

mission to study quality controls and manufacturing procedures of medical devices, surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments and devices, and other medical and hospital equipment; to determine the need for, and the extent of, Federal regulation of such medical devices; to recommend to the President and to the Congress methods for determining constructive minimum performance standards, and feasible methods for Federal regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4121. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

6. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the allocation of certain imported fuel oil to New England and the establishment of a foreign trade zone and subzone for the purpose of oil refining, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4122. A bill for the relief of Herminia Dulay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 4123. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Jara Obregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4124. A bill for the relief of Maria David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4125. A bill for the relief of Pasqualina Silveroli (Linda) Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4126. A bill for the relief of Maria Labrizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (by request):

H.R. 4127. A bill for the relief of Victoria Georgina Morena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### PENDING TREATY ON NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

#### HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20, 1969

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the address I made before the West Point Society at Fort Myer, Va., on January 15, 1969.

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

The remarks are as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER BEFORE WEST POINT SOCIETY, FORT MYER, VA.

Needless to say, I am very happy to be back in Washington and the United States Senate. I am also happy that I was put on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Of course, many changes have been made during my four years of absence and many more, as you all know, are about to be made in the near future. One of the alterations on the Washington scene of particular note to me like you and me is the absence of Robert McNamara from the Pentagon.

I have got to say that this absence does not make my heart grow fonder of Mr. McNamara and his policies. Frankly, I am delighted that he no longer has the right to dictate our Nation's defense policy. I only wish he could have taken with him the legacy which he left behind.

But perhaps I was too fast in assuming that Mr. McNamara has relinquished his voice in the affairs of this Nation having to do with defense. I noticed in the papers not long ago that he visited the Soviet Union and discussed with the leaders of that nation the question of the pending treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

And that brings me to the subject of my talk here today. I am deeply concerned at the emotional, oversimplified arguments that are being advanced to bring about a speedy Senate ratification of this treaty. What bothers me is that not nearly enough attention is being given to the technical and practical weaknesses of this diplomatic device, to say nothing of its dangerous psychological implications.

Let me take you back for a moment to another treaty with the Soviet Union. That one, negotiated in 1963, was called the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. It was promoted to an almost hysterical degree by those advocates of accommodation as a "great forward step" in the never ceasing struggle for world peace. In that instance, all technical and factual consideration were swept aside in a wave of optimism generated by one of the sharpest

public relations promotions in our history. I would remind you that I, along with most other members of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, voted against that treaty.

In opposing that earlier nuclear treaty, I was swayed by the testimony, a lot of it still secret, of scientists and military experts who believed sincerely that the Russians had an ulterior motive in accepting the treaty. It was pointed out that unlike the United States, the Russians had already conducted a series of high magnitude and high altitude nuclear tests and had gained valuable information about the mysterious problem called EMP (electro-magnetic pulse). By pushing through the test ban treaty, the Russians could make sure that the United States would not solve the problems of EMP in the near future. In fact, there are military experts today who insist that we will never discover how to solve this problem until the testing ban is abrogated.

Now we are being asked to adopt a nuclear non-proliferation treaty with the Soviet Union and other nations. The arguments are familiar. They are all lofty and noble. They say that the greatest way in the world to avoid a nuclear holocaust is to deter the proliferation of the most horrible weapons ever devised. I ask you who, on the surface, could oppose such an appeal? If we want to take this argument at its superficial face value, then the answer is—no one could oppose it.

But I'm sure I do not have to tell most of you here that this question, no more than the test ban treaty, does not lend itself to quick and easy answers.

To begin with, the treaty is meaningless because two present nuclear powers, France and Red China, will have nothing to do with it. In addition, many nations who presently are on the brink of developing nuclear weapons are likewise among the nonsignatories. These include nations such as India, West Germany, and Israel.

Consequently, we see that the most probable sources of nuclear proliferation in today's world are beyond the treaty's reach.

If there is a reason for ratification of this treaty, it has to be nothing but a token. In other words, if we are interested in trying to tell the world that the United States and the Soviet Union are engaging in meaningless gestures of accommodation, then there might be some excusable reason in the area of hope, humanitarianism or good will. This, of course, assumes that there are no technical disadvantages to the United States in the way the treaty is presently drawn. I believe that there are such deficiencies, and I will discuss them.

