improving American life morally, socially, and culturally by proudly proclaiming what is right with America.

The Order of Ahepa, the American Hellenic Education Progressive Association, has been generous to America and Americans, and I extend my best wishes for its continued long life.

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION ANALYSIS OF SALT AGREEMENT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Defense Information has published in its third edition of the Defense Monitor an excellent analysis entitled "SALT and Afterward" describing both the advantages and disadvantages of the recent SALT accord. Unfortunately much of the debate surrounding these agreements has been charged with partisan politics. This analysis offers respite from the political battle and presents an objective and balanced view of the SALT accord. I recommend it to my colleagues for careful study. It follows:

SALT AND AFTERWARD

The SALT accords, signed May 26th in Moscow, were written in the face of a rapidly moving nuclear arms race. At the time of the signing the United States was installing multiple independently targetable warheads (MIRV) on its land and sea-based missiles. It was going forward with a program to greatly expand the destructive power of its strategic bombers by equipping them with short range attack missiles (SRAM). Together these steps would increase the US strategic nuclear warhead and bomb total from about 5700 in 1972 to more than 10,000 in 1976. On top of this the United States was developing a new strategic submarine called Trident, with new missiles to go with it, and a new strategic bomber, the B-1.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union was building new intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) launchers at a rate of 250 per year. These included silos for the huge SS9 missile, capable of carrying 25 megatons (a US Minuteman II carries about 1 to 2 megatons). The Soviets had dug 25 silos possibly for a new missile even larger than the SS9. They were building new nuclear-powered strategic ballistic missile submarines at a rate of 7 to 9 per year, and could at this rate have twice as many such submarines as the United States in five years. The Russians were, however, years behind in MIRV. They were working on MIRV technology but had yet to test what US technicians considered to be a MIRV system.

Thus, the two superpowers were running their nuclear race in different ways. The United States was concentrating on MIRV, while holding its missile totals constant and reducing megatons. The Soviet Union was increasing numbers of missile launchers and deploying larger vehicles to carry fewer warheads but with greater megatonnage. Both sides were developing anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems.

For the question "Who's ahead?" there were as many answers as there were ways to measure the strategic arms balance.

In numbers of ICBM launchers, the Soviet Union had come from behind and passed the United States.

In numbers of submarine missile launch tubes the Soviets were catching up, and would in a few years pass the United States.

In numbers of heavy bombers the United States had a 4 to 1 lead.

In numbers of separately targetable nuclear weapons, the United States had a 2 to 1 lead, and because of this country's head start in MIRV, this lead was rapidly widening in favor of the United States.

In total megatons the Soviets had about a 2 or 3 to 1 lead.

When all these measures were considered together the Soviet Union clearly had come from a position of nuclear inferiority to a position of rough parity.

THE ACCORDS

The SALT accords consist of a treaty limiting ABMs, a five-year Interim Agreement which puts certain partial limits on offensive weapons development pending further arms talks, a protocol to this Interim Agreement, and a number of statements of "interpretation", some agree and some unilateral. Based on all these documents, the following is a summary of the main provisions of the accords:

ABM Treaty

Each country agrees not to build an ABM system for defense of its entire territory or major region. This amounts to a pledge that neither will try to upset the present deterrent balance by deploying ABMs to protect its general population and industry.

Each will limit ABM systems to two sites—one in defense of its national capital, the other in defense of an ICBM field. These must be at least 1300 kilometers (800 miles) apart, which means the Soviet ICBM field to be protected must be east of the Ural Mountains, away from the major western USSR population centers.

No more than 100 ABM launchers and 100 interceptor missiles may be deployed at each site.

Restrictions are set on numbers, types and placement of ABM radars to foreclose a radar capability for nationwide defense of either country.

In addition to these basic provisions, the two countries agree to ban sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based ABMs; not to deploy ABM systems of new kinds without prior discussion; not to convert air-defense or other systems to an ABM role; not to build radars for early warning of strategic ballistic missiles except along the edges of the country facing out; not to transfer ABM systems to other states or deploy them overseas.

There is no on-site inspection. Each side will use its own technical means of verification and each pledges not to interfere with these means or resort to deliberate concealment.

A Standing Consultative Commission will be established to implement the treaty and consider questions involving it.

The ABM treaty is of unlimited duration but either side can withdraw for supreme interest.

The treaty would require the United States to cut back its 12-site ABM program (of which four sites have been approved by Congress) to a maximum of 2. The Administration plans to complete the ABM site on which construction is farthest ahead—at the ICBM field at Grand Forks, N.D. It has halted work on three other sites at ICBM fields and has asked Congress to approve an ABM site at Washington, D.C. The treaty permits Russia to continue its ABM site already under construction at Moscow and to start a second site at an ICBM field.

Interim Agreement and Protocol

These deal with offensive nuclear weapons. In general they limit the numbers of ICBMs, ballistic missile submarines and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) to levels which each side agrees are presently deployed or under construction. These limitations are for five years, pending further SALT talks. With agreed "interpretations" the limitations are as follows:

No additional fixed, land-based ICBM launchers may be started during the freeze above the numbers deployed and "under ac-

tive construction" at the time of signing—1,054 for the United States, and about 1,618 for the Soviet Union.

Launchers for so-called "light" ICBMs (the U.S. Minuteman and Soviet SS11 and 13) and "older" LCBMs (the U.S. Titan and Soviet SS7 and 8) may not be replaced by "modern heavy ICBMs" (the Soviet SS9). The SS9 class missiles may, however, be made heavier. Russia has 288 SS9s now and 25 apparently larger silos dug. It could therefore end up with 313 "modern heavy" ICBMs of SS9 size or larger. The United States has no "modern heavy" ICBMs and plans none.

