

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, acting for the distinguished majority leader and at his request, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes with speeches by Senators limited to 3 minutes at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, H.R. 10947.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with those who work with and for the majority leader, and I understand it is his desire to convene at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. That is in accordance with our desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. An order has been entered to that effect.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M.

Mr. LONG. So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 12, 1971, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 11, 1971:

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

James S. Holden, of Vermont, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Vermont, vice James L. Oakes, elevated.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Earl Lauer Butz, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MAN VERSUS INSTITUTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Perspective page of the Chicago Tribune, which has gained nationwide attention for the nature and variance of its commentary, featured a column in its Tuesday, October 26, edition by columnist Ernest Furgurson of the Baltimore Sun, which highlighted two very interesting subjects which deserve our scrutiny.

One makes the point of the right a conscientious student has to receive an education without interference from social malcontents.

The other points out the proper emphasis which the Air Force Academy is placing and the necessary action being taken to prevent abuse by an individual of his service academy training and his resulting obligation.

MAN vs. INSTITUTION

(By Ernest Furgurson)

WASHINGTON.—Let's hear it for Nancy Graber, who has socked Vassar College with a million-dollar suit for tolerating her schoolmate's pot smoking to the extent that it ruined her studies.

Also let's hear it for the United States Air Force [?].

In the continuing campaign of individual vs. institution so brashly pushed by young Americans these last years, there is no more heartening intelligence than Miss Graber's individual assertion that the young ladies' institution at Poughkeepsie-on-the-Hudson has let permissiveness go a long step too far.

Unless, perhaps, it is the parallel action of the Air Force as an institution against a 24-year-old individual who has enjoyed a four-year education at government expense and now decided with exquisite timing that he doesn't really like the Air Force business after all.

Each case, you see, breaks the pattern that got to be so boring—that of freedom-loving student or other juvenile challenging stuffy conservative institution and sometimes prevailing and sometimes losing, but always drawing hosannas from the youth cultists and two minutes on the evening news.

Here we have a straight-arrow student [insofar as her attitude toward dope is concerned; I care not how she feels about sex, booze, religion, or "Oh! Calcutta!"] cast as

heroine, and on the other stage the most expensive of the overabused military branches, the wielder of the big bomb itself, playing hero. Ask who cast them in these roles, and I will answer: Me.

I am qualified to, along with X-million other parents in this country who have sent, are sending, or are saving to send their children to college on their own [the parents'] hard-earned money.

That is how the 20-year-old Miss Graber went to Vassar, which is a lot more dear than your average county community college. Having shelled out for tuition, room, books, and whatall, she found herself billeted with a roommate she refers to out of legal discretion merely as "Pamela." Pamela got her collegiate career off to a fast start by taking a whiff of hemp and, in the words of the Graber suit, "quickly embraced all aspects of the drug culture" and "became a focal point of all the drug users on campus."

Well, that's Pamela's business, you may say. Perhaps so, even when it is against the law. "But being a focal point meant having psychedelic gatherings, playing loud music, and singing with abandon and all thru the night, both in our suite and elsewhere in the corridor," Miss Graber said. And since Nancy and Pamela were roomies and Nancy had this queer notion about doing her homework, they didn't precisely groove together.

Now Nancy is suing for \$1 million, on grounds that the college's laissez-faire attitude toward Pamela's partying caused her failure and that this will stigmatize her in later life.

At the Air Force Academy, they don't go in for Vassar's style of progressive education in either classrooms or dorms. But that did not bother young John McCullough, from the time he signed his contract until six months after he graduated last June with a bachelor's degree financed by you and me.

His contract required McCullough to serve six years, five of them on active duty after graduation. He opted to go to law school first and do his active duty later. The Air Force agreed. While his time at law school did not count as active duty, it did add to his service longevity, and once he had six months of that, he was exempt from the draft. So six months, two weeks, and one day after graduation from the academy, McCullough notified the Air Force that he was a conscientious objector.

Pretty neat. He gets a high-class education, he beats the draft, and the taxpayers never get a day's work out of him.

He breaks his contract, which is something any ordinary workingman attempts at considerable peril. But—stroke of brilliance!—he breaks it because he disagrees with the Vietnamese war.

The Air Force, unamused, is billing McCullough for \$53,575, which it figures is his pro-rated share of Air Force Academy expenses for four years. McCullough's senator, Mark Hatfield, calls the billing un-American and undemocratic. I call it an admirable effort to recover our good-faith investment in the young gentleman.

Good faith—sounds quaint, doesn't it?

FOR MANY AMERICANS, NOVEMBER 11 IS ARMISTICE DAY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, November 11 is an appropriate day to pay tribute again to the gallant men and women of America who have worn their Nation's uniform with dignity and honor. For many Americans it is and always will be Armistice Day.

Federal law notwithstanding, this is the anniversary of the end of World War I and a day traditionally set aside to honor the veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Although more and more people appear to consider it fashionable to belittle the military, it remains an unquestioned fact that it is the military might of the United States which has kept much of the world free of oppression and slavery under communism and other alien forms of dictatorship.

It is the very dedication of those who wore the uniform that has guaranteed freedom in our Nation; even freedom to abuse our country and its institutions. One need not ponder long the fate of anyone who, in 1916 or 1942, strode the streets of America waving the flag of our enemies, calling for the overthrow of our form of Government, and castigating the men and women who wear our Nation's uniform. Yet, this is exactly what occurs on our streets today. This freedom to denounce has been won and kept secure by the very men and women the radicals belittle. The tragic part is the failure of other Americans to speak out in

behalf of our country, its traditions, and its veterans.

We do not today show sufficient regard for our veterans and their services, Mr. Speaker. True, many of them receive veterans benefits, but there is more to having served America than a dollar benefit. They are entitled to the respect and appreciation of their countrymen. As old fashioned as it may sound, we need a few more parades to honor veterans and a few less demonstrations against America.

Let those who would seek means to let off steam do so by being affirmative rather than negative. Let them ponder history as it would have been written had there not been Americans willing to shed their life's blood in defense of freedom.

And let us on that solemn day, November 11, reaffirm our belief that the highest call to national service is the call answered by the brave Americans who wear their uniform with pride.

THE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER LABORATORIES, BOULDER, COLO.

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would change the name of the Department of Commerce laboratories in Boulder, Colo., to the Dwight David Eisenhower Laboratories.

These laboratories, located at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, were opened during the autumn of 1954, early in the first administration of President Eisenhower. Although the facilities originally housed the radio section of the National Bureau of Standards, they have since grown to include segments of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and numerous other Department of Commerce laboratories.

The commitment of President Eisenhower to the peaceful uses of scientific advancement is well known. The Boulder laboratories, like the atoms for peace plan and the space program, evidenced his interest. As a matter of fact, it was President Eisenhower who formally dedicated the original Boulder laboratories on September 14, 1954.

The Boulder facility was first initiated in 1950 when Congress authorized an expanded radio section for the National Bureau of Standards. A site selection committee chose Boulder when the citizens of the city gave the Government 217 acres of land for the facility.

In addition to President Eisenhower's interest in science, there was also his interest in Colorado. His wife is from Denver, and Ike often vacationed in the State. Thus, it is altogether fitting that the Government he served in war and peace permanently honor his memory at one of its many fine scientific facilities located in the State of Colorado.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished Senators from Colorado, Mr.

ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK, are today introducing an identical proposal in the other body. We all join in expressing the hope that Congress will act to name the Commerce Department's Boulder laboratories in honor of one of the Nation's truly outstanding soldier-statesmen.

**NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY—
PART XI**

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, recently, in my capacity as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee's Task Force on Energy, I visited with some of my colleagues Princeton University's Plasma Physics Laboratory in order to understand better the problems and possibilities of fusion power. Other members of the task force also visited FMC Corp.'s Chemical Research and Development Center in Princeton to hear an explanation of the firm's plan to make synthetic fuels from coal.

The visit was instructive in many respects, but it is neither the time nor my place here to elaborate on all we learned that day.

However, I was given, as were my task force colleagues, some published, but not widely circulated, information on national energy policy matters which I believe might interest not only all my colleagues here in the House, but those citizens who seek to establish some order out of the current chaotic state of our energy system.

One of the key problems in establishing a National Energy Policy is understanding what new systems of energy conversion are possible, their feasibility, how much they may cost, and when they might be put to practical use. The information below describes in detail the current state of recommended research projects for energy conversion, their priorities, benefits, status of work, significant obstacles, and estimated costs and schedules.

I have taken the information from appendix B of the "Electric Utilities Industry Research and Development Goals Through the Year 2000," a report of the R. & D. Goals Task Force to the Electric Research Council, dated June 1971, ERC publication No. 1-71. Although written for industry, the material, I believe, is sufficiently dispassionate to warrant consideration by those in our Government charged with establishing a National Energy Policy.

The material follows:

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Method of Generation: Breeder Reactors.

Priority: 1—Critically Important.

Description: Breeder reactors utilize neutrons produced in fission reactions to bombard blanket materials, thereby creating a new fissionable material. Since the schemes under investigation produce more than one neutron per fission, there are sufficient numbers of neutrons available to sustain the fission chain reaction and to produce significant amounts of new fissionable material.

Power is extracted from the reactor in a conventional manner.

Benefits and Goals: Breeder reactors will have a marked impact on the fuel situation. Fuel reserves will be greatly conserved and enrichment capacity will no longer be critical as the breeder reactors will be producing fissionable fuels—enough for themselves and another reactor of equal size approximately every 7-10 years.

Status of Work: There is presently and has been for some years a good deal of work in the field of breeder reactors. Principally, the AEC and the industry have been supporting the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR). Other concepts have been proposed, however, and there is work going on to investigate Molten Salt Breeder Reactors, Gas Cooled Fast Reactors, and Light Water Breeder Reactors.

Significant Obstacles: The chief immediate problem is to raise funds and begin construction of a demonstration plant to prove the present technology. There will be difficult problems of site selection for breeders. Additional problems, primarily due to the higher enrichment of the fuel than for thermal reactors, are ability to license, plant safety, shipping of spent fuel, and disposal of more radioactive wastes.

Timetable and costs for development—Millions of 1971 dollars

By period:

1972.....	250
1973.....	340
1974.....	369
1975.....	427
1976.....	432
1977.....	476
1978.....	415
1979.....	331
1980.....	208
1981 to 1985.....	500
1986 to 1990.....	250
1991 to 2000.....	200

By function:

Demonstration* (three plus Fermi).....	-1,250
Continuing Research.....	-2,948
Total (29 years).....	-4,198

* Capital costs in excess of power value.

Method of Generation: Nuclear Fusion.
Priority: 1—Critically Important.

Description: Confinement of heavy isotopes of hydrogen (deuterium and/or tritium) at sufficiently high temperature and density, and for a long enough time will result in the fusion of these isotopes to produce a heavier element and the release of a large amount of energy. Conversion of this energy to electricity is the method of power production by means of a nuclear fusion reaction.

Benefits and Goals: The fuel required for the fusion reaction (deuterium) is naturally abundant. If a D-T reaction is used, the tritium required could be taken from a tritium inventory at first and, in the future, the tritium could be "bred" during the fusion reaction. Higher efficiencies are possible if topping cycles can be used to extract high quality energy and adverse environmental impact will be minimal. In addition, the chance for a nuclear excursion will be impossible.

Status of Work: In recent years, important strides have been made toward setting up the conditions required for the thermonuclear fusion reaction. Large scale efforts have been going on both in this country and abroad and the scientists seem to agree that a controlled thermonuclear reaction will be demonstrated by the mid 1970s, with satisfactory funding.

Significant Obstacles: The chief problem at this stage is to actually sustain a thermonuclear reaction. Additional problems are: design of vacuum wall, avoiding escape of

tritium, lithium blanket design, chemical and safety aspects of handling liquid lithium, fuel injection system, spent gas removal system, magnet design and tritium handling.

Timetable and costs for development—millions of 1971 dollars

By period:	
1972	50
1973	60
1974	95
1975	110
1976	135
1977	160
1978	170
1979	215
1980	245
1981 to 1985	1,000
1986 to 1990	1,000
1991 to 1995	500
1996 to 2000	500
By function:	
Basic Research	1,240
Pilots (late 1970's)	300
Demonstration (by mid-1980's)	1,000
Continuing Research	1,700
Total (29 years)	4,240

Project: R&D on Present Methods of Generation.

Priority: 1—Critically Important.
Description: Work to improve the reliability and efficiency of present day equipment must be continued. Because the units on the line today will be in our generation mix for many years to come, it is essential that all possible improvements be made on these units to make them more efficient, reliable, and acceptable to the public. This work must continue on nuclear generators as well as fossil, including fluidized bed combustion.

Benefits and Goals: Because of the heavy industry-wide investment in present day equipment, it is essential that any and all possible improvement be realized. Operating savings and reduced environmental impact would be hoped for.

Status of Work: For many years past and up to this time, leading manufacturers have been seeking ways to improve their products. These efforts have involved substantial sums of money which would be expected due to the heavy industry investment in generating equipment. It is expected that such work will continue.

Significant Obstacles: Materials problems have been defined in many instances. Work to develop materials capable of handling the severe stresses which they face in operation is underway. On the nuclear side, fuel handling and cycling problems are being investigated along with safety requirements for nuclear power plants.

Timetable and expenditures—millions of 1971 dollars

By period:	
1972	165
1973	180
1974	195
1975	210
1976	225
1977	240
1978	255
1979	270
1980	285
1981 to 1985	1,650
1986 to 1990	2,025
1991 to 1995	2,400
1996 to 2000	2,775
Total (29 years)	10,875

IV

Method of Generation: Fuel Processing.
Priority: 1—Critically Important.
Description: Gasification and solvent processing of coal, and hydrogen production (to be used as fuel) are proposed to provide high quality clean fuels for generating plants. The refined coal products are projected to be economically attractive in the fuel mar-

ket. Transmission of hydrogen by pipeline to the point of use could be an attractive prospect in the future as natural gas fuels dwindle.

Benefits and Goals: Greatly reduced pollution from the combustion of these refined fuels is projected. Higher heat rate and ease of transportation of the fuel to the point of use are predicted benefits which will add to the economic attractiveness of these processes.

Status of Work: There is a great deal of interest in these processes and considerable work is going on under the auspices of the Federal Government. Mid 1970 dates of development have been targeted and progress is steady.

Significant Obstacles: Gasification and solvent processing techniques are being perfected. Areas of poor understanding have been identified and work in these areas is underway to improve the techniques.

Timetable and costs for development—millions of 1971 dollars

By period:	
1972	8
1973	10
1974	10
1975	15
1976	10
1977	6
1978	2
1979	2
1980	2
1981 to 1985	5
1986 to 1990	5
1991 to 1995	—
1996 to 2000	—
By function:	
Basic Research	6
Pilot Models	16
Demonstration	45
Continuing Research	8
Total (19 years)	75

Method of Generation: Magneto-hydrodynamics (MHD)—open cycle.

Priority: 2—Very important.

Description: An MHD generator converts the kinetic and thermal energy of a moving plasma directly into electrical energy by passing the "seeded" flow through a strong magnetic field. Seeding is required to produce high conductivity in the gas flow. The MHD unit will probably be used to "top" a conventional steam cycle. Fully developed, 50% or more of the total output power of the combined cycle will be extracted from the MHD portion.

Benefits and Goals: MHD is proposed for fossil fired, central station, base load power production. Peaking power MHD plants would likely be spun off from an MHD developmental program. Increased cycle efficiencies are projected, resulting in significant decreases in thermal pollution. Higher combustion temperatures should facilitate flue-gas cleanup (essential to the process in order to recover expensive seed material) and could provide economies resulting from the sale of refined waste products. Increased efficiency will also help alleviate projected fossil fuel shortages by requiring less fuel for the generation of a given number of kilowatt-hours than present day generators.

Status of Work: MHD technology is well advanced, both in this country and abroad. Engineering solutions to many problems encountered have been found. Significant efforts have been carried on in the decade of the 60's, providing much insight into problem areas and potential problems of open cycle MHD. It has been reported that the Russians have started up the MHD portion (25 MW) of a 75 MW combined cycle plant early this year.

Significant Obstacles: Problems encountered in the burning of coal in an MHD generator are presently not well understood. The effects of the combustion products on generator performance and lifetime need to be

investigated. Preheater technology and methods of highly efficient stack-gas cleaning are other areas in which significant work is required for MHD base load plants.

Timetable and costs for development—millions of 1971 dollars

By period:	
1972	4.2
1973	4.4
1974	4.7
1975	9.5
1976	16.2
1977	14.4
1978	5.0
1979	4.5
1980	30.0
1981 to 1985	120.0
1986 to 1990	25.0
1991 to 1995	—
1996 to 2000	—
By function:	
Basic research	12.3
Pilot	39.0
Demonstration	150.0
Continuing research	36.6
Total (19 years)	237.9

Method of Generation: Fuels Cells.
Priority: 2—Very Important.

Description: The fuel cell intended for substation application and installation at isolated locations on distribution circuits would utilize a fossil fuel, air, and water. These would be processed and sent to the hydrocarbon-air fuel cell where chemical reactions would produce dc power. Resultant waste products would be air, water, and heat which could be recycled for the most part in the fully developed system.

Benefits and Goals: The chief goal of fuel cells for substation use is to provide economic generation at dispersed locations on a power system in 10-20 MW blocks. Reduced physical plant investment in transmission lines (resulting in environmental improvement), centralized base-load generating plants, and substation equipment will help provide economic incentive for this method. Air pollution problems should be eased by the employment of fuel cells because of (1) reduced emissions from the cells themselves, and (2) "scattered" sources of emissions. Because of probable modular construction, high reliability can be attained from these units. Siting problems could be minimized if, as predicted, fuel cells could be located in urban areas and areas where water is scarce.

Status of Work: Fuel cells have been developed for use in the United States space program. These were hydrogen-oxygen cells, much too costly and inefficient for power system application. The technology is, however, in hand for the development of hydrocarbon-air fuel cells, and considerable work is presently being carried on in the United States.

Significant Obstacles: Developing multi-fuel capabilities, achieving higher voltage output, interfacing with electric utilities, meeting desired economic design criteria and operating endurance are the areas of fuel cell development requiring the most effort.

Timetable and costs for development—millions of 1971 dollars

By period:	
1972	6.5
1973	8.0
1974	4.0
1975	4.0
1976	3.0
1977	2.0
1978	2.0
1979	2.0
1980	2.0
1981 to 1985	5.0
1986 to 1990	—
1991 to 1995	—
1996 to 2000	—

By function:

Basic Research.....	9.4
Pilot Plants.....	8.6
Demonstration (by late 1970's).....	10.5
Continuing Research.....	10.0
Total (14 years).....	38.5

Method of Generation: Bulk Electric Storage Batteries.

Priority: 2—Very Important.

Description: Bulk electric storage batteries envisioned for use on power systems would serve a purpose similar to that of pumped storage. During "off-peak" hours, low cost power would be used to charge the batteries (made of materials capable of storing large amounts of power). During peak conditions, the batteries would be connected to the system for power production.

Benefits and Goals: The development of large energy storage batteries would allow more efficient use for installed generating equipment and would eliminate the need of relatively inefficient steam and gas turbines for peaking power. If charged by means of base-load nuclear plants, air pollution would not be associated with this peak power. Dispersed siting near load centers and perhaps even in the cities would be possible with bulk storage batteries.

Status of Work: Most of the work done to date on bulk energy storage batteries has been single cell experiments. Many combinations of electrodes and electrolytes are being tested for maximum energy density, acceptable high temperature performance characteristics, etc. Problem areas are still being identified and actual batteries have not as yet been built. This technology is in its infancy.

Significant Obstacles: Among those problems already identified in storage battery research are materials corrosion at high temperatures, incomplete discharge, and large voltage drops at the electrodes. Systems engineering problems have not been identified at this time, but they are expected to be encountered when we try to incorporate large batteries into our generation mix on the power systems.

*Timetable and costs for development—
millions of 1971 dollars*

By period:	
1972.....	5.0
1973.....	5.0
1974.....	6.0
1975.....	6.0
1976.....	4.0
1977.....	4.0
1978.....	5.0
1979.....	5.0
1980.....	5.0
1981 to 1985.....	5.0
1986 to 1990.....	10.0
1991 to 1995.....	---
1996 to 2000.....	---

By function:

Basic research.....	8.0
Pilot models.....	15.0
Demonstration (by early 1980's).....	20.0
Continuing research.....	17.0
Total (19 years).....	60.0

Method of Generation: Unconventional Cycles.

Priority: 3—Important.

Description: The use of helium or CO₂ as a working fluid instead of conventional steam, or the use of two working fluids (e.g., potassium and steam) in the power cycle allows for the rise of higher temperatures and pressures in the plant cycle. For the case of the potassium binary cycle or the helium cycle, special turbines would be required for the power extraction from these fluids. In the binary cycles, the balance of plant is conventional steam.

Benefits and Goals: Unconventional cycles utilizing working fluids other than steam

offer increased efficiencies, for the most part, for present day plant designs. Higher efficiencies result in savings of operating dollars and reduced thermal waste. Problems with corrosion are lessened or eliminated by the use of CO₂ or helium in conventional cycles. Binary plants offer increases in efficiency on the order of 15% since power is extracted from high quality heat before the fluid produces steam for the conventional steam cycle, that steam at modern day conditions.

Status of Work: A good number of studies and some tests have been performed on these unconventional cycles. Problem areas have been identified and some engineering solutions have been proposed. Much of this work is interesting because of the capability shared by several of these methods to extract power from very high temperature fluids, making the concepts applicable (perhaps) to high temperature nuclear reactors.

Significant Obstacles: Design, development, and testing of new turbines, shaft seals, condensers, etc. would be required for some of the proposed concepts. Effects of the working fluid on life-time of all equipment would require investigation. There are no apparent technological roadblocks to impede the development of any or all of these unconventional cycles.

*Timetable and costs for development—
millions of 1971 dollars*

By period:	
1972.....	6.0
1973.....	6.0
1974.....	9.0
1975.....	9.0
1976.....	6.0
1977.....	4.5
1978.....	3.0
1979.....	3.0
1980.....	3.0
1981 to 1985.....	7.5
1986 to 1990.....	---
1991 to 1995.....	---
1996 to 2000.....	---

By function:

Basic Research.....	11
Pilot Models (by late 1970's).....	30
Demonstration.....	---
Continuing Research.....	16
Total (14 years).....	57

Method of Generation: Solar Energy Conversion.

Priority: 4—Desirable.

Description: Conversion of the sun's energy to electric energy can be accomplished either directly through photovoltaic cells or indirectly by means of collecting and focusing this energy to a point. In the former method, solar cells convert a portion of the energy incident to them by means of voltage differences between materials of the cell. In the latter method, the sun's energy is used to produce steam, which is then sent through a conventional steam plant.

Benefits and Goals: Solar energy conversion offers free fuel and greatly reduced environmental intrusion. Large land area requirements would be the only intrusion by a scheme utilizing photovoltaic cells for the direct conversion.

Status of Work: Virtually all of the work done on the development of solar energy conversion schemes has been done in connection with the United States space program. Satellites are currently being powered by solar cells. Only recently have the efforts of the scientists and engineers in the solar energy conversion field been turned toward the commercial application of solar cells.

Significant Obstacles: Discouragingly low efficiencies (on the order of 10%) of present day solar cells, and the very high cost of producing these cells are the two most significant obstacles. Low efficiency requires huge land area for a sizable power plant. Increasing the efficiency of the cells to 20%

(as some feel possible) would reduce the land area required for the same plant by 50%. Development of auxiliary equipment for fully developed plants is another area where significant work is required.

*Timetable and costs for development—
millions of 1971 dollars*

By period:

1972.....	3.0
1973.....	3.0
1974.....	4.0
1975.....	4.0
1976.....	4.0
1977.....	8.0
1978.....	10.0
1979.....	15.0
1980.....	17.0
1981 to 1985.....	45.0
1986 to 1990.....	30.0
1991 to 1995.....	15.0
1996 to 2000.....	10.0

By function:

Basic research.....	22.0
Pilot models (late 1970's).....	22.0
Demonstration (mid-1980's).....	50.0
Continuing research.....	76.0

Total (29 years)..... 168.0

Method of Generation: Magneto-hydrodynamics (MHD)—liquid metal.

Priority: 4—Desirable.

Description: The differences between a liquid metal MHD generator and a plasma MHD generator are basically two: (1) the working fluid; and (2) the method of power extraction. In a liquid metal MHD unit, the power is extracted as alternating current by taking advantage of the difference in velocity between the fluid and the applied magnetic field.

Benefits and Goals: Liquid metal MHD appears promising since, due to its operation at lower temperatures, no significant materials breakthroughs seem to be required for its development. Used as a topping cycle, this concept would afford increased efficiency with its related benefits.

Status of Work: Work done in the past has shown that power can be extracted from an induction liquid metal MHD generator. However, predicted efficiencies and performance have not been reached for a number of reasons. Some work on this concept is still continuing, both in the U.S. and abroad.

Significant Obstacles: Problems with generator performance have been uncovered during model testing of these generators. Failure to completely understand and compensate for these difficulties has resulted in an inability to attain the level of performance predicted for this concept. Specifically, claimed increases in efficiency have not been realized in units suitable for power system application. Increased understanding of the systems engineering problems and component problems is necessary.

*Timetable and costs for development—
millions of 1971 dollars*

By period:

1972.....	0.3
1973.....	.8
1974.....	.8
1975.....	1.0
1976.....	1.0
1977.....	2.0
1978.....	2.0
1979.....	5.0
1980.....	5.0
1981 to 1985.....	10.0
1986 to 1990.....	5.0
1991 to 1995.....	---
1996 to 2000.....	---

By function:

Basic research.....	7.4
Pilot models.....	3.0
Demonstration (by mid-1980's).....	10.0
Continuing research.....	12.5

Total (19 years)..... 32.9

Method of Generation: Magneto-hydrodynamics (MHD)—Closed cycle plasma.

Priority: 4—Desirable.

Description: The basic principle underlying the operation of closed cycle plasma MHD is the same as that for open cycle MHD—conversion of thermal and kinetic energy of the flowing plasma to electric power. Seeding of the plasma is not required (but is sometimes used) for this concept since high conductivity is attained by means of "non-equilibrium thermal ionization" of the hot gas. Lower temperatures are required for this method than are necessary for open cycle operation.

Benefits and Goals: The closed cycle concept is aimed at a central station, base load application. Its use for topping a nuclear cycle is proposed, thus allowing the use of the very high quality heat available from the reactor cores. Increased overall cycle efficiencies are, therefore, the chief benefit to be realized from this concept. Associated environmental effects (i.e. decreased thermal pollution) and economic benefits are predicted as a result of the higher efficiency.

Status of Work: Much laboratory work has been carried on in both the United States and abroad to investigate the properties of the plasma in the non-equilibrium ionization mode. Problems have been encountered in maintaining the stability of the plasma under this condition. However, recent investigations abroad have been aimed at determining the criticality of maintaining plasma stability. Early results seem to indicate operation of a closed cycle plasma MHD generator may be possible even with plasma instabilities. This work is proceeding.

Significant Obstacles: At present, the plasma stability problem is still considered to be the most difficult concern. The engineering problems associated with the topping of a nuclear reactor have not been explored in depth, and this could prove to be a difficult problem.

*Timetable and costs for development—
millions of 1971 dollars*

By period:

1972	1.0
1973	1.0
1974	1.0
1975	1.5
1976	1.5
1977	2.0
1978	2.0
1979	2.5
1980	2.5
1981 to 1985	25
1986 to 1990	45
1991 to 1995	20
1996 to 2000	10

By function:

Basic Research	6.0
Pilot Models (by early 1980's)	12.5
Demonstration (by late 1980's)	66.5
Continuing Research	30.0

Total (29 years) 115.0

Method of Generation: Thermionic Conversion.

Priority: 4—Desirable.

Description: Thermionic converters utilize heat applied to an electrode to "boil off" electrons. The electrons cross a gap, usually occupied by a highly conductive vapor such as cesium, and are collected on a cooler electrode. Power is extracted from the process by connecting a load between the emitter and the collector, allowing the higher potential electrons at the collector to flow through the load back to the emitter, thus completing the circuit.

Benefits and Goals: The thermionic converter is proposed as a topping cycle for either nuclear or fossil-fired plant. In either case, the converter would be very near the heat source (in the reactor or furnace) and rejected heat (cooling the collector) would be transferred to the working fluid of a con-

ventional cycle. Higher efficiencies are projected and the thermionic converter itself would cause no pollution problems, bringing about a reduction in overall plant waste heat, and savings in capital investment on the power system.

Status of Work: Studies have been done to show the expected magnitude of increased efficiencies when the converter is applied on a coal fired unit. 10% increases have been projected. In-core reactor studies and tests are currently underway. Similar efficiency increases are projected for this application.

Significant Obstacles: The effect of a coal environment on the thermionic converter electrodes could be a problem. Relatively few hours have been accumulated by electrodes in a coal environment, leaving an incomplete knowledge of the problem. Radiation damage to insulators and the accumulation of fission products on the electrodes are problems with the in-core approach. Fundamental tests investigating these areas could prove fruitful.

*Timetable and costs for development—
millions of 1971 dollars*

By period:

1972	1.0
1973	1.0
1974	2.0
1975	2.0
1976	3.0
1977	3.0
1978	2.0
1979	2.0
1980	1.0
1981 to 1985	2.5
1986 to 1990	2.5
1991 to 1995	-----
1996 to 2000	-----

By function:

Basic research	6.5
Pilot models (early 1980's)	2.5
Demonstration	-----
Continuing research	13.0

Total (19 years) 22.0

Method of Generation: Geothermal and Air Storage Peaking.

Priority: Suggested for Private Support.