But my objection to the non-proliferation treaty at this time has to do more with the effect it might have on foreign affairs generally. Look at what has happened in the struggle between East and West since we

ratified the test ban treaty and presumably took a giant step toward resolving our differences. The Soviet Union has repeatedly demonstrated that, far from reducing or being interested in a reduction of world tensions, it has actively and aggressively promoted such tensions on a worldwide basis. Vietnam is a case in point. The Vietcong and Hanoi couldn't have kept up the pace at which they are killing American soldiers for six months without the supplies and support sent to them by our partner in the test ban treaty. The Middle East would not today be the tinder box threatening the peace of three continents if it were not for an aggressive policy of Soviet arming of the Arab nations. The Mediterranean would not today be bristling with Soviet naval power. Czechoslovakia would not have been invaded, nor would Rumania and West Germany be threatened.

No, I tell you there can be no case made in fact for the argument that the Soviet Union is mellowing and that we must further that softening process through the ratification of a nuclear non-proliferation treaty. There is reason to believe that ratification of this treaty at this time would in effect place the U.S. stamp of approval on an aggressive and militant move made by Russia to stamp out human freedom. Members of the Senate I believe will have to ask themselves, if they accept a treaty with the Soviet Union in good conscience, whether they don't also ratify Soviet moves in other areas. Do we dignify Soviet policy, in effect, saying that they are honorable enough to sign a treaty with? Do we, in ratifying this treaty, announce to the world that we are ready to forget that the Soviet Union has a long, dishonorable history of broken treaties?

These are serious questions which bear directly on the security of this Nation and which the advocates of the non-proliferation treaty would have us skip over in the interest of a word they love to use called "detente."

They don't seem to understand that there can be no accommodation, there can be no true *detente*, so long as the Soviet Union continues to foment aggression and stir up war. A thousand non-proliferation treaties with the Soviet Union will not wipe out actions such as the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

I presume by this time you understand that I am opposed to Senate ratification of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty at this time.

Now I want to go into some of the technical and practical aspects of this treaty.

A close examination of the possible effect leads to the conclusion that a definite possibility exists that if this treaty is ratified, some 100 non-nuclear nations may construe it as giving rise to a commitment of the United States to provide immediate military support in case of a nuclear attack or the threat of a nuclear attack against any such nation.

It will be remembered that President Johnson and Secretary McNamara declared in 1966 that nations not seeking nuclear weapons can be sure of our strong support against nuclear blackmail.

In addition, during 1968 the United States, the United Kingdom and Russia each issued similar declarations of intent to act immediately through the Security Council of the United Nations to assist any non-nuclear party to the treaty that becomes a victim of nuclear aggression or threat.

Another weakness of the treaty is that it would provide no safeguard which would go into effect simultaneously with the application of the treaty. The safeguards for verification of compliance would not be negotiated nor established until after the treaty enters into force and need not be concluded for two years thereafter.

The inspection phase of the treaty would be entrusted to the International Atomic Energy Agency which has no proven inspection skill. Even if adequate safeguards could be developed, the agency is limited under the treaty to declared nuclear facilities. There is no provision for searching out clandestine facilities. Nor does the treaty impose any penalty or sanction on any nation that violates the treaty.

Another thing the treaty would do would be to surrender our strategic options of placing strictly defensive nuclear devices in the control and custody of our allies. Under this option, our allies both in Europe and Asia conceivably would be able to secure their local defense without immediately triggering the intervention of the United States.

Interestingly enough, the Soviet Union violated the treaty by its invasion of Czechoslovakia while the document was awaiting action in the U.S. Senate. The preamble of the treaty declares that "states must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of political independence of any state."

One of the most exhaustive studies of this faulty treaty was prepared by Dr. Walter B. Wentz of Claremont Men's College. He raised this interesting point about article III of the treaty. This is the only article which deals with inspection and control and it applies, Mr. Wentz emphasizes, only to "fissionable" material. He points out that the day is not far off when nuclear explosions will be achieved by direct fusion without the preliminary trigger of fissionable uranium or plutonium.