Within these restrictions, ICBMs may be replaced with more modern ones—for example with MIRV. But in the process of modernization, launchers may not be increased in size more than 10-15%.

The number of launchers for submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) each side presently has deployed or under construction was stipulated to be 656 U.S. and 740 USSR. These numbers can be increased subject to two provisions:

"Additional SLBM launchers may become operational only as replacements for an equal number of 'older' ICBM launchers (first deployed prior to 1964) or for launchers on older nuclear-powered submarines or for modern SLBM launchers on any type of submarines.

"During the five year freeze the U.S. is limited to 44 modern ballistic missile submarines and 710 SLBM launchers. The Soviet Union is limited to 62 modern ballistic missile submarines and 950 SLBM launchers."

As in the case of ICBMs, submarine missile systems can be modernized. Single-warhead missiles can be replaced by MIRVed missiles. New submarines can be substituted for old.

Destruction or dismantling of old ICBMs or submarine missiles must begin by the start of sea trials of a replacement ballistic missile submarine.

Each side agrees not to significantly increase its number of test and training launchers for ICBMs or SLBMs.

There were several unresolved points of disagreement in the accords:

"The Soviet Union stated unilaterally that if US allies in NATO should increase their numbers of ballistic missile submarines beyond those presently in operation or under construction, the Soviet Union would have the right to make a corresponding increase in its number of submarines.

"The United States was unable to get agreement on a common definition of 'heavy' ICBMs. The US considers it to be any missile bigger than the largest existing 'light' ICBM, which is the Soviet SS11.

"The United States was unable to get agreement to include mobile ICBMs in the freeze. (Mobile ABMs are banned). The United States declared unilaterally that deployment of mobile ICBMs during the freeze would be considered 'inconsistent with the objectives' of the agreement."

WHAT THE ACCORDS MEAN

From an Arms Control View

The SALT accords can be examined from several viewpoints. One of these is the viewpoint of international arms control—that is, in terms of what effect the accords will have on the arms race.

Among the achievements in this regard:

The SALT accords represent the first—even though partial—limitations by the United States and Soviet Union dealing with the fundamentals of their arms race. Previously, the two countries had agreed to bar nuclear weapons from the Antarctic, from outer space, and from the sea bed. They had agreed not to test them in the atmosphere, underwater or in space and not to give them to other countries. But never had the two superpowers reached agreement on the nuclear weapons targeted at each other.

The ABM treaty bans the kind of ABM system which could be most de-stabilizing—a nation-wide or major regional defense of population and industry. Such a system, undertaken by either country, could threaten the other's deterrent and cause it to respond with additional offensive buildup. The complex restrictions on ABM sites should convince each side the other is not developing an ABM for defense of large areas. The treaty rules out a US ABM for population defense against China, which this country once planned but later abandoned.

Freezing ICBMs, SLBMs, and ballistic missile submarines at levels deployed and under construction is a first step in limiting offensive nuclear weapons, a step on which future SALT talks can build. Broadly speaking, the accords accommodate themselves to the different kinds of offensive weapons buildup which each side now has underway—Soviet construction of more and bigger missiles and US MIRV. They allow each side to substantially complete the round it now has in progress. The new levels become the starting point for attempting to freeze the arms race.

Among the debits from an arms control viewpoint:

Except for ABMs the accords do not stop any of the major weapons programs now in progress. This is because numerical limits are set high, qualitative improvements are allowed, and many weapons systems—including bombers, air-defense, anti-submarine warfare, air-breathing strategic missiles and tactical nuclear weapons—are not covered. Under SALT the United States can continue conversion of Minuteman and Polaris to MIRV, development of Trident submarines with new missiles, the B-1 bomber, research on "site defense" for ICBMs, submarine-launched cruise (air breathing) missiles and new submarines in which to carry them. The Soviet Union can continue, up to a point, building additional land and sea-based missile launchers, and could develop and deploy MIRV.

Because all these programs are allowed, and because numerical limits are set so high, military planners on each side will still point to future possibilities rather than existing or likely forces to justify their own building programs.

From a US Defense View

The accords can also be looked at from a much narrower view of US military defense.

Advantages:

Since only the Soviet Union is presently building up its number of offensive weapons launchers, it is to the advantage of the United States to put ceilings on these numbers. Within the totals the number of "heavy" ICBMs Russia can have is limited to 313. Without SALT, the Soviet Union could, at present rates of construction, exceed the freeze ceiling. Instead of 62 modern ballistic missile submarines it could have 80 or 90. The US has no plans to add to its numbers of ICBMs or build "heavy" ones. It could, under the freeze, build 13 Trident submarines. Defense Secretary Laird has said only ten are planned. Actually the first Tridents would not become operational until after the 5-year freeze, and are therefore more related to future rounds of SALT than the first.

Freezing the number of ICBM launchers, especially "heavy" ones, will leave only one route for the Soviet Union to develop increased "counterforce" capability to knock out US ICBMs—qualitative improvements such as increased accuracy, MIRVing, and throw weight.

The ABM limit plus the limits on ICBM numbers lessen the chance that the Soviet Union could develop the capability for a successful "first strike"—that is, the ability to knock out enough US missiles to suffer no or substantially less damage in return.

Criticisms:

On the surface, a number of criticisms of the treaty can be made:

"The accords allow the Soviet Union more ICBM launchers, SLBMs and ballistic missile submarines than the United States.