Description: The methods named above have a potential place in electric power generation of the future. However, due to specific requirements for the several concepts, their application is limited to certain geographic segments of the country.

Benefits and Goals: Each concept offers its own unique advantages and all appear to be feasible under the conditions dictated for their application.

Status of Work: Feasibility has been shown and work is currently underway to either sell or develop these methods.

Significant Obstacles: Suitability and applicability to relatively minor segments of the industry do not appear to warrant industry-wide participation in the development of these concepts.

Timetable and Costs for Development: No recommendation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

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 sadis-

tically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

GULF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TAKES THE LEAD IN POLLUTION PREVENTION

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for their positive innovations in protecting America against industrial pollution Gulf Research & Development has been awarded a first place in Petroleum Engineer's environmental control development program. Gulf was recognized for developing a process that substantially reduces the sulfur content of residual fuel burned in industrial production and power generation.

The subject of environment is becoming more and more important to Americans. We greatly appreciate the tremendous efforts of Gulf Research & Development and the petroleum industry as a whole as they develop new methods of protecting ecology.

Gulf Research & Development was recognized as follows for their new program for emissions control during processing and manufacturing:

Gulf Research & Development Co.'s residual hydrodesulfurization process (HDS) can substantially reduce sulfur content of residual fuel oil burned for industrial production and power generation.

Its original design, proved out during the last year and a half in commercial application, is capable of reducing sulfur content in Kuwait residual oil from 4% to 1%. New developments offer further reduction to .5%, well within generally established guidelines for air purity in most of the world, and possibly as low as .3%.

After 30 years of research and development, engineering design, materials study, and a total expenditure of about \$20,000,000, Gulf HDS has been successfully commercialized.

Most residual fuels contain high levels of sulfur (typically, 2-5%). Burning of such fuels obviously pollutes the atmosphere with sulfur oxides and cannot be tolerated. Reduction of sulfur contents is difficult because residuals contain contaminants, principally vanadium- and nickel-organo compounds.

In the process of removing sulfur by hydrogenation, the vanadium and nickel are deposited on the catalyst. Normal desulfurization catalysts thus lost activity rapidly, cycle life is short and processing cost is prohibitive. Oxidative regeneration of these used catalysts is unsuccessful since vanadium sulfates are formed, which poison hydrogenation activity.

Thus, a catalyst was needed which would (1) tolerate a large amount of deposited vanadium and nickel without losing hydrogenation activity and (2) be cheap enough to be economically used in a single cycle and then replaced with fresh catalyst. Gulf's catalyst meets these requirements—retains activity while accumulating as much as 65% of the contaminants, the company says.

First commercialization of Gulf HDS process was made in Nippon Mining Co.'s refinery at Mitsuishima, Japan. Unit was de-

signed to process 27,760 bpsd of Kuwait atmospheric tower bottoms (4% sulfur) to produce a residual fuel of 1% sulfur. The operation was designed for a 6-month operating cycle as desired by the refiner. Started up in January of 1970, the plant has operated successfully ever since. Operations, including startups and shutdowns, have been smooth and each cycle produced 1% sulfur residual fuel for six months as designed, Gulf said. The fourth cycle has been started.

About 15 million bbl of 1% sulfur fuel oil have been produced—with potential sulfur pollutant to the atmosphere reduced by 76,000 tons.

Two additional Gulf HDS, now in design and construction stages, will have a total capacity of reducing the sulfur contents of 80,000 b/d of Kuwait residual to 1%, the company said.

Recently Gulf has developed a modification of the process (HDS-Type III) by which Kuwait atmospheric tower residual (4% sulfur) can be reduced in sulfur content to 0.5%.

BELOIT, WIS.—CANDIDATE FOR THE ALL-AMERICAN CITY AWARD

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of the House the following article which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on Monday, October 25, about Beloit, Wis. Beloit is an excellent candidate for the All-American City Award and I am personally delighted that Beloit has been nominated.

The article follows:

WORKING TOGETHER PAYS OFF IN BELOIT

BELOIT, WIS.—The president of the Beloit City Council, Everett C. Haskell, feels that this city was nominated for the All-American Cities Award because it is "a community that knows how to work together."

Beloit recently was named as one of a dozen or so candidates for the national award.

"We have a tremendous amount of community functions and citizens take an active part so the residents know what's going on in government," Haskell said.

He said citizen committees had helped solve problems of labor relations, urban renewal, welfare, wage negotiations and race.

"We get along very excellently with the minorities here because everyone takes part," he said.

This city of 35,000 on the Wisconsin-Illinois border is a heavy industrial town.

It has a seven man city council and has had a city manager, a position now held by Herbert Holt, for 40 years. Haskell said the city manager form of government was more efficient and business like.

The city manager has a job to do; he's not politicking from the time he gets in, and it works out better that way when it's just a job and not an office," Haskell said.

Haskell also said that the City Council regularly asked classes at Beloit College to do research for the city.

A few years ago when the city was in the midst of wage negotiations with city employees, city officials asked the school to collect statistics on pay scales in other cities.

"They got the statistics for us and it was a valuable experience for them . . ." he said, adding that citizen participation like that was the key to clean government.

The contest is sponsored by the National

CXVII—2567—Part 31

Municipal League. The winner will be named Nov. 15 during the league's convention at Atlanta.

PAPER ON A POPULATION DISTRIBUTION POLICY

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Members of the Congress and many other national leaders have been expressing varying levels of concern over demographic patterns within the Nation. Numerous studies have been made on the crisis created within our major cities and metropolitan areas by increasing densities of population. A few of these studies have also touched on the tragic and continuing disappearance of our smaller towns and communities.

Some note has been taken of the adverse economic, social, and health effects growing populations have on metropolitan areas. There is now also some attention being given to the detrimental effect that diminished populations have on the future of community development and job opportunities in nonmetropolitan areas.

During the community development hearing which I recently held in Walnut Ridge, Ark., Dr. C. Clyde Jones, chairman of the division of political science, sociology and geography at the Arkansas State University, presented excellent testimony which bears directly on this problem.

I would like to share that information with my colleagues today.

Dr. Jones' testimony follows:

PAPER ON A POPULATION DISTRIBUTION POLICY

(Presented to Community Development Proposal Hearing, October 23, 1971, Walnut Ridge, Ark., by Dr. C. Clyde Jones, chairman of the Division of Political Science, Sociology, and Geography, Arkansas State University)

INTRODUCTION

A population distribution policy should be adopted to encourage a more rapid growth rate for the country's less densely populated regions. The question whether the United States should have a population distribution policy is relevant. There are historical precedents for such a policy. In the first hundred years of our history, the government pursued a deliberate policy of dispersing people westward. The government subsidized railroads and river navigation. It opened public lands for homestead and built roads. Once the frontier ended, governmental programs continue to encourage a balanced regional development by such programs as electric power projects and the depressed areas legislation of the 1960's. With the heavy concentration of votes in large metropolitan areas, Congress has been reluctant to pass legislation to encourage economic developments in middle-sized centers. This attitude needs to be changed.

POPULATION CONCENTRATION

The present trend in population settlement in the United States is toward a concentration in metropolitan areas and this needs to be slowed or reversed. Population concentration is the result of employer-established job patterns in which the people have been forced to follow. The job patterns have been

created by considerations of economic efficiency.¹ In strictly economic terms, concentration of industry in large population centers is an advantage.² But in terms of social costs (crime, pollution, slums, welfare expenditures, commuting time, and loss of community), this concentration is seriously questioned.

CAUSES OF POPULATION CONCENTRATION

Some young people go to the large cities in search of adventure, entertainment, and opportunity for economic advancement. For the most part, however, the migrants have little preparation for life in the large city. Most of the uprooted rural and town people inevitably find their destination in the slums of metropolitan areas. These displaced individuals are indirectly forced into the migration stream by economic forces beyond their control. The distribution and concentration of population is largely due to the distribution of jobs.³ Governmental policies toward agriculture, business, education, and highways give impetus to this concentration.

SOCIAL COSTS OF POPULATION CONCENTRATION

The concentration of jobs in large metropolitan areas causes the migrant families to lose their most cherished associations and sense of community identity. It is time to consider the social and economic costs to the heavy concentration of our population in metropolitan areas. These social and economic costs are presented by Mr. James L. Sundquist, a Senior Fellow in the Governmental Studies program at the Brookings Institution:

It seems reasonably clear that our largest urban concentrations have grown well beyond the point at which diseconomies of scale begin to show. The costs of moving people and things within large metropolitan areas are demonstrably greater than the costs of moving them in smaller population centers. Commuting distances are obviously longer, the time loss greater, the costs higher.

There are enormous costs as well as appalling cruelties in the forced displacement and migration of populations. . . . Some of the migrants are too ill-prepared, too sick, or too poor to adjust to city life successfully; many of them wind up on welfare and they burden every kind of institution.⁴

Many of these migrants move to the slums and require a higher per capita cost for health, fire, and police protection. The per capita cost for unemployment and welfare is also higher. The highest crime rates in the country are in the slums. There are some unmeasured costs to this migration, such as urban congestion, noise, loss of privacy and freedom, reduction in security, pollution of the air and water, and destruction of wildlife and recreational opportunities.⁵

Due to these considerations it is concluded that our largest metropolitan areas are less governable, less desirable places to live, and economically less sound than smaller communities. If this is true, it is in the public interest to encourage the dispersion of our population. It is safe to assume that a majority of population migration is involuntary. A population distribution pattern could be designed to encourage people to remain where they desire to live.

Most people move to the city because of economic pressures. Many go home eagerly as soon as the economic opportunity arises. A Gallup poll in 1968 revealed that 56 percent of the American people prefer a rural life if they had a choice.⁶ A governmental policy should be adopted to permit people to live and work where they desire whether it be in the big city or smaller community. With a large number of migrants to the big city, the problems of our large cities are enormous and becoming increasingly more severe with time. The solution to these problems seems to call

Footnotes at end of article.

for a reduction of the migration to our large cities.

A PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL POPULATION DISPERSION

A program should be adopted to create a rural-urban balance. In order to create this balance, towns and smaller cities must improve their offerings and amenities. This improvement should encourage an accelerated rate of growth in smaller economic centers of the less densely populated regions.

Jobs should be created where the people live and want to remain. Tax incentives have proven to be an effective method of stimulating investment for economic growth. If tax incentives were available for specified types of new industry for the desired spatial population distribution, the desired rural-urban balance could be achieved.

SIZE OF CITIES TO ENCOURAGE GROWTH

The economies of scale cannot be totally ignored. There are advantages in larger towns and cities. It is likely that the quality of service will be higher with lower prices in large towns and small cities than in small towns.⁷ In 1960, 58.3 percent of the population in the United States lived in rural areas or in cities under 50,000. "At least since 1920, the class of cities with the largest single segment of the nation's urban population (and it is also the fastest growing segment) has been that of the 10,000 to 50,000 group."⁸ This very well may be the size of the community that people desire most to live. If this is the case, serious consideration should be given for the government to encourage industry to locate in cities of this size. Most people in Arkansas live in or within commuting distance of a city of this size. If no city of this size exists within commuting distance, a smaller city should be assisted by the federal government to grow.

INVESTMENT IN HUMAN CAPITAL

Skills and knowledge are a form of capital. Expenditures on education and health to take advantage of better job opportunities are examples of this investment.⁹ Investment in human capital can be easily justified as it strengthens the national security of the United States. The government discriminates against human capital as it permits depreciation allowances for worn out machines and investment credit for new machines. The investment in human capital, however, receives no such favored treatment. Tax credit should be available to restrain workers for new skills. It is good business to invest in human capital to make taxpayers out of welfare recipients.

Change in farm policy

Our federal government has not come to grips with the costs of off-farm migration. Our subsidy programs encourage the big farmer to get bigger and the marginal farmer to go out of business. Soil bank subsidies have reduced farm employment. This needs to be reconsidered.

Encourage youth to remain at home

The largest labor force growth in 1960's was among the 16-24 age group. During the 1970's the dramatic increase will be the 25-34 age bracket. The workers of this age bracket will be far better educated than those of the same group in the 1960's.¹⁰ It will be an economic advantage to the less densely populated areas to keep these prime age workers. The federal government should subsidize on the job training.

There is a slowed growth in overall teenage labor force which will reduce unemployment. The youth labor force (ages 16-19) increased by forty-three percent in the 1960's but will be only eleven percent in the 1970's. It is essential to devote more energy and effort to

providing improved recreational facilities and programs to occupy young people. This would likely reduce drug usage, juvenile delinquency, and crime. If these young people can be satisfied, they are more likely to remain in their nature area.

Encourage women employment

The increasing number of working women indicates the need for day care and more female oriented jobs. Tax incentives should be granted to industries, employing high percentage of women workers, to locate in less densely populated areas. The proportion of women in the labor force will continue to increase, with married women accounting for most of the increase. The number of women at work in 1980 will double the 1950 figure. "Working wives make significant contributions to total family income. In each income bracket women contribute about one-fourth or more of the family income."¹¹ This makes it highly desirable to encourage an increasing number of jobs for women to keep the families in less densely populated areas.

Train more service workers

Employment will continue to increase in white collar and service occupations. "White collar workers will outnumber blue-collar by more than fifty percent in 1980."¹² Schools must change their emphasis to meet this need. "The largest number of employment opportunities will continue to be in the service producing industries."¹³

Before World War II more workers produced goods than provided services. By 1980 service producing industries will provide twice as many jobs as goods producing industries. In order to meet these requirements, the federal government should provide opportunities to train or retrain potential workers. Increasing emphasis should be placed on training white collar and service workers. At the present time approximately ninety-six percent of all expenditures for post-high school education is spent on college education. Many college professions are already overcrowded. Strong consideration should be given to reducing this high proportion. More efforts must be directed to vocational training with increasing emphasis on testing and counseling students to enter areas for which they have proper aptitudes. The students should be trained in fields of potential employment.

Modernize local governmental structure

City and county governments need sufficient power to carry out the desires of their people without unnecessary restrictions imposed by the State. Cities should be given increased power over their own local affairs.¹⁴ Cities should be given increased powers to tax to meet the growing needs of government. The structure of state and local governments should be reorganized to improve efficiency.

Improve transportation system

Federal and state governments should take the initiative in the improvement of our highway system. This is essential to attract industry. It is also necessary to improve the commuting distances of workers. This will encourage individuals in less populated regions to remain in their native community.

Conclusion on national population distribution policy

It is the judgment of the author that a national population distribution policy should be established to encourage a more rapid growth rate for the country's less densely populated cities. The federal government should take the leading role in this endeavor. The above discussed programs will go a long way toward the establishment of a successful national population distribution policy to permit people to live and work where they desire.

A PROGRAM FOR ARKANSAS

Although the state had a 7.7 percent population increase in the 1960's, there was a net outmigration of 51,022 persons. A net outmigration of 433,000 persons occurred from 1950-1960.¹⁵ Of this amount, whites accounted for 283,000. The state of Arkansas experienced during the 1960's a reversal of the white outmigration of the 1950's, and a continuation of the non-white outmigration pattern.¹⁶ The rate of outmigration has steadily declined since 1950. There was a net in-migration of 43,036 whites in the 1960's.

The attached map of Arkansas reveals that most of the outmigration occurred in the First Congressional District. A net outmigration of 79,457 from this district in the 1960's indicates the problem for this area. Mississippi county had a net outmigration of 20,335 of which about sixty percent were white.

Feasibility of rural-urban balance in the south

Cities of the South with less dense population and smaller size can meet the tests of economic efficiency and support a way of life with access to the open country. "This balance of the urban and rural ways of life has often been advocated but rarely achieved."¹⁷

The feasibility of the South developing the rural-urban balance is presented by Rupert Vance and Sara Smith as follows:

It should not be forgotten that the patterning of urban location in the South took place under the domination of the cotton economy. Whereas financial control centered in several futures markets and in points of export like New Orleans, the actual buying, collecting, and storing of cotton was spread among many small communities around railroad stations, cotton gins, and crossroads stores. This has resulted in very few large cities and many towns of even size rather than the sharply competitive grading of population in an industrialized area.

Instead there has grown up a number of well spaced, fairly evenly populated, middle-sized centers which should have considerable autonomy over their surrounding areas, the pattern set down by the old agricultural economy.¹⁸

The South is conducive to a policy of encouraging its population to remain in their native area. Our policy should be to keep what we have and improve it. These middle-sized population centers of 10,000 to 50,000 people should be encouraged to grow. Most workers in Arkansas are within commuting distance of a city of this size. The larger cities do not need the farm migrants in their slums. The small towns are not capable of economic efficiency to cope with increased numbers. Some degree of population concentration is an economic advantage. It is, therefore, my judgment that our policy should be directed toward improving the amenities of these medium sized centers. This can be achieved by the adoption of some of the above proposals plus those suggested by those to follow. The limitations on floating industrial bonds should be reduced to permit local governments to encourage industry to locate in their area.

In order to meet the objective of rural-urban balance, it will require the support of federal, state, county, and city governments as well as the business community. Presently, our cities are in serious trouble. The solution is to stop the influx of migrants to the city slums. The best way to achieve this is to make jobs available in the less densely populated areas as Arkansas so the people may live where they want to live. It is time for Congressmen from urban districts to unite with Congressmen from the less densely settled areas to sponsor and im-

Footnotes at end of article.

APPENDIX B

Not reproduced.

APPENDIX C

Observation and Recommendations for Local Government in Arkansas

The Arkansas Constitutional Revision Study Commission in its Report to the Governor and to the Sixty-Sixth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas made the following recommendations and observations pertaining to local government:

City and county governments should have sufficient power to carry out the wishes of the people whom they govern without unnecessary restrictions imposed by the State. On the basis of this goal, The Local Government Committee brought up these points:

(a) The structure of county government in Arkansas is tailored to the needs of an agrarian age and offers no flexibility to fit the great variations between population sizes and economic conditions in counties of Arkansas today.

(b) Duties of some of the numerous elected officials at the county level, such as the county coroner and the county surveyor, are technical in nature, which suggests that they should be appointed rather than elected.

(c) The county judge exercises legislative, executive, and judicial power in one office, which is contrary to the concept of separation of powers.

(d) The quorum court has little effectiveness as a legislative body and is too large to operate efficiently even if it had the power to do so.

(e) The five-mill limits on general operating revenues of cities and counties are unrealistic ceilings established in an era when most services now taken for granted—such as paved streets and full-time fire protection—were nonexistent.

(f) Cities often find themselves governed more by the state legislature and state law than by their own citizens and governing bodies.

(g) The five-mill tax limit on counties and cities for general operations is inadequate for the maintenance of local government, resulting in dependence on the legislature for turnback funds.

(h) The constitutional limitation of \$5,000 on salaries for elected city and county officials tends to discourage capable office seekers. It was outdated by inflation decades ago.

(i) The Commission recommends a provision giving cities increased power over their own local affairs, encouraging the exercise of local initiative, and permitting general legislative control of all municipalities, or those of a class, only on matters as to which uniformity throughout the State is desirable.

(j) Cities and counties cannot incur short-term debt consistent with sound business principles. This sometimes leads to long delays in obtaining needed improvements and services, or makes them more costly in the long run.

(k) Many local government provisions in the Constitution, particularly those pertaining to taxation and indebtedness, are long, hard to understand, filled with statutory detail, and apply only to narrow special interests.

(l) Local government provisions in the Constitution tend to discourage assumption of local responsibilities in such a way that effective democratic government is difficult to achieve at the city and county level.

Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of testimony and other materials which I have gathered during my search for ways to assist community development in areas of low population. Other materials on this subject appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of September 22, pages

32740-32741; October 1, pages 34505-34506; October 6, pages 35409-35410; October 13, 36133-36135; October 21, pages 37358-37361; October 28, pages 38121-38123; and November 3, pages 39156-39158.

FINANCING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—TWO VIEWS ON THE REVENUE BILL

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, the House began consideration of H.R. 11341, the District of Columbia Revenue Act. In today's Washington Post there is an excellent editorial and a splendid letter to the editor clearly setting forth the issues that the House faces in considering the bill. I want to share with my colleagues both of these items which are set out below:

THE HOUSE MONEY BILL FOR WASHINGTON

At some point today or Thursday—when ever the more worldly legislative matters of the week have been disposed of by the House of Representatives—a little floor time is to be set aside for the congressionally tedious business of dealing with matters vital to the District of Columbia. While it's unfortunate that our busy lawmakers have to knuckle down to these local chores every once in a while (and Washingtonians have thought it unfortunate for decades now), consideration of the fiscal 1972 revenue bill for this city will require serious attention.

For one thing, this is the annual legislation that is supposed to provide the means by which the District can meet its fiscal needs; to put it another way, it is the colony's allowance from the congressional overseers—for a fiscal year that began last July 1. Secondly, the bill coming before the House—contrary to what some senior members of the House District Committee would have their colleagues believe—is austere financially, but replete with irrelevant legislative provisions that have not been properly considered in the House, have not been the subject of hearings and, in our view, ought to be stricken from H.R. 11341. Finally, the bill is accompanied by an atrocious committee report loaded with paternalistic assumptions about the people who live and work in Washington but devoid of any judicious conclusions by which other members of the House might be guided.

Basically, the bill calls for an increase of \$44 million in the annual federal payment to the District, which along with other revenue-raising provisions, falls \$16 million shy of what the city government says it needs to balance its current requests. It is by no means a generous authorization, nor is there any guarantee that all of it will be appropriated, since spending is handled through another bill. But thanks to efforts by Rep. Ancher Nelsen of Minnesota, ranking Republican on the District Committee, the \$44-million increase is a considerable improvement over the committee's original agreement on only \$20 million. In effect, it is a minimum; if it cannot be raised, it certainly should not be cut by the House.

But then there are the provisions that do not belong in the bill, as nine committee members have pointed out in a minority view filed with the report. Noting that the bill began as a revenue-raising measure, these members wrote that the legislation "looked more like a Christmas tree when it was reported. In the markup session, without the

benefit of any evidence or hearings, members were presented for the first time with a series of riders which bore little or no relationship to the revenue-raising provisions of the original bill, and which had never been considered during the hearings":

1. There is a provision to force rezoning of the property once used by Providence Hospital, between D and E Streets SE., from 2d to 3d Streets, for development of a high-rise complex to include apartments, stores and a 1,500-car garage. The complex would be within an area zoned for low-density, low-rise construction, and would either face or be within one block of four elementary schools. Understandably, residents of this Capitol Hill area oppose this change, but more importantly, they object to the devious way in which it is being presented.

As the dissenting committee members put it, this provision "verges on being a private bill for the relief of a group of real estate investors," which, whether one agrees with the purpose or not, does not "belong in a revenue bill, for the same reasons that the Rules of the House prohibit the inclusion of legislative provisions in an appropriations bill." Besides, there haven't even been any hearings held on this special-interest legislation.

2. There is a provision requiring the mayor to withhold shelter allotments from welfare recipients when a landlord charges that the recipients' rents have not been paid; the mayor would have to make a finding as to whether there is legal basis for the failure to pay rent, and then figure how much the landlord should receive. Quite aside from the constitutional question of whether this amounts to denying welfare recipients equal protection of the laws, it is a colossal administrative burden to heap on the mayor when there already are judicial remedies available.

3. There is a provision that would relieve area retailers and truckers from a D.C. Minimum Wage Act requirement that certain drivers, helpers, loaders and mechanics be paid overtime. This is a complicated question that ought to be considered, like the other two provisions, on its own merits, after thorough hearings.

The real question before the House, then, is not how many obnoxious local ordinances can be lumped into one big bill, but whether a pertinent, minimum fiscal authorization can be passed that will permit this city to provide essential—and necessarily expensive—municipal services.

FINANCING D.C.

On Nov. 3 The Post printed an article entitled "Hill Unit Calls City Officials 'Extravagant'", concerning a report prepared at the direction of House D.C. Committee Chairman McMillan. I was appalled at the evidence of rank antagonism toward D.C. citizens exhibited by quoted portions. I was relieved that of the 26 members on the committee, 10 dissented from the report's conclusion.

The report would have one believe that D.C. is floating on the financial good graces of the nation's taxpayers. We taxpayers in the District are among those Americans; we pay the same stiff federal taxes and a full range of local taxes. According to the latest figures available, local revenues raised in D.C. were higher per capita, by a wide margin, than corresponding receipts raised in the metropolitan jurisdictions except Falls Church. The federal payment—made only to the General Fund—was 17 per cent in FY 1970. This is supposed to be adequate compensation for the extensive service requirements of the federal establishment and for the fact that about 51 per cent of the District's land area is, by federal law, exempt from D.C. taxation. Washington competes for other federal monies, e.g., matching grants, like any other eligible jurisdiction. Has the committee forgotten that D.C. cannot annex territory to increase its tax base,

that the locally set real estate tax cannot be used without limit?

The committee report complains that, if D.C. "wants" to crowd in 700,000 people, it is obliged to provide employment, not the federal establishment. What primarily attracts people to Washington is the presence of the federal establishment—its need for employees and the needs of groups all over the nation to do business with it. Think what would happen if D.C. tried to, let alone could, develop high employment potential by means normal to other communities, e.g., attracting heavy industry or building huge complexes to encourage relocation of a large insurance company's main office. As we all know, congressmen are quite sensitive to proposals to raise the city's building height limit, change its basically residential character.

To top it off, the D.C. public school system is attacked for "budgetary chaos." Hand in hand with such thought must go the recognition that Congress controls that budget—the entire city budget—but it has yet to pass this fiscal year's appropriations even though the year is about half over.

BARBARA H. THOMAS.

WASHINGTON.

FORCED SCHOOL BUSING: A DRASTIC ERROR

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Star of September 23, 1971, the eminent columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, comments upon the "drastic error" committed by the Supreme Court in its latest decisions endorsing forced schoolbusing. Concerning this Mr. Kilpatrick quotes from a major address by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, who was "reared in the Yankee hills of West Virginia and 'won his post as assistant majority leader with liberal support."

In his address Senator BYRD made some very astute and perceptive observations concerning forced schoolbusing. For example, he pointed out that busing lessens the chances for improvement of the inner city schools, and that the recent Supreme Court decisions upholding forced busing represent a "distorted, twisted interpretation of the equal protection clause."

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Mr. Kilpatrick's brief but illuminating article:

A DRASTIC RESPONSE TO A DRASTIC ERROR

(By James K. Kilpatrick)

It has been an exercise in futility, these past 17 years, for a Southerner to raise his voice against any requirement having to do with the desegregation of public schools. He is licked before he starts. It is as if John Roche of General Motors were to expound an objective view of Ralph Nader.

Sen. Robert C. Byrd, though he was born in North Carolina, suffers from no such bill of attainder. He was reared in the Yankee hills of West Virginia. He has devoted his life to public service in that distinctly non-Southern state. Byrd holds a rating of 85 from the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education, which puts him in a class with such moderates as Mathias of Maryland and Case of New Jersey. He won his post as assistant majority leader with liberal sup-

port. Byrd's speech of Sept. 3 in Houston, before the national convention of Young Americans

for Freedom, thus qualifies as the expression of a veteran lawmaker whose personal or political motives cannot be challenged. His devastating attack on what he terms the "madness" of compulsory busing is clear and convincing.

Simply on its merits, apart from the law, mass busing strikes the West Virginian as a "senseless" waste of money. He deplors its effect upon the cities: "When children are going to be hauled willy-nilly away from their homes and neighborhoods, it lessens the chances for improvement of the inner-city schools which are most in need of improvement."

Far from enhancing "quality education," in Byrd's view, busing tends to destroy education—especially for the black children whose needs are paramount. He sees only "increasing mediocrity in education" as a consequence of the "nonsensical obsession these days with racial quotas." Byrd flatly denies the contention that forced integration will teach children of different races to live in harmony together. "Polarization of the races is intensified when neighborhood and school identities are destroyed."

Byrd is a lawyer. He has steadfastly supported the Supreme Court's landmark decision of 1954, holding that children cannot lawfully be assigned to schools by reason of their race. He continues to defend that proposition. But he looks at the court's recent line of decisions, upholding the busing of children by reason of their race, and he sees a perversion of the 14th Amendment. "What a distorted, twisted interpretation of the equal protection clause!"

In Byrd's view, "the equal protection clause forbids segregation but it does not command integration." That distinction seems to him fundamental. He agrees with the court—the court of 1954—that a state violates the Constitution when it undertakes to treat children differently because of the color of their skin. He is thus baffled by the court's 180-degree turn: Now the states are told they must treat children differently because of the color of their skin. This is lunacy, says Byrd; and many will agree.

What is to be done? "Voices must be raised throughout the country which will move this nation's highest tribunal to the realization that its position . . . is going to impair public support of the public school system and will continue to produce chaos in the public schools." But Byrd acknowledges that the court has been unanimous in its racial opinions. Mere protest, however widespread and eloquent, may accomplish little.

One takes a long breath. Constitutional amendment is like matrimony, not to be entered into lightly. Yet amendment may now offer the only effective recourse. Since his speech in Houston, the assistant majority leader has endorsed a resolution sponsored by Sen. William E. Brock, R-Tenn., and eight others. It would write this into the Constitution:

"No public school student shall, because of his race, creed or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school."

That is Senate Joint Resolution 112. It demands prayerful thought. As the "madness" spreads beyond the South, to California, to Michigan, to Indiana, perhaps the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the resolution's drastic response to drastic error.

THE U.S. MARINE CORPS: 196 YEARS OF SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an ever-changing world, this Nation has had

in its service an organization whose characteristics do not change, whose qualities are steadfast and constant—the courage, resolution, readiness, and faithful performance of duty of the U.S. Marines.

One hundred and ninety-six years ago today the U.S. Marine Corps was formed. And the purpose of the corps in 1775 was the same as it is today: To seek and maintain peace for the people of our country. For nearly two centuries we have had a corps of marines with small numbers and high standards. They have been, and are, a few good men—and women—who are proud of their corps and of America. On this 10th of November, the Congress and the country extend greetings and gratitude to all marines, in uniform and out, who have put their country before themselves.