These are the basic reasons why I plan to oppose this treaty if and when it is brought up for ratification in the U.S. Senate. I believe it contains absolutely no value in the field of deterring the spread of nuclear weapons. I believe it can only place this Nation in a false and uncomplimentary light throughout the world if it is adopted.

## IN OUTER SPACE AS ON EARTH PRAYERS ARE NEEDED

### HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, several hundred of my constituents, 294 to be precise, in Texarkana, Tex., who are also members of the First Baptist Church in that city, a church which I have attended for over 50 years, have sent to me a petition stating as follows:

In this day of radical theology when God is declared dead, and many people live without a divine point of reference, it is reassuring

and inspiring to hear from three brave men, having gone faster and farther than man has ever gone into space, reading the Scriptures and reminding us that the God of today was also the God of the beginning. Our signatures affixed denote our appreciation and express our prayerful concern for every future space venture.

The very fine dedicated man of God, Dr. Lory Hildreth, pastor of the First Baptist Church, transmitted the petition to me with the following message, which I believe highly pertinent and significant:

Enclosed you will find a petition with several hundred names affixed. This is our way of expressing our commendation for the recent moon shot as well as for the conduct of the astronauts on the same. We were thrilled in their spiritual orientation of the same and we would urge you to discourage any attempt to interpret what they said as a violation of the principle of church and state.

We feel that our freedom under God entitles one to express his belief in God as well as giving the person who believes that there is no God the right to express himself accordingly.

We will be mailing you in the near future two sermons which we preached on the two Sundays following the astronaut's return to earth. This in no way is an attempt to force any kind of religious belief on you, but to register the spiritual inspiration which the fight and the conduct of the astronauts especially gave to each of us.

I would like to add at this time my own name, and that of Mrs. Patman, to this petition, because we, too, firmly believe that in this day of great technological advances, we must always return thanks to God and remember that the works of man are but the expression of His will.

## DEAN RUSK—EXCELLENT SERVICE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1969

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the January 18, 1969, edition of the Washington Daily News:

#### DEAN RUSK'S 8 YEARS

If the job of President of the United States is the most demanding in the country, surely the job of secretary of state comes next.

For eight full years, the aim of Dean Rusk, as he often said, has been to help build "a decent world order" as set forth in Articles 1 and 2 of the United Nations Charter, a community of independent nations, each with its own system, but cooperating on common problems and solving conflicts peacefully, not violently.

The 1960s, however, have seen a continuation of a persistent crisis caused, as Mr. Rusk saw it, by the determination of certain nations to "impose a world of coercion upon those not already subjected to it."

The three chief crises of Mr. Rusk's years—Berlin, the Cuban missile confrontation and the Vietnam war—all pitted him against the forces of coercion, and so far as his role was concerned, he proved himself a man of high intelligence, prudence and persistence. On dozens of other, less bell-clanging issues—disarmament, economic development,

free trade, regional cooperation—Dean Rusk also put in long hours toiling to build that decent world order.

His critics complained Secretary Rusk was colorless or inflexible or unimaginative. But his own view was that fireworks and splashy rhetoric had no place in successful diplomacy. He once said the biggest victories for peace might never get into the newspapers; that was all right with him.

Along those lines, one of his accomplishments was to conduct a patient dialog with his Soviet counterparts. The Soviets came to learn where America's vital interests lie and thus were not to push too far. They also came to drop their tiresome ideological clichés and deal in a more straightforward, practical matter. The results show up in the U.S.-Soviet treaties banning atmospheric nuclear tests and proliferation of nuclear weapons, and in the greatest accomplishment of all: the absence of a nuclear war.

Considering Dean Rusk's integrity and good sense, our only complaint is that he did not speak up forcefully enough in the President's highest councils and nudge out some of the obviously faulty advice the President got. But modesty is another Rusk characteristic: He regarded himself as the President's servant.

Adding up these eight grueling years, however, it can be said that Dean Rusk, secretary of state, 1961-1969, under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, served this nation with devotion and distinction.