"Only the Soviet Union can have 'modern heavy' ICBMs, with capacity to carry more megatons than U.S. missiles. (Also more MIRVs than U.S. missiles if the Soviets develop a MIRV.)

"The Soviet Union retains more megatonnage and more throw weight than the United States."

On the other hand, the SALT accords provide several effective limitations on Soviet weapons. Assuming recent Soviet construction rates were to continue until 1977, the Soviets could have built 200 ICBMs but now are limited to 1618. The Soviets could have built 1200 SLBMs, but are now limited to 950; and they could have built 80-90 modern ballistic missile subs but now are limited to 62.

While ICBM numbers are frozen at levels deployed and under active construction, the Russians did not say exactly how many they have under construction. The United States considers the freeze level to be 1618 for the Soviet Union. Dr. Henry Kissinger said on June 15 that the Russians could not exceed the freeze level to any significant degree without the United States detecting it, and if this happened the whole agreement would be in question.

An important factor in the defense controversy is MIRV. If the Soviet Union does not develop MIRV, it will still have little more than 2500 warheads five years from now when the United States will, under presently planned programs, have more than 10,000.

If the Soviet Union do develop MIRV, two key questions will be: How fast? And how much?

The Soviet Union appears to be years behind this country in MIRV. The United States began MIRV tests in August, 1968. The first squadron of Minuteman III missiles became operational Jan. 8, 1971; the first wing of 150, on Dec. 13, 1971. The Soviet Union has also been working on multiple warhead technology since about August, 1968, but it has yet to test a MIRV system as the United States knows the term. The Russians tested a triple-warhead system in which the warheads may or may not have been independently targetable. (US analysts differed on this point.) But these tests stopped in late 1970, suggesting that the Russians might have decided to start over on a new tack.

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said June 5 that Russia "could have a MIRV capability in 24 months." But he did not say how many they might have by then.

Senator Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) has said that when the Soviets achieve MIRV "... the combination of their vastly superior payload and modern MIRV technology will give them superiority in warheads." There have been published reports that Soviet missiles larger than SS9s could hold up to 20 MIRVs each. (A US Minuteman holds up to 3; a Poseidon, 10 to 14). But other defense analysts believe this overstates what Russia could realistically achieve in MIRV during the next five years.

Table IV shows the Center for Defense Information's calculation of what the Soviet Union probably could achieve in MIRV during the five years of the Interim Agreement, if it develops MIRV. At the end of five years it would have some 3800 warheads compared to more than 10,000 for the United States under programs now planned. (Table III)

If the Soviet Union were to embark on an extensive program to MIRV its missiles, it could have some 14,000 warheads. This

would involve installing 20 MIRVs in its bigger missiles and MIRVing its smaller missiles by the same factors as the United States. But it is doubtful that Russia could achieve this level in five years. The United States could have more than 16,000 warheads in the 1980s by exceeding present plans. This would include MIRVing all Minuteman missiles instead of only 550 of them, plus building ten Trident submarines and a fleet of B-1 bombers. (See Table V)

However, such calculations of marginal advantages for the United States or Soviet Union—whether they be in warheads, launchers or megatons—overlook one important point: Both countries have the power to destroy each other several times over, and this will remain the case during the five years of the Interim Agreement.

Gerard Smith, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, when asked during hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee June 19 whether Russia would get ahead of the United States during the five year agreement, replied: "Nothing the Soviets can do within the five year agreement will offset the present strategic balance between the US and USSR."

COST

The immediate cost impact of the SALT accords on the fiscal 1973 defense budget has been listed by the Defense Department as follows:

(In millions)

Reducing ABM program to two sites..	-\$711
INCREASES IN OTHER STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	
Accelerate and complete development of Site Defense.....	+60
Develop submarine-based cruise missile	+20
Accelerate bomber rebasing.....	+45
Augment verification capabilities.....	+13
Develop improved reentry vehicles for ICBMs and SLBMs.....	+20
Improved command, control and communications	+10
Net change.....	-543

Secretary Laird has testified that the total ABM saving through 1981 as a result of SALT would be \$9.9 billion, figured in 1968 prices.

Further savings could come from the first round of SALT if the United States decided that, as a result of the recent accords, it could safely stop or slow down some of its other major nuclear weapons programs, such as Trident, the B-1, or air defense. The Administration wants to go ahead with these programs. The question of what this country's pace in nuclear weapons building should be following the first round of SALT has become a major issue.

POLICY FOLLOWING SALT

Secretary Laird told newsmen June 6: "I could not support the (SALT) agreements if Congress fails to act on the movement forward of the Trident system, on the B-1 bomber, and the other programs that we have outlined to improve our strategic offensive systems during this five year period." Admiral Moorer said the Joint Chiefs were in accord with the SALT agreements provided the older programs went ahead.

In a briefing for Senators and Congressmen June 15, Dr. Henry Kissinger, assistant to the President for national security, considerably moderated this stand. He said the Administration wants Congressional approval of both SALT and the new weapons programs but: "We are not making them conditional. We are saying that the treaty is justified on its merits, but we are also saying that the requirements of national security impel us in the direction of the strategic programs . . ."

Laird told the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations June 5 that "Just as the Moscow agreements were made possible by our successful action in such programs as Safeguard, Poseidon and Minuteman III, these future negotiations to which we are pledged can only succeed if we are equally successful in implementing such programs as the Trident system, the B-1 bomber, NCA defense, Site Defense, SLCM, and accelerated satellite basing of strategic bombers. We must also initiate certain other measures in areas such as intelligence, verification, and command, control, and communications."