OPPOSING CONFISCATION OF HANDGUNS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Michigan United Conservation Clubs representing over 130,000 sportsmen, hunters and conservationists in the State of Michigan at its meeting in Harbor Springs, Mich., on October 16-17 adopted a strong resolution opposing confiscation of handguns and reiterating that fine organization's support of the constitutional right of American citizens to keep and bear arms for legitimate sporting and defense purposes.

MUCC is the official affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation and the principal sportsman-conservationist organization in the State of Michigan. I believe this resolution of Michigan's citizens, sportsmen and conservationists deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I include its text at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, some elected and appointed public officials have expressed their opposition to the private ownership of not only hand guns but also long guns such as are commonly used for hunting; and

Whereas, hundreds of thousands of Michigan citizens enjoy hunting and target shooting; and

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States guarantees the right of its citizens to keep and bear arms; and

Whereas, taking guns away from law-abiding citizens would have little effect on the possession of guns by criminals; and

Whereas, crimes of violence would be committed by other means if guns were not available; and

Whereas, effective guns can be crudely made from commonly available components or well made in a home workshop; and

Whereas, people, not guns, commit crimes: Therefore be it resolved that no laws be enacted that would dispossess law-abiding citizens of their guns; and

Be it further resolved that penalties for law violations involving the use or threat of the use of a gun be increased; and

Be it further resolved that MUCC hereby express their opposition to any governmental action that would restrict the right of law-abiding citizens to own, keep and bear arms for the purpose of hunting, target shooting

or the defense of themselves, their families or their homes.

NOVEMBER 20 TO BE LILY PONS DAY

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, the Palm Springs Opera Co. will pay tribute to the world's foremost coloratura soprano, Miss Lily Pons, with a gala Grand Opera Ball in the Riviera Hotel.

Simultaneously the mayors of Dallas, Tex., and Palm Springs, Calif., will declare the day "Lily Pons Day."

The festivities in the Riviera Hotel will be climaxed by the presentation to her by French dignitaries of the scroll appointing her commander in the National Legion of Merit, completing the rare honor conferred upon her earlier this year by order of the President of France.

Miss Pons was born in Cannes, France. At the age of 13, she entered the Paris Conservatory as a piano student, but her plans for a virtuoso career as a pianist were changed after a serious illness. She turned to singing, under the direction of the famous vocal teacher, Albert di Gorostiaga, and developed her singing voice to the point that she was able to make her operatic debut in the Mulhouse Opera in Alsace in 1928.

She made her historical debut at the Metropolitan Opera on January 3, 1931, in "Lucia di Lammermoor." Overnight she was a national sensation, and the Metropolitan revived several operas for her. Among them were "Daughter of the Regiment," "Linda di Chamounix," "Mignon," "La Sonnambula." Probably she is most famous for her role in the opera "Lakme," for she was the first singer in half a century to render the high F in the "Bell Song" that Delibes originally indicated.

Her brilliant coloratura range—2½ octaves—led Maestro Gatti-Cassaza, the Metropolitan Opera manager, to remark that Miss Pons had the only true coloratura voice he had ever heard or hoped to hear.

During World War II, Miss Pons was active in entertaining American and French soldiers. When France was liberated Miss Pons stood beside General de Gaulle in the Place de l'Opéra and led the singing of "La Marseillaise." In appreciation of her wartime activities De Gaulle decorated Miss Pons with the Legion of Honor medal. Miss Pons had become an American citizen in 1940.

In 1963, President de Gaulle created a new order in France, the National Legion of Merit, to reward distinguished services rendered in public, civil, private, or military life. The order includes the same ranks and dignities as the Legion of Honor. The President of the Republic is the Chief of the order and the Chancellor is the guardian.

On July 19, 1971, Miss Pons was awarded the rank of commander in the

National Legion of Merit. It was bestowed upon her by M. Jaques Chabon-Delmas, the Prime Minister of France, whom Miss Pons personally selected, because of his closeness to the late President de Gaulle.

This is the highest national award that has ever been bestowed upon a woman. The award consists of two phases, the placing of the medal about the neck of the recipient, and the awarding of the scroll, which is the official recording of the award. The scroll will be bestowed upon Miss Pons at the Gala Grand Opera Ball in Palm Springs on November 20, 1971.

It seems fitting that the United States should recognize the great honor that has been bestowed on Miss Pons by the country of her birth, and that the country of her citizenship should in like manner pay tribute to the greatest living coloratura soprano, the first lady of the opera world. Further, it is appropriate that such a tribute should be paid in the city of her winter residence, Palm Springs.

I take this opportunity to call my colleagues' attention to this important event and add my own personal word of tribute to the many fine moments of pleasure Miss Pons' gifted talents and discipline have given opera lovers around the world.

WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members who voted against the standby authority in imposing wage and price controls, which the Democrats insisted on giving President Nixon sometime ago, I take the position that the permanent maintenance of economic controls would be harmful to our economy and contrary to the free enterprise principles that have been our country's great economic asset.

I believe that figures demonstrate the success of the President's program and that the phaseout of controls can be properly implemented.

A point very effectively made by the Chicago Daily News in its Friday, October 29, edition is that the Bureau of Labor Statistics does in fact give us good reason to have confidence in the future of our country and its economic stability and strength. The point made in this editorial is, in my judgment, extremely pertinent.

The editorial follows:

NO NEED TO JUGGLE FIGURES

The pressure on the Bureau of Labor Statistics to make its employment and living-cost figures enhance the Nixon administration's image is disquieting on many counts. The BLS over the years has earned high marks for serving Republican and Democratic administrations with the same professional integrity and nonpartisan objectivity. Its statistics have been key factors in shaping government economic policy. They also play an important role in the private sector, which

relies on them for cost-of-living pay hikes and for other purposes.

The AFL-CIO's George Meany has raised serious questions about the administration's attempts to "politicize" the bureau, and they merit a serious reply. In a letter to Labor Sec. J. D. Hodgson, Meany expressed proper concern over the plan to drop the Bureau's special reports on unemployment in the nation's poorest neighborhoods starting next year. That is a presidential election year, and the publication of such statistics, which generally show an unemployment rate much higher than the national average, would not put Mr. Nixon in the best possible light.

Particularly disturbing about the tampering with the BLS is that it has been for so long above politics. If the BLS can be enlisted for partisan advantage as administration aides have tried to do ever since last March, not only will the bureau lose its credibility but other government agencies hitherto thought to be above politics will likewise fall under public suspicion.

Phonying up employment figures, apart from being dishonest, is pointless. Though worryingly large pockets of unemployment exist in many sections of the country—and being jobless is tragic business to those caught in that predicament—the picture is not as bleak as some of the administration's detractors contend. The fact is that despite the large number of people without jobs, there are proportionately more at work than ever before.

Figures compiled by the Wall Street Journal reflect a big job growth factor since 1950, lasting straight through the 1969-70 recession. The number of men working has shot up by 16 per cent, while the number of jobs held by women and teen-agers has increased an incredible 71 per cent and 65 per cent respectively. Since 1965, the number of jobs has risen by 12 per cent—twice the population growth rate in the same period. There has thus been none of the severe job contraction that took place in the Great Depression, when the number of jobs shrank 23 per cent between 1928 and 1932.

Figures like those cited by the Journal could go a long way toward restoring public confidence in the economy and persuading people to start spending some of their record savings. The administration would be better advised to recite such facts than try to convert BLS into a propaganda arm of government.

THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION IN TENNESSEE

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is helping people make significant contributions to rural development, through its renewed efforts of placing much-needed resources at their disposal.

The assistance provided by this agency is exemplified in a small rural community in my congressional district known as Pigeon Forge. Pigeon Forge is located in Sevier County, Tenn., near the entrance to the Smoky Mountain National Park. Through the years this had been primarily an agricultural community consisting of small hillside farms. However, the local citizens realized there was a potential for attracting tourists to the area and began to plan accordingly. The

town was incorporated, enabling it to take over and operate an existing water facility district assuring an adequate water supply. Rapid growth followed with motels and restaurants springing up at a rapid rate.

But rapid growth sometimes brings on problems as well, which was the case with Pigeon Forge. Sewage disposal became vital. The Tennessee Health Department was contemplating closing many of the tourist establishments because of the health hazard created by the surfacing of raw sewage. This problem had to be solved if Pigeon Forge was to continue to grow and prosper. So the town turned to the Farmers Home Administration for help. With a \$544,660 loan and \$90,555 grant from this agency, plus grants totaling \$104,048 from the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency, a sanitary sewage system was constructed.

This basic FHA service has contributed significantly to creating job opportunities, as exemplified by the establishment of 29 new businesses, since the sewage system was built. These include eight motels, three craft shops, two branch banks, three apartment houses, two beauty parlors, two radio and TV shops, and a warehouse. Present plans call for an icehouse, another restaurant, and a 200-unit motel. These businesses represent an increase of almost 50 percent in the number of commercial establishments in the town and provide many new jobs for the local residents, making it unnecessary for them to migrate to distant cities in search of opportunity. In addition, 60 new homes have been constructed in Pigeon Forge during the 2-year period the sewage system has been in operation.

Mr. Speaker, all this represents a much-increased tax base, which permits continued development, while, at the same time, maintains a good financial condition for the town. This development exemplifies rural development resulting from local people assuming the role of leadership and becoming determined to improve their surroundings. In such cases, the FHA is always standing by to help as it helped at Pigeon Forge.

However, FHA services are not confined to sewage systems for rural communities. It provides assistance in other areas as well. During fiscal year 1971, 30 families in my congressional district, of which a number are still in their twenties, received FHA loans in the amount of \$468,000 to purchase farms; 364 rural families received housing loans in the amount of \$4.2 million, enabling them to become homeowners; eight loans amounting to \$1.6 million and seven grants amounting to \$174,000 were made to rural communities for constructing central water systems.

Mr. Speaker, I think this provides an insight to the contributions the Farmers Home Administration is making toward helping those who desire to help themselves. It is putting the resources at the disposal of rural people when and where they are needed to help move rural America forward. I commend FHA Administrator James V. Smith and the FHA

State Director Paul Koger and express to them my gratitude for the great work they are doing in Tennessee and particularly the first congressional district.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS: DIVIDE AND CONQUER

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Milton Friedman, professor of economics, University of Chicago said:

Most discussion of the wage-price freeze and the coming Phase II controls has been strictly economic and operational: were they needed, will they work, how will they operate? . . . There has been essentially no discussion of a much more fundamental issue. The controls are deeply and inherently immoral . . . Is it morally wrong for Chile to expropriate the property of Anaconda Copper—i.e., to force it to sell its copper mines for a price less than its value; but morally right for the U.S. Government to force the worker to sell his labor for less than its value to him and to his employer?

Professor Friedman, one of the academic world's last defenders of the free market against the Keynesian prescription for a Government-controlled economy which President Nixon has now embraced, has penetrated to the heart of the issue in the administration's price and wage controls program. Yet how many readers even of this newsletter would still in defiance of all fairness and logic, answer the second part of his question with an angry "yes"?

Middle-class America has been encouraged to blame inflation on the labor unions and therefore to welcome even the most drastic Federal controls to limit pay increases. But at the very same time the workingman has been encouraged to blame inflation on "big business" and its greed for profits, and therefore to welcome even the most drastic Federal controls on prices and rents. Consequently, for opposite reasons, both business and labor—and most Americans—have been persuaded that price and wage controls are desirable. As Professor Friedman points out, opposition to them on principle is, so far, scarcely to be found. By setting class against class in America, the Government economic planners—at least for the time being—appear to have conquered.

Let there be no mistake about it: These controls are for all intents and practical purposes permanent. On September 9 President Nixon told Congress that—

The freeze will not be extended beyond 90 days.

and that—

Nothing could be more detrimental to the new prosperity in the long run than to put this Nation's great, strong free enterprise system in a permanent straitjacket of government controls.

On October 7, speaking to the Nation, he said:

I am announcing tonight that when the 90-day freeze is over on November 13, we shall

continue our program of wage and price restraint.

Though he still made passing mention of an intention not to make the controls permanent. But by October 28, when Under Secretary of the Treasury Charles Walker briefed Members of Congress on the full phase II program of price and wage controls, most of the pretense was dropped.

Mr. Walker could not foresee when or how the controls would end, and explained that the freeze would in fact continue after November 13, with only such exceptions as the new Pay Board and Price Commission would in their own good time allow. It is hard to see how this can be called anything other than a direct breach of the President's promise September 9 that the freeze would not be extended beyond 90 days.

Economic columnist Sylvia Porter has stated what is almost certainly the truth:

We entered a new economic era in the United States on August 15 . . . Not in the foreseeable future will our economy be as free as it was in the weeks leading up to that fateful Sunday evening.

Lasting government price and wage controls have never worked in the whole history of the world, and can only be made to seem to work in a fully totalitarian state. The reason is simple, but needs to be repeated over and over again: The primary cause of inflation is government itself, through deficit spending and debasing the currency. Price and wage increases are the result, not the cause, of inflation.

President Lyndon Johnson's budget, for his last year in office, was \$185 billion. President Nixon's budget this year is \$230 billion. For next year it will be at least \$250 billion, possibly as high as \$275 billion, and the Treasury Department admits there will be at least a \$27 billion deficit—assuring that inflation will continue, controls or no controls. Yet the American people, divided against themselves, are being taught to blame everyone for this but the real culprit.

If we do not value our free market we will lose it forever. The only alternative is full-scale socialism.

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS ON FREE MARKET DISCIPLINES?

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, many people ask what is a constructive and positive alternative to the use of wage and price controls by the Federal Government? In my opinion, and that of many constructive economists, it is to allow the discipline of the free market place and, more important, permits the consumer to make the final determination on the basis of the daily free vote of what the consumer intends to either purchase or not purchase. Leonard E. Read, in his book "Let Freedom Reign," chapter 8 entitled "Free Market Disci-

pline," very thoughtfully explores this whole area of the usefulness of the free market system and what it means. I recommend that my colleagues thoroughly consider the concepts developed in this chapter:

FREE MARKET DISCIPLINES

Contrary to socialistic tenets, the free market is the only mechanism that can sensibly, logically, intelligently discipline production and consumption. For it is only when the market is free that economic calculation is possible.¹ Free pricing is the key. When prices are high, production is encouraged and consumption is discouraged; when prices fall, the reverse holds true. Thus, production and consumption are always moving toward equilibrium. Shortages and surpluses are not in the lexicon of free market economics.

Conceded, the above is no news to those who apprehend free market economics; they well know of its disciplinary influence as regards production and consumption. This alone warrants our support of the free market. However, the free market has two other quite remarkable disciplinary possibilities which have seldom been explored.

Before making that exploration, it is necessary to recognize the limitations of the free market. The market is a mechanism, and thus it is wholly lacking in moral and spiritual suasion; further, it embodies no coercive force whatsoever. In these respects, the market is without disciplinary possibilities.

"Like all mechanisms, the market, with its function for the economizing of time and effort, is servant alike to the good, the compassionate, and the perceptive as well as to the evil, the inconsiderate, and the oblivious."² Scrupulosity is not among its characteristics.

The free market is a name we give to the economic activities—a short-hand term, we might say—of a people acting freely, voluntarily, privately, cooperatively, competitively. It is distinguished by universal freedom of choice and the absence of coercive force. Ideally, only defensive force—government—is employed to put down fraud, violence, predation, and other aggressions.

Given a society of freely choosing individuals, the market is that which exists as a consequence—it is a mechanism that is otherwise nondefinitive. It is the procession of economic events that occur when authoritarianism—political or otherwise—is absent.

While private enterprise is often practiced in a manner consonant with free market principles, the two terms are not synonymous. Piracy is an enterprise and also private. Many businesses when in league with unions, for instance—willingly or not—feature elements of coercion and thus are not examples of the free market at work.

The free market has only been approximated, never fully attained, and, doubtless, never will be realized. It is an out-of-reach ideal; we can only move toward or away from it. Yet, in the U.S.A., even in these days of a rapidly growing interventionism, the free market flourishes to a remarkable extent. To appreciate this, merely envision the countless willing exchanges—hundreds of millions daily—such as Mrs. Jones swapping a shawl she has made for a goose Mrs. Smith has raised, or the money you pay for a phone call or a quart of milk. In these instances, each party gains, for each desires what he gets more than what he surrenders. In a word, the free market is individual desire speaking in exchange terms. When the desire

for Bibles is accommodated in noncoerced exchange, we can conclude, quite accurately, that we are witnessing a market for Bibles. Or, when the desire for pornography is being thus accommodated, we can conclude that there is a market for trash. I repeat, scrupulosity is not a feature of the market.

When the desires of people are depraved, a free market will accommodate the depravity. And it will accommodate excellence with equal alacrity. It is "servant alike to good . . . and evil."

AN AMORAL SERVANT

It is because the free market serves evil as well as good that many people think they can rid society of evil by slaying this faithful, amoral servant. This is comparable to destroying the sun because we don't like the shadows we cast or breaking the mirror so that we don't have to see the reflection of what we really are.

When I sit in front of a TV and view trash, I tend to rant and rave at what I'm seeing. Wake up: What I hear and see is a reflection of what's in me! Thus, my only corrective is to read a good book or otherwise cease to patronize such low-grade performances.

The market is but a response to—a mirror of—our desires. Once this harsh reality is grasped, the market becomes a disciplinary force. To elaborate: Say that a person desires, buys, and reads a filthy book. Were he to realize that what he's reading is a picture of what's in his own make-up, such a realization, by itself, would tend to change him for the better. The market would then reflect the improvement. But note that the market has no such effect on those who are oblivious to this fact. *It's the knowledge of this character-revealing fact that makes of the market a disciplinary force.* I am only trying to point out the market's potentiality in this respect.

Instead of cursing evil, stay out of the market for it; the evil will cease to the extent we cease patronizing it. Trying to rid ourselves of trash by running to government for morality laws is like trying to minimize the effects of inflation by wage, price, and other controls. Both destroy the market, that is, the reflection of ourselves. Such tactics are at the intellectual level of mirror-smashing, attempts not to see ourselves as we are. The market's potentiality as a disciplinary force is thereby removed. To slay this faithful, amoral servant is to blindfold, deceive, and hoodwink ourselves. Next to forswearing a faith in an Infinite Intelligence over and beyond our own minds, denying the market is to erase the best point of reference man can have. So much for the first somewhat unexplored possibility of the market as a disciplinary force.

IMPERFECT MAN

Now to the second. This cannot be explained unless we are aware of our numerous shortcomings, of how narrow our virtues and talents really are—everyone's, no exceptions.

Let's take, for example, the greatest mathematical genius who ever lived. He's a giant in his field. Yet, without any question, he's a know-nothing in countless other ways. This goes for outstanding generals, chemists, physicists, scientists of whatever brand. No one ever gets more than an infinitesimal peek at the Cosmic Scheme, at the over-all luminosity, even at himself. We must see that the biggest among us is tiny. And one who denies this about himself is displaying the greatest ignorance of all: he doesn't even know how little he knows! "If we wish to know anything, we must resign ourselves to being ignorant of much."³

Reflect on this human reality, on imperfect man, particularly on the more imaginative and brilliant individuals among us. While they possess an outstanding and remarkable aptitude or two, they, too, are day-

dreamers. "If only I had a million dollars," is a dream that flashes across countless minds. Many of these specialists want above all else to pursue their own peculiar bent whether it be going to the moon, genetic alteration of other human beings, releasing the atom's energy, or whatever.

Knowing so much about one thing and so little about everything else, they are unable to know what effect their ambitions, if achieved, might have on the human situation. Just as a baby with a stick of dynamite and a match is unaware of what the consequences might be!

The lamentable fact is that scientists, pseudo scientists, and other technologists have been given a wishing well: the Federal grab bag. They, thus, are encouraged to carry out any experiment their hearts desire, without let or hindrance. Leaving aside the destruction of our economy by inflation—featured in the grab bag's financing—they are alarmingly endangering all the people on this earth, even the earth itself. And primarily because they suffer no restraining and disciplinary forces; their passions and ambitions are on the loose!

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE MARKET

The remedy? Let these ambitions be submitted to the discipline of the market precisely as are most other commodities and services. Go to the moon? Of course; that is, when the market permits the venture, if enough people voluntarily subscribe the cash. Release the atom's energy? By all means; that is, when the market is ready for it.

Am I saying that the market has a wisdom superior to the President of the United States, or the Congress, or a bureaucracy? I am not. The market is a mechanism and is neither wise nor moral. I am only claiming that it has disciplinary qualities. To understand why requires no more than a knowledge of what the components of this mechanism are: millions upon millions of individual preferences, choices, desires. *The market is an obstacle course;* before I can pursue my bent or aptitude or obsession, I must gain an adequate, voluntary approval or assent! No wishing well, this! My own aspirations, regardless of how determined, or lofty, or depraved, do not control the verdict. What these others—impersonal as a computer—will put up in willing exchange for my offering spells my success or failure, allows me to pursue my bent or not.

There are exceptions to this rule, of course. For instance, some of us who may be unable to win the market will, like Van Gogh, face starvation in order to pursue our passions. The threat of starvation, however, is quite a discipline in itself; at least, not much is likely to be uncovered in these circumstances that will destroy life on earth. It takes big financing to do unearthly things.

The market very often returns fortunes for comparative junk and, on occasion, returns nothing at all for great and beneficial achievements—temporarily, that is. Eventually, in a free society, the junk goes to the junk heap and achievements are rewarded.

I believe that anyone should follow his star; but let him do so with his own resources or with such resources as others will voluntarily supply. This is to say that I believe in the market, a tough, disciplinary mechanism. I do not believe in cars without brakes, impulses without repulses, ambitions with check points, wishes run riot. Societal schemes that are all sail and no ballast head society for disaster!

The rebuttal to this line of reasoning is heard over and over again: "But we voted for it," meaning that the Federal grab bag—open sesame with other people's income—has been democratically approved. Granted! But this is nonsense: the fruits of the labor of one man are not up for grabs by others,

¹ Professor Ludwig von Mises establishes this point, irrefutably, in his book, *Socialism* (London: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1969).

² See "Value—The Soul of Economics," by W. H. Pitt. *The Freeman*, September, 1969.

³ John Henry Newman.

that is, not rationally.⁴ This is not a votable matter, except if one's premise be a socialistic society. What's right and what's wrong are not to be determined at the shallow level of nose-counting or opinion polls. To argue otherwise is to place the same value on the views of morons as you do on your own.

As a disciplinary force over wild aspirations, the President of the United States, a member of Congress, a bureaucrat is not only less effective than the market but less effective than any single buyer or seller in the market. An individual, when a government official, considers only how much of other people's money should be spent. The motivation in this instance favors spending over economizing. The same individual, in the free market, considers how much of his own property he is willing to put on the line. The motivation in this instance is self-interest. And this is tough! Ambitions as silly as tracking the meanderings of polar bears by a nimbus satellite stand a chance for satisfaction when a grab bag made up of other people's money is readily at hand;⁵ whereas, the free market gives short shrift to projects that are at or near the bottom of individual preferences.

True, were personal ambitions subjected to the disciplines of the market, trips to the moon would have to be postponed. Atomic energy might be a phenomenon of the future. Many other scientific explorations—some secret—taking place today in our universities and Federally financed would, under the discipline of the market, still be safely stored in imaginative minds.

This is no argument against technological breakthroughs. It is merely to suggest that these illuminations be financially encouraged only as the free market permits. The resulting steadiness in progress might then be harmonious with an expanded understanding of what it is we really want and can live with.

I repeat, societal schemes that are all sail and no ballast head society for disaster. The free market is ballast—a stabilizer—we might well put to use if we would avoid wreckage in the stormy seas of political chaos.

THE GUINEA PIGS—NOBODY KNOWS IF DRUGS TESTED ON HUMANS WILL CAUSE CANCER

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend and constituent, Dr. John O. Nestor, recently called my attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Post on October 24, 1971, concerning the testing of powerful and possibly dangerous medicines on humans before experiments with animals have proven their safety.

Dr. Nestor feels, and I agree, that the American public should be warned about the dangerous practices described in this article and that the public and the Congress should insist that the Food and Drug Administration tighten its regulations which make such practices possible.

⁴For what I consider to be a rationally constructed explanation of this point, see "The Limits of Majority Rule" by Edmund A. Optiz. Copy on request.

⁵See "The Migration of Polar Bears," *Scientific American*, February, 1968.

I insert the full text of the article at this point in the RECORD:

THE GUINEA PIGS—NOBODY KNOWS IF DRUGS TESTED ON HUMANS WILL CAUSE CANCER

(By Morton Mintz and Tim O'Brien)

Pharmaceutical manufacturers are testing potent new medicines in thousands of humans every year even before they complete experiments designed to show if the same chemicals may cause cancer in laboratory animals.

In numerous cases, cancer has developed in animals after tests. The Food and Drug Administration has publicly disclosed only one such case, that of MK-665 compound—an experimental birth control pill given to more than 400 women and belatedly reported in January 1966, to have caused cancer in the breasts of beagles.

All told, more than 1,000 chemical substances, out of some 20,000 in our environment, have been shown to be carcinogenic—cancer-producing—in animals. And several individual chemicals or mixtures among them have also been shown conclusively to produce cancer in men.

Many cancer specialists apply a rule of thumb: If a chemical is reliably and definitely carcinogenic in one or two species of animals, it is very likely to be similarly active in other species—including humans.

But proof that a substance produces cancer in humans is hard to obtain. This is because such a substance takes approximately 10 years—and sometimes as much as 30 years—to bring a human cancer to the point of development where it can be detected.

Bladder cancer, for instance may be present for 20 or even 30 years before it is detected. Thus we will not know for a long, long time whether cyclamates, the synthetic sweeteners found in 1969 to be causing bladder cancer in rats, also cause it in humans.

Most always, companies experimenting in humans while animal tests are still under way are complying fully with FDA's regulations. The FDA's General Guidelines for Animal Toxicity Studies require a company starting human testing to notify the agency that it is doing so, but neither to have first completed animal testing nor first to have obtained approval before moving to humans.

The regulations permit a drug that has been used in animals for two weeks to be administered to humans, sick or well, for up to two weeks (the regulations do not apply to estrogen, progesterone and the oral contraceptives, which in every case contain these synthetic hormones).

After four weeks' use in animals, the rules permit an experimental drug to be used in humans, sick or well, for up to three months; and after a medicine has been tried in two species of animals for three months, a manufacturer is free to give it to humans for an unlimited period of time.

What all this adds up to, one disillusioned FDA scientist told a reporter, is that "the drug companies, with the collaboration and collusion of the FDA, are really doing their experimentation with new drugs on humans while simultaneously carrying on limited and minimal animal studies on the side as a facade. That is it, pure and simple."

NINE-TENTHS OF CANCERS

In the view of leading scientists, no amount of a substance that is carcinogenic in animals should be presumed safe in humans. Last January, for example, Dr. David Rall of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences said that it is "essentially impossible to suggest a safe dose in humans of a chemical that is carcinogenic in animals."

That view is consistent with the 1958 legislation, sponsored by Rep. James J. Delaney (D-N.Y.), which forbids the use of any food additive that has been demonstrated to cause cancer in either animals or man.

And that view is consistent, too, with an appeal made last winter by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Jesse L. Steinfeld. Calling for controls on production of all known carcinogens that man has introduced into the environment, he said exceptions should be limited to substances offering "a well-defined health benefit" that "outweighs their risk."

Chemicals cause the great bulk of cancers in man; viruses and radiation together cause possibly only 10 per cent of them.

Chemical carcinogens have been shown to act by inhalation (cigarette smoking alone is blamed for most of the 68,000 deaths a year from cancers of the respiratory system), by ingestion (the foods, beverages, drugs, additives and other chemicals we take in are believed responsible for possibly most of the 45,000 fatal cancers in the intestinal tract), by surface contact with the skin and mucous tissues, and occasionally by injection or implantation.

The risks and the difficulty of control are illustrated in a hypothetical example offered by Dr. Umberto Saffiotti, an associate scientific director of the National Cancer Institute, in testimony last April before the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization and Government Research.

Suppose, he said, that thalidomide, instead of producing deformities which were obvious at birth, had produced a form of cancer which would not become manifest until adulthood.

"The lethal effects of the drug would probably still be undetected, women would possibly still be taking it during their pregnancy, and a large number of people would have been born with a built-in sentence to early death by cancer," he said.

While a chemically induced cancer escapes detection for possibly two decades or longer, it can be administered "under the false appearances of harmlessness," Dr. Saffiotti warned.

"If the effect is then detected and properly attributed to the specific chemical, and this is then removed from the environment, the cancers it induced will continue to appear for the next 20 to 30 years," he testified.

"POTENTIALLY PREVENTABLE"

Rather than seeing all of this as a cause of despair, Saffiotti expresses a view held by many cancer experts: "The majority of human cancers are potentially preventable."

The work of preventing cancer, he has suggested, can be sensibly concentrated on the "maybe just a few dozen" new environmental chemicals that, on testing, will be shown to be carcinogenic in humans.

In most cases, Saffiotti told the Senate Subcommittee, pursuit of such proof requires "extremely complex and lengthy epidemiological studies."

And in some cases, he continued, such proof actually may be "impossible to obtain . . . because of the complexity of controls that would be needed for a satisfactory demonstration."

The birth-control pills illustrate the problem. The steroid substances they contain have caused cancer in five species of laboratory animals. Millions of women, in an uncontrolled mass experiment, take them daily (and more millions have taken them and given them up, for one or another reason).

Yet controlled studies to determine if the pills do—or do not—cause, say, breast cancer have not been done. Such studies would have to enlist tens of thousands of women for approximately a decade.