## THIS IS ANNUAL PRAYER WEEK

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1969

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 18, 1969, edition of the Washington Daily News:

#### THIS IS ANNUAL PRAYER WEEK

(By Louis Cassels)

Protestants and Catholics around the world will observe their annual week of prayer for Christian unity for one week, starting tomorrow.

This period of joint prayer is at once a testimonial to how far Christians have come down the road to reunion, and a reminder of how far they still have to go.

After 10 years of dramatic progress, during which Catholics and Protestants moved from a state of cold war to at least the threshold of brotherhood, the ecumenical movement seems to be slowing down.

This may be a necessary and constructive phase—a pause for consolidation of gains.

#### SYMPTOM

But it also could be a symptom of distraction.

Catholics are preoccupied with internal dissension over birth control and the exercise of authority in the church.

Protestants are embroiled in controversy among themselves over what role the church should play in trying to remedy the ills of the world thru direct political and social action.

Much of the energy and dedication formerly channeled into the ecumenical movement is now being diverted into these intramural disputes.

The ecumenical movement also is being hurt to some degree, perhaps a serious one, by the spirit of anti-institutionalism which is endemic among educated young people today.

Many of the younger clergy and laymen, who might be expected to display the greatest fervor for the ideal of unity, actually tend

to be disdainful of moves toward organizational union, which they regard as mere tinkering with institutional machinery.

#### MERGER PLAN

This attitude is causing particular concern to leaders of the Consultation on Church Union, the forum in which 10 major Protestant denominations are trying to agree on a merger.

After seven years of negotiations, COCU is approaching the day when it can offer to its constituent denominations a detailed plan for coming together in one great new church.

While the plan has been difficult to work out, the greater difficulty will be selling it to the 25 million members of the participating denominations.

Recognizing that middle-aged and elderly people naturally tend to shy away from any change in familiar ways, COCU leaders feel the only hope for putting the merger across lies in enlisting the enthusiastic support of the younger clergy and laity who are receptive to change.

Thus far, however, there is no indication that the proposed merger is generating much excitement among the young.

While indifferent toward the redrawing of institutional lines, many young people are intensely concerned with establishing warm human relationships with members of other denominations.

#### COMMON GOALS

They have found that Christians can love and respect each other, work together toward common goals, and attain a strong sense of community without wearing the same label.

A large number of them also are convinced that the urgent need right now is to renew the church, all branches of it, with each person working at the task of renewal in the particular corner in which he happens to find himself.

Reunion, they believe, can afford to wait on renewal, and will tend to follow it quite naturally.

The founding fathers of the ecumenical movement saw it the other way around. They looked upon unity as a source of new vitality.

What both views have in common is the institution that reunion and renewal go together. The church can't achieve one without the other.

#### SPACESHIP EARTH

### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the technological triumph of Apollo 8 has confirmed the fact that our planet is truly "Spaceship Earth." Both Colonel Borman, in his graceful speech before the joint session of Congress, and President Nixon, in his inspired inaugural address, borrowed the words of Archibald MacLeish to describe this concept:

To see the earth as it truly is, small and blue and beautiful in that eternal silence where it floats, is to see ourselves as riders on the earth together, brothers on that bright loveliness in the eternal cold—brothers who know now they are truly brothers.

But how long will the earth retain its "bright loveliness" if we continue our destruction of our physical and psychological resources? Speaking directly to that awesome challenge is Dr. Rene Dubos, professor at Rockefeller University and head of its Department of Environmental

Biomedicine. Not the least of the virtues of his article in the *New York Times* of January 6, 1969, is a quotation of that far-seeing American statesman, Adlai Stevenson:

We travel together, passengers on a little spaceship . . . preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say the love we give our fragile craft.

Mr. Speaker, technology has placed in the hands of man the opportunity to create either enduring "bright loveliness" or the darkest of tragedies. Few men are more eminently qualified than Dr. Dubos to describe the dangers facing our intellectual and environmental heritage and I am pleased to insert his eloquent and profound statement into the *RECORD* at this point:

#### IS THIS PROGRESS OR SELF-DESTRUCTION?

(By Rene Dubos)

In his last speech as ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai E. Stevenson poignantly expressed our dependence on the conditions prevailing over the whole earth:

"We travel together, passengers on a little spaceship . . . preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say the love we give to our fragile craft."