Transmitting the SALT agreements to Congress, President Nixon said: "Just as the maintenance of a strong strategic posture was an essential element in the success of these negotiations, it is now equally essential that we carry forward a sound strategic modernization program to maintain our security and to ensure that more permanent and comprehensive arms limitation agreements can be reached."

The Administration's position is that if the United States had not been deploying MIRVs and going forward with other programs it would have lacked the bargaining power to obtain a ceiling on Soviet building of SS9s and other systems.

CONCLUSIONS

Arms Control

The ABM treaty limits ABM systems and therefore is a significant and stabilizing step in limiting the arms race.

The five-year agreement on offensive weapons allows the United States and Soviet Union each to continue its present round of nuclear buildup, and then establishes a partial, quantitative freeze at the resulting new levels. This is a start which can be followed up in future SALT negotiations.

US Security

The accords place ceilings on numbers of offensive weapon launchers at a time when only the Soviet Union is increasing these numbers. Without the accords, Soviet construction could be greater. The offensive freeze plus the ABM limitation lessen the chances of Russia ever becoming able to launch a preemptive nuclear strike against this country without being destroyed in return. The accords thus tend to make nuclear war less likely.

While Russia under the accords will continue to lead the United States in numbers of launchers and total megatonnage, the United States will retain its lead in numbers of warheads. These differences, however, are less important than the fact that each country retains the power to destroy the other several times over.

Weapons Policy

It the objective of SALT is to limit weapons proliferation and thereby reduce tensions, the open end "bargaining chip" game has severe deficiencies. For so long as the United States and Russia are free to develop and build larger and better "chips", real limits will not be imposed. The goal of future SALTs should be to reduce and ultimately eliminate strategic weapon systems.

MISS LAKE COUNTY OF CALIFORNIA

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to bring

to the attention of the House of Representatives a poem written by a lovely young lady who, to me, represents the very finest qualities of America's youth.

She is Kathleen Ann Covey of Lakeport, Calif., in the First Congressional District. Miss Covey is serving as Miss Lake County and was present at a recent ceremony I attended in California.

At that time she read the poem she composed for the occasion and I was touched by the depth of feeling she exhibited for her home area. Those of us who live in northern California share a great pride in the bounty nature has given us—a pride that is reflected in Miss Covey's composition.

I proudly submit her work for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and for the attention of all Members of Congress:

POEM

(By Kathleen Ann Covey)

I stood upon a hill, looking out to the world
Seeing life in its stillness.
A peace of country living seen in the distance,
Where nestled among the trees
Proud and tall stands a church steeple,
Weathered with the years.
Reflected in the lake below, Mt. Konocli, a legend in itself.
A valley filled with history seen from every view.
An ancient Indian mountain, a hundred year old church,
Yet a youngness is seen here too.
Towering among the trees, the courthouse built not so long ago.
Here, we stand looking out at the babe of history
The freeway now complete.
A playground for the young, a fountain for us all
A storehouse of information,
But BEST of all, our county in all its splendor.
I stand upon a hilltop, looking out to the world.
An outstretched hand, a friendly "hi", warm smile
To greet a passerby.
But BEST of all, a moment of beauty, renewal of life,
As they too may now stand upon a hilltop,
And see life capturing history and helping to write another page.
A gift we give to all who come
Whether from near or from far
The beauty of God's creation seen from a hilltop.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 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 sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

TIGHTENING UP THE LAW ON
AUTO EMISSION DEVICES

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which would make an important contribution to cleaning up air pollution in America. The legislation would prohibit tampering with antipollution devices which have been installed in automobiles in compliance with regulations under the Clean Air Amendments of 1970.

Automobile emissions are one of the leading sources of air pollution in this country today. Autos emit 64.7 percent of the carbon monoxide, 45.7 percent of the hydrocarbons, and 36.6 percent of the nitrogen oxides. In many cities, they account for more than 90 percent of carbon monoxide, more than 80 percent of hydrocarbons, and more than 70 percent of nitrogen oxides.

These pollutants constitute a serious threat to the health and well-being of all our people. Hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides form oxidants, which cause respiratory and eye irritation and possible changes in lung function. They are extremely toxic to many plants and can physically weaken such materials as rubber and fabrics. And the aerosols formed in the production of these oxidants contribute significantly to white smog, which reduces visibility.

Carbon monoxide can be fatal in large amounts. Smaller concentrations place greater strain on persons with heart disease. Exposure for several hours to certain carbon monoxide levels can affect brain function, changing, for example, time-interval discrimination. In this way, it is feared, high carbon monoxide levels could contribute to traffic accidents.

The 100 million motor vehicles on the road today are the source of about 60 million tons of carbon monoxide, 16 million tons of hydrocarbons, and 7 million tons of nitrogen oxides annually—1,200 pounds of carbon monoxide, 320 pounds of hydrocarbons, and 140 pounds of nitrogen oxides per car. In an uncontrolled vehicle—that is, a car sold before any pollution-control devices were required—these emissions come from the engine crankcase, from fuel evaporation in the fuel tank and carburetor, and from the exhaust pipe.

To stop motor vehicles from spewing these large quantities of pollutants into the air, Congress enacted the Clean Air Act and the Clean Air Amendments of 1970. These acts provided for a vehicle emission control program based on the following premises. First, that ambient concentrations of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, and oxidants in our large urban areas are much too high and must be greatly reduced; damage to health and to the environment have been shown. Second, that since there are only a few major manufacturers of automobiles, control is best

carried out at the source—on new vehicles. Third, that since automobiles are sold nationwide, control should be at the Federal and not the State level.