In 1969, the FDA's expert outside advisers on contraception issued a report saying that "the major unsolved question" about the pills is their relation to the induction of cancer. Consequently—nine years after the FDA pronounced the pioneer pill safe and let it go on sale—the advisers were pleading

that well designed studies be initiated "to elucidate or eliminate" the relation between such products and cancer of the breast and uterus.

For Dr. Saffioti, among other experts concerned with the whole range of cancer problems, the "only prudent course of action at the present state of knowledge is to assume that chemicals which are carcinogenic in animals could also be such in man, although the direct demonstration in man is lacking."

Another prudent course, emphasized by scientists including Sir John Eccles of the State University of New York, is to exploit our ever greater proficiency in conducting animal carcinogenicity tests meaningful to man.

"... there will be progressively less necessity for human experimentation," Eccles said. "We must plan to minimize human experimentation and maximize animal experimentation, and we must define quite rigorously the conditions under which human experimentation can be carried out."

This was one of the major goals of the Kefauver-Harris amendments to the drug laws, which Congress, suddenly motivated by the thalidomide episode, enacted in 1962, in hopes of averting any future drug catastrophes.

With this mandate, the FDA, in January, 1963, adopted implementing regulations. Their high purpose, as expressed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was "to eliminate all unnecessary risk to the public that may attend the development of new drugs and to impose only necessary restrictions on the conduct of investigational drug research."

For about three years, so far as the public and most of the medical profession were aware, the regulations were working well.

THE MK-665 CASE

But in early 1966, serious doubts surfaced. First came the case of MK-665 compound, the experimental birth control pill, that led then FDA Commissioner James L. Goddard to make the one and only agency announcement that an investigational drug used in human beings had caused cancer in animals.

On Jan. 21, 1966, Merck & Co. had notified the FDA of the finding of breast cancer in beagles that were sacrificed after receiving large doses of MK-665 compound for 12 months.

An "alarming finding," William W. Goodrich, then FDA's general counsel, called this in hearings on the case held by the House Intergovernmental Relations subcommittee in March, 1966. And, he testified, such a finding must, under the regulations, be reported to the agency "immediately."

Merck scientists had sacrificed the dogs on July 30, 1965, but did not make microscopic examinations of tissue sections until four months later—a precedent of sorts for the Triflocin case detailed in the accompanying article.

Explaining the delay, the firm said the findings from another group of dogs sacrificed in February, 1965, had been negative, and that the tissues from the July group had become available during an inconvenient period, vacation time.

If reasons of this sort can immunize a company from the requirement to report "alarming findings" at once, W. Donald Gray, then a subcommittee investigator, told Goodrich, "a company could do animal studies and not make final tissue examinations and reports for years."

The FDA did refer the case to the Justice Department for a possible criminal prosecution, but the department declined to act.

In November 1965, while the July tissues still were awaiting evaluation, Merck had notified the FDA that it was beginning large-scale testing in women.

The notification—legally, an application to be exempted from requirements that any

drug in interstate commerce be demonstrated to be safe and effective—cited the negative February results of six months' testing. The July results, covering a full year, not having been analyzed, were ignored.

On Dec. 9, 1965, however, the July tissues were analyzed and cancer was found. Merck "should have reported the results . . . immediately," but, instead, was "getting in touch with their consultants," Goodrich testified.

Not until 43 days later did the company notify the FDA. "That was a violation," the counsel told the subcommittee. Merck said it had acted "responsibly and as promptly as warranted." Soon after receiving the notification, then Commissioner Goddard announced the cancer finding at a press conference.

Merck said it had halted testing in 340 women who had been receiving the experimental birth control pills from authorized medical investigators, and in 127 others who had been getting MK-665 from two other investigators who had not been cleared by Merck.

THE NEEDED REFORMS

At the time, the FDA said Merck had initiated a program of followups for the 340 women who had gotten MK-665 through proper channels.

By replying to a recent inquiry, the FDA said that while no adverse effects in the users had been found, Merck had "lost track of many of the women." In addition, some of the follow-up tests were "inconclusive" because the women took other oral contraceptives abandoning MK-665, the spokesman said. He added that the whole matter has been referred to an FDA advisory committee.

In a follow-up of its own, the FDA ordered manufacturers of all of the marketed oral contraceptives to undertake studies of up to seven years' duration in monkeys, the species closest to man, as well as in dogs. Each of the pills contain synthetic estrogen, which, under certain conditions, can be carcinogenic.

Yet the FDA has demanded no counter-part of the monkey-beagle tests for numerous non-hormonal medicines, many of which have not been shown to provide a therapeutic advance that outweighs their hazards.

The House subcommittee also investigated the case of DMSO, an industrial solvent built by almost hysterical publicity into a "wonder drug" useful for most any affliction from arthritis to headaches. One of the distressing revelations was that several drug firms had failed to report adverse (though non-cancerous) reactions in animals, and that the FDA had failed to enforce its own experimental drug rules.

The subcommittee hearings, led by Chairman L. H. Fountain (D-N.C.), prodded the FDA to make some improvements in its investigational drug regulations, but fundamental deficiencies nonetheless went uncorrected.

The needed reforms are, in some areas, obvious: tougher regulations to implement the law, and tougher enforcement of those regulations; more congressional oversight of the FDA, and the use of substitutes for carcinogens (which is often possible), or the outright abandonment of such chemicals unless there are truly compelling justifications to use them.

A larger question arises from the legislation approved by the Senate to create a Conquest of Cancer Agency, finance it generously, and have it report directly to the President—an idea to which Mr. Nixon and the American Cancer Society attach importance.

The question is, can the conquest be achieved so long as the FDA does not routinely require that drugs be adequately screened for cancer-producing potential, and so long as it permits drugs that are carcinogenic in animals to be administered to humans?

TRIFLOCIN: CASE HISTORY OF A DRUG

In February, 1968, Lederle Laboratories, the pharmaceutical division of American Cyanamid Co., began experimenting with a medicine that rids the body of excess fluids.

Such products are called diuretics. Approximately two dozen of them long have been available to physicians.

Lederle says that Triflocin held promise of offering special advantages over rival products.

At the Food and Drug Administration, however, some scientists say that the diuretic market is saturated. "We need another diuretic like a hole in the head," one FDA scientist said.

Initially, Lederle administered Triflocin to rats and dogs. Some time after that—both the company and the FDA are vague about precisely when—medical investigators working with Lederle began administering Triflocin to human beings here and abroad.

The number of patients is uncertain. The FDA says it was "about 205," but Lederle says it was 253. The FDA says that "at least 63 non-Americans" got Triflocin; Lederle says that "98 foreign humans" were involved in the Triflocin studies.

The date when human beings began to take Triflocin has not been disclosed, but FDA regulations for "INDs"—investigational new drugs—permit clinical trials to begin after animals have received them for two weeks.

In September, 1969, some of the first rats given Triflocin were killed and autopsies performed.

In the urinary bladders of some of the rats, the FDA said, Lederle found "abnormalities." The company, replying to written questions from *The Washington Post*, said that it detected no cancerous tumors at that time, but neither it nor the FDA disclosed exactly what the "abnormalities" were.

According to the account Lederle gave the newspaper, the next important development came when dogs given Triflocin experienced kidney effects "unrelated to cancer." On the basis of these findings, the letter said, Lederle on Jan. 22, 1970, instructed Triflocin investigators to discontinue human trials.

The FDA made no mention of the January development and, indeed, there are signs it did not know of it.

After the rat studies disclosed unspecified "abnormalities" the obvious next step was to examine the animal tissues under a microscope to find out if the "abnormalities" were cancers. This process takes two weeks to a month, according to FDA scientists.

But the microscopic examinations actually were not completed for seven months, and during this time Triflocin was being administered to human beings. The possibility that the "abnormalities" were cancers not having been excluded, the delay was "inexcusable," one FDA scientist said.

The precise date Lederle gave the FDA for completion of the microscopic examinations was April 15, 1970. At the time, Lederle said, four out of 13 rats had developed cancer 18 months after being treated with Triflocin; seven out of 12 got the disease after 22 months. In all, 11 out of 24 became cancerous. None of the control rats—those not given the drug—developed cancer.

Lederle reported these findings to the FDA not by phone or with some other sign of urgency, but in a letter dated April 27, 1970, or 12 days later.

"During routine evaluation of slides from our chronic toxicity study in rats, we discovered changes in the urinary bladder which appear to be drug related," Lederle told Dr. Henry E. Simmons, director of the FDA's Bureau of Drugs.

Because the "changes" were cancers, "We immediately discontinued clinical studies and requested return of all outstanding drug supplies," the Lederle letter said.

The statement that "we immediately dis-

continued human trials" did not seem to suggest that these trials were going on in only two human beings. Yet, Lederle, in its subsequent letter to The Washington Post, said that all but two persons "had been off Triflocin for several months," as a consequence of the January, 1970, dog kidney findings "which were unrelated to cancer."

In dealing with the finding of bladder cancer in rats, Lederle proceeded differently with its eight foreign investigators than with its 10 domestic Triflocin investigators, the FDA said.

"Copies of letters to the domestic investigators, dated June 18, 1970, identified the adverse finding as papillary carcinoma," the agency said. "Foreign investigators, however, were advised in letters dated April 27, 1970, of . . . lesions with occasional malignant degeneration."

Asked for an explanation of the April-to-June delay in notifying American investigators, Lederle said that the June 18 letter "transmitted further detailed reports of the rat bladder cancer findings . . . as a follow-up to prior notification" of these physicians "by letter and/or visit."

Between September, 1969, when the "abnormalities" were found in the test rats, and late April, 1970, when this finding was reported to the FDA, "about 205" or 253 persons—depending on whether the agency's count or Lederle's is correct—had taken Triflocin.

The conflicting statistics raise questions as to how the FDA can monitor the human subjects' reaction to Triflocin if uncertainty exists about precisely how many persons got it.

Asked how many of the human subjects were informed of the suspected toxicity of Triflocin—information which would encourage them to undergo regular examinations—the FDA said the number was "indeterminable."

The FDA made "specific recommendations" to Lederle as to procedures that would be appropriate in following up the effects the drug may have had on patients, Dr. Simmons said.

But Lederle officials "rejected some of the recommendations, stating that they would consult a 'panel' for advice," the FDA official reported.

Lederle, in its reply to The Washington Post's inquiries, said nothing about having rejected some of the follow-up procedures recommended by the FDA. Instead, the company said its recommendations were "communicated to investigators" who conducted clinical trials with Triflocin.

The Lederle panel—said by the company to be made up of scientists from an unidentified but "outstanding" medical school—concluded that Triflocin patients "are at little risk of developing bladder tumors," because the amount of the diuretic given and the duration of exposure to it "are not at all comparable to the animal dosages or durations."

The panel concluded that "no follow-up is necessary for those individuals who received the drug for less than two weeks."

The FDA disagreed, saying that all persons who got Triflocin should be followed up. And until the company panel made its recommendations, Lederle had undertaken to inform its investigators of its discussions with the FDA and had supplied them with patient follow-up sheets listing specific tests to be made.

The Triflocin case first came forcibly to the attention of FDA Commissioner Charles C. Edwards thanks to Dr. John O. Nestor, an agency medical officer and pediatric cardiologist.

Nestor told Dr. Edwards of a situation he considered "scandalous": Animals treated with an unnamed experimental drug (later

publicly identified as Triflocin by a drug trade paper) had developed cancer after human testing had begun. He also questioned the adequacy of the FDA guidelines for experimental drugs, as well as the adequacy of follow-up on persons exposed to such medicines.

Nestor used the "Critical Pathway," an administrative channel specially created by the Commissioner to enable FDA personnel to slash red tape and bring urgent situations directly and promptly to his attention.

Edwards replied two months later. He implicitly recognized that drugs were being tested in humans before adequate animal studies were completed and evaluated, but said no policy changes by FDA were required. The letter mentioned neither Lederle nor Triflocin.

DANGER IN GERMANY'S OSTPOLITICK

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, while many in this country have hailed West German Chancellor Willy Brandt's Nobel Prize for Peace, and while our Government seems satisfied with the Big Four agreement reached on the future status of Berlin, the unfortunate fact seems to be that the West has lost and the East has gained in this entire transaction.

In that agreement, travel was simplified for West Berliners wishing to visit East Berlin, but no provision was made whatever for East Berliners wishing to visit the West. Similarly, we agreed that no sessions of the West German Parliament nor the Congress, which elects the West German President, may take place in West Berlin. In this one-sided agreement, the situation in East Berlin was not even mentioned. Contrary to all previous agreements, the East German regime has installed all its governmental offices and parliament in East Berlin. In addition, East German soldiers are stationed in East Berlin, while no West German soldiers are permitted in West Berlin. This situation has now been made into a formal agreement, and incredibly is hailed as a victory and achievement in the West.

Discussing the Berlin agreement in a speech before the National Press Club here in Washington, Axel Springer, founder and owner of the leading West German publishing group, declared that—

Completely incredible is the concession to establish a Soviet consulate general in West Berlin, a concession obviously granted upon German urging. The Berliners already call this the future home of all the spies who were kicked out of Britain recently.

Mr. Springer stated that—

The West also gave a death blow to all hopes for eventual reunification of Berlin and Germany. I mean, of course, reunification in freedom. This new policy will most likely bring in its wake international diplomatic recognition for the East German regime. The run has already been started.

The treaty, it must be remembered, has greater implications for East-West relations than the status of Berlin alone. Mr.

Springer places this treaty in some perspective:

These treaties, in my mind, are so dangerous, not only because they give away German rights without getting anything back in return, but because they are the first sign of a new "reversement des alliances," reversal of alliances, as Bismarck called it.

The Berlin treaty is only the first step in the Soviet timetable, a timetable which Western leaders seem eager to help them fulfill. Mr. Springer notes that—

The next step, according to the Soviet timetable, will be the so-called European security conference. Here the often-told, long-range aim is to find a political and legal justification for the demand that "all troops return home from foreign soil." This in effect would mean that the Soviet units might retire beyond the new Polish eastern border, and that the American units retire beyond the Atlantic.

Those who somehow believe that the Brandt policies and their counterpart in our own country will somehow bring peace, should carefully consider the words of Axel Springer.

I wish to share this speech, given in Washington, D.C. on October 26, 1971, with my colleagues, and insert it into the Record at this time:

STATEMENT BY AXEL SPRINGER

Ladies and gentlemen, your chairman asked me to be brief. I think he was right. Because as you know the Germans write the longest articles in the world and make the longest speeches—with the possible exception of the Russians and the Cubans.

The duty to be brief reminds me of a very pleasant ceremony at the Chaim Weizmann Institute in Rehovot, Israel. Before we, the designated Honorary Fellows of the Institute, got our caps and gowns, there were several speakers; they all were asked to be brief.

One of them, the British Ambassador, solved this problem in a very humorous way: he purposely spoke so fast, that nobody understood him. But he stuck exactly to the given time, and the results were waves and waves of laughter in the audience.

Don't be alarmed. I cannot speak English that rapidly.

Seriously, I am grateful and happy to be here today to talk to you about Berlin.

Before I get to Berlin allow me to introduce myself by telling you the four basic principles to which all journalists of our newspapers are bound.

1. Reunification of Germany in freedom, if possible within the framework of a United Europe.

2. Reconciliation between Jews and Germans, which includes strong support for the life-rights of the people of Israel.

3. Rejection of any kind of political dictatorship.

4. Defense of the free market economy with social responsibility.

When I said before that I am grateful to be here at this time, my main reason is that I believe we are witnessing today not the beginning of a Berlin solution, as many want us to believe, but the beginnings of a new future Berlin crisis, different from earlier ones.

Many who compared the building of the Wall in 1961 to a painful amputation, now fear that in the meantime the city has been infected by a dangerous creeping illness.

It is, therefore, not a matter of accident that people are leaving Berlin these days in great numbers. The census officials of the city are alarmed. Many more Berliners, they say, have left the city in the past months than those who left even after the building of the Wall.

For years and years I have been calling attention to this danger.

I remember especially a dinner in Bonn, ten years ago, on Friday, August 11th, 1961. Next to me sat the late Edward R. Murrow, then head of the USIA.

At that time, once again, access routes to Berlin were under discussion, and Mr. Murrow asked for my opinion. I shocked him by saying:

"You are all looking in the wrong direction. Watch out for a move to cut off West Berlin from the East by barbed wire and military units."

Mr. Murrow seemed more than interested and urged a detailed continuation of our talk a few days later, when he planned to be in Berlin.

One night later the barbed wire was actually strung, the Western powers reacted only reluctantly, and a short while afterwards a very excited and agitated Ed Murrow sat in my Berlin home.

In a long, extremely serious talk I warned him that this period may some day be regarded as the starting point of a neutralism which might embroil Germany at some future date and break up the NATO alliance.

You all remember, that soon thereafter President John F. Kennedy sent his Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and the, in Germany, very popular General Clay to Berlin, to bring reassurance to the threatened city and to its people.

But the doubts remained.

It seems that especially Willy Brandt, the former Mayor of Berlin and present German Chancellor, never got over the shock caused by Western inaction in face of the Wall. It may be that the seeds for his new dangerous policy towards the East were already laid on this fateful August 13th, 1961.

During a recent discussion in the Bonn parliament, Herbert Wehner, the strong man in the SPD, said: "We must not forget that this Wall was accepted, even though with protest, by those who solemnly signed with us mutually binding treaties:—meaning the Western powers."

Brandt underlined this statement by almost jumping from his seat and three times in a row nodding his head in approval.

Ladies and gentlemen, we spoke of the days when the Berlin Wall was built. Those were trying times. But all this did not in any way change my earlier decision to move the headquarters of my publishing group from Hamburg to Berlin. I felt at that time, as I am convinced now, that in Berlin the future not only of Germany will be decided, but the future of Europe, possibly even the future of modern Western society.

Our move to Berlin was a deliberate decision motivated by politics and not by economy. Almost five years ago we opened our 20-story publishing house, a stone's throw from Checkpoint Charlie and seemingly astride of the ugly and dangerous Berlin Wall.

West Berlin, by the way, is not a small enclave. It covers an area in which you could put the cities of Munich, plus Frankfurt, plus Duesseldorf, plus a large hunk of Hamburg too.

From my office window I look deep into the other, the Eastern part of the city, and I invite each and every one of you here to come, visit us in Berlin, and share with me this depressing but illuminating view.

A few years ago Willy Brandt said: "Berlin exists for the vision, some day once again to be the capital of a free and united people. The note of alarm from Berlin will continue to exist, even if people elsewhere should get tired."

Let me add two other quotes from earlier speeches of the present German chancellor:

"We must get used to the fact that Russia

insists on treating and denouncing Berlin as an alleged focus of danger, a cancer, as they say, a fuse in the powder barrel, a foreign body. But behind the Soviet demand for a treaty with the two forms of state on German soil there is not merely the—understandable—desire on the Soviet part to pocket Berlin, immediately or bit by bit; there is also the idea of globally fixing the results of World War II as the Soviet Union sees them."

Nobody could have put it more clearly. Nor this: "For anyone who put up with the partition of Germany, Berlin would become unnecessary. Berlin upsets the all too comfortable concepts. For it is clear that that miserable Soviet satellite regime which is neither German, nor democratic, nor a republic cannot be consolidated as long as the reddening evening skies over the free part of Berlin light up the hopes of men on the other side of the Wall."

Willy Brandt spoke like this for many, many years. But in the past two years something almost unthinkable has happened in Germany:

After the last federal election campaign in 1969, during which no political party mentioned that a totally new foreign policy was planned, the traditional, generally accepted, common political basis of all three democratic parties in the Bonn parliament *vis-a-vis* the communists broke apart. (As an aside let me add, that this is reported by a man who in past elections has given his vote to everyone of these parties, as the occasions demanded.)

Let me make something else clear: I am not here to criticize my government or its policies. This my political friends and I do at home. And be assured, what I am saying here has been said and printed again and again back in Germany.

But because our papers are printed in German, I play the role of the interpreter to you today.

As to the Nobel prize given to Willy Brandt, I don't know exactly what my papers have written because I have been away from home for two weeks.

Personally, I am very happy that a German chancellor got this prize. Peace in connection with the new Germany I like very much. For me, in this respect, Willy Brandt is a link in the chain of all German chancellors since the foundation of the Federal Republic, all of whom worked for peace.

I do not like the prize, though, as approval of Brandt's new policies towards the East because I consider these policies very dangerous. I shall explain why in detail in the course of this speech.

Many are warning who, like myself, have all respect for Willy Brandt's political past.

One out of many of these I quote: "The future of the Federal Republic is dependent upon its ties with the West. Therefore, the new Eastern policies of the present government must be criticized again and again. I foresee a sad ending."

This warning was given just last week by Margarete Buber-Neumann on her 70th birthday. Mrs. Buber-Neumann, a former communist, is an important German political writer. In 1945 she was freed from a Nazi concentration camp. She now lives in Frankfurt.

Some politicians in Germany never stop arguing behind closed doors that the United States is preparing withdrawal from Europe, and that therefore Germany must make arrangements with the Soviets. This German flirting with the communists in turn strengthens the hand of those in America who want to pull back the troops. And this again gives new arguments to the proponents of the German "Ostpolitik." This goes on and on—a vicious circle.

When I discuss today here in Washington the trends of the present West German policies towards Communist Europe, I do so, because I feel and fear that by these policies the whole West is endangered. If this goes on unchanged, the result will not be a peaceful, prosperous, quiet, united Europe, which is a partner of the United States, the result will be rather a Europe whose total resources would be at the disposal of the Soviet Union.

I know others are less alarmed and believe once again in "peace in our time."

Who is right? Those who believe that the Soviets have changed their aims and that we can trust them? Or those who, while admitting that the Soviets have at times modified their methods, are convinced that their aims are the same?

I belong to the latter group, and with good reasons. We in the West focus our eyes on measures of disarmament, arms limitations, manpower cuts, etc. The Soviets however give only lip service to such intentions, and at the same time build up their armed forces. They rearm in such a way and with such speed, that soon they may be the world's number one military power.

This, by the way, is not only the opinion of a disillusioned publisher from Berlin, it has been confirmed to me by top intelligence officers from my own country as well as from yours, from Britain, from Switzerland and from Israel.

What is to be done?

Maybe the question to be answered is a very simple one: Will we see in the last third of our century a *pax americana* or a *pax sovietica*?

One excludes the other. *Pax americana* would mean continued hope for all mankind; *pax sovietica*, new dark ages in our times.

You, our American friends, after your victory in 1945, had the wisdom to help rebuild the destroyed countries of Europe, including my own, your former enemy. This is never forgotten.

When shortly after the war the Soviet Union resumed its aggressive policies, you brought together worldwide alliances. Especially in Europe, they stopped the aims of the communists and allowed the countries protected by the NATO shield to live through years of unheard-of prosperity and growth.

The question, as I said, is: Do we want to work for this *pax americana*, or are we willing to let the other side win?

These are the only alternatives—a compromise is not possible. Even the Soviet term for international compromise—peaceful co-existence—does not mean cooperation, but continuation of the confrontation on other levels.

Piotr Abrassimov, until a few weeks ago Soviet Ambassador in East Berlin, calls peaceful co-existence "a form of the 'class struggle' on an international level."

"Trybuna Ludu," the communist party paper in Poland, makes it still clearer, saying:

"The policy of peaceful co-existence aims at taking away from the capitalists by peaceful means all positions they still hold."

Aggression and peaceful co-existence, disarmament talks and rapid build-up of the armed forces, subversion and cooperation, trade negotiations and trade war—all these and many other seeming opposites are for the Soviets only two different sides of one coin. As long as we refuse to realize this, we are in great danger.

In this worldwide gamble for final victory by the communists, Berlin is one of the most important pawns for the Soviet Union.

The Soviets still quote Lenin who said: "Whoever controls Berlin will rule Germany, and whoever controls Germany rules Europe."

Up to this time, in the struggle for Berlin, the communists have not won. The blockade in 1948, the Krushchev ultimatum in 1958, the Wall in 1961, the constant intimidations and the shootings—all were a combination of naked power and blackmail. But they did not succeed.

Should the Soviets and their friends now obtain by sweet talk what they failed to get by threats.

Sweet talk? What am I saying?

In the Berlin agreement of the third of September of this year, the four powers condemned the use of force. But of course we continue to hear the shots and also the cries of those who try to flee from the East. Their number has even increased.

Ladies and gentlemen, just about ten years ago Robert Kennedy told me in Berlin that the Wall was the most effective propaganda against communism. I answered:

"I am afraid, in time, people will get used to this monstrosity. And if we keep quiet, if we fail to create permanent worldwide moral pressure, ten years from now the Wall will still be here, will be an accepted 'reality'."

Today, ten years later, the Wall is still there. Worse: its existence has been silently tolerated by the West in the Berlin agreement, which was signed only a few weeks ago.

What was really gained by the West in this agreement? I know the Western representatives invested immense good will and the greatest efforts. But the so-called concessions from the Russians are all self-understood and accepted among decent nations.

Travel simplified from and to West Berlin. Visits by West Berliners to East Berlin and East Germany, of course not vice versa. All this is emotionally important to individuals, but politically unimportant.

The West, however, conceded important political ground.

For instance, it diminished the influence of the Federal Republic in West Berlin by accepting that no sessions of the Bonn parliament nor the Congress, which elects the Federal President, may take place in West Berlin.

On the other hand, the situation in East Berlin was not even mentioned, where, contrary to earlier agreements, the East German regime has installed all its governmental offices and its mock parliament, not even to speak of the East German troops, which are stationed there. No West German soldier may—of course—enter West Berlin.

Completely incredible is the concession to establish a Soviet consulate general in West Berlin, a concession obviously granted upon German urging. The Berliners already call this the future home of all the spies who were kicked out of Britain recently.

You may be interested to hear how a member of the Western negotiation team sees the future of this institution. He said:

"At first the Soviets will do nothing. But after two years at the latest, they will press for their own liaison officer at the seat of the West Berlin government. Then we shall have Four Power Rule for West Berlin."

The West also gave a deathblow to all hopes for eventual reunification of Berlin and Germany. I mean, of course, reunification in freedom. This new policy will most likely bring in its wake international diplomatic recognition for the East German regime. The run has already been started.

This is, of course, not admitted in such terms by the involved Western representatives. But these are the facts, and the Soviets and their allies already speak and act accordingly.

Believing that self-determination is a basic political right, I, for one, would have been happier, had it been possible to put the Berlin agreement up for a referendum vote to the people of West Berlin.

Ladies and gentlemen! "Berlin exists for the vision some day to be the capital of a free, and united people," said Willy Brandt in former times, as I have quoted earlier. This has also been the policy of all American Presidents from Harry S. Truman to Richard M. Nixon.

Without this vision, what will Berlin be? To this city, also, the aphorism applies: "It shall not live by bread alone."

Are these the words of a German nationalist? Certainly not.

If I speak of reunification, I think mainly of bringing freedom and civil liberties to the Germans in the other part of my city and my country. Reunification on other terms is for me unthinkable.

For a long time I have been content, because at last Germany has found itself on the right side in world politics. It was on the side of the free world, on the side of the United States, on the side of Israel.

The German Chancellor claims that this will continue. But I am not so sure.

What will be the next moves?

The Soviets, and probably also my own government, will press for a speedy accord among the two parts of Germany to fulfill the Berlin agreement. They will also press for a speedy ratification of the Moscow and Warsaw treaties.

Concerning these treaties, a friend of mine, a high official in a country which is also under pressure from the Soviets, asked me recently: "Please explain to me the Russian 'Westpolitik,' which in your country is called German 'Ostpolitik.'"

These treaties, in my mind, are so dangerous, not only because they give away German rights without getting anything back in return, but because they are the first sign of a new "renversement des alliances," reversal of alliances, as Bismarck called it.

And this would most certainly be a catastrophe. Without the alliance of the West, which was built with your help and with America as the leading member, the free world would be doomed.

The next step, according to the Soviet timetable, will be the so-called European Security Conference. Here the often-told, long-range aim is to find a political and a legal justification for the demand, that "all troops return home from foreign soil." This in effect would mean that the Soviet units might retire beyond the new Polish eastern border, and that the American units retire beyond the Atlantic.

The Russians plan to have the European Security Conference by spring 1972. During his visit in the Crimea, near Yalta, Willy Brandt accepted this timetable. Or, so I have been informed.

The Soviets expect that next spring President Nixon will be so involved in the elections that only little energy can be spared by him for other matters. This the Russians hope to exploit.

It appears that the British government has chiefly recognized this situation and tries to at least postpone this conference. I hope it succeeds.

If the Moscow and the Warsaw treaties and the Berlin agreement become effective, and if the Soviets reach their goal at a European Security Conference, Russia would become the dominant power over all of Europe.

However, the majority of Europeans and most certainly the majority of my German countrymen still hope for the *pax americana*. In a recent poll 79 per cent of all West Germans considered continued friendship with the U.S.A. as the most important foreign policy issue. And I know that the *pax americana* can only be reached with the full and enthusiastic cooperation of all the friends and allies of the United States. And this, of course, also includes the fair sharing of financial burdens.

Finally: A last word about Berlin. Almost exactly 25 years ago today the first free, secret and direct elections under the Four Power Statute were held in all of Berlin. Shortly before election day, Hans Wallenberg, then an American Major and chief editor of the "Allgemeine Zeitung," wrote an important article. It was entitled "Have No Fear" and, among other things, killed the viciously-spread rumors that American and British troops soon were to leave Berlin.

The elections brought an overwhelming victory for freedom against the darkness of a new, a Soviet dictatorship. Hopes were high.

But never again have there been free elections in all of Berlin. Instead we have had set-back after set-back.

We must recover lost ground and, once again, together build something new, so that it never again will be necessary to say: "Have No Fear."