The expression "Spaceship Earth" is no mere catch phrase. Not only do we live on the earth, we are completely dependent on the conditions of its crust, drawing breath from its shallow layer of air, using and re-using its limited supply of water and other essential resources.

It would be far too easy to show that mankind on its spaceship may be on a course of self-destruction because it behaves as if it were unaware of the social and physical constraints resulting from the limitations of the earth. This is a real possibility.

But it is a certainty that mankind shall experience a rapid degradation of the quality of life if present trends are allowed to continue. We may escape nuclear warfare, widespread poisoning and mass hunger. But unless we act drastically, and very soon, we shall not escape the progressive loss of humanness resulting from life in a closed environment which is every day more crowded, polluted, depleted and desecrated.

#### NO PLACE TO MOVE

This is not the first time, of course, that men have spoiled their surroundings, but in the past they could move to other parts of the earth and establish new settlements. Very soon, this kind of migration will be impossible: All habitable parts of the globe are now occupied and most of them are already spoiled. Nor is there any chance that we can escape to other worlds.

Despite the irresponsible assertions of a few scientists and the imaginings of science-fiction writers, we are bound to the earth by the exigencies of our biological nature. The range of conditions under which we can survive and function is so narrow that it exists only on the surface of the earth. We may establish stations in outer space or on the bottom of the oceans, but the few persons who will live in these outlandish places will have to remain linked to the earth's crust, as by an umbilical cord. We are wedded to this planet.

Since the birth rate now exceeds the death rate almost everywhere, world population is soaring. This situation is not peculiar to the underdeveloped parts of the world. Admittedly, the birth rate is beginning to fall in industrialized countries, but not fast enough to prevent their populations from continuing to increase.

In the United States, this increase is approximately 2,500,000 persons a year and a similar rate is likely to continue for at least a few decades. Just to accommodate this

added population, we would have to create a new large city, or 10 medium cities, every year.

#### IS OUR PLANET TOLERABLE?

Technologists may brag about nuclear energy, scientific agriculture and ready-made housing developments, but the overpowering fact is that we shall soon be running out of desirable places and essential resources. As Thoreau remarked, "What is the use of a house if you haven't got a tolerable planet to put it on?"

Furthermore, almost everywhere economic and social forces are driving people from the country to urban areas and this trend also is likely to continue. High population density inevitably brings about gross pollution of the environment, by man's own biological processes and particularly by technology. No one knows exactly the maximum size of the population that the earth can support. What is certain is that it cannot be many times greater than at present.

Environmental pollution used to be localized, but it now affects the whole earth.

Smog produced in urban and industrial areas is hovering over the countryside and beginning to spread over the oceans; cities will not benefit much longer from the cleansing effects of the winds for the simple reason that the wind itself is contaminated. Sewage and chemical effluents are spoiling rivers, lakes and coastlines; slowly, but surely, even the best-protected urban water supplies are being contaminated by countless chemical substances. Tin cans, plastic containers, discarded machinery, oil and other indegradable forms of garbage are overflowing from city dumps; they are seen everywhere.

Radioactive products and various forms of pesticides are beginning to accumulate in the soil and in water. They will progressively ruin cultivable land and even the oceans. Furthermore, their concentrations increase along certain food chains.

For example, radioactive products from the fallout of nuclear explosions in the United States were absorbed and concentrated by the lichens of the arctic. From the lichens, they reached reindeer which feed on these plants and eventually the Eskimos who eat the reindeer. Insecticides such as DDT accumulate in earth worms, and in ocean plankton, contaminating and killing the birds that feed on worms or on the plankton.

#### EFFECT ON BIRDSHELLS

A very recent study reveals catastrophic declines in several bird species, because the accumulation of insecticides thins, to the point of breakage, the shells of their eggs. As to insecticides and human beings, the concentration of DDT exceeds 12 parts per million in the fatty tissue of United States residents.

Excessive sensory stimuli, and especially mind-bewildering noise, are among other forms of environmental pollution which are now so ubiquitous as to be inescapable.

The complexities resulting from technological advances and crowding inevitably engender social regimentation, loss of privacy and other interferences with individual freedom.