Regulations issued under the law have already had some effect. The amount of carbon monoxide emitted by vehicles under present controls is 62 percent lower than that emitted by uncontrolled vehicles. Hydrocarbons have been reduced by 73 percent in controlled cars.

The Clean Air Amendments of 1970 and the regulations issued under the act require auto manufacturers to produce 1975 models which will emit no more than .41 grams of hydrocarbons per mile, or a reduction of 90 percent from 1970 levels of 4.1 grams per mile. The 1975 cars must emit no more than 3.4 grams per mile of carbon monoxide, also a 90 percent reduction from the 1970 level of 34 grams per mile.

The 1973 cars are restricted to nitrogen oxides emissions of 3 grams per mile, the first restrictions imposed on those pollutants. By 1976 nitrogen oxides must be reduced to 0.4 grams per mile. Uncontrolled cars emit 6 grams per mile of those pollutants. The table in the appendix shows the amounts of pollutants emitted under controlled and uncontrolled conditions.

In May 1972, William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, rejected requests by auto manufacturers for a 1-year extension of the 1975 emission deadline. Mr. Ruckelshaus recommended the use of noble-metal catalysts to meet the new requirements. He promised to allow the replacement of catalysts at least once during 50,000 miles of vehicle operation if that is necessary to keep the emission controls effective.

But, it has been charged, emission controls impair the performance of the vehicle. Auto manufacturers and others claim that the antipollution devices reduce gas mileage and contribute to hesitations. However, V. W. Makin, president of Matthey-Bishop, Inc., the world's largest refiner of platinum and an experimenter with catalytic converters, said that his firm's own tests showed the fuel penalty under the 1974 emissions requirements would be no greater than 5 percent and that the reduction in performance would be negligible. Furthermore, New York City has shown that its antipollution controls in police cruisers have not cut down driveability. Neither have they increased fuel consumption nor breakdowns. Fred C. Hart, director of the clean air program in the city, told the St. Louis Post Dispatch:

The obvious conclusion is that if New York City can accomplish as much as it has, the auto manufacturers, with much greater resources, should be able to do much better.

Nevertheless, many car owners have been removing the antipollution devices from their automobiles. When they go to mechanics, these owners usually do not specify that they want the emission controls unfixed, although some do. Most of them only say that they want improved performance. But they realize, and do not care, that the tuneup may involve an unfixing.

Norman Shutler, director of the Mobile Source Division of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, told the Wall Street Journal,

It's kind of frightening that we don't know the extent to which this is going on.

If this practice is widespread, the effort to reduce auto emissions is in severe jeopardy. And there are facts which point to the prevalence of this practice. For example, the Wall Street Journal reports that sales by Detroit high performance warehouse of a kit to modify a car's distributor have increased from 15 to 20 percent in the last year. Distributors have been readjusted to control emissions. Mr. Gasket Co., a Cleveland firm that manufactures the kits, says sales have increased by 25 percent. Larry Pipes, manager of the auto diagnostic clinic of the Auto Club of Missouri, says that about 25 percent of the late-model cars passing through the clinic show that the emission controls have been tampered with.

But under Federal law tampering with the antipollution devices is illegal only if it is done before the sale and delivery of the vehicle to the ultimate purchaser or if it is done by the manufacturer or dealer. Only a few States, including New York and California, have laws against such tampering by anyone. Thus, in most States, owners, independent mechanics, or tuneup specialists can tamper with the devices.

At the present time the tampering involves adjusting various parts of the engine or sometimes removing or replacing certain parts. But removing the devices can be difficult and detrimental to the car. Because many controls now are designed right into different parts, there is not usually an easily identifiable mechanism or even a series of such mechanisms that can be eliminated. If all the emission controls were disconnected, the engine would be harmed.

In the Wall Street Journal article Charles Heinen, Chrysler's top emissions expert, reports that tampering with the engine's timing could cause a knock that could harm the pistons. Disconnecting the positive crankcase ventilation valve, the valve that keeps crankcase gases from leaking into the air, could lead to bad sludging and thus to sticking parts. Tampering with the carburetor can result in even poorer gas mileage, says Mr. Heinen.

A General Motors emissions engineer also reports in that article that a careless job of removing the antipollution devices could result in the leakage of poisonous carbon monoxide into the passenger compartment. Owners have been known to ruin their cars by tampering with the emission controls by themselves. Finally, tampering with these controls could result in voiding the warranty on the emissions devices and the warranty on all parts.

In the future tampering may be more difficult. The controls are becoming increasingly more complex. Eventually it might be almost impossible to tamper with the controls without almost ripping

the car to pieces. With respect to legal impediments to tampering it should be noted that a New Jersey law, beginning July 5, will require emission tests

when car owners bring their cars in for annual safety inspections.

Federal action to prohibit all persons from tampering with auto emission con-

trols after the sale of the car is needed now if national air quality policy is to be implemented. Thus, I am introducing the following legislation:

APPENDIX

	Carbon monoxide		Hydrocarbons		Oxides of nitrogen		Particulates	
	g./mi.	Percent ¹	g./mi.	Percent ¹	g./mi.	Percent ¹	g./mi.	Percent ¹
Uncontrolled vehicles	125		16.8		6		0.3	
Present degree of control	47	62	4.6	73				
1972 standards	39	69	3.4	80				
1975 standards					3	50		
1976 standards	4.7	96	.45	97	.4	93	.1	67

¹ Reduction from uncontrolled vehicle.