ITALIAN PRESS REPORTS ON VISIT OF AMERICAN CONGRESSMEN TO GENOA

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues an article written by Mr. Guido Mariotti, of *Il Cittadino*, which is one of the prominent daily newspapers serving the people of Genoa.

I had the pleasure of meeting and conferring with Mr. Mariotti at a reception given by Mr. Thomas H. Murfin, American Consul General at Genoa, in honor of the Congressmen who visited Genoa in early October on the occasion of the first celebration of Columbus Day in America as a national public Federal holiday.

The text of the article is most comprehensive and I know that many of my colleagues in the House will enjoy reading it, because it further demonstrates that the bridge and the ties between the people of Italy and the people of America are strong and enduring.

The article follows:

[From *Il Cittadino*, Oct. 5, 1971]

"COLUMBUS DAY" WILL BE A NATIONAL HOLIDAY IN THE UNITED STATES

To solemnize the event a delegation of American Congressmen has been hosted in Genoa—The significance of the celebrations that are now in preparation.

Christopher Columbus has received the high honor of having a national holiday of the United States of America officially dedicated to him. Until today there were eight national holidays but only one was reserved to an individual, George Washington, the Father of the nation of the Americans. The decision of Congress to declare Columbus Day a national holiday of the States of the Union therefore takes on particular significance because it is one of the greatest honor which the great Genoese mariner could have had. The law was sponsored by United States Congressmen of Italian origin and was approved in 1968 with an overwhelming majority and great enthusiasm. According to the American legislation the law enters in force three years after its adoption so that 1971 is the first year in which Columbus Day becomes a national holiday.

To solemnize the event a delegation of Members of Congress, many of whom of Italian origin, visited Genoa as guests. The group was led by Honorable Peter W. Rodino who worked for 23 years to obtain approval of the law. "For us it is a great honor as Americans of Italian origin"—stated Congressman Rodino—"to come to Genoa bringing the greetings of President Nixon and the Speaker of the House of Representatives Carl Albert. Columbus Day will have a special significance this year and large celebrations are in preparation in all American cities having substantial Italian or Italian-American population; above all in those cities—and there are 14—which carry the name of Columbus. If George Washington is for us Americans the Father of our country, Columbus can be considered the Father of the immigrants. With this holiday we intend to give a new impulse to the Columbian spirit and specially to strengthen the wonderful bridge of friendship and fraternity which binds the old world to the new. On October 11 at Chicago, October 6 at Washington, and also in New York, New Jersey and 100 other American cities Columbus Day will be celebrated with great ceremonies."

The family of Congressman Rodino of the Democratic Party was from Avellino. The family of the Congressman of Illinois, Frank Annunzio, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, is originally from Cosenza but resident of Chicago. Speaking with the typical accent of Italo-Americans, he said "It's a hundred years since our paparan, that is our grandfathers and great-grandfathers who came illiterate to America, have wished to honor Columbus because they were proud of him."

The delegation met yesterday evening at Palazzo Spinola with the President of the Region Hon. Dagnino to whom Congressman Rodino delivered a personal letter from President Nixon and a framed reproduction of the law establishing Columbus Day. "For a long time" wrote the President of the United States, "we have particularly cherished the ties between the US and the City of Genoa. I am particularly pleased that this message to you can be carried by a distinguished group of American political leaders who are of Italian descent. They are eminently representative of that special part of our national heritage that is Italian. These men embody the finest tradition of America and they also take great pride in the cultural heritage of the land of their ancestors." President Dagnino on his side stressed the "value of relations between USA and Italy" stating that "the example of Columbus is a great light which enables us to understand our world better."

Most of the Congressmen who came to Genoa are from the District of New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, New Jersey, and Connecticut. All said they were impressed by the "rhythm" which they found in Italy both in traffic and shops and by the reception and the wonderful climate.

Yesterday the Congressmen, accompanied by their wives, were received at Palazzo Tursi by representatives of the Commune with representatives of the Region and Province present. In the evening the group left Genoa for Milan from where they depart today for the United States. In his address of farewell Dr. Carlo Pastorino, Vice President of the Regional Assembly, recalled that "in the name of Columbus we should celebrate the initiative of the great Genoese of the past and of the astronauts of today whose courageous endeavor was accompanied by an advanced technology but also by a will employed in a politic of peace and understanding." Dr. Pastorino concluded with the hope that "the political, economic and monetary decisions of the government of the United States as a consequence of the monetary situation of the entire world can be quickly overcome in a policy of progress."

A NEW NATIONAL HOLIDAY

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last October 11, Federal employees celebrated a new national holiday, Columbus Day. Many of those who enjoyed this new holiday may be interested in how it came to be added to the list of national holidays.

An article in the September-October 1971 issue of the Bay State Postal Worker serves well, I think, to enlighten us on the origin of Columbus Day, and on the efforts of one particular man, a determined postal worker, Mr. Mitchell Harb of Lawrence, Mass., to have his dream of making Columbus Day a national holiday become a reality. I would like to share this article with my colleagues.

The article follows:

COLUMBUS DAY—WHO REALLY GOT US THIS HOLIDAY?

(By James Smyrnlis)

October 11, 1971, will be an additional paid Holiday this year for us as Postal Employees. Since the passage of this Bill through Congress, many Postal employees and Local leaders are claiming to be the one responsible for the passage of this Bill.

Well there should be no doubt in anyone's mind, that the residents of Massachusetts and the members of the Knights of Columbus were highly instrumental in obtaining passage of Columbus Day to be observed as a National Holiday.

Hearing these various claims from Postal employees, I decided to do a little research work on this matter. This research has come up with documented facts, that the Lawrence Local No. 366, in my opinion, played one of the most important roles in seeking and promoting the National observance of Columbus Day.

Mitchell A. Harb, Past President, Lawrence Local No. 366, was possibly the key figure amongst Postal Employees in Massachusetts in spearheading the drive for National observance of Columbus Day. For many years, Mitch submitted and resubmitted resolutions through his Local to the State and National Conventions for the observance of Columbus Day as a National Holiday. Through these resolutions and the help of Congressman Brad Morse, Mitchell Harb has finally seen his long dream come a reality.

One only has to look at the Resolution submitted by the Lawrence Local at the 1962 State Convention in Lowell, Mass.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, has legally adopted and accepted the observance of October 12th, Columbus Day as a legal holiday, and whereas this date is partially observed by some Post Offices in the Commonwealth as a Holiday, by partially closing the office hours,

Be it resolved, that in accordance with the spirit intended by the State Legislature, that Columbus Day, October 12th be recognized as a full State Holiday observed by all Post Offices in the Commonwealth. Services to the public to be suspended and that this date to be recognized as a Paid Holiday.

I ask you now, is there any doubt in your mind, as to the fact, that the Massachusetts Federation of Postal Clerks and the determined attitude of Mitchell Harb, played a

most important part in obtaining Columbus Day as a Paid National Holiday for Postal Employees?

SUPPORT GROWS FOR THE REDUCTION OF U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have expressed grave concern over the recent ouster of Nationalist China from the United Nations for, as a result of the China episode, the future of the free world has become somewhat obscure.

Of the 59 nations who defied the United States and voted to expel the Republic of China, all but six have received U.S. foreign aid totaling over \$47 billion since 1946. And while there are over 125 nations participating in the United Nations with equal voting power, the United States provides 31.52 percent of the operating costs of the United Nations and over 40 percent of the funds which it uses for special projects.

In view of these alarming facts, I feel that it is definitely time for us to reassess our priorities as a Nation and to reassess the overgenerous contributions—contributions which are made up of the American taxpayer's hard earned money—from our Government to an organization which has, in effect, slapped us in the face.

It is encouraging to note this feeling is shared by the Republican Party of Florida which, on October 30, 1971, unanimously passed a resolution in support of any move which would reduce the U.S. contribution to the United Nations. For the benefit of my fellow Congressmen, I am herewith including the text of this resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Nixon Administration desires to curb inflation and one of the cures for inflation is reduced spending, and

Whereas, the present trend in the Congress of the United States is to cut back foreign aid expenditures, and

Whereas, the General Assembly of the United Nations violated its own charter by expelling the Republic of China, since Chapter II, Article VI of the Charter makes it illegal for the General Assembly to expel a member without the recommendation of the Security Council, and

Whereas, even though each country in the United Nations has one vote, the assessments for each nation are not so equal, for instance, Albania with 2,000,000 people pays .04 percent of the United Nations budget; Cuba with 8,000,000 people pays .16 percent; the U.S.S.R. with 250,000,000 population pays 14.8 percent and the United States with 204,000,000 people pays 31.52 percent, and

Whereas, the old adages, such as "no taxation without representation" and "never bite the hand that feeds you," are still remembered in these United States of America, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Florida supports and encourages those Republican Congressmen and Senators of the United States Congress who are in favor of

and working to reduce the United States contributions to the United Nations.

(Passed unanimously by the Republican Party of Florida, in meeting assembled October 30, 1971.)

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD RECEIVES THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY'S AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening, our distinguished colleague and good friend, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, received the cancer award of the American Cancer Society for distinguished service in the fight against cancer at its annual meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

Congressman FLOOD was so honored for his outstanding leadership and his consistent legislative support of noteworthy health measures, as well as his wholehearted dedication to the vital programs of the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert for the RECORD a copy of Congressman FLOOD's acceptance speech, for I believe it reaffirms the commitment and the leadership that he has so often displayed in the fight against cancer, as well as reflecting the commitment of all of us in Congress to cure this dread disease and to provide the best possible health care for all of our citizens.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD

I am deeply honored to receive the Distinguished Service Award today from the American Cancer Society, and thank the Legislative Committee for its flattering recommendation.

For more years than I care to remember, I have been profoundly interested in cancer research. I have been fortunate for the past several years to be Chairman of Labor-HEW subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, which has enabled me to take an active role in the support of the Federal cancer research effort. It is a role, ladies and gentlemen, which I treat with the greatest respect.

I think we truly live in an exciting period—possibly the most exciting period in cancer research. I can recall that in 1945—the year I first entered the House of Representatives—some of the accomplishments which we now accept as a matter of fact would have then been considered daydreams: the progress against leukemia, a disease which causes more deaths among American children than any other illness; the progress against breast cancer, the major cancer killer of women; and the advances in the treatment of Hodgkin's disease, a cruel killer of young adults.

Equally heartening is the development of new detection techniques for breast cancer—and of immunologic techniques that may detect intestinal cancer before symptoms occur. Lung cancer prevention measures, such as your educational campaign against cigarette smoking, will save many lives. Recent findings in virus research are likely also to play a significant role in cancer prevention.

We can all thank dedicated scientists across the Nation for their outstanding contributions to the progress against cancer. But we in the Congress realize that the effort cannot be accomplished by the scientific community alone. The role of dollars—in making progress possible—is a fact of life in our society which we all recognize. In this regard I think the Congress has played a highly significant role. The recent appropriation for cancer research is an excellent example. The voice of the President, the scientific community and especially the American Cancer Society was heard loud and clear by the Committee on Appropriations. We on the Labor-HEW Subcommittee shared the Cancer Society's belief in the urgent need to increase American cancer research capabilities and resources. We shared the belief that the time was in fact ripe to exploit the many new research leads recently uncovered by cancer scientists.

We all can share a high degree of pride in the passage of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, signed by the President on May 25, which is now providing an additional \$100 million to the national effort to conquer cancer. This additional \$100 million, when added to the regular appropriation for this year, gives the National Cancer Institute a current operating level of \$337.5 million; almost double the amount available only two years ago. I think the Congress has made it clear by its action that it stands ready to support cancer research to its fullest capacity.

Once again may I say how pleased I am to accept this honor today from the American Cancer Society. Private support of cancer research, such as that provided by the American Cancer Society, has immeasurably strengthened the national effort to fight this dreaded disease. The Cancer Society's various programs of research, its extremely effective volunteer efforts, and its many programs of public and professional education, make it an important partner in the national effort to conquer cancer.

CHARLES E. PERRY, PRESIDENT, FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, next fall Florida International University, Miami's first State-supported university, will admit its first students. As the first urban university in the State's system, FIU has the opportunity to focus its programs in economics, political science, management, sociology, and education on the immediate Dade County community which will serve as its laboratory. The university will also play an important role in the development of the permanent international cultural and trade center at the Interama site where its second campus will be located.

Named as President of this new university, with a projected enrollment of 30,000, is Dr. Charles E. Perry. Dr. Perry, at age 32, is one of the youngest college presidents in the Nation. A graduate of Bowling Green University in Ohio, Dr. Perry was named that school's admissions director at the age of 23. He subsequently came to Florida as an assistant to the chancellor of Florida's university system, and was then appointed to the new presidency at FIU.

Dr. Perry's enthusiasm and expertise have been invaluable during the university's formative period. Through his leadership the university has acquired an outstanding roster of nationally recognized educators to head its schools.

Dr. Perry is also a member of the U.S. Commission for UNESCO. Speaking before the United Nations Day Observance Dinner of the United Nations Association of the United States of America, Miami-Coral Gables chapter, Dr. Perry announced he was recommending to U.N. Secretary-General U Thant, recipient of an honorary degree of international laws from FIU, a far-reaching program for the international exchange of teachers. Dr. Perry recommended:

That there be established by the United Nations, through UNESCO, one central world clearing house for the international exchange of teachers—a function aimed at world peace and the advancement of mankind, which are the primary goals of the United Nations.

While education was the main theme of Dr. Perry's remarks, he also outlined the strengths and successes of the United Nations. I call his entire speech to the attention of our colleagues. These remarks give a glimpse of Chuck Perry's insight into international relations and the problems of education, and illustrate part of the reason Florida International University and south Florida are so very grateful for his leadership.

The remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES E. PERRY

We are gathered here tonight to observe the occasion of United Nations Day. Similar gatherings are being held elsewhere, both in this country and throughout the world.

Obviously, all of the people who attend these meetings are supporters of the United Nations. One measure of our support is the fact that we want this observance of UN Day to have the public recognition it deserves. But beyond that, I would hope—and I believe—that all of us are taking this occasion to increase our own personal involvement with the work and goals of the United Nations.

In the preamble to the charter of the United Nations, the signatory countries pledged themselves to peace, human rights, justice and social and economic progress. True, these are ordinary words—but the goals they so briefly define are extraordinary in human history. What is even more significant is that the pledge was given not in the name of any government or any country, but, rather, in the specific words, "We, the peoples of the United Nations..."

Not governments, not nations, not presidents or prime ministers, but "the peoples." The founders of the United Nations saw very clearly that the goals they were setting forth could only be achieved by the united effort of the peoples of the world. And while the charter obviously refers to people in the millions and hundreds of millions and even billions, the word "peoples" also means us—you and me.

So, even though each of us is but one individual, it is up to us as individuals to do all that we can do to support and sustain the United Nations; to be involved in its work to the extent possible and to take its successes—and its failures—as uniquely personal responsibilities.

Here in South Florida, we have many opportunities to become personally involved in international affairs. Miami is rapidly becoming an increasingly significant international port of entry—a gateway both to

and from the United States. The peoples of the Americas flow through Miami all year long—and so do citizens of many other nations.

Many large business and banking organizations now have their international headquarters in this area. More will come.

Students from all parts of the world come here to study at our colleges and universities.

The businessmen, the students, the tourists, the local population—which is constantly growing—all meet here. They mingle, they interact, they impress and are impressed. And in this jet age, the same people are often here two and three times in a single year. For many of them Miami is the United States of America.

I know that many of us who live in this community participate actively in the international sphere. I'm certain that some of you are active members of the Council for International Visitors which does such an excellent job of people-to-people work with our visitors. This is also the headquarters for "Operation Amigo" which has originated so many productive student exchanges with Latin America and this effort involves many of the people who live here. And the fact that many residents of this area have close family and business ties in other nations automatically brings all of us closer to becoming involved internationally.

While I am not here to deliver a report to you about Florida International University, I think it is appropriate to say that our planning has been designed from the inception to create a university with a major international thrust and significant international programs and participation. The University will have as part of its core a Center for International Affairs which will provide an over-all focus for our internationally-oriented programs.

In addition to what goes on at the University itself, we shall be able to play an important part in the development of the permanent international cultural and trade center that will surround our second campus at Interama. That will also be the site of Greater Miami's official role as one of the four cities selected by the president to celebrate this nation's Bicentennial in 1976.

But, above all, the University is committed to supporting the goals of the United Nations. And, as supporters of the United Nations, each of us has at one time or another been called upon to account for the supposed lack of progress of the United Nations. The most common question is, "Well, what has the United Nations accomplished, what has it done in a period of 25 years?"

The first and most obvious answer is that in no less than 70 cases involving either an outright breach of world peace or the threat of such a breach, the UN has been of direct and significant help in world peacekeeping. In a shrinking world, where even the smallest conflict carries with it the ultimate threat of nuclear extinction, this is no small achievement.

Beyond those 70 clearly identifiable incidents, the United Nations has for a quarter-century served as a forum where nations can state their case, make their arguments, and, yes, on occasion vent their spleen at one another. But far better to be the victim of a belligerent speech than the victim of an armed attack.

Those of us who live in South Florida can relate that very personally to the events of the Cuban missile crisis a few short years ago.

In that instance the United Nations joined with the United States and with the Organization of American States in asserting the rule of international law. The UN provided the forum in which the facts became known to the entire world. The Secretary-General

personally intervened to help divert the Soviet ships while they were en route to Cuba. The United Nations also volunteered to send an inspection team to Cuba, and it was Castro's refusal of that offer that cast him in the role of the would-be war-maker.

Certainly, the United Nations has not been equally successful in all its peacekeeping efforts. But what is important is that there is an organization ready and able to attempt to keep the peace. It is quite likely that had the United Nations existed in 1914, those two quick pistol shots which killed Archduke Ferdinand and his wife might not have led directly to the First World War.

History relates that, despite all the threats and statements and despite the mobilization in Germany and Russia, both the Kaiser and the Czar, to the very end of the last hour of the ultimatum, sought desperately for a way out. But there was no forum, no international body, no place to go to still save face—so the world was at war!

So much for war and peace. Important as they are, there is more to life than soldiers and diplomats, and the United Nations is active on many fronts that the public seldom hears about. Next year in Stockholm, the UN will hold a conference on environmental abuses. Every nation is now concerned about the deterioration of the environment—and it is a problem that knows no borders and no political boundaries. Here is an ideal place for the United Nations to serve as a focus for increased knowledge and a pivot point for meaningful international action.

Do you know about UNRRA? This is the UN agency that for a quarter-century has stood between millions of refugees—or as we now call them, "stateless persons"—and extinction. There are 63 of these special UN camps in the Middle East alone where they serve as the only home for better than half a million people.

You have probably heard about UNICEF, but did you know that this UN Agency has vaccinated more than a quarter-billion of the world's children against tuberculosis. UNICEF is active in 115 countries and it is performing miracles this very minute for more than 55 million children and their mothers.

Through the UN development program, 137 of the world's "have-not nations" have taken the first, difficult steps toward the economic development they must have to survive—and to remain peaceful. A number of the poor nations wanted no part of bilateral entanglements, so they were pleased to participate in this "bootstrap-operation" under United Nations auspices.

I don't want to turn this into a statistical review, but I could go on for hours reciting facts and figures to prove beyond question that the world is a better place—and that it has prospects of becoming considerably better than it is now—as a result of the work of the United Nations. And not only the world we live in—the world of outer space that we are exploring also. The United Nations has drafted the two major treaties that are now in effect to regulate the peaceful uses of outer space.

And beyond the achievements, beyond the facts and figures, is the example set by the United Nations. Merely by existing, merely by being there, it has encouraged men of good will to move ahead. The principles embodied in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights are now included in the constitutions of no less than 43 separate nations.

All of us have had the experience of hearing the United Nations criticized, sometimes justly, sometimes unjustly, and all of us have wanted to reply. There can, I think, be no better reply than the words of Adlai Stevenson before the American Association for the United Nations meeting in San Fran-

cisco just 10 years ago tonight. It is a fairly lengthy statement, but I think it bears repeating because it is hard to imagine that anyone could say it more effectively:

"In April, 1945, toward the end of humanity's most terrible war, but before any man had seen the atomic age, the architects of peace met in San Francisco to complete the design of a new dwelling house for the Family of Man.

"I was there during those golden weeks. And no one who was will ever forget them. It was a beginning. It was the morning—fresh with the hope of a new day.

"But the house is now battered. It re-sounds endlessly with family quarrels. There are cracks in the walls, and inside the cold winds of war and danger and strife from every quarter of the globe rattle the doors and windows. And, as is usual in such cases, quite a number of the tenants are behind in the rent.

"But the house is still standing, and I am far from downhearted. We will meet all our problems and in time we will solve them in a way which is tolerable to the community of nations and to our own purposes. But it will be a slow game, and we are not going to score a touchdown on every play . . .

"I believe the cause of freedom and peace has a glorious future in this world. And in that future the United Nations will play a mighty part. Let none of us mock its weakness, for when we do we are mocking ourselves. It is the hope of the world; and our country's pride should be that we stood by the United Nations, the meeting house of the Family of Man, in its time of hardest trial."

So, for those who may doubt—I can only echo Mr. Stevenson's comments.

Now I come to an international subject which is nearest to my heart—education. And, in the interest of world peace and progress, I am prepared tonight to suggest a new role for the United Nations in education. Before I make my proposal, however, I feel it is necessary to delve briefly, but deeply, into history. Please bear with me for a moment.

More than 2,000 years ago, Kyan-Tsu (Kee-yan-Soo), the Chinese philosopher, is reported to have said:

"When planning for a year, sow corn. When planning for a decade, plant trees. When planning for life, train and educate people."

More recently—just about 300 years ago—Moravian Bishop Johann Amos Comenius was thinking along the same line, and had an idea which he felt would lead to world peace. He viewed education as a bridge to better understanding, and urged that it be organized and promoted on an international scale.

The Bishop's idea, spawned in an era of poor communications, was slow in moving into the world stream. The Catholic Church, of course, has been involved in international education for centuries, but it was not until 1904 that two countries, Great Britain and France, established an exchange system for teaching assistants. Then, in 1925, the International Bureau of Education was created, and it is today the oldest international organization concerned with education.

Great impetus to the Bishop's 17th Century idea was given in 1946 with the establishment of UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The fact that the headquarters of both UNESCO and the International Bureau of Education were located in Western Europe acted as a stimulus to international educational activities. More important, the two organizations got together in 1950 at Geneva, and submitted to the ministries of education recommendations that encouraged international understanding by having major programs for the interchange of teachers and urged that other similar programs be established to promote international peace and progress.

West Germany was quick to recognize the importance of teacher exchanges in fostering better understanding, and, by 1952, had established them with various countries. The National Education Association has informed me that West Germany is still actively recruiting teachers from other countries.

France acted, largely in its own orbit. By 1967, 21,500 teachers from France were employed in the schools of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, and another 6,000 were scattered throughout 12 tropical African states and Madagascar.

Recently, the Soviet Union has been engaged in a wide range of international education programs, including teacher exchanges. In one short year, 1,500 Soviet educators went abroad for 150 short-term reciprocal visits. Communist countries were mostly involved, although non-Communist nations were included.

At the 1969 Assembly of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, Sir Ronald Gould, the president, declared that "we must urge the development of teacher visits and exchanges, and with them exchanges in ideas." He cited "the pioneer work so brilliantly commenced by Canada which has sent a considerable number of capable, experienced teachers to provide in-service training for our colleagues in the poor countries."

For the last quarter-century, an increasing number of United States colleges and universities have been managing programs for the sending of professors and students abroad and/or bringing their counterparts to campuses in the United States. Today, more than 20 percent of our colleges and universities are engaged in such programs.

Two-thirds of the current programs involve European countries, but significant is the fact that there has been an increase in programs on other continents. About 15 percent of the programs are now in Latin America, more than five percent in the Middle East and Africa, and more than six percent in Asia.

The international educational and exchange programs related to the Fulbright Act, started in 1949, have enabled more than 125,000 students, teachers, university professors and advanced researchers to study and teach outside their native lands—in more than 130 different countries.

The Peace Corps, born in 1961, has sent thousands of young American volunteers to other countries, with half of these volunteers directly engaged in teaching and the other half in educationally related areas.

There are many other international teacher exchange programs. In fact, UNESCO has issued a booklet containing information on agencies and organizations in 83 countries concerned in one way or another with the recruitment of staff for teaching assignments abroad. I have mentioned only a few to point out that much is being done in this area—and is being done well with untold dividends in better international understanding.

But now I come to my crucial point. Suppose you are trained as a teacher—are adept in several languages or are willing to take studies to learn another language—how do you become a participant in a teacher exchange program?

For the average person, the answer to that question is a most difficult and puzzling one. Recently, a young woman, who holds a master's degree in education, but has been doing secretarial work at Florida International University because she has been unable to get a job in her field, made many telephone calls to different organizations in Washington, D.C., and New York, asking about the possibilities of teaching in another country. The answers were indefinite and confusing. And, upon further investigation, I found that there is no single centralized system avail-

able to handle this situation. Consequently, I am taking the opportunity of this occasion to make public my recommendation for such a system, although as a member of the United States Commission for UNESCO, I have already officially asked the Secretary General of the United Nations to implement the idea. The recommendation is:

That there be established by the United Nations, through UNESCO, one central world clearing house for the international exchange of teachers—a function aimed at world peace and the advancement of mankind, which are the primary goals of the United Nations.

When the United Nations was established in 1945, such a world clearing house for the exchange of teachers might not have been practical, but, with computer and other technological advances, I submit that it can be done today.

Adding to the urgency for the need of such a clearing house is the fact that, for the first time in the history of the United States, there is a surplus of teachers in many fields. And with so many persons in the world in need of more educational assistance, the idea of a surplus of teachers—anywhere—is ridiculous.

Surpluses of both wheat and knowledge in a world with under-nourished and under-educated people should not be tolerated. Certainly better understanding and better living in the world can come only by eliminating the surplus of ignorance.

In the United States, with its nation-wide surplus of teachers, regional clearing houses to assist the United Nations may be necessary. America's colleges and universities are particularly geared to serve in this capacity. Certainly, Florida International University, at the gateway between the two Americas, would volunteer its services in this regard for Latin America. The nation's colleges and universities could also be utilized for intensive work for teachers in foreign languages, and for the specialized programs to prepare teachers for an international assignment.

Throughout the years, the United Nations, despite its frustrations and setbacks, has successfully been a clearing house for many differences and conflicts. But what I am suggesting now is an educational clearing house aimed at reducing the differences and conflicts.

The United Nations has seen this clearly from the beginning. The Constitution of UNESCO says it in these words: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

What I have suggested tonight is, hopefully, a new and better way of moving to construct those defenses in the minds of men throughout the world.

We must all remember that we live—especially those of us who dwell in the more advanced nations of the world—amid technological and scientific breakthroughs that have come upon us so rapidly that they pose grave difficulties in their handling. Growth versus environment, mass employment versus automation, food surpluses in one nation versus starvation in another—all these are problems that must be solved in the minds of men before they can be solved anywhere else.

The peoples of the world—the peoples mentioned in the preamble to the United Nations Charter—are keenly aware of the multitude of problems. And through effective international education programs—enhanced by the development of the international teacher exchange clearing house—we can and will solve the problems facing mankind.

But the question may still be asked. Can the United Nations, which is only 26 years old, perform its mission of peace and progress? Can the United Nations do what we ask of it? Can any organization made up of

peoples from all parts of the world create this kind of monumental achievement?

In April of 1945, Franklin D. Roosevelt was at Warm Springs, taking a brief rest before addressing himself to the problems of the coming peace and to the organization of the United Nations. Worn out physically, exhausted mentally, from the burden of leadership he had shouldered for so many critical years, this man was still the supreme optimist.

Seeing not simply the depths to which man had fallen, he looked equally upon the heights to which he was certain we had it in our power to rise. And he set down these words as part of a speech he was soon to give:

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Death overtook President Roosevelt before he could speak these words, but they are as true today as they were then. They summon us all to the work that must be done, to the tasks that must be accomplished, if we are to survive in peace on this small space ship called Earth.

THE PACE OF MIDEAST DIPLOMACY

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from today's Washington Post persuasively states the case for providing Phantom jets to Israel without further delay:

THE PACE OF MIDEAST DIPLOMACY

"I shall not allow 1971 to pass without the battle (with Israel) being resolved, either by war or by peace," Egypt's President Sadat said July 23. But of course he will. Peace by year's end is out of the question: nobody's ready to compromise. And there is, by Mideast standards, no more than routine danger of war.

Israel, enjoying both the possession of Egyptian territory and an American-made cease-fire, simply has no logical incentive for war. Some partisans of President Sadat insist that he is the prisoner of his rhetoric and cannot much longer hold his championing army back, but his record belies that belittling judgment. Since replacing Gamal Nasser, he has undone a serious political challenge, turned his people's attention toward domestic reform, and made more effective arrangements with Russia for the defense of Egypt against Israeli air strikes. The result is that he is freer than ever from a compulsion to lead Egypt to a fourth defeat, as the experts agree another war would be. A policy combining ardent slogans and prudent acts seems to suit his diverse political needs. Certainly that's better than the other way around.

The attitude of the superpowers is also relevant. Moscow, by agreeing to receive Mr. Nixon next May, has in effect said it won't precipitate a Mideast collision before then. Moreover, the deeper the Russians penetrate into the Egyptian military, the more they presumably discover its inadequacies relative to Israel. Moscow could compensate by assuming an even larger direct combat role than it had before the cease-fire started in August, 1970, but that would involve political and military risks it can hardly wish to accept before next May. Soviet policy comes down to waiting.