Few persons can remain completely unaware of the dangers experienced by man in the technological world. But, on the whole, there is little sense of alarm about them.

We tend to ignore progressive changes until they reach catastrophic dimensions. For example, we no longer notice that the air over urban agglomerations is hardly ever luminous and fragrant. We have learned to tolerate air pollution and foul water, crowding, garbage, noise and confusion in the streets.

Similarly, we can learn to tolerate the sonic boom, invasion of privacy and even the loss of freedom. Adaptability is an asset for

survival, but, paradoxically, the greatest threat to the quality of human life is that the human race is so immensely adaptable that it can survive even under the most objectionable conditions.

One might have hoped that the miraculous achievements of science during the past few decades, and the promise of many more to come, would provide easy solutions for the problems now facing mankind. In fact, confidence in the creative and predictive power of science is now so great that several groups of scholars have recently published forecasts of the technological and medical advances that can be expected for the year 2000.

#### BREAKTHROUGHS FORESEEN

Naturally enough, they predict spectacular breakthroughs in the production of nuclear energy, the development of electronic gadgets, the chemical synthesis of materials better than natural ones, the discovery of drugs and surgical techniques that will delay death and change man's nature. From permanent lunar installations to robot human slaves and to programmed dreams, many are the scientific miracles that have been predicted and, indeed, can be anticipated for the 21st century.

Individual scientists would differ as to which of the possibilities will be converted into reality, but all would agree that scientific research can provide new, powerful techniques for manipulating external nature and man's nature.

Yet it is my opinion that, despite past achievements and promises for the near future, we do not truly live in an age of science. We have great expertise in the technological applications of science, but practically no knowledge, and even less wisdom, concerning the effects of these applications on man and on nature. In particular, we are grossly ignorant of the effects that modern technologies will have on the future of children who are exposed to them during their early development. We know only that some of these effects will be tragic.

#### ENVIRONMENT STUDY NEEDED

These remarks do not imply a defeatist or anti-intellectual attitude. They are meant rather to emphasize the need for directing scientific research to the study of the effects that the modern environment exerts on man and nature. The social and environmental problems that plague mankind will not be solved until we develop a new kind of science, focused on the fundamental needs of man and on the maintenance of a healthy, well-balanced environment.

Scientists must involve themselves widely in the investigation of the social consequences that will result from their professional activities. The man of flesh and bone will not be impressed by the fact that a few of his contemporaries can explore the moon, program their dreams, or use robots as slaves, if the planet Earth has become unfit for everyday life. He will not long continue to be interested in space acrobatics if he has to watch them with his feet deep in garbage and with smog in his eyes.

The present flurry of predictions concerning the scientific breakthroughs that can be anticipated for the year 2000 is a form of social escapism. Whatever their scientific interest may be, many of these breakthroughs will create new dangers for man and nature. Hardly any of them will help solve such problems as the raping of nature, environmental pollution, urban crowding, the feeling of alienation, racial and national conflicts and other threats to human life.

#### DEATH OF SHEEP RECALLED

A few months ago, many sheep died of a new kind of disease in valleys near the Army's Dugway Proving Grounds in Utah. Death was caused by minute amounts of a chemical substance that had been deposited by the wind on pastures over the mountain ranges while being tested as a biological

weapon inside the proving ground. The Army was publicly criticized for having used the new chemical substance before knowing how it moves through nature and determining all its biological effects.

The same criticism can be leveled against society as a whole. Since we make so little effort to investigate the effects of social and technological innovations on human life, we are practicing—not by intention but irresponsibly—a kind of biological warfare against nature, ourselves and especially against our descendants.

Mr. Speaker, I believe one idea expressed by Dr. Dubos needs amplification. He writes:

... we can learn to tolerate the sonic boom, invasion of privacy, and even the loss of freedom. Adaptability is an asset for survival, but, paradoxically, the greatest threat to the quality of human life is that the human race is so immensely adaptable that it can survive even under the most objectionable conditions.

This is certainly not a description of Dr. Dubos but if one were only a scientist concerned with man solely as an interesting species for dispassionate study, one could accept such a gloomy prospect with resignation. However, since man is an intensely political creature and since those of us charged with the responsibilities of governing and lawmaking have the solemn obligation to promote far more than mere survival, we must specifically consider the impact of often obscure but deeply felt human desires upon our democratic institutions.