TRIBUTE TO THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in this year of 1972 as the Order of Ahepa celebrates its golden anniversary of 50 years dedication to the promotion and encouragement of loyalty to the United States of America, it is, indeed, an honor for me to join my colleagues and fellow Americans throughout the Nation in paying tribute to this organization which has contributed so much to the improvement of education and civic affairs in our country.

History tells us that democracy was born in ancient Greece on a hill in Athens called the Pnyx. Here three or four times a month an assembly composed of the Athenian citizens met to vote. It can be no coincidence that the members of AHEPA, promoting as they do the attributes of Hellenic culture, have done so much to emulate and foster in America the high ideals which are the foundation of our democracy.

The Order of Ahepa—The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—can be justly proud of its 430 chapters throughout the United States composed of men of high moral character whose vigorous activities include not only those of local community projects and services but also undertakings on a national and international scale. While the organization is first and foremost in its service to America, the fruits of its endeavors have reached far corners of the world in relief to earthquake and flood victims and numerous causes which have alleviated much suffering and hardship of mankind.

Few organizations have championed the cause of education as has AHEPA with such projects as national scholarships, the AHEPA Agricultural College in Greece, the AHEPA School at St. Basil's Academy in Garrison, N.Y., and the Journey to Greece Student Program.

One of the many worthwhile objectives of AHEPA is to instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship. Truly, the Order of Ahepa is a group of citizens who recognize that with the privilege of citizenship also comes the civic responsibility and it is undoubtedly that sense of responsibility

with which AHEPA has endowed its members that has made possible its outstanding contributions to its fellow men.

As an American, I am grateful to AHEPA and most pleased to have the Garden City Chapter of San Jose, Calif., located in my congressional district.

NEW ENGLAND ECONOMY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press in New England has recently undertaken an in-depth analysis of the state of the New England economy and its hope for the future.

The first article of the four-part series, examines the problem of unemployment. With 8 percent of the work force in New England unable to find jobs, unemployment ranks as the region's most serious problem.

This informative article, by Daniel Q. Haney, deals with the grim personal realities behind the unemployment statistics. I commend it to the attention of my fellow Members:

UNEMPLOYMENT GRIPS NEW ENGLAND AND SWEET LIFE GOES SOUR

(By Daniel Q. Haney)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This begins a series on the status and future hopes for the New England economy, compiled by the Associated Press across the 6-state region. Today's article: the human problem of unemployment.)

BOSTON.—Edgar Lane is a little part of a statistic—the 8 per cent of the work force in New England that doesn't have a job.

But for Lane and 435,900 like him, his problems are catastrophic and have the ring of the sweet life gone sour.

Four months ago, the 44-year-old father of six was pulling in an annual salary of \$25,000-plus as an engineering manager at RCA's computer plant in Marlboro. That was just after RCA announced that it was getting rid of its computer business.

Lane lost his job, and now he gets \$110 a week in state unemployment money.

Unemployment is the economic problem that touches most New Englanders the closest.

It ranges from about 9 per cent in Connecticut, hard hit by defense spending cutbacks, to under 5 per cent in New Hampshire, where many hard-to-employ young people

are leaving the state. The national average is just under 6 per cent.

New England is traditionally a difficult place to make a living; expenses are high and wages are low.

The cost of living, mainly food and housing, is high because of New England's location. It dangles off the northeastern corner of the map, away from where most of the nation's goods are produced. It's cold, and there's not much agriculture.

As a result, building materials, heating oil and food have to be shipped in, and that makes them more expensive.

Because of the climate, houses are expensive to build. They require central heating, insulation and full cellars. And in the winter it takes a lot of fuel to heat them.

In Boston, for example, the cost of living for a family of four is 17 per cent above the national average. That makes it the most expensive city in the continental United States in which we live—2 per cent above New York.

Wages are lower in New England. The average weekly salary of an American factory worker is \$152. Connecticut is a bit higher at \$157, but it's followed by Massachusetts at \$144; New Hampshire, \$135; Vermont, \$134; Rhode Island, \$122, and Maine, \$120.

To keep family incomes up, many women in New England have jobs.

"In New England, we have high living costs and low wages—a tough squeeze," says Wendall D. McDonald, regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"Part of the reason for our high unemployment is the declining industries," says McDonald, pointing to textiles, shoes and other business which make bulky low-priced products that have been hurt by high shipping costs and foreign competition.

Added to that are layoffs from defense and aerospace cutbacks and large numbers of women and teenagers entering the labor market.

But for people like Edgar Lane, the unemployed computer engineer, the reasons for New England's tight working picture aren't much comfort.

"We're dipping into our reserves," Lane says, "and we're trying to pare our expenses to the bone."

"We told the kids they'd have to buy their own clothes. We're making do with our old car, and we've cut down on the amount of freedom the children have with it. We've put our cottage up for sale, and we're not going out to eat once a week like we used to."

Lane is one of the lucky ones who had some savings. For people who were living to the hilt of their pay checks before they got laid off, the shock of being without enough money is harsh, says David Jacobson, a Brandeis University anthropologist who is studying the effects of unemployment on people.

"People who have money cut back on some material things," says Jacobson, "but they try not to isolate themselves socially."

"But people who don't have money are in tough shape. They cut off almost all their relationships. They're embarrassed that they can't afford the social amenities. For instance, they can't go out to dinner at other people's houses, because they can't afford to invite them back."

Alice Ferreira, a 54-year-old single woman of Bristol, R.I., had to move in with her parents when she lost her job at a Providence department store last fall.