Waiting for what? For the United States to force Israel to withdraw to pre-1967 borders on terms acceptable to Egypt. The U.S.

wants a settlement in a hurry: there lie easier relations with the Kremlin, political rewards in 1972. To a settlement pressed by Washington, however, Israel prefers a peace fashioned with Egypt. In pursuit of a made-in-America settlement, Secretary Rogers is trying to compromise Egyptian-Israeli differences. The Egyptians stand firm, so the compromises now all involve Israeli concessions. In an interim settlement, Mr. Rogers argues, Israel should let Egyptian forces cross the Suez Canal, accept a certain time limit on the cease-fire, and agree to move on to complete withdrawal from Sinai. To overcome Israel's reluctance to accept these points, the United States is withholding Phantoms, which are militarily, politically and psychologically Israel's critical weapon.

The pressure is not working. American undercutting of its negotiating position while cutting off its Phantoms has stirred Israel's deepest fears and alarms and has frozen its Mideast diplomacy. The way to thaw it is for the United States to open the Phantom pipeline—what goes through it may not be so important as Israel's knowing that it's open—and to back off and let Egypt and Israel reach toward each other at their own pace.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES V. STANTON'S CALL FOR UNITY TO SOLVE CLEVELAND'S PROBLEMS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today our colleague, JIM STANTON, addressed the Cleveland Men's Club of Washington on the future of his home city of Cleveland, Ohio. Because of Mr. STANTON's important role in the affairs of Cleveland and the importance of the suggestion he has made, his statement will be of interest, not only to the people of Cleveland and surrounding communities, but to Members of Congress from other large metropolitan areas with similar problems.

Representative STANTON has offered to work with Cleveland's new mayor, Ralph Perks, and with all other local officials, to promote a new spirit of unity. He has also proposed a new caucus of the four U.S. Representatives from Cleveland to collaborate on matters affecting Cleveland. Earlier this year, the four Democratic and three Republican Representatives from the Cleveland and Akron metropolitan areas formed the Northeastern Ohio Congressional Council to work together on matters affecting the entire region. It seems to me that Representative STANTON's proposed Cleveland caucus could make an effective contribution working within the seven-man regional council to advance the interests of all the people of Cleveland.

The text of Representative STANTON's speech follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES V. STANTON

Thank you, Matt De More, for that fine introduction and biography—which I admit was fully authorized—and boldly conceived—by my highly objective office staff.

And thank you, Ed Seitz. You are not only the unofficial Secretary-for-life of this orga-

nization, but also a top-notch gentleman and scholar. (I insist on saying nice things about you, Ed, because you're a good Slovenian friend of my boss, Congressman John Blatnik, the Chairman of the Public Works Committee).

And thank you, gentlemen of the Cleveland Men's Club, for inviting me here and giving me absolute authority to make a speech in Washington, D.C., my first full-fledged effort since my arrival in the capital last January. As you people know there is an unwritten rule around here that freshmen Congressmen are supposed to be seen and not heard—but that if they find it impossible to keep quiet, and if they MUST make a speech, they had better find a more congenial forum than the House floor, where the duty of a good freshman is to sit and listen, with his hands folded.

I won't say I've been muzzled. Every now and then, I do sneak in a word or two—but then I stop when I realize that no one is listening. This is especially hard to take for a graduate of the Cleveland City Council where—I'm sure I don't have to tell you this—the First Amendment is fully exploited with freedom of speech guaranteed to the councilmen of all 33 wards and exercised on occasion, in the heat of controversy, by all 33 simultaneously.

Now that you've given me the floor, Matt, I refuse to relinquish it. I'm going to warm up, and train for that first speech I am going to give some day on Capitol Hill, as soon as I get enough seniority.

In the meantime I ask you as fellow Clevelanders to give me a break, and bear with me.

I promise not to take too long, but I do have something important to say. I'd like to talk with you about Cleveland—the city that all of us feel an attachment for—the city that brings us together around this splendid luncheon table—the place where each one of us got our start in life—and the community that, I trust, none of us will ever turn our backs on.

I haven't been away from there so long—really not at all. I've been going back there nearly every weekend, as part of my job. I've been in touch as some of you perhaps haven't, and I can report to you—or repeat to you—what you've already heard. The city has changed, and not for the best. The old neighborhoods have dispersed, or they are well along in the process of being shattered. Freeways have displaced the homes where you and your parents or grandparents used to live. The lake is filthy, and the air is fouled.

But there are two changes that are worse than all the others put together. The spirit of Cleveland has changed, and its image has changed.

The image I'm referring to is the national reputation that Cleveland once had—as the breeding ground of political progressives like Mayor Tom L. Johnson; as the home base of financial titans like John D. Rockefeller; as the community so full of compassion that it gave birth to the combined charities concept, which other cities have long since copied, but not as successfully, in the form of, say Washington, D.C.'s United Givers Fund. Cleveland had its troubles in those days too—even when we could boast of a Harold Burton, a Lou Boudreau, and a George Szell—but somehow we managed to keep our troubles to ourselves, and, outside of Cleveland, nobody heard much about them.

But what do we hear today about Cleveland? We hear this—and I quote from the Rowland Evans and Robert Novak column of October 29, on the eve of the mayoral election:

"Racial polarization is typified by murmurings in Cleveland's white neighborhoods

about seceding to form a new all white town to be called Ohio City."

And we also hear, from the Washington Post of November 3—the day after the election:

"Cleveland's housing is dilapidated. The Cuyahoga River is filthy. 'Packs of vicious dogs are said to roam some neighborhoods.'

That's what you read about Cleveland these days. That's what an outsider sees—or hears—when he visits the city. That's our image now—and you can see how much we've lost—what the country thinks now about that area that we used to call boastfully "the best location in the nation."

And what about the spirit of Cleveland—the Cleveland that used to pride itself on being, if you will, a miniature United Nations—the home of a people enriched by so many races, religions, and nationality groups; where cultural pluralism prevailed and was encouraged—in fact, gloried in—while at the same time unity was achieved. Where is that Cleveland?

That Cleveland, my friends—and I tell it to you straight out, because you already know it—is gone. Something rather ugly has taken its place. It's a Cleveland broken into three parts—a black part where black people live, many of them in misery, many of them defiant because of it, and nearly all of them hostile to the whites living across the street and across the river. There's also a slightly larger white part of Cleveland, where white people live, good people and hard-working people, many of them also in need, who have come to believe that they must resist the growing black population and its political power.

We needn't go into the reasons, at least not here, for this mutual hostility. Whether the reasons are good or bad or unjustified, the fact is that they EXIST. And both sides know that this situation is tearing Cleveland apart.

And, my friends, there's a THIRD part of Cleveland—the suburban part. You can put a capital "S" on that. Today we have suburbanites who hardly ever enter the city any more, even though their livelihood ultimately depends on the city. They too feel alienated. The sad fact is that they sometimes pat themselves on the back for having—quote—"escaped," even though the truth is that they haven't escaped at all. For the problems of the city spill over into the suburbs, and catch up to the people who have fled there.

Gentlemen, we have just come through a mayoral election that reflects this division of Cleveland into three parts. I'll be blunt about it. Ralph Perk, who won the election—and I do not say this unkindly about him—was, whether he liked it or not, the candidate of the white part, and I hope he's not stuck with being the mayor of just the white part. Arnold Pinkney, also because of disruptive forces that were greater than he was, was the candidate of the black part. And Jim Carney, the duly nominated Democratic candidate whom I, as a Democrat, later supported, was in many respects the candidate of the suburban part, drawing much of his support from the downtown interests whose promoters live in the suburbs. The simple fact is that Ralph Perk won because there are more whites than blacks in the city; Arnold Pinkney lost because there are LESS blacks than whites; and Jim Carney lost because, in spite of a sizable vote from the residents of the city, which was a tribute to his hard work, many of his more ardent advocates lived in the suburbs and couldn't vote for him from that refuge of theirs.

Well, now that I've unburdened myself here—articulating what I'm sure you men have been thinking as well—where do we—where does Cleveland go from here?

I know where we ought to go. We ought to break up that street brawl we've plunged

ourselves into, and we ought to start moving. Together down a new street where we can recapture the old Cleveland spirit, and restore our once enviable national image.

I know that is Ralph Perk's goal—and good Republican that HE is, and good Democrat that I am—I want to help him all I can—for Cleveland's sake. In his quest for unity on a high plane, he has my support. We can retain our political differences but still work together toward the common goal, as all Clevelanders should while maintaining their own differences—ethnic, racial and religious, as well as political.

Yet, my friends, what must be done in Cleveland is the awesome responsibility that Ralph Perk is charged with. He's the mayor. HE has the initiative there. Much as I and my colleagues here would like to help him, there's a limit to what we can do in Cleveland. That is a hard political fact.

And yet, as a Congressman from Cleveland, I am not pretending that I am altogether helpless. There IS something that I can do here in Washington, D.C. There is something that my colleagues can do here. What WE can do in Washington—my colleagues and I—is something that I don't think any of us—or our predecessor—have ever done before. What we can do is set an example for the people back home.

That is to say, we—the four of us—could start working together right here. I submit that the best way for us to bring our people together is for the four of us—Bill Minshall, Charley Vanik, Louis Stokes and myself—to come together ourselves. I suggest, in other words, that if true unity can't be achieved immediately in Cleveland, at least it can be established instantly, painlessly—and really with no trouble at all—in Washington, where the four Congressmen representing Greater Cleveland work another street, playing—if you will—another ball game. But we do have a game going here that all Cleveland does watch, and hopefully we can give our constituents something to emulate.

If you'll bear with me, let me blurt again. I represent one part of Cleveland, Louis Stokes represents another part. Charley Vanik and Bill Minshall each has a piece of Cleveland, but they also have large suburban constituencies. Three of us are Democrats, one is a Republican. Three of us are white, one is black. If I'm not mistaken two of us are Catholics, two are Protestants. I'm Irish with a lot of ethnic constituents, Charley is an ethnic with a lot of Jewish constituents.—Need I go on? The point is that all of us are Americans, and beyond that, we're all Clevelanders. This diversity among the four of us reflects the diversity of our larger community—and that diversity can again become our greatest strength if it rises, as it used to in Cleveland, to the plateau of unity.

So my proposal is that the four Cleveland Congressmen come together in what I suggest, could be called a Cleveland caucus—a formal structure for the four of us, in which unity would become institutionalized—hopefully, in fact, surviving all four of us. Anyone elected to succeed each of us would automatically take the open chair in the Cleveland Caucus, which would be a continuing body. The Caucus chairmanship could rotate among the four of us—say, every three months or, perhaps, every six months. And we could start it on the basis of seniority, as we do everything else around here. The Caucus could meet at the call of the chair. But in between these formal meetings, our staff members could get together quietly and more frequently—perhaps every week. It would be their job to search out the issues and other matters that we are likely to agree on and act in concert on.

Now, again, I'm not at all suggesting that we surrender our legitimate differences, or that we abandon our individual constitu-

encies. I would continue to owe my first loyalty to the 20th Congressional District. The people who live in that part of Greater Cleveland are the people who elected me, and I would never yield in my primary representation of them. Nor would I expect my colleagues to do other than the same with respect to their own districts.

But the plain facts remains, as my good friend and your trustee, Bob Crater of the Press, has told me so often—and I doubt that anyone in Cleveland would challenge it—that there are concerns which the four of us, and our four districts, do share—issues on which there is likely to be unanimity anyway. Where there is such unanimity, it could be formalized through the Caucus—and thereby enhanced.

For example, I don't think we could ever achieve a unit rule which would bind the four of us on partisan issues or matters of conscience. But there's no doubt in my mind that we could achieve a united front on those matters which affect Cleveland as a whole, if not the nation as a whole. Let me suggest a few:

The four of us would have no trouble agreeing on the need for additional federal aid for:

Cleveland crimefighting projects; for the Port of Cleveland; for cleaning up the lake and the river; for developing the two airports; for expanding the mass transit system; for modernizing mail delivery; for boosting the city's economy with public works projects; for expanding medical research in Cleveland—and other types of research; for establishing more park land along the river and more open space throughout the city; and for strengthening our cultural institutions and our institutions of higher education.

The list, as you can see, could go on and on. On these matters, Cleveland competes with other cities for federal largesse. But should the four Cleveland Congressmen compete with each other for influence with the federal bureaucracy, and for the public credit which stems from such presumed influence?

Or in a situation that is more common, should we each go our own way, ignoring or not knowing what each of us is doing to get the federal departments to help our city? I ask you: Wouldn't it be far better if the four of us were to meet together under the auspices of the Cleveland Caucus, work out a joint strategy—and then make our approach to the bureaucracy as a TEAM, either by going in person to see the federal official involved, or by shooting off a letter signed by the four of us? We could also testify as a group before committees on Capitol Hill.

It seems to me that the administration might yield to us at least now and then if we were to show them that here is a big-city Congressional delegation that has learned to work together—and that could be counted on to stick together until its goal is achieved. My friends, I can tell you from my legislative experience that four lawmakers can be four times as insistent as one lawmaker—and four times more difficult to placate.

Another thing that the Cleveland Caucus could do would be to provide a central point of contact for the legislative representative that Ralph Perk might want to send down here on the city's behalf. The Caucus would set up procedural machinery through which he could act.

And we could also work out the same sort of relationship with Herb Jolovitz, Governor Gilligan's representative in Washington. In that way, we could help Ohio in its problems with the bureaucracy, and the state could help Cleveland.

I say to you, members of the Cleveland Men's Club, in all sincerity, that if the four of us were to begin pursuing a common cause through the Cleveland Caucus, that our

people back home, looking on, might be better able to perceive that their own best interest could be served by a good dose of ecumenicism at the municipal level as well.

Frankly, I float this here as a trial balloon—for what I hope is the good of Cleveland. I have not floated the idea in advance to the members of the Cleveland Caucus, because at this time, of course no such Caucus exists. The fact is that, in my time here in Washington, there has been not even one formal meeting of the four of us. I understand no such meeting ever took place, either, before I got here—or even before Bill Minshall or Charley Vanik or Louis Stokes got here. I suppose this stems from the fact that the four of us, and our predecessors, were elected from different constituencies, not having greatly helped each other and therefore owing nothing to each other afterward. But the fact that there has been no history of partnership and collaboration needn't prevent us, in my opinion, from turning the page and starting a new chapter in our relationship.

I hope you'll agree, and I'll be happy right now to answer any of your questions. But first there is one thought that I'd like to impart to you people, as members of the Cleveland Men's Club. It seems to me, that this organization could play a role of its own in this effort. You gentlemen here all feel some loyalty to Cleveland too, or you wouldn't be here. And it occurs to me that you are spread out in various positions in the federal government, and in other organizations in Washington, where you have picked up a great deal of experience and specialized knowledge that could benefit Cleveland. I wonder whether, should the Cleveland Caucus come into being, you people could serve as a sort of informal advisory group for us—giving us the benefit of your expertise, feeding us information and, in general, encouraging us to keep going. I would suggest, if you don't mind my saying so, that you DO owe that much to the city that brought you here.—Now, thank you very much and I'll try to answer your questions.

TREATMENT OF NARCOTICS ADDICTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Post of November 9, 1971, an editorial on the District of Columbia's Narcotics Treatment Administration. In view of the controversy surrounding this program and in light of the great importance of narcotics treatment efforts, I commend this editorial to the attention of every Member of Congress:

ZEROING IN ON WASHINGTON'S DRUG PROBLEMS

In a bureaucratically short span of 21 months, Washington has made waves with its rapidly expanding anti-heroin efforts, having established and built up its Narcotics Treatment Administration into one of the nation's largest treatment programs for addicts. As we noted a month ago, NTA has moved from treating 150 addicts at its inception last year to a new reorganization and expansion plan aimed at reaching 5,500 of the city's roughly estimated 17,000 heroin addicts by next summer.

Given the proportions and complexities of heroin addiction here and elsewhere in this country, NTA's swift start has won generally

high marks in medical and law enforcement circles as an impressive initial effort to get a grip on one of the community's ugliest and least researched problems. Yet throughout this period of rapid growth, city officials have been careful to emphasize that NTA's accomplishments constitute only one part of an uncharted course toward a real solution to the ills brought on by heroin.

The operative word in this effort has been—and still is—*treatment*, for as NTA Director Dr. Robert L. DuPont has said repeatedly, his agency does not claim to be curing its thousands of patients, or even rehabilitating them to any remarkable extent. Basically, NTA's achievement has been to attract heroin addicts (three-quarters of them are volunteers) to a set of flexible treatment programs that can get them off heroin.

In the bulk of cases, it has meant getting them "on" another controversial, addictive drug: methadone. But unlike heroin, methadone does not produce a "high" when taken orally, and can allow the treated patient to work and to lead a more normal social existence if—and it's a big if—the patient has the desire and opportunity to do so. In short, NTA's objective, whether through a methadone treatment program or a straight withdrawal and abstinence plan, is to offer immediate results in stabilizing the heroin addict's chronic inability to function in a self-supportive way.

At the outset, Dr. DuPont noted, however, that any official attempt to make a dent on the heroin problem was bound to encounter misconceptions and false expectations—natural offshoots of panic over the drug problem or byproducts of the inevitable chaos in any hurry-up effort to deal with a scary situation.

For example, he warned that "methadone certainly is not a panacea. We still have the old problems of jobs, race, heroin supply and so on. This is only part of the attack. There remains the need to stop illegal drug traffic." In addition, Dr. DuPont has stressed, much more research needs to be done not only on methadone treatment over the long run, but on the results of other anti-heroin programs. To this end, NTA has been publishing regular patient performance studies.

Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, director of President Nixon's newly created special action efforts for drug abuse prevention, has praised this aspect of the local agency's work, noting in a letter to Dr. DuPont that "NTA research into the dimensions and characteristics of the heroin addiction problem in Washington has been of national importance. The steps you have taken to institute a regional registry of addicts and to coordinate treatment programs in the Baltimore-District of Columbia corridor is an example for effective drug programming . . . Moreover, in view of the clinical resources available at the NTA and throughout the Washington-Baltimore axis, the Special Action Office is developing a National Training Center in the Baltimore-Washington area." All of these encouraging findings, coupled with the reservations expressed by Dr. DuPont, lead us to believe that NTA has been a fine public investment, worthy of encouragement by the entire community.

Thus, we are puzzled by a recent television program and an accompanying editorial purporting to show that NTA has not done a good job. The program, billed as a "special report" based on a year's findings by WTOP investigator George Allen, makes much of a "confidential study which [WTOP] obtained which shows that in the eight months from August, 1970, to April, 1971, more than 5,000 people signed up with NTA, but more than 4,000 dropped out."

A little checking on this "study" proved useful in putting the whole program into perspective. According to Paul Rosenfeld, the man who wrote the document, it was not a "study," but a memorandum to Dr. DuPont

that, aside from being six months old, was meant merely to illustrate problems connected with the computer tabulation of weekly patient flow.

Thus the weekly figures on "new" patients included former patients returning for treatment in a given week, while not reflecting any "dropouts" who may not have required further treatment. "The figures by themselves don't indicate the quality of the program, anyway," said Mr. Rosenfeld, who had asked that his memo not be aired, and certainly not held up as evidence of any sensational failure on the part of NTA.

Besides, he said, "this was not research, simply an interpretation. Actually, it showed a normal pattern for a treatment program of this nature, which is not selective . . . the advantage of NTA is that it takes anybody who comes in the door, it reaches more people; but addicts are unstable human beings. Furthermore, it is not unusual to have a high dropout rate on the adolescent level. Despite all this, NTA has done an immense amount of good."

The television report also quoted Dr. DuPont as having stated, "in a written response to a WTOP question," that "only 17 per cent of patients—just under 600—had been in as long as a year." Well, again, a look at the written response showed that 17 per cent of those in treatment August 15 had been in NTA programs since before August, 1970, but that another 16 per cent had stayed in the program from between nine months and nearly a year at that point. That makes 33 per cent—or more than 1,100 patients—with good track records. And the worst attendance was for those not in methadone programs.

At any rate, without going into some of the other findings (such as the fact that some methadone patients occasionally sneak heroin on the side, or find a way to cheat on their urine tests), it is dangerous to undercut public and financial support of anti-heroin programs on the basis of certain shortcomings that the director readily acknowledges, or on the grounds that the programs are failing to convert the city's street addicts into productive, solid citizens.

Just as our police departments have never been expected to "cure" crime, a city's young efforts to cope with heroin addiction cannot be expected to "cure" 17,000 addicts, when past rehabilitation programs have failed to demonstrate spectacular progress on this score. To be sure, NTA is not a flawless operation, nor is that of the police department. But the anti-heroin effort of NTA is a serious endeavor to cope with a terribly difficult medical and social problem in this community, and ought to be handled with care by critics as well as by those who administer the program.

CONGRESS IS UNDERMINING THE POWER OF PHASE II

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, now that the Pay Board has ruled against retroactive pay raises, the House Banking and Currency Committee is on a collision course with that group.

As we all know, the committee has voted to direct the Pay Board to allow retroactively those raises forestalled by the price and wage freeze.

It is my view that the House should reject the committee's recommendation on retroactive pay increases—and that also is the view of the Detroit Free Press.

It is particularly interesting that the Detroit Free Press is backing the President on this issue because the Free Press normally is antiadministration. The Free Press sets forth its reasons for supporting the President on retroactive pay raises in an editorial published November 6, 1971. I commend a reading of this editorial to all of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

CONGRESS IS UNDERMINING THE POWER OF PHASE II

When all the overzealous dentists in Congress get through, Phase II of the Nixon economic program won't have enough teeth left to take care of the Thanksgiving turkey.

The latest bit of tooth-yanking came Thursday, when the House Banking Committee voted to direct the President and his Pay Board to allow retroactively those raises denied during the present freeze. It is fair to say, as the President did, that this will "seriously jeopardize" the attempt to enforce restraint in Phase II.

It may also be fair to say that the administration has invited this kind of intervention by waffling on its own commitment to restraint. The question of retroactivity seems to us to be a threat to the stabilization program whoever does it. How can retroactive pay raises be granted without opening up the need for compensating price increases?

If retroactive raises are granted, are retroactive price increases to be allowed? Of course not; it cannot be done. But the government would assuredly be forced to allow compensating price increases in Phase II. Profits margins are already depressed.

Phase II cannot be as rigid as the initial freeze. Some flexibility is in order, on both wages and prices.

If the program is not tough across the board, though, it will quickly breakdown. The country must escape the inflation trap it has been in over the past several years. It cannot move effectively to create new jobs if there is no wage-price stability.

Congress puts itself in a peculiar position through actions such as the House committee's. It was Congress, after all, which gave the President the power to impose controls on the economy. The Democrats dared him to use the power, thinking it a safe bluff. He called the bluff, and the freeze affords the best chance we have had in some time to restore a measure of stability.

Now, however, the Democrats are apparently unhappy with what they have wrought. They have been catching hell from their friends in the labor movement. Hence, they are trying to gum up Phase II.

We hope Congress doesn't follow that course. The Nixon economic program had its origins in the Democratic Congress, and Congress has no right to sabotage the program now. At this point, the best course for everyone is simply to try to make the program work.

Unfortunately, interest in the best course does not seem to be especially high right now among the statesmen in Congress.

HIS WAR GOES ON

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, war brings many examples of heroism, of devotion to duty, of suffering for the accepted cause.

I would like at this point to call attention to the great courage in Vietnam of

Capt. Ralph A. Sambuchi, whose mother, Mrs. Harry Sambuchi, resides in my district at 590 Willet Road, Lackawanna, N.Y.

Captain Sambuchi now is a patient at Walter Reed Army Medical Center here in the Nation's Capital. He has been hospitalized since May 18, 1969, when his unit was ambushed by the enemy.

The captain's body was riddled with bullets, shrapnel, and fire. He thought his time had come and he was left for dead by the enemy soldiers who followed up their attack. After 4 hours of suffering alone, three of his own men risked their lives to rescue him and start him on his way to his long hospitalization.

A professional soldier for 9 years, Captain Sambuchi is bitter today because he feels, as I do, that the toll in Vietnam has been so much greater for our men simply because, as he says:

The United States did not go all out to win the war. I thought before and I think now the soldiers were sold down the creek.

Mr. Speaker, we have paid a dreadful price for our operations in Vietnam. The toll of lives lost, coupled with the thousands injured in this war, many critically, is a black mark on our Nation's history.

As a part of my remarks, I include an excellent article from the Washington D.C., Evening Star of November 8 regarding the heroism and the suffering of Captain Sambuchi:

HIS WAR GOES ON
(By Michael Anders)

"The humidity was unbelievable. It was the beginning of the rainy season and we were getting ready for an inspection which never came off. I was in a sandbagged bunker and the Viet Cong started a mortar attack about 1 a.m. It was overcast. I don't know who their weather forecaster was, but they picked a good night."

Ralph A. Sambuchi sat in the middle of his hospital bed at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, his sky-blue hospital pajama top open to the waist. As he talked, he blew clouds of cigarette smoke into the antiseptic surroundings of Ward 9.

The night of May 18, 1969, is etched in the mind of Sambuchi, an Army captain who was serving with the 2nd Battalion, 35th Artillery Unit near Xuan Loc, Vietnam. That night his body was all but blown apart as an estimated three battalions of North Vietnamese Army regulars and Viet Cong rained heavy artillery fire on his unit.

Sambuchi was struck 14 times by shell fragments. A bullet from a Viet Cong rifle tore away his nose and right eye. Another severed a toe. His burning bunker caused second- and third-degree burns. And a ball of fire from a flamethrower hit him in the forehead and shaved off his hair.

THIRTY LONG MONTHS

That was nearly two years and six months ago. Now, at a time when the war in Vietnam is winding down and casualties are at their lowest in many years, Sambuchi, 29, still is recovering from the four-hour ordeal he suffered in solitary agony.

His old crewcut abandoned for long brown locks which hide the surgical scars on his forehead, he is one of many others at Walter Reed for whom the hospital is home. The war memories will never fade.

"I was giving first aid to a sergeant. I was bent over him, and he had a big shoulder wound. A lieutenant said 'Hey, you.' I stood up to look and that's when the round came in. It landed less than 10 feet away and knocked me into a corner. If I had been bending over, I probably wouldn't have got a fragment."

Sambuchi, called "Sam" by everyone, was a rugged, athletic 6-footer. Football was his sport and Rep. Robert Mathias, R-Calif., the former U.S. Olympic decathlon champion, was his idol.

Sambuchi's prowess on the football team at Lackawanna High School just outside of Buffalo, N.Y., won him an athletic scholarship to the University of Buffalo. But it was his legs which put him into the record books. His triple jump mark in track still stands in his western New York schoolboy division.

LEGS LIKE PRETZELS

"The fragments completely tore up my legs. My legs were just like two pretzels. I couldn't stand up. I said 'goddamit, I'm going to die. This is it.' When the haze cleared from my head, I was there by myself. No first aid. The guys must have thought I was dead and left."

Sambuchi said he was "extremely depressed" as he began his slow recovery. "Nobody" he recalled saying in those early dark days, "can put this body back together again and make a presentable person out of me—especially, when your face is in your lap."

"At times I felt like the guy in (the movie) 'Cat Ballou' who had the silver nose," he said. "I thought I was going to be a vegetable . . . out selling pencils."

It was during this time that Sambuchi learned to dread the one thing that could repair his disfigured body—operations and plastic surgery. Not even winning the Silver Star, the nation's third highest medal for valor, was any comfort. The hours on the operating table were lonely and many. So far, he has had 25 operations and more are scheduled.

Still sitting on his hospital bed, a paperback copy of "Patton," nearby, Sambuchi's mind went back to that night.

"A rocket hit the powder bags and set the bunker on fire. When the fire started, my legs functioned awfully good. But while I was putting the fire out, one of them shot me in the nose and it put my eye out. The first time I only thought I was dead. This time has got to be it. I thought to myself, 'What else can possibly happen?' It kept happening. An NVA soldier approached me, but figured I was dead and he shouldered his weapon. I rolled over and shot him. But when the nerve endings came back to life, I envied that corpse. He had nothing to worry about. I was bleeding from every spot you could think of."

NO SELF-PITY EVIDENT

There is no self-pity in Sambuchi's blue eyes. He can laugh easily and possess an inner strength from which springs optimism that his future has not changed drastically.

Sambuchi says he has no regrets about fighting in Vietnam. He is a career officer who loves the military. "I was a professional soldier for nine years," he said. "I was dedicated to the Army. I got a lot and I gave a lot. It was the greatest job I could have hoped for. Things come up in Vietnam that would never come up anywhere else."

But he is bitter because he believes that the United States did not go all out to win the war. "I thought before and I think now the soldiers were sold down the creek. The men weren't allowed to fight because of political hand-tying," he said.

The shot Sambuchi fired alerted the Communists and they swarmed all over the encampment. "That's when I was scariest. I thought they would realize I wasn't dead and start pumping bullets into me. My heart was in my throat. But God was with me."

"There was another fire in the bunker and I couldn't put it out. I was crawling to another bunker and I heard a rifle shot. I felt a tingling sensation but I kept going. I found out my toe was gone. I said what the hell else is going to happen. The NVA fired a flame thrower . . . the combustible material landed on top of my head, setting my hair on fire . . . and landed on my back."

Sambuchi's adoration for Dr. Harlan Thering of Walter Reed is understandable and uncontained. Dr. Thering grew Sambuchi a new nose, using skin grafted from his forehead. A blue plastic eye matches the color of his left, and today Sambuchi's physical defects are barely noticeable without a second glance.

WONDERS OF MODERN MEDICINE

Even some of his fellow patients, who knew him when he arrived there at 129 pounds, have failed to recognize him with a new face and weighing 180 pounds. "I never knew I'd be in this good shape today," he said. "It's the greatest feeling. This hospital is fantastic. You've never seen such professionals."

"I was in that bunker over four hours. Then I heard someone calling 'Sam, Sam.' Cpl. James Barker, Pfc. John Indelicato, and Sgt. Ross Clark—these kids risked their life for me. When I found out these kids didn't get a damn thing (citations), that hurt me. I was evacuated by helicopter to Long Binh Hospital about 25 to 30 miles away. At the hospital, I had two cardiac arrests and I literally died on the table."