Erich Fromm has recently written an extremely valuable book, "The Revolution of Hope: Toward a Humanized Technology." Among his brilliant insights are many which warn legislators and executives of the danger of attempting to insure stability by inhibiting humanity.

If man were infinitely malleable, there would have been no revolutions; there would have been no change because a culture would have succeeded in making man submit to its patterns without his resistance. But man, being only relatively malleable, has always reacted with protest against conditions which made the disequilibrium between the social order and his human needs too drastic or unbearable... Man's protest arose not only because of material suffering; specifically human needs... are an equally strong motivation for revolution and the dynamics of change.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the perceptions of Fromm and Dubos are relevant to the political process and they cannot be ignored. If they are, the twilight years of the 20th century will witness the twilight of the America we know and love.

#### OUR COUNTRY SHOULD BE FOREVER GRATEFUL TO LYNDON JOHNSON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the January 17,

1969, edition of the Washington Daily News:

#### OUR COUNTRY SHOULD BE FOREVER GRATEFUL TO LYNDON JOHNSON

As the tumultuous years of Lyndon Johnson's Presidency come to a close, it will not be disputed that he is leaving an indelible imprint on our country.

With one strong arm he tried to fight what became a giant-sized war in Asia, and with the other he tried to guide a giant-sized revolution at home.

The President himself has said he wants to be remembered as a man who tried.

He tried too much. He crowded the country—and human nature—too fast. He tried for instant success, which is nearly always improbable; and for a national consensus, which is impossible.

A man who grew up in a Jim Crow area, he tried in a single Administration to abolish prejudice and create a smooth-going rapport between the races. A just and humane objective, but not one to be achieved in a flash.

A man who had shined shoes and known the troubles of the penniless, he tried in his brief span in the White House to vanquish poverty—a condition of life which has plagued mankind since the beginning. An overwhelmingly desirable purpose, but not to be accomplished by a blitz from Washington.

More of a political activist than scholar or philosopher, Mr. Johnson seemed to see success for his goals as something to be pursued primarily by exhortation, by merely passing more laws, by spending taxpayer money.

Complex and difficult problems, unfortunately, are never overcome quickly or by simple formula. They are diminished only by long and constant effort, by understanding, by education, by a leadership which inspires wide cooperation.

Our country should be forever grateful to Lyndon Johnson for the magnificent way in which he assumed control of the government when the assassination of President Kennedy thrust that heavy duty upon him.

Because of national appreciation of his conduct in his first year as President he could have ridden the crest of popularity thru the 1964 election without promising anything. But with that exuberant self-confidence which always has been his hallmark, he promised too much.

He promised that American boys would not be called to do the fighting that Asians should do for themselves. He promised quick results in the fields of poverty and civil rights, and many more things.

They were promises which could not humanly be fulfilled, and they bred disappointments, frustrations, angry resentments, violent reactions.

The Vietnam war he inherited has hung like an albatross around his Administration's neck. He and his advisers underestimated the enormity of the conflict and the complexity of the problem.

So much was the war and its costs underestimated that one of Mr. Johnson's early acts was to talk Congress into a reduction in taxes. As the war escalated, so did the federal deficit—and so did inflation.

It was a serious miscalculation of both human and fiscal consequences.

Later, at first half-heartedly and finally with full force, he fought for and eventually obtained a war surtax—three years tardy.

Even as difficulties mounted abroad, they boiled up in this country in angry confrontations and disorders—we became a society which was anything but great.

Mr. Johnson's goals were equal rights, equal opportunity, and peace and abundance. But the harvest was unequal sacrifices and disaffection.

He never balanced the budget in his years and at times seemed to regard this as some-

thing not worth trying. But he left for his successor a budget balanced—on paper.

And along with that he bequeathed to Mr. Nixon the enormous problems of ending the Vietnam war and restoring tranquility at home.

There are areas in which the Johnson Administration's contributions have been without parallel in our history:

One is the conservation of resources—such as alerting our people to the pollution

of water and air, and to the blight of the landscape; afflictions which are so rapidly diminishing the quality of our life.