She had worked for the store for 22 years, part of that time as a payroll supervisor, and when it merged with another department store, there was a general layoff.

Miss Ferreira was making \$97 a week at the store, and now she gets \$54 unemployment compensation. The store employees weren't unionized, and there are no pension benefits.

"I go out every week (looking for work) and see what they have to offer me," she says. "But they prefer to give it to the young. I know I was discriminated against."

Prejudice against older, experienced workers appears common.

Philip N. Hambleton, 62, of Bedford, worked on the invention of color television in the 1950s. He's been out of a job for more than a year.

Hambleton, a Ph.D.-holding physicist, says, "I'm one of the hard-core unemployed—overtrained, overaged, overexperienced and oversalaried."

He's sent about 300 resumes and applications to possible employers, "but most of them never bother to write back."

"Their philosophy is, 'If we hire you and things get better, you'll leave us.' They can hire younger fellows for less."

"Maybe I'm retired and don't know it," he says.

But also in difficult straits are the young whose talents are not in demand.

George D. Moore, 27, of Arrowsic, Maine, last worked a year ago as an inspector in a South Portland plant that makes jet engine parts.

"It's impossible to find anything in my line of work around here," he says.

The state employment office told him that the companies where he might find openings are in Massachusetts and Connecticut.

"But I like living in Maine," he said.

ANOTHER HERO IN FLORIDA

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise the heroic act of three young men. David L. Hartshorn, a 19-year-old college student, rescued a man who was drowning off the beach at Ponte Vedra, and he, then, was aided by two others.

On December 28, 1971, Mr. Donald Niedhammer, swimming out a distance from the shore, encountered a strong undercurrent as he attempted to return to shore. He became exhausted and semi-conscious and began to drift seaward. Young Hartshorn noticed the situation and swam out to Niedhammer, reaching him 390 feet from shore in water 10 feet deep. Towing Mr. Niedhammer, aged 36 and outweighing him greatly, Hartshorn fought against the undercurrent which had caused Mr. Niedhammer to falter. Two young men with an air mattress

swam to Hartshorn and Niedhammer, reaching them 100 feet from the shore.

David Hartshorn, and the two young men who helped him, are to be deeply congratulated for their heroism. On behalf of all the citizens of this area, we salute them.

BILLS INTRODUCED OR COSPONSORED BY THE HON. BILL FRENZEL

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, a number of constituents have requested a list of bills I have either introduced or cosponsored. In order to make this list more easily accessible for them, I am submitting for the RECORD a list of such legislation.

Bill introductions and cosponsorship are but a small part of a Congressman's activities. A voting record, committee work, constituent relations, and much more project a better profile of a Congressman. However, it is helpful for interested parties to have a bill introduction record readily available. I hope that this list will help to provide the information:

LIST OF BILLS

The following is a complete listing of all the bills which Congressman Bill Frenzel has cosponsored or introduced thus far in the second session of the 92d Congress:

VIETNAM/DEFENSE

H.R. 13155. A bill to provide for a study and investigation to assess the extent of damage done to the environment in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia as a result of the operations of the United States Armed Forces in such countries and to consider plans for effectively rectifying said damage. February 16, 1972.

H.R. 14710. A bill to amend chapter 5, title 37 of the United States Code to revise the pay structure relating to members of the Armed Forces and for other purposes. May 1, 1972.

H. Res. 1189. A joint resolution declaring the policy of the United States with respect to the termination of hostilities in Indochina. May 4, 1972.

H. Res. 1200. A joint resolution providing for an end to the hostilities in Indochina. May 15, 1972.

H.R. 15383. A bill to provide for an end to the hostilities in Indochina and to secure the withdrawal of all United States forces therefrom and to express the sense of the Congress for a cease fire and an arms embargo therein. June 7, 1972.

ECOLOGY

H.R. 13025. A bill to amend the act of 1945 with respect to the use of real property for wildlife conservation purposes. Feb. 8, 1972.

H.R. 14155. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to establish an upland game reservation and conservation program. March 28, 1972.

H.J. Res. 1164. A joint resolution declaring the third week in April as "Earth Week." April 17, 1972.

H.R. 14809. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic rivers Act by designating a segment of the Saint Croix River, Minnesota and Wisconsin, as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system. May 4, 1972.

H.R. 14888. A bill to establish a commis-

sion to investigate and study the practices of clearcutting timber resources of the United States on Federal land. May 10, 1972.

THE ECONOMY/TAXES

H.J. Res. 1040. A joint resolution to create a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax forms. Feb. 1, 1972.

H.R. 12848. A bill to amend the Railroad and Labor Act and the Labor Management relations Act, 1947, to provide more effectively means for protecting public interest in national emergency disputes, and for other purposes. Feb. 2, 1972.

H. Con. Res. 516. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to motor vehicle insurance and an accident compensation system. Feb. 2, 1972.

H.R. 13668. A bill to provide for paper money of the United States to carry a designation in BRaille indicating denomination. March 8, 1972.

H.R. 14417. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profits sharing retirement plans to establish minimum standards for pension and profit sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program and to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a United States Pension and Employee Benefit Commission, to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act and for other purposes. April 17, 1972.

H.R. 14551. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the same tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed. April 20, 1972.

H.R. 14665. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employees receiving lump sums from tax free pension or annuity plans on account of separation from employment shall not be taxed at the time of distribution to the extent that an equivalent amount is reinvested in another plan. April 27, 1972.