"I kind of look forward to it now," Sambuchi said of the daily plastic surgery session. The sessions also include progress reports, a change of dressings, and what the future "battle plans" are. But most of all, Sambuchi said he looks forward "to seeing my doctor . . . just passing the time away with him. He has the greatest attitude and he is never pessimistic."

After nearly 30 months with the sprawling Walter Reed as his home, Sambuchi expects to quit the hospital in the next few months. Maybe by Christmas. Maybe by Valentine's Day. He isn't sure.

But he is positively certain of one thing. He is going into the future—a civilian when he leaves the hospital—undaunted by Vietnam. "The job possibilities are unlimited," he said, although with one eye "I have lost my depth perception" and won't be working in his vocation as a meteorologist.

However, his first plans call for him to return to college and study at the Curry School, a small institution in Milton, Mass. That, he said, is his first step towards a new life.

"I was dying. I was making a confession so maybe the old man would let me in. I was fingering my rosary of St. Christopher (which the Vatican has dropped from the liturgical calendar) and I started laughing. I said, 'Here I am dying and I've got a second-rate saint.'"

A TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR RAYMOND

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Aerospace Corp.'s board of trustees, September 10 and 11, 1971, Mr. Arthur E. Raymond, a charter trustee and one of the board's most distinguished members, retired after long and dedicated service. My pleasure in making these remarks is heightened in that Mr. Raymond is not only from my district, but is also a neighbor of mine.

As many of my colleagues will recall, the Aerospace Corp., was incorporated under the laws of the State of California June 3, 1960, to render scientific and engineering services to or for the U.S. Government. It was formed at the request of the Secretary of the Air Force to aid the U.S. Air Force in applying the full resources of modern science and technology to the problem of achieving

those continuing advances in ballistic missiles and military space systems which are basic to national security. In recent years, a portion of the corporation's high technical competence has been directed toward solutions of the Nation's civil problems.

The control, supervision, and direction of the general management of the corporation are vested in the board of trustees who are leading citizens selected from fields of industry, science, education, and public service, and who take very seriously their Aerospace trusteeship. The Board meets at least four times a year and its several committees hold additional meetings. I believe that those who have had the opportunity to become familiar with the work of Aerospace will agree with me that the company's technical and managerial accomplishments attest to the faithfulness of the board's administration of its responsibilities.

Mr. Raymond was elected to the Aerospace Corp.'s board of trustees on June 4, 1960. He brought to the board three and a half decades of engineering and administrative wisdom to help assure the advancement of space and missile systems. He joined the Douglas Aircraft Co. in 1925 not long after earning his master's degree in aeronautical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He advanced to chief engineer of Douglas in 1934, and engineering vice president in 1939. He was named senior vice president in 1958, and retired from that company in 1960. His talent has been a major force in advancing aerospace technologies from the frail "kites" of the 1920's through the long-lived DC-3 air transport plane of the 1930's, the DC-4, DC-6, and DC-7 of the 1940's and 1950's, and on to the giant airliners and powerful space boosters of the 1960's and 1970's.

In recognition of these contributions, Mr. Raymond received the U.S. Certificate of Merit for aircraft production during World War II; the Spirit of St. Louis Medal in 1954; the Daniel Guggenheim Medal in 1957; and the Sylvanus Albert Reed Award in 1964.

Mr. Raymond's service to the Nation was again recognized on the occasion of his retirement as an Aerospace Trustee when the Secretary of the Air Force awarded him the U.S. Air Force Exceptional Service Award, its highest civilian award. The accompanying citation reads as follows:

Mr. Arthur E. Raymond distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious public service as a charter member of The Aerospace Corporation's Board of Trustees, charter member of the Board's Executive Committee from June 1960 to July 1971, and as a member of the Board's Compensation Committee from October 1964 to July 1971, and its chairman since September 1969. He also served as the chairman of the Board's Space Systems Committee for the seven year appraisal of The Aerospace Corporation which was published in 1968. During this period, Mr. Raymond devoted himself to the furtherance of the Corporation's role in aiding the United States Air Force in applying the full resources of modern science and technology to the problems of achieving those continuing advances in ballistic missile and military space systems which are basic to national security. His efforts constitute an unusually outstanding contribution by a civilian in support of the Air Force's participation in the national

defense and space programs, thereby reflecting great credit upon himself and earning for him the sincere gratitude of the United States Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my own congratulations to this gentleman for his distinguished service and to send every good wish for the future. The Nation is fortunate to have men such as Arthur Raymond serve in these important capacities.

FIGHTING FOR 21

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to share with my colleagues in the House a letter which appeared in the Piggy-Back Shopper on October 28, 1971. The article was authored by Sgt. Harold D. Updike, of Fallsington, Bucks County, Pa.:

FIGHTING FOR 21

Just imagine, most of the guys over here are 20, and fighting to make 21. The average man in most units is 20, and what a man! A pink-cheeked, tousled-haired, tight-muscled fellow, who under normal circumstances, would be considered by society, half-man, half-boy, still wet behind the ears, and a pain in the unemployment chart.

But here and now, he is the beardless hope of free man. He is for the most part unmarried and without material possessions, except for an old car at home and a transistor radio here. He listens to rock 'n roll, 105 millimeter howitzers, and the laughter and screams of his buddies.

He is out of high school with so-so grades, played a little football and had a girl who promised to be true. He has learned to drink beer, 'cause it is cold and the "in" thing to do.

He is a PFC, a one-year military veteran with one or possibly two years to go. He never cared for work, preferred to wax his car to washing Dad's. But now is working or fighting from dawn to dusk or often longer.

He still has trouble spelling, and writing letters home is a painful process, but he can break down his rifle in 30 seconds and put it back together in 29. He can describe the nomenclature of a "frag," explain how a machine gun operates, and use either if the need arises. He can dig a foxhole, apply first aid to a wounded companion, march until told to stop, or stop until told to march. He has seen more suffering than he should have in his short life. He has stood among hills of bodies, and he has helped to build those hills. He has wept in private and in public, and not been ashamed at doing either, because his pals have fallen in battle and he has come close to joining them. He has become self-sufficient. He gets clean clothes once a week, and shave and shower twice a month or at every stream. He sometimes forgets to clean his teeth but never his rifle. He keeps his socks dry, his canteens full, cooks his own meals, fixes his own hurts and mends his own rips, both material and mental. He will share his water, if you thirst, break his rations in half, if you hunger, and split his ammo if you are fighting for your life.

He can do the work of two civilians, draw half the pay of one, and see the ironic humor in it all. He has learned to use his hands as weapons, and his weapons as hands. He can save a life or most assuredly take one. He's 20, a veteran, fighting to make 21 . . . give him a chance, he's your son.

TITO'S RISE TO POWER

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, I spoke on the House floor about what I felt were some misrepresentations in CBS commentator Walter Cronkite's interview of Yugoslav President Tito. My objective in these remarks was to clarify the opening statements in which Tito was introduced as the last leader alive among those who helped to bring about the Allied victory in World War II. I felt that there were other considerations which should have been brought into the picture and facts in Tito's rise to power which needed to be presented to the American public.

Mr. Cronkite saw fit to respond and because I feel the public interest will be served by making public his letter and an elaboration of my own position, I insert Mr. Cronkite's letter at this point in the RECORD, followed by additional comments of my own:

CBS News,

New York, N.Y., October 29, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAKER: I noted your remarks, as extended, in the October 27th Congressional Record regarding my characterization of President Tito of Yugoslavia. The thrust of your statement seemed to be that I did not properly identify him as the Communist he is.

May I suggest that perhaps you missed this paragraph in my six-paragraph introduction of our interview:

"Today he still demonstrates the self-assurance, the self-confidence, the strength of purpose and the candor that enabled him, a Moscow-trained Communist, to proclaim, even as his partisans battled the Germans in the thick of World War II, that he had no intention of returning his country to its king."

I know that you would not intentionally have ignored such a clear delineation of President Tito's past and, since your statement and remarks clearly were based on misconception, I know, too, that you are going to want to correct the record.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER CRONKITE.

Perhaps I failed to realize the full thrust of Mr. Cronkite's statement that Tito was a Moscow-trained Communist. However, since Mr. Cronkite is aware of this detail, I am certain that he would be interested in and agree to the fact that Tito is an example of the purest form of Marxian communism and a man who massacred hundreds of thousands to establish his power. This is what needs to be brought out more completely and this was my intention in my remarks of October 27 and also today.

Many are at present labeling Tito as a daring statesman, a teacher of diplomats, a man possessed of integrity, strength, and dedication. But dedication to what? Certainly he was pledged to his own ambitions, to the establishment of a dictatorship. However, this does not make him a contributor to the allied effort in World War II because his commitment was not the same as that of men such as Eisenhower and Roosevelt.

Tito, with Russian assistance organized his partisans—the so-called Liberation Front—amidst confusion. At

first, many were fooled into thinking his aim at the German occupation would help their country. However, all too soon, they realized that he intended to use this to achieve his own ends. He manipulated anti-Nazi sentiment repeatedly to rid himself of anti-Communist elements among the population. Just as Stalin in his purges, Tito realized that he would not succeed unless he destroyed his opponents.

He discredited such men as Mihajlovic, branding them as collaborators with the Germans. Unfortunately, the Allies failed to see this cover tactic for what it was.

Tito succeeded in confusing the issue so completely that in 1944, over 12,000 Slovenian Domobranci—Home Guards—were repatriated to Yugoslavia only to be promptly executed—thrown into mass graves. This is nothing compared to the other numbers of Serbs and Croats who were also massacred. Is this a man to dignify to such an extent?

Places such as Celje and St. Vid near Ljubljana were saturated with the blood of those who sought to fight tyranny. Too late was this move recognized for what it was. There are eye witnesses alive today in the United States to testify to these facts—to astonish us with accounts of these atrocities.

Certainly, Tito was clever as a politician who capitalized on the chaos of the times. But whether or not we choose to admit it, his independent communism is no different in essence from that of the Russians and his atrocities are no less unbelievable than those of the Germans against the Jewish people.

Even today, his heart is with world communism while his empty pockets are with us here in the United States. Over the years many men have given their lives in an effort to bring peace and democracy to the peoples of the world. We owe something to these. Have we sunk so far that the future of the United States depends on close friendship and cooperation with such a man? Must we support economically a regime created in such a manner?

Yugoslavia today does enjoy some measure of economic prosperity but the traces of dictatorship linger. People do not feel free to express themselves and act as they please. There have been many examples of what would occur if one was not careful to remain silent.

The Yugoslavs were a people who believed that communism could never engulf them. Americans today feel that they have some sort of a talisman to protect them from a similar occurrence. However, can we afford to be so blind to reality?

I believe that there is a strong need to emphasize this point and I am sure that Mr. Cronkite would agree with me. Too long have we courted these nonaligned countries on the premise that they could be won over to our side. But we cannot be so foolish—their stature and makeup prevents this. Is it not time that Americans as well as the rest of the world learn from past mistakes so that they will not happen again?

My only concern in commenting on the original interview was the fact that too often these facts are smoothed over. The past is often ignored in light of present

expediency. My intention is simply to bring some of these facts to the attention of the American people.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VIOLENCE REPORT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington's newspapers report the continuing deterioration of law, order, and morality in the Nation's Capital.

The Washington Daily News reveals that rape has accelerated to a rate of one every 12 hours. A veteran officer on the District's sex squad claims that nearly half of the rapes committed go unreported because the woman is too embarrassed to face the police or to have her case publicized.

An account in another Washington paper indicates that behavior problems are so critical on buses transporting students that some drivers have refused to work unless there is another adult on the bus. An assistant District of Columbia school superintendent has requested 35 nonprofessional aides at \$115,000 to help keep order on the buses. Earlier this year I pointed out that District school officials were seeking additional policemen to augment the 40 already assigned to the schools because of robberies and shootings.

The long-suffering, law-abiding taxpayers are asked to pay for additional policemen and now for busers' aides in an effort to curb the lawless element.

What is the answer to this crime problem? More laws are not the answer when laws on the books are not enforced. Additional massive grants of tax dollars for social programs accomplish nothing. Criminals must be punished or anarchy prevails. How much longer must the people suffer before our liberal friends admit their failures.

I insert two pertinent newsclippings at this point in my remarks:

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 10, 1971]

RAPE PACE HERE: ONE EACH 12 HOURS

(By Patrick Collins and Louise Lague)

Every 12 hours a woman is raped here and the frequency of attacks has startled police, frightened women and puzzled psychologists.

In the District, the number of reported rapes has climbed significantly and three of the city's suburban police departments say that the number of rapes in their jurisdictions have already equalled or passed last year's total.

RESPONSES

Officials have responded to the rash of rapes in different ways:

The District police have begun a concentrated program to counsel Georgetown girls on how to ward off rapists.

After three girl hitchhikers were raped last week-end, Montgomery police officials said they could no longer guarantee the safety of the estimated 200 girls who solicit rides on county roads each day.

Prince Georges police have enlisted the aid of a clinical psychologist to help them "better understand the rapist and his technique."

Government officials and private offices have moved to lock doors leading to women's washrooms.

Campus security forces have increased security patrols around women's dorms and in some cases have provided an escort service for girls after dark.

These are just a few of the repercussions of the rising rape rate uncovered in a study of the crime by The Washington Daily News.

The News study shows:

Individual women have become concerned that they themselves might be raped and are thus becoming concerned with how the victims of the crime are treated by police and hospitals.

That most rapes are committed between the hours of 8 p.m. and midnight by men aged 17 to 20 who have developed some subconscious hostility toward women.

Rape is sometimes used to terrorize and embarrass women into failing to report a burglary or robbery to the police.

More often than not, a rapist is middle class man who is perfectly normal until, according to one psychologist, he gets the urge to rape and then "becomes a werewolf."

So far this year, the District has reported 97 more rapes than last year's total of 313; Montgomery county has nine more than the 28 rapes it recorded last year; Alexandria has logged eight more rapes than the 39 it reported last year and Arlington has matched last year's total of 23.

Last April Police Chief Jerry Wilson directed all policemen to include all complaints of rapes in the monthly crime reports and in the periodic crime reports to the FBI. Before the chief's order the police reported rapes only after the U.S. Attorney's office reviewed the case and decided there was enough evidence to take it to trial.

The police point to the new reporting technique in explaining away the increase in rape in April thru September. They say that since the new reporting system began, 90 rape cases have been dropped by the U.S. Attorney's office for lack of evidence.

However, an examination of the rape statistics shows that the increase in reported rapes for January, February and March (the three months before the new reporting system) was as great if not greater than the months following the change in rape reports.

And police agree that even tho the U.S. Attorney may decide not to take the case to trial does not necessarily mean no rape was committed.

"Oh, we have more rapes this year," a spokesman for the sex squad said, "But I just don't think the increase has been as great as the statistics indicate . . . We have more because the women take more chances . . . And those mini skirts and filthy movies don't help it any . . ."

"A rapist is an opportunist and when the situation presents itself he takes advantage of it. They do it for a lot of reasons, but most rapists do it because they hate women—most of the time it's their wife or mother—and they want to get back at them. He wants to show his superiority so he takes it out on women."

PSYCHOLOGIST

Sheldon Freud, a clinical psychologist who is helping the Prince Georges County police explore the rape problem, agrees with the sex squad's characterization of a rapist. "They have a basic hostility for females of any age—it doesn't matter whether the woman is 70 years old or 25 years old every woman is a potential rape victim."

"The rapist is a severely disturbed person," Dr. Freud said. "And most often he has repressed a hostility for women, not necessarily a hatred for his mother but maybe an unfortunate love experience. Normally, the rapist is a pretty good guy, but when this hostility builds up he acts very much like

a werewolf and once he starts moving nothing will stop him."

Dr. Freud says that a rapist does not derive any pleasure from the act of intercourse, but from the panic he provokes in the victim. "Rape is the thing a woman is scared of most, so that's what he does. And he gets an internal orgasm of pleasure knowing that he has fulfilled his destructive need."

DIRTY BOOKS

Dirty books or obscene magazines rarely affect the rapist, Dr. Freud says, because they get no satisfaction out of "watching some one else do something . . . In fact they don't get an erection until they actually have confronted the frightened woman. The rapist likes to reduce women to their most menial role. He likes to scare them and only he knows how far he will go to produce the fear, but most of them are capable of murder."

The increase in the number of rapes, according to Dr. Freud, is a result of a series of breakdowns within the social structure.

"Before World War II we had a Victorian attitude toward women," Dr. Freud said. "It was an unthought of act to strike a woman. But then came a general disregard for natural law and coupled with that came a period of women's liberation where they became more involved in politics and took on important jobs. And the women told us 'We are no better than you.' These factors along with the current women's liberation movement have created a great change in the respect of man for woman and have provoked a certain hostility toward women."

Dr. Freud says the rapist is generally middle class because "the freedom in the upper class and lower classes provide other ways for release of rapist hostility. It is the frustrated middle class man who is the rapist. The man who reaches the dead end and feels a need to release his anxiety. And when he attacks . . . he is a very dangerous man."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1971]

SCHOOL BUS DISORDER BRINGS CALL FOR AID

Behavior problems are so severe on buses carrying Washington students to school that some drivers have refused to work unless there is another adult on the bus, an assistant D.C. school superintendent said last night.

"There is a need to keep discipline on the buses," declared Assistant Supt. Harris M. Taylor, as he asked a school board committee to approve spending \$115,000 to hire 35 non-professional aides.

About 1,000 youngsters, most from Anacostia, ride the buses each day to elementary schools with extra space, many of them west of Rock Creek Park.

Supt. Hugh Scott has asked for another \$362,000 to operate and service the buses, which also are used for field trips.

The crosstown busing, which is voluntary, was ordered several years ago by U.S. Judge J. Skelly Wright.

The request for busing money is part of the superintendent's proposal for spending \$9.5 million in federal impact aid, allotted on the basis of the number of city students whose parents work for the federal government. Last night committee members questioned administrators closely about which schools would get the extra services under the proposal.

MAST IS A MUST

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, too much of the time Americans think of

the armed services as simply the troops which are constantly on alert to defend our country.

Actually all branches of the armed services are engaged in research and in cooperative endeavors with civilian units which provide answers for civilian needs other than the bearing of arms to protect our shores.

As an example of this activity, we can point to the project known as MAST—Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic—which has operated on a test basis since July 15, 1970, and now includes areas around five Army and Air Force installations.

One of the MAST programs is located in my home city of San Antonio, and it has been so successful there that the city council has asked the service be carried on "indefinitely."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my other colleagues in the House an article which appears in the November 1971 issue of Armed Forces Journal entitled "Military Invades Civil Domain with MAST" which gives an excellent account of the success of the program.

MILITARY INVADES CIVIL DOMAIN WITH MAST

(By George Weiss)

Invasion of the civil domain by the military, usually strongly resented by the American people, has existed in five areas of the United States on a continuing basis over the past 16 months. Instead of protests, demonstrations, or litigation there have been letters of praise and appreciation.

If there has been any grumbling most of it has come from areas within the military. Suddenly the Services find themselves involved in a project with a growth potential which caused one physician interviewed by The Journal to comment, "I don't think they [the military] could get out now if they wanted to."

The project is MAST (Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic), which has operated on a test basis since 15 July 1970 and now includes areas around five Army and Air Force installations.

In each area military helicopters and medics have been made available to assist civilian authorities. They are on call for a medical emergency which can be handled by no other means.

From the inception of the program through 10 October 1971, the Air Force and Army have responded to a variety of calls ranging from highway accidents to heart attack victims in remote areas. They have flown 681 humanitarian missions to bring 881 persons to hospitals or performed emergency transfers of patients needing specialized care.

LCol William H. Smith, who monitors the project within DOMS (Directorate of Military Support) for the Department of Defense, sees it this way: "The Services learned to save lives in Vietnam with helicopters and immediate medical treatment. We have just been asked to put it to use at home."

Dr. Raymond Moore of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who until recently was the HEW coordinator for MAST, sees the program as a great aid to small-town doctors who "can get emergency cases to more definitive care quickly."

The project, in fact, has uncovered a need for inter-hospital transfers little suspected when it began. Many accident cases in rural areas need to be stabilized by local physicians and then rapidly and smoothly moved to specialized hospital facilities. In many cases this could not previously be done because of the trauma of a long or rough road trip. MAST has provided fast, smooth transportation for such cases on a request basis.

One HEW official estimated that up to 70% of the patients moved by MAST helicopters have been emergency inter-hospital transfers.

Over the Labor Day weekend, one MAST unit responded to five emergency calls. Only one of them involved a highway accident. The other four were to move a burn victim and three persons with critical internal injuries from various rural area hospitals where they had been stabilized to larger hospitals where they could receive specialized treatment.

One of the best examples of the MAST program capabilities occurred 11 September, when a school bus loaded with members of the Gunnison, Colo., junior varsity football team overturned near Salida, Colo., with 48 passengers aboard. Nine of the students died in the crash and many were seriously injured. Local ambulance and medical facilities were immediately overloaded. The local sheriff placed a call for MAST and three helicopters from the 78th Medical Detachment (Air Ambulance) were dispatched from Ft. Carson, arriving in a little over an hour at the small-town hospital. At the request of the local medical authorities 15 patients needing specialized medical care were loaded and dispatched on the MAST helicopters for St. Luke's Hospital in Denver.

En route, the medics made an evaluation of the specialized care each patient would require and the emergency equipment needed immediately upon arrival. The helicopter pilots were unable to establish air-to-ground communications as they flew through the Rockies between Salida and Denver, but a United Airlines captain and the pilot of a MAC C-5A overheard their MAST call sign and volunteered to act as airborne radio relay platforms.

An Army medic was credited with saving the life of one patient by giving him constant mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and suction to draw blood from his throat and lungs.

As a result of the interaction by the Salida physicians, MAST, a passing airliner, and a C-5A, hospital attendants at St. Luke's were waiting to receive the patients and begin immediate treatment.

Another plus for the MAST program has been that, in addition to rapid transportation of accident and other emergency cases, military hospital corpsmen are, on the whole, better trained than the average (and sometimes nonexistent) ambulance attendant. The military helicopters in most cases are also better equipped to handle emergencies than the average ambulance outside of an urban area.

As it was stated by one person interviewed at HEW, "MAST is providing medical care now to persons who otherwise would not be receiving it [before death]."

HEW declined to estimate the number of lives saved in the first 15 months of operation by the MAST experiment, saying, "There is no way to make an accurate estimate."

MAST's beginnings have a long and detailed history, but there is little or no evidence as to who originated the idea. One prime mover in the project was Capt. John M. Waters, USCG, who served in the Department of Transportation's Emergency Medical Programs. It is said that Captain Waters pressed for the program three years before his suggestion finally reached the desk of Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird.

As a Congressman, Secretary Laird had been a member of the House Appropriations Committee and ranking member on the Health, Education and Welfare Committee. He recalled, during the public announcement of the MAST test program, that he had once written into a report a suggestion that "the federal government go forward with such a program."

The Army received the DoT proposal from Secretary Laird in August 1969 and reported back that such a program "might be possible."

GETTING STARTED

Secretary Laird then wrote to Secretaries Robert H. Finch of HEW, Walter J. Hickel of Interior, and John A. Volpe of Transportation, as well as to Attorney General John M. Mitchell and George A. Lincoln of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, to say that DoD had examined the proposal and that "the concept has merit and warrants further study and participation by other federal agencies." He requested that an Interagency Planning Group be formed to discuss the "legal status of the use of military resources and the responsibilities of state, local and federal agencies."

In December 1969 the first meeting of the interagency ad hoc study group was held, with all agencies represented.

The decision was made to explore the MAST concept through a demonstration program at some military base during the spring or summer of 1970.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

There were groans from those in the military who foresaw a potential situation which could affect them in several ways. While trained medical technicians, pilots, and helicopters are available, they are engaged in national defense training and operations, and Congress appropriates money for that purpose—not for a far-reaching domestic program such as MAST.

Where could the military cut off such assistance once it began? Military hospital staffs and helicopters available for such tasks are planned and allotted for the estimated needs of military posts and air bases, not for an entire civilian community.

There were also legal implications. What was the military liability if a helicopter crashed while transporting a civilian to a hospital? Could a specialist 4th class be sued for malpractice if the patient he treated died? Could the government be sued if a military base refused to order a mission for one or more reasons once summoned by competent authority?

There were many complexities which had to be considered. One which everyone knew would appear was the opposition of commercial ambulance companies, which would recognize MAST as unfair competition.

In addition, there was an underlying fear among military representatives that the program might be misunderstood. Invasion of the civilian domain by the military, unfair competition, illegal medical practice, and an overall expectation that the services would be available throughout the nation, if successful, were only part of the problem. What might be involved when a helicopter or medical unit was ordered out of the local operating area or to an overseas area? Military units could not become dedicated to a particular area, since they are subject to periodic reorganization, transfers, and training operations. Political pressure might force them into difficult positions.

THE NEED FOR MAST

Each year more than 50,000 Americans die in highway accidents, a quarter of a million are permanently injured, and two million persons receive lesser injuries, according to national statistics.

A paper written by two members of the Emergency Medical Services Division of the National Highway Safety Bureau, Department of Transportation, states that many ambulances responding to emergencies are ill equipped to handle serious trauma and are manned by poorly trained attendants, primarily due to the precarious economic situation of most ambulance operators, low pay of personnel, and rapid employee turnover. Moreover, low-population rural areas are even harder hit, since they cannot support an ambulance service and have to rely on an urban ambulance system which may have to travel long distances to reach the scene.

The Department of Transportation pointed out that a multi-million-dollar rescue operation is available to any offshore boatman through the Coast Guard, while inland any private pilot down or in trouble has the rescue facilities of the combined Air Force and Civil Air Patrol to locate, rescue, and care for his injuries until he can be brought to a hospital. But that same service available to a boatman or airman is not available if they have a hunting or auto accident in the same general area.

The truth is that the Armed Forces have always extended a helping hand to civilian rescue agencies in the event of an emergency such as a flood, storm, tornado, or similar disaster. It is also true that in most areas no agreements exist between the military and local civilian authorities for assistance in the event of highway accidents. Moreover, there is a lack of common communications facilities which would enable the two organizations to communicate.

Other communications problems are more easily understood. A phone call for an ambulance to proceed to a location "half a mile south of the Old Black Place on State Highway 5" may mean something locally, but very little to a military helicopter pilot whose familiarity with the area is best expressed in map coordinates.

The appalling death and injury rate on U.S. highways is not decreasing, but is growing, along with the population and numbers of vehicles in operation. A new problem is also injecting itself into the highway situation: Many of today's superhighways find bumper-to-bumper traffic during rush hours at speeds in the 70-mile-per-hour range. The two-car accident is fast becoming an urban rarity—it isn't uncommon today to find up to half a dozen vehicles involved in a single accident. It takes 50 or more cars in a single wreck to make national news today, and the number of victims in one accident can resemble a small-scale combat operation.

If nothing else, Korea and Vietnam proved the effectiveness of the helicopter as a rescue vehicle. Combat casualties evacuated are said to have a death rate of about 2%. At the very outset it would appear that a similar program made available to U.S. accident victims would save thousands of lives a year.

The only problem is that a similar civilian rescue service is currently beyond the reach of most state and municipal governments. Comparable commercial services are still few and far between and have had economic problems since the cost of operation is naturally high and collection sometimes difficult.

Another limiting facet of a comparable helicopter ambulance service is the need for an accompanying doctor or nurse skilled in emergency treatment of serious wounds.

Recognition of the military hospital corpsman as a skilled technician capable of performing efficiently in areas of his training is now generally accepted. Most Americans have actually witnessed corpsmen working swiftly and competently on the Vietnam battlefields via their home TV screens.

The first pilot project was established at San Antonio, Tex.—chosen, in part, because of the excellent military-civilian relationship that has existed over the years. To get the project underway, on 15 July 1970 in the Alamo Area Council of Governments, which takes in 10 counties around the city, a civilian committee headed by Bernard Rappoport of San Antonio began to work out the details to assure a smooth integration of the operation.

The military organization selected to provide support was the 507th Medical Company (Air Ambulance), located at Ft Sam Houston.

On 6 August two more sites were activated. Locations were West Central Washington state, supported by the Air Cavalry Troop, 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment, Ft Lewis, and Colorado Springs, supported first by the 283rd Aviation Company, 43rd Group, 4th Infantry

Division (Mechanized), Ft Carson, Colo., and now by the 78th Medical Detachment. (Helicopter Ambulance).

Two final projects were established at Phoenix, Ariz., and Mountain Home, Idaho. Both of these were supported by local detachments of the 42nd Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron, Hamilton AFB, Calif.

The 507th Medical Company (Air Ambulance) has been the most used of all the MAST participating organizations and the two USAF units the least called on. All Air Force spokesman explained to The Journal that the Air Force accepted the mission with the understanding that it would provide requested assistance during normal duty hours and only when there was no interference with their normal detachment duties, which are operational and not training.

After a year in test, however, the Air Force agreed to increase its participation by augmenting the Air Rescue detachments at Luke AFB and Mountain Home AFB, giving each enough aircraft and personnel to provide 24-hour, seven-days-a-week alert. According to one source, police and highway patrolmen in each area were reluctant to call on the Air Force helicopters since they knew the crews were not always on duty. The Air Force points out that rescue has always been a mission of AERS and that the Air Force has never refused a MAST mission when contacted for any reason.

The Air Force HH-43 helicopters are primarily for rescue of air crews and are short-ranged. The Army's UH-1H Hueys are larger, faster, and carry more people. The Army tries to hold missions to within 100 miles of a post and the Air Force to 75 miles. Both ranges are based on the nonrefueled radius of the different helicopters. Missions of greater range can be flown, but they may require fuel stops, which limits their effectiveness.

