

July 12, 1967

of caviar or chipped beef. Which one will it be, Sir?"

I grimly replied that chipped beef would be suitable knowing well that I would never see the day when the Army offered Eggs Benedict. It was a nice thought though. I often wondered how General was able to do his job without completely flying off the handle. With a couple dozen patients screaming different orders at him at the same time it must have been hard. But the general always smiled and the patients always got what they asked for.

Table conversation among patients was notoriously dull. I was able to stay out of it by bringing something to read. A usual topic of conversation was how long it takes for things to happen at Forest Glen. Many patients were awaiting medical discharges—a long and tedious process.

"Hey, Mac, when you gettin' out of this place?" one would ask.

"I don't know, when you gettin' out?" the other would reply. "If something don't happen pretty soon, I'm sure as hell going to write my Congressman."

"Yeah, I'll write mine too."

And so it went. If you don't like something in the Army you write your Congressman and let him fight it out with some general who is forced to go all the way down the line to a sergeant to see what the whole thing is about.

In Basic Training some guy wrote his Congressman and complained that he wasn't getting enough sleep. After that, the whole battalion went to bed at 9 p.m. like it or not. The complainer became amazingly unpopular.

As far as I was concerned there were five highlights in a day at Forest Glen—three meals and two mail calls. Whatever I did with the rest of my time was optional. I sometimes had to travel over to the main hospital for an appointment, but they were infrequent and usually lasted no more than fifteen minutes. Some of the patients I knew like to spend the entire day at the main hospital for reasons which I could never figure out. Maybe they wanted a change of scenery or perhaps they thought the food was better over there. I really couldn't see any difference.

I repeatedly found myself seeking refuge in the library during the mornings and afternoons. Quiet and fairly well stocked, it was a pleasant change from the constant bustle of the rest of the place. In the library, you lost all sense of time and became engrossed in what you were reading. This is possibly because you knew there was nothing else to do. It was at this time that I began to take an interest in reading the history of Forest Glen.

Forest Glen is not particularly easy to find, and it wasn't meant to be. The people who originally built it in 1890 had in mind an exclusive resort for those wishing to escape the heat of downtown Washington during the summer months.

It wasn't that the city didn't get hot during the summer, but "Ye Forest Inne," as it was called in those days, failed to turn a profit and closed within four years. For the next half century, Forest Glen played host to young women in the form of National Park Seminary and later, National Park College. The school changed ownership several times and in spite of the lavish furnishings added to the original Forest Inn, the college sold out to the Army in 1942.

This sale may have been a disturbing fact to alumnae of National Park College, but patients, beginning with those returning from World War II, were enthusiastic. The Army's investment again proved wise during the Korean Conflict; and now, Vietnam veterans and others such as myself come to Forest Glen, taking the strain off the overcrowded wards of Walter Reed proper.

For all the facilities it offers, Forest Glen, in the opinion of many, is distinctly dis-

pleasing to look at. It is a conglomeration of different types of architecture which one visitor recently described as "early nothing to late Halloween."

The description may not be far from wrong. At Forest Glen you will find a Japanese pagoda, a Spanish mission, a Swiss Chalet and a medieval castle with, that's right, a drawbridge. It was Post Theater No. 2 that resembled the front of an old, Southern plantation. First-run films are shown there five times a week for an amazingly meager price of admission, Thirty-five cents.

Other oddities you will find at Forest Glen include bronze castings of sphinxes, lions and barking dogs which decorate bridges that span numerous gulleys. Cast iron figures attired in iron robes hold street lights. Concrete statues, usually of young girls, support some of the porch roofs. Former sorority houses are now officers' quarters.

With no discredit to the above, the pride and joy of Forest Glen has to be its three-tiered ballroom with stained-glass windows and a 70-foot ceiling. Once used for the most formal occasions at National Park College, the ballroom is now the scene of "pop-corn parties" put on by the Red Cross. The ballroom, affectionately known as the patients' lounge, also contains television, pool and ping-pong tables, and plenty of comfortable easy-chairs. The highly polished, stained wood floor in the center of the room has a sign which warns patients to "Please Keep Off."

There are those times, however, when the sign is removed and the patient's lounge becomes the center of festivity—as much as it ever will. Dances are held frequently during the evenings and entertainment ranges from a ladies' barbershop quartet to the never-ending beat of a "hard rock" band. Since many of the patients at Forest Glen are amputees, sit down entertainment is stressed over dancing.

The Army "blurb" about Forest Glen, put out in 1963, says "Forest Glen retains the charm of the old with the serviceability of the new." Indeed, a great amount of research is conducted in or around the Forest Glen area. The Army Bio-mechanical Research Laboratory, established in 1963, is the site of advanced study in prosthetics (artificial limbs). There is also a speech and audiology center, a medical specialist advanced course, a historical unit and the Military Entomology Information Service.

As the weeks went by time began to really drag and I began to notice more people and associated them with certain characteristics. I noticed amputees in particular. Not because they stood out for any reason, but because I could identify with the sense of loss some of them apparently had. Ninety per cent of the amputees at Forest Glen, I learned, were from the Vietnam war; and from what I could gather, many were ostentatiously proud to have served there in spite of their present condition.

There were little indications. The Vietnam veterans always wore their olive drab field jackets over the required blue hospital uniform. The field jacket was better than the name tag of cloth that was sewed above the left pocket. A quick glance at the jacket could tell you the rank of the owner, whether he had been to Vietnam, and what unit he served with. Since injured soldiers from the war are automatically given a promotion of at least one grade upon their return to the states, it was understandable the men would delight in showing off their new ranks.

It seemed evident to me that none of the veteran amputees that I met at Forest Glen felt sorry for himself to