Another is the push he has given to education for all who wish it, and the laws and the support he stimulated in behalf of civil rights. And the landmark decision which set up Medicare for the elderly.

Still another is the achievement in space. This was not something he inherited, like the Vietnam war or the racial conflict. As a

leader in the Senate, he was the political architect and the driving force in setting up the space program. As vice president, he was chairman of the Aeronautics and Space Council which nurtured the program. So, as President, he was there to see astronauts Borman, Lovell and Anders fly around the moon and lift the horizons of all people.

And this, perhaps more than anything, gave a triumphant ending to his uniquely beleaguered Administration.

## SENATE—Tuesday, January 21, 1969

(Legislative day of Friday, January 10, 1969)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President, SPIRO T. AGNEW.

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

Eternal Father, with whom we walk and for whom we labor, teach us the truth that whoever would be greatest among us must be the servant of all. Receive, O Lord, the love of our hearts and the service of our minds and hands this day that we may be instruments of Thy purpose. Give us strength to walk and work with Thee in fellowship with all Thy faithful people, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### WELCOME TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

(The Vice President was greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are delighted to see you assume the gavel in this great body. Having known a good deal about you before you assumed this responsibility, I know that you will carry out those duties with high credit to yourself, to this body, and to the country.

So, we extend to you today the hand of fellowship, as we mark the beginning of another year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, let me say that the rules of the House do not apply in the Senate. As some of the proponents of the pending effort to change rule XXII would state, Senators can speak at some little length on every issue.

I join the distinguished minority leader in extending congratulations to our new Presiding Officer; and if the minority leader would join me, I would like to break a rule of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that, if the Presiding Officer so desires, he may proceed for not to exceed 2 minutes. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, before the Presiding Officer proceeds, may I simply join in the good wishes of the Senate and

the people, in the fact that we have here a new President of the Senate. And may I add, with some transliteration of the ancient words, "Dominus Vobiscum et Cum SPIRO T. AGNEW."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I could not let this occasion pass without adding my congratulations to those of my colleagues.

I think you will find your experience here rewarding. We know that the future here, under your guidance in the chair, will be excellent. Perhaps we still will not always be harmonious within this body, but we will accomplish great things. We bid you welcome.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I echo the sentiments which have been expressed in extending a word of welcome to the Presiding Officer.

As our majority leader has said, we look forward to many years of your service here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with all of the leadership who have extended their greetings to you as our new Presiding Officer.

One of the unique qualities of the Senate is the fact that we have a member of the executive branch of the Government presiding over the most powerful legislative body in the world.

I welcome you here. I hope that with all of the new duties that the press reports you will assume, it will not mean you will desert the Senate or that chair, and that you will perform as often as possible the constitutional responsibility of presiding over the Senate.

I am glad to greet you here, and I extend my very best wishes and promise cooperation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appreciates the courteous and gracious remarks of the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, the majority and minority whips, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), and the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The Chair is fully aware of the limited nature of his participation in these deliberations and does not wish to set a bad precedent by exceeding the time limit so graciously allowed him. He feels a tremor of uncertainty. It is not a personal uncertainty, but awe, because of the honor of presiding over this select and august deliberative body. The Chair will try to discharge the responsibilities of this office adequately and, hopefully, to the satisfaction of the Senate.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 20, 1969, be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief period be allowed for the transaction of routine morning business, and that statements therein be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, it is not the intention of the leadership to bring up today the nomination of Mr. Walter J. Hickel, of Alaska, to be Secretary of the Interior. The reason is that an objection has been entered because neither the printed hearings nor the committee report is available. That is a courtesy we always extend to any Member.

I am sorry that that is the case, because we had intended to bring up the Hickel nomination today. If the documents are ready, it is the leadership's intention to bring up the nomination the first thing tomorrow.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield. It has nothing to do with the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I want the RECORD to show very clearly that I raised the question yesterday afternoon on this matter; namely, that the hearings had not as yet been printed. I did not do that for the purpose of delay. I merely did it as a predicate to have the members of that committee on the floor to explain to us the pros and cons, their impressions of this man, his financial background, and