FUTURE?

By 1 December 1971 Secretary Laird will have on his desk a Service recommendation on future participation in the MAST project. The report will primarily cover such items as the practicality of helicopter operations in rural and urban areas of the nation, cost effectiveness, and other problems of an operational nature. But one of the big unanswered questions to be addressed is: can the military save lives, and can it do the job more economically than a similar civilian organization?

Two other effects are likely to result from any expansion of helicopter rescue services, in the opinion of Defense observers. If MAST is broadened and continued as a mission of the Services, the reserve components surely will be involved, they say. According to LGen. W. R. Peers, Chief of Army Reserve Components, the Army National Guard and Reserves will have 1,800 modern helicopters in FY 72 and 2,300 in FY 73. This represents a massive capability which must be reckoned in any MAST calculations. If the Services get out of the business and the civil sector of government gets in, says DoD, the result could be a shot in the arm for the ailing helicopter industry (Journal 13 June 1970).

Whatever the DoD findings, there is a definite opinion in San Antonio: Shortly before the program was extended to December of this year, the City Council of San Antonio adopted a resolution requesting that the service be carried on "indefinitely."

MISLEADING SCIENTISTS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the scientific community

has increasingly taken sides in the controversy surrounding a number of public issues—notably that of the ABM and the SST. It has long appeared to me that the opinions of many of the scientist-opponents of the ABM and the SST were clouded with emotional bias. On Monday, November 8, 1971, columnist Joseph Alsop cited an investigation made by a panel of the Operations Research Society of America which bears out my view. I call the attention of my colleagues to this column, since the views of the scientific community have of late had such a heavy bearing on issues being decided in the Congress. The column follows:

MISLEADING SCIENTISTS

(By Joseph Alsop)

The clamor surrounding the underground nuclear test at Amchitka is a very good reason for offering an extremely solemn warning. On such occasions, a great deal of the more leftwing "scientific" evidence must now be expected to be as crooked as a ram's horn.

Some attention has already been given to the so-called ORSA report that contains the proofs of the foregoing extremely grave statement. But no one has even begun to grasp the full seriousness of this solid, stolid, unimpeachably factual report. So it deserves re-examination.

ORSA, in brief, is the Operations Research Society of America, with a membership of about 8,000 scientists doing defense and industrial research and analysis. One of the society's stated original aims was to establish uniform standards and guidelines for this new and growing branch of research.

Hence, the society was interested when one of its members, Dr. Albert Wohlstetter of the University of Chicago, asked for a panel to judge the standards of research and analysis displayed in the bitter debate about the "Safeguard" antiballistic-missile system in the Senate in 1969. Essentially that meant a panel to judge between ABM supporters like Dr. Wohlstetter, and its chief scientific opponents, such as the new president of MIT, Dr. Jerome Weisner, and Drs. George Rathjens and Stephen Weinberg.

The ABM opponents were invited to make any contribution they chose, and also to nominate a member of the proposed panel. They haughtily refused to have anything to do with the inquiry. And they added a wholly groundless charge that the inquiry "could well appear to the nation as an ugly resurgence" of McCarthyism—but they ducked using the actual word.

A six-man panel of industrial and academic scientists was none the less formed, under the leadership of Thomas E. Caywood, past president of ORSA. The panel included men who had opposed the ABM in 1969, as well as men who had been for it. At least one former panel member, Dr. Howard M. Berger, of Xerox, "still hasn't made up his mind."

The results were devastating. "Analyses" that were "often inappropriate, misleading, or factually in error"; failure to meet "elementary standards for proper presentation of results to permit verification"; failure to "distinguish properly between the roles of analyst and advocate"—these were the main phrases in the summary of findings.

Dr. Rathjens was held guilty of "specific abuses of professional standards" in the ABM debate. He was further condemned for selecting his material in a most peculiar manner, mostly by omitting "data (that) would have substantially weakened his case". Other highly partisan inaccuracies were also found in his ABM testimony and in his subsequent exchanges with Dr. Wohlstetter.

Drs. Weisner and Weinberg were found to have "ascribed official validity" to calcula-

tions which had no such validity. They were further found to have made extremely nasty false charges against the chief scientist of the Defense Department, Dr. John S. Foster.

Drs. Weisner, Rathjens and Weinberg were jointly held to have been guilty of "misuse of source material" in the study of the ABM in a critique of the Pentagon's ABM position that was circulated by Senator Edward Kennedy. The same "misuse" was also found in the work done for Senator Kennedy by Dr. Weisner and ABM charges throughout the ORSA report.

Thus placed in the dock and found guilty and crooking the evidence and purposeful prevarication, the anti-ABM scientists finally condescended to notice ORSA more seriously. They issued a reply, admitting some mistakes, yet claiming they were right about what mattered. To this Dr. Rathjens added the charge that the neutral panel member, Dr. Herbert Berger, secretly harbored personal animus against himself.

To this charge, Dr. Berger has now replied, in effect, that Dr. Rathjens is again prevaricating, and again, Dr. Berger's evidence is solid, stolid and unimpeachably factual, like the ORSA report itself. No open-minded person can fail to read either report without concluding it is all too true, both in detail and in broad outline.

It needs only to be added that the supposed "mistakes" proven in the report were at the very heart of the ABM debate. In sum, warning.

HAYS GETS THINGS DONE

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, for more than two decades, the House of Representatives has enjoyed the mercurial outspoken opinions of Congressman WAYNE HAYS of Ohio and today the Evening Star has joined Congress in its evaluation of WAYNE HAYS—a Congressman who gets things done. The Star does not endorse all of his statements but it does write of his courage and dedication toward getting things done as effectively and efficiently as possible, regardless of whose toes are stepped on.

I include in the RECORD the attached article appearing in the Washington Evening Star of November 10, 1971, commending the efforts of WAYNE HAYS to improve our Congress:

HAYS GETS THINGS DONE AROUND THE HOUSE

(By Shirley Elder)

Wayne Hays describes himself as a man who abhors waste, sloth, inefficiency, errant behavior of any kind. "All my life," he says, "I've had a drive to get things done."

Now, after 22 years as a Democratic congressman from Belmont County, Ohio, the 60-year-old Hays is in a unique position to get things done around the House of Representatives, and he is tackling the job with a vengeance. He is chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Never before has the Administration Committee been a very prestigious assignment. Under many of Hays' predecessors, it merely ratified decisions made by others. House rules describe its duties as policy-making.

TAKES CONTROL

But under Hays, the committee—or, more accurately, Hays himself—is well on the way towards taking over actual operations of an

incredible array of Capitol activities. Hays has, for instance:

Raised the price of the formerly-bargain-rate haircuts in House barbershops from 75 cents to \$2.

Removed jump-seats for operators from elevators, and ordered operators not to read on the job.

Ordered linen cloths taken off the tables in the staff dining room, and converted a basement cafeteria into a carry-out.

Tried and failed, under pressure from colleagues, to eliminate breakfast service in the members dining room.

Audited restaurant finances, collected thousands of dollars from congressmen who ran up bills, and caught (with the aid of Pinkerton men) a cashier who was accused of stealing as much as \$100 a day.

Took over authority, with House approval, to increase fringe benefits for congressmen without having to go back to the House (and thus into the public view) for a vote each time. These fringes include paid trips home, stationery allowances, telephone services and office staff money.

Set aside one of the three Capitol elevators from the Rayburn Building subway for members only.

Established a firm limit of six telephone lines for each congressional office (such decisions had been left up to a staff member in the office of Clerk W. Pat Jennings, Hays said, and varied according to the whim of the staffer).

And, perhaps most significant, in a resolution adopted yesterday with no objections from the handful of House members on hand, Hays moved to run the House's IBM 360-50 computer now under Jennings command. The resolution gives the Hays committee \$1.5 million to set up and staff a Computer Service Center.

The computer program is only the most recent Hays move; it certainly is not the last.

Just last week, he signed a contract to begin installing an electronic voting system in the House chamber.

And he is actively involved in an effort to clean up House restaurant kitchens so they are as spick and span as the Senate's.

STEPS ON TOES

Hays' path has not been smooth. He has, in fact, repeatedly stepped on the toes of those who think they should be running things, such as Jennings and Capitol Architect George White, who supervises restaurants and elevators, and Doorkeeper Fishbait Miller, whose office is in charge of the army of patronage jobs and, among other things, the barbershops.

Hays has an unsettling style of direct action. If he sees something he doesn't like he summons the offender, or his boss, into his private office on the third floor of the Capitol and chews him out.

He is said to remind minor functionaries around the House that he, Hays, is the man who signs their paychecks. Little things often command his attention. For instance, he ordered name plates for elevator operators after one refused to identify himself to Hays. Now, Hays said, if an operator misbehaves, his name can easily be jotted down.

"The guy's a bully," one colleague said bluntly of Hays the other day. "A tyrant. This is not a happy situation."

But even Hays critics are forced to admit that under his scrutiny restaurant deficits have been reduced and, in some cases, eliminated. Haircut charges have been placed on a more businesslike basis. Instead of barbers pocketing the 75 cents plus tip, they now split the \$2 half and half with the House contingency fund.

The computer, a sophisticated machine rented for \$42,000 a month, has been operated by Jennings' office at something like 10 percent of its capacity.

By moving in and taking it over, Hays

promises to develop a data retrieval system that could make the legislative history of every bill instantly available to members, while simultaneously handling House book-keeping operations such as payroll and inventory.

NOT SEEKING FRIENDS

Hays is not disturbed over reports that some people are unhappy with his actions. "I didn't come to Washington to win friends and influence people, just to influence people," he says. "Congress does a lot of talking about economy but it must start at home."

Hays has never been known as a jovial fellow. His role on the House floor often is that of a heckler, a needler. When GOP Leader Gerald R. Ford once raised the threat of a presidential veto of an appropriations bill to keep several federal agencies going, Hays said:

"I do not think he would dare because . . . what if he closed the government down and the people found they could get along without it?"

He seldom really smiles. The comments are delivered deadpan, often angrily. Persons he doesn't quite approve of are referred to as "that character" or addressed as "you people."

HE CRACKLES

Hays does not give long thoughtful speeches on the issues of the day. He takes quick verbal swipes at those he thinks are ridiculous or wrong. One observer once said Hays' anger has a certain splendor: "He snaps and crackles and flashes. If you are safe, it is pleasant to behold—like a summer electrical storm."

He has, at one time or the other, been mad at Castro, Zsa Zsa Gabor, the late Secretary John Foster Dulles, Reps. Otto Passman and H. R. Gross, everyone in the State Department, Madame Nhu, Stokely Carmichael, all liberals, President Eisenhower, President Nixon, Arthur Goldberg and Adam Clayton Powell.

It was Hays who prepared the case against Powell when the high-flying Harlem minister was a member of Congress. As chairman of the Administration Committee's subcommittee on accounts, Hays conducted the inquiry into Powell's spending spree that led eventually to his exclusion from the House.

ROAMED THE WORLD

Hays probably spent tax money at as brisk a clip as Powell but with a totally different philosophical approach. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Hays roamed the world as he now roams Capitol corridors and when he found excuses and wrongs, then as now, he demanded corrective action.

Hays' compulsion to erase inefficiency and eliminate wrongdoing is not limited to the world and the Congress. It extends into his home district.

Just last week, Hays was elected to the Belmont County School Board, a non-paying post, with the avowed intent of finding out whether the board does anything worthwhile. If it doesn't, he said, he will march straight to the state legislature and ask that it be abolished.

TRANSMISSION LINE TESTIMONY

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1971, I brought to the attention of the Members an environmental problem in my congressional district, in a statement "The Big Boys Against Prink Hill."

In that statement I covered some of the problems being encountered by the residents of my district as a result of the actions of the power authority of the State of New York. These acts of the State authority are encouraged in many ways by the Federal Power Commission's apparent indifference to the public interest and indifference to environmental guidelines as laid down by the President's Council on Environmental Quality.

On Tuesday, November 9, 1971, a hearing on the proposed transmission line was held in Albany, N.Y. For the information of the other Members of this House, I include my remarks at that hearing, in full:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HAMILTON FISH, JR.

I wish to apologize for not being able to be personally at this hearing, but Congressional business requires me to be in Washington. However, I appreciate the opportunity to present a statement on my position on the Gilboa-Leeds transmission lines, a subject of great importance to the people of my Congressional District, which also affects the ecology of our entire Hudson Valley region.

I formally intervened in this proceeding for two basic reasons. First, because I felt my direct participation would afford many of my constituents, who otherwise would not be represented, an avenue to express themselves in this matter. Second, I wanted to assure that recent Congressional mandates in the area of environmental decision-making are faithfully complied with by the Federal Power Commission and the Power Authority of the State of New York. In my opinion, such care of the public interest was not shown in the original licensing of the Blenheim-Gilboa pumped storage project and its attendant transmission lines. I am hopeful that this hearing will provide the proper forum for beginning an in depth inquiry into whether this power line is needed at all, and, if so, what will be the best possible route to cause the least environmental damage to a uniquely unspoiled area. Such an inquiry requires the Federal Power Commission to balance all of the elements involved: alternative sources of power, actual power resources and needs, and most importantly, any possible detrimental environmental and social effect that construction of this proposed line will have on Greene County and the Hudson Valley.

These are not idle or useless concerns. We live today in an era concerned with environmental values. This concern has been caused by our ability to view what destruction can be wrought by neglect of proper attention to the environmental impact of any project. The present destruction of our air, our water and our land stand as mute witnesses to this past neglect. This newly found concern and awareness brings with it new responsibilities for those dealing with public policy decisions such as the one at issue here today.

There are three questions I would like to raise and discuss this morning. First, have the basic elements of due process, adequate notice and fair opportunity for a hearing been fully complied with in this case to date? Second, have the Federal Power Commission and the Power Authority of the State of New York complied with both the spirit and the letter of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969? Third, what is the actual scope of proper inquiry here? Realistically, is the decision that is being made on Project No. 2685 confined to one power transmission line, or are we actually opening an irreversible Pandora's box of Power Authority plans that will affect the entire Schoharie and Hudson Valleys.

On October 29, 1971, the Federal Power Commission issued an order which, among other things, denied my motion for a hearing on this project in Greene County. I was extremely disappointed by the Commission's decision, for it seems to me yet another indication of official indifference to the public interest and convenience. For Greene County, as we all know, is the location of both of the two primary routes which have been proposed. It is where the real affected parties in this matter live and work. My motion did not necessitate the postponement or cancellation of this hearing. It suggested alternative Greene County sites for this hearing, but more importantly, moved for an additional hearing in the Catskill area so that those unable to be here today would be afforded an opportunity to give their views on the proposed routing.

The selection of Albany as the sole site has clearly precluded the participation of many individuals who will be affected by the decision on this proposal—individuals unable to be here for such reasons as inability to get off from work, time loss, travel difficulty, expenses involved, and general inconvenience. The denial statement by the Federal Power Commission implies that an undue and unreasonable delay would result from granting the motion. Yet I was not talking about an indefinite or unreasonable delay of these proceedings. Appropriate hearing sites in the Catskill or Greenville area can be made available on short notice. Furthermore, when we are talking of a decision that will determine the environmental future of Greene County and possibly the Hudson Valley, would a delay of one day, or one week, or even one month be unreasonable? If one wishes to be a careful preserver rather than a hasty destroyer, the answer can only be no.

Therefore, today I am renewing my motion for an additional hearing to be scheduled in Greene County in the near future. I do this for the self-evident reason that the further such hearings are from the affected area, the less influence residents of those areas have upon the final decisions reached. Through the inconvenience of distance, individual right is more easily subverted for an abstract "public" right. I urge adoption of my motion for an additional hearing in the affected area.

Other intervenors have dealt in depth with the issue of whether adequate notice was initially afforded certain parties to this proceeding. I mention this point to couple it with my concern over the decision on the hearing site. Due notice, and the opportunity to be heard are essential elements of due process under our legal system. The "fundamental fairness" of due process applies to administrative as well as judicial proceedings. It is my view that due process requirements have been given less than full consideration by the Federal Power Commission and its staff in this matter to this point.

In response to the evident deterioration of our water, our air and our land, Congress and the entire Federal government has become increasingly concerned with the environment. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is the foremost statutory expression of national policy on the subject. It establishes environmental protection as part of the mandate of every Federal agency and department, and requires that they consider the environmental implications of their decisions to the "fullest possible extent." Specifically, Section 102(2)(c) requires that every agency file a detailed environmental impact statement on all projects it undertakes or licenses, with the Council on Environmental Quality for their review.

The impact statement on this particular project is currently being reviewed by the Environmental Protection Agency at the request of Environmental Quality. In September, the Environmental Protection Agency indicated that the original impact statement

filed by the Power Authority of the State of New York, and circulated by the Federal Power Commission for comment, was not as comprehensive or complete as needed. In short it was defective.

I might also point out at this time that at present, negotiations are going on between the Federal Power Commission and the Council on Environmental Quality, as the Council is not satisfied with FPC's interpretation of the Environmental Protection Act's environmental requirements. As of this moment, the FPC has filed no independent environmental statement, nor does it accept responsibility for the applicant's statement which it circulates. Following this hearing the FPC will submit a staff brief on the environmental impact of the proposed project, which has been found at fault in the past as generally a restatement of the applicant's statement.

Thus, this project's status under the criteria established by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 has not yet been settled. It is too early to tell whether or not environmental values have been adequately considered. Until a determination and recommendation is made by both EPA and the Council on Environmental Quality on the impact of this project, there should be no final decision by the Federal Power Commission.

In addition to the strong indications I have received from the Council on Environmental Quality that the FPC's present interpretation of the environmental guidelines are unsatisfactory, recent court decisions interpreting the intent and scope of the National Environmental Policy Act have stressed the broad responsibilities it imposes on the Federal agency involved—in this instance the Federal Power Commission. For example, in the case of *Calvert Cliffs Coordinating Committee vs. Atomic Energy Commission* (U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Docket Number 24,830, decided July 23, 1971), the Court emphasized that the mere filing of the impact statement does not exhaust an agency's responsibility under the Act. They emphasized that at both the hearings on proposed licensing, that the licensing agency must conduct an aggressive inquiry on the environmental issues raised. The Court used the following language: "an agency has a responsibility to not simply sit back, like an umpire, and resolve adversary contentions at the hearing stage. Rather, it must itself take the initiative of considering environmental values at every distinctive and comprehensive stage of the process beyond the staff's evaluation and recommendation."

In spite of off-hand licensing of the Blenheim-Gilboa pumped storage station and two of three power lines, in spite of the fact that the FPC to date has filed no independent environmental impact statement but simply circulated the applicant's statement for comment; in spite of the fact that the Commission has summarily denied every motion by the intervening parties; in short, in spite of what can at best be described as a dismal track record of agency concern for the interest of the public, I hope these hearings will set the tone for such an aggressive inquiry.

Finally, the scope of this inquiry cannot be restricted to the narrow consideration of the specific power line in question. That is why, when I filed my intervention petition, I included specific language aimed at raising the broader issues of impact that this decision will have on the ecology of the entire Hudson Valley. I again urge the Commission to carefully and closely study the long range impact that approval of this proposed line will have on nearby and adjacent areas in the Hudson Valley region as well as in Greene County. By PASNY's own admission, this power line is only the beginning in the

development of a vast network of interlocking energy projects.

It is, in effect, a very small part of a massive development, and to concentrate our gaze simply upon this line, while ignoring these broader considerations would be like studying a tiger cub, while ignoring that the kitten could grow into a highly destructive cat. So, properly, the Federal Power Commission should view the proposed project not only in the light of its impact on the uniquely unspoiled Durham Valley, which is important and consequential in itself, but also in the broader perspective of its growing impact on the entire region. For if, as many of us believe, this project is only a small section of a massive plan, then a "yes" or "go" decision here could mean the ecology of the entire Hudson Valley and the Schoharie Valley will be forever determined. What are the extent of PASNY's plans? Have they been fully divulged? Will they be fully explored here? It would be a dereliction of responsibility not to ask these questions, and not to ask them at this time.

Thus, as we begin this detailed inquiry into the need, propriety and location of this proposed Gilboa-Leeds power line, the Federal Power Commission should carefully consider its massive responsibilities as they reach any decision. A Federal regulatory agency has a mandate to protect the public interest. Recent legislation underlines this with a mandate to protect the environment. This is the issue of the inquiry we begin here today.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS—COMMISSION
ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE
GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA**

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under letter dated October 15, 1971, a notice of public hearings of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia was mailed to a number of groups and associations in the District who have a client relationship with the District government. Also, the notice was published in the District of Columbia Register on October 4, 1971, and all relevant House and Senate committees have been advised.

We welcome the attendance of any interested Members of the House and Senate at the hearings scheduled in room 2125 of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce hearing room on Thursday afternoon and evening, Friday and Saturday the 11th, 12th, and 13th of November. For further information please call the Commission office at 386-5577.

I insert the letter notice sent to over 600 organizations in the District of Columbia to be reprinted in full in the RECORD:

COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION
OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA,

Washington, D.C. October 15, 1971.

DEAR FRIEND: On behalf of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, I am sending this letter to many organizations in the District of Columbia to inform them of the public hearings which our Commission will hold November 11 and 12, 1971. The hearings will

be held in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Hearing Room, Room 2125 of the Rayburn House Office Building (East entrance) commencing at 2:00 p.m. on November 11 and at 10:00 a.m. on November 12.

In view of your organization's interest in good government, our Commission would like to have its views about ways and means of promoting economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the Government of the District of Columbia. I am enclosing a copy of the Commission's Notice of Hearing recently published in the *D.C. Register* so that you may be advised of the areas of our concern and study.

I cordially invite you to submit your organization's views in writing to our Commission by November 5, 1971. Should you or your organization experience any difficulty in preparing a written statement of proposed testimony. I urge you to contact the Deputy Director, Mr. Adrian Dove (386-5577) who can assist you. Meanwhile, it would be very helpful if your statement could be prepared as a five-minute oral presentation suitable for the public hearings. Additional comments may, of course, be submitted in writing and will be made a part of the hearing record.

Naturally, because of time limitations, our Commission will not be able to hear from all organizations at the public hearings scheduled for November 11 and 12. This is why I am requesting you to submit your organization's statement in writing to the Commission by November 3 so that the staff may review them and prepare a schedule of those who will testify at our hearings. Be assured, however, that whether your organization presents its views in the form of testimony at the hearings or as a written statement to be inserted in the RECORD, our staff will carefully review all of the views submitted so that they will be available to the Commissioners.

I am appreciative of the efforts of your organization to assist in bringing about better government for the District of Columbia and I trust that you will continue in your effort by providing the Commission with your organization's views with regard to our study.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Chairman.

COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE
GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The undersigned, as Chairman of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, established under authority of Public Law 91-405, as amended, hereby gives notice that the Commission will hold public hearings in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Hearing Room, Room 2125 of the Rayburn House Office Building (East entrance), commencing at 2:00 p.m. Thursday, November 11, 1971, and at 10:00 a.m. Friday, November 12, 1971. These public hearings have been scheduled to afford interested parties an opportunity to present their views concerning matters relevant to the declared policy of Congress in establishing this Commission, that is, to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the Government of the District of Columbia.

While the hearings will not encompass the subject of home rule, the following general functional or managerial areas of concern

are being studied by the Commission and will constitute the agenda for the public hearings:

1. The organization and internal management of the District of Columbia Government;
2. The executive management processes, especially as they relate to the Mayor/Commissioner and the District of Columbia Council, and whether the local government is responsive to the needs of residents and others whom it serves;
3. The efficiency of the District of Columbia Government personnel systems, activities, functions, etc.;
4. The fiscal affairs and financial management of the District Government, including: an analysis of revenue and expenditure trends; a study of the budget process, long-term capital financing, the balanced budget concept, program budgeting, grants-in-aid, and enterprise funding; accounting and internal auditing; ADP and MIS, and financial reporting;
5. The efficiency and effectiveness of the regulatory procedures (including the issuance of licenses and permits) in effect in the District of Columbia and conformance to the D.C. Administrative Procedure Act;
6. Public education in the District of Columbia, both the public school system and public higher education; primarily as it relates to administration and management and not course content or curriculum problems;
7. A study to improve the integration/coordination/effectiveness of youth services delivery in the District of Columbia;
8. Greater utilization of private sector assistance to the D.C. Government;
9. A housing study and inquiry into functions performed by National Capital Housing Authority, Redevelopment Land Agency, Board of Zoning Appeals, and Model Cities Program, as well as the private sector;
10. A study of delivery systems for health services; and
11. A contemplated study of procurement practices in D.C. Government contracting.

UNITED STATES, KREMLIN SUMMITS CAN GIVE CASE OF JITTERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the news media looks ahead in commentary and forecast to the forthcoming trip by President Nixon to Peking and Moscow, it is well to keep in mind the pattern of previous summit meetings. This point is very properly made by international correspondent Dumitru Danielopol in the following article which appeared in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News on October 22:

UNITED STATES, KREMLIN SUMMITS CAN GIVE CASE OF JITTERS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Every time I hear of a "summit" meeting between a U.S. president and Kremlin leaders I get the jitters.

Men from lands behind the Iron Curtain have a "Pavlovian" reaction at the word "summit."

Past meetings have proved so disastrous for our countries, for the West and the United States that our first question is:

"What are the Americans going to give away this time?"

"The trouble with these meetings," said one exile leader "is that the Americans judge

the Russians by their own standards and give them the benefit of the doubt. They do not always realize, unfortunately, that the Reds are not there to negotiate honestly but to grab as much as they can."

The germ of this reflex was there when Mr. Nixon announced his visit to Peking. But it wasn't as intense. China is a new state. Though some ethnics objected, the overwhelming majority accepted the Peking trip. It could place the Kremlin on the defensive, we felt, weakened Moscow's political and diplomatic impact and gave them something to worry about.

Resistance to Soviet pressures increased in Eastern Europe and the Balkans.

But now comes the mission to Moscow which seems to calm all Soviet fears.

Every American President in the last generation or so has come to that moment when he convinced himself that he can "reason together," eye-ball to eye-ball with the men in the Kremlin.

Mr. Nixon's announcement that he is going to Moscow came as an anti-climax. All the psychological, political and diplomatic advantages seen in the Sino-American meeting seem to be slipping away.

Leonid Brezhnev and Alexei Kosygin can crow again that all roads lead to Moscow.

"The President took a step backwards," said one exile leader.

Back flashed pictures of Franklin Roosevelt at Yalta, Harry Truman at Potsdam, Dwight D. Eisenhower in Geneva, John Kennedy in Vienna and Lyndon Johnson in Glassboro, N.J. That President Nixon could have refused the Kremlin's invitation in an election year is a moot point.

Mr. Nixon's political adversaries are already discounting his trip as political ploys. This is hardly fair. The President deserves honest appreciation for his goal of a "generation of peace."

And perhaps the scars and memories of the last 35 years have made some of us too cynical. But when dealing with the Russians there is only one truism:

One must deal from a position of strength. Accommodation in the Soviet mind has always been only a way-station on an inexorable march to domination.

SENIOR CITIZENS GOLD TURNS TO BRASS RING

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has the so-called welfare reform bill, H.R. 1 on the slow burner and as a result millions of needy retirees are stewing while waiting for the much needed social security changes and benefit increases.

H.R. 1, which passed the House on June 22, 1971, and was hailed as the welfare reform bill tied the social security amendments to this welfare bill.

The supporters of H.R. 1 did this for one reason. There is strong congressional support for increasing social security for our elderly, but there was not real great support for guaranteeing an income for those on welfare. For this reason the two programs were tied together as one package and the elderly today are the losers.

The Senate is reluctant to take up the provisions since many of the liberal block want the guaranteed income for welfare recipients increased above the estab-

lished \$2,400 level but do not feel they have the public's support or sufficient votes.

It is estimated that of the some 20 million Americans over age 65, 5 million are living on wages below poverty levels; another million are at the "near poor" category; while still more are reaching this state due to higher living costs and restrictions placed on senior citizens.

Thus it appears the welfare reform program is making more of our elders paupers and thereby cheating them out of what they rightfully deserve.

It is one thing to talk about guaranteeing welfare recipients a specific sum, but the financial burden placed on the working sector of our Nation is quite another. It is said, with good basis, that half of the country will be working to support the other half.

And what incentive will there be for people to work, or even be foolish enough to save, since big brother will take care of them?

The original intent of social security was to aid those who qualified for payments to an income as a supplement to a regular retirement plan. But, the socialist planners now look at social security as a welfare plan.

The social security program needs to be revised, but I suggest that it does not belong as part of any so-called welfare reform program.

I introduced a bill which would provide for at least a 10-percent social security benefit effective January 1, of this year, but it was reduced to 5 percent by a majority vote of the House when H.R. 1 passed the House last June.

I further proposed that there be an automatic cost-of-living increase clause in the program so as to provide continuous benefit increases based on the increasing living costs to be completed each fiscal quarter. This was included in H.R. 1, but now that the bill is delayed it is hard to determine its future on final passage.

Other bills I introduced or cosponsored included legislation which would award increases in benefits to a widow, from 82½ percent, which she currently receives to 100 percent. These proposals, together with the need for improvements in the medicare program and others too numerous to mention, are reasons the social security amendments should be reviewed as separate items, rather than tossing them in with welfare questions.

There are 985,690 people over the age of 65 living in Florida today, which comprises almost one-sixth of the State's population. Furthermore, our senior citizens compose one-tenth of the Nation's population, are one of our Nation's largest minority, and yet they became political pawns in the arguments on welfare.

They have been penalized for working throughout the years since the social security was a pay-as-you-work program, paid into by the employee with the hope for a chance to enjoy their golden years, but alas, they now find that the gold has turned into a brass ring which they cannot even grab, since the Senate has a hold on it.