H.R. 15346. A bill to provide that existing Federal tax subsidies will terminate on January 1, 1974, and to provide for a maximum duration of two years for federal tax subsidies hereafter enacted. June 6, 1972.

TRANSPORTATION

H.R. 15492. A bill to authorize construction of certain highways and public mass transportation facilities in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code and to establish an urban transportation program. June 15, 1972.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

H.J. Res. 1143. A joint resolution to establish a commission on United States' Participation in the United Nations. March 29, 1972.

H.R. 14329. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to furnish assistance for the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel. April 12, 1972.

H. Res. 973. A bill calling for the ban of all nuclear underground testing. May 9, 1972.

CIVIL RIGHTS

H.R. 13515. A bill to restore the right to vote in federal elections to certain disenfranchised citizens. March 1, 1972.

HUMAN RESOURCES

H. Res. 830. Resolution to authorize each member, resident commissioner, and delegate to hire within the monetary limits of the existing clerk hire allowance two additional clerks who are physically handicapped. Feb. 22, 1972.

H.R. 13835. A bill to provide for the establishment of an office for the aged in the executive office of the president, for the fulfillment of the purposes of the Older Amer-

icans Act, for enlarging the scope of that Act and for other purposes. March 15, 1972.

H.R. 14626. A bill to provide the secretary of Health, Education and Welfare with the authority to make grants to States and local communities to pay for the costs of eye examinations programs to detect glaucoma for the elderly. April 26, 1972.

H.R. 14880. A bill to provide for the comprehensive development of correctional manpower training and employment and for other purposes. May 10, 1972.

H. Res. 1033. A bill authorizing senior citizens as interns for members of the house of representatives. June 29, 1972.

H.R. 12708. A bill to establish a commission on penal reform. January 27, 1972.

H.R. 12842. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to reorganize certain grant programs and for other purposes. Feb. 22, 1972.

H.J. Res. 1242. A bill designating the month of September, 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month". June 28, 1972.

AN ARGUMENT AGAINST THE GSA GRANTEE PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I joined Congressman WYMAN in cosponsoring legislation to limit Government competition with small business. The enactment of this bill is a step which must be taken to insure the permanent prohibition of unnecessary and unwarranted Federal competition with small firms.

The problem precipitating this legislation surfaced in 1969, when the General Services Administration proposed to use the newly enacted Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 as a basis for extending its services to all State and local governments. This was the first time GSA openly extended its services beyond the scope of the Federal agen-

cies and bureaus it was designed to serve.

The Nixon administration immediately recognized the detrimental implications of such a proposal. By offering its procurement and supply services to non-government institutions, GSA would be using taxpayers money to the disadvantage of small businesses.

Under the "grantee program" GSA is able to sell directly through its self-service stores and indirectly through its procurement and supply schedules.

With the recognition that government marketing is contrary to our free enterprise system, the administration ordered GSA to discontinue its plans, and to reserve its services exclusively for the giant Federal system.

However, GSA decided to recreate the same program under the assumed authority of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

After further expression of public and governmental objection to this provision, GSA has begun the process by which it may withdraw the program.

To insure this recent step taken by GSA is followed through, and to prohibit its occurrence in the future, I believe that legislation placing a permanent prohibition on this type of program is in order.

The express purpose of the bill is to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to prohibit the making available of Government procurement sources to Federal grantees and contractors.

It is the Government's job to protect the rights of small business in the preservation of free competitive enterprise—not to jeopardize its success as a contributor to the community, the people of that community, and our Nation as a whole.

This is a job we must recognize and take the responsibility for. I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to this legislation.

UNION CARBIDE CORP. ADVANCES EDUCATION OF TODAY'S YOUTH

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, throughout the year Washington is visited by thousands upon thousands of our Nation's young people. It is heartening indeed to see these young Americans visiting their halls of National Government and gaining a better understanding of the processes of government and the men and women who are their representatives in this Nation's Capitol. One such unique group of students from the Washington Workshops Foundation has been with us again recently. During the seminar they attended, these young people visited with many Senators, Congressmen, members of the press, and executive department officials.

It is my sincere pleasure to note that Mark Caudill, who is a constituent of mine and lives in Sheffield, Ala., was among those attending. Mark's presence here in the District was made possible through the citizenship education award by the civic-minded Union Carbide Corp. Every year Union Carbide grants numerous scholarships of this nature to students of their plant communities across the Nation, who have displayed outstanding merit and ability in their search for knowledge and creativity.

Mr. Speaker, may I commend wholeheartedly the Union Carbide Corp. for the faith they have displayed in the leaders of tomorrow. In this world of mistrust and strife, it is extremely refreshing to observe the willingness of Union Carbide to preserve the spirit of young citizenship manifested in the Washington Workshops and displayed so readily by Mark Caudill.

SENATE—Wednesday, August 2, 1972

The Senate met at 9:45 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:

Almighty God, from whom every good prayer cometh, and who pourest out on all who desire it, the spirit of grace and supplication, deliver us as we draw nigh to Thee, from all coldness of heart and wanderings of mind, that with steadfast thoughts and kindled affection we may commit our ways to Thee. Look upon our inmost longings and our deepest needs and hear our prayers both uttered and unexpressed. Grant that we may sincerely, faithfully, and honestly serve Thee this day, in obedience to Thy law and in love and fellowship with our colleagues. In our speaking and in our silence so guide us by Thy spirit

that we may ever remain Thy faithful servants and finally know the peace of those whose minds are stayed on Thee.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 1, 1972, be dispensed with.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Dixy Lee Ray, of Washington, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Marshall A. Neill, of Washington, to be a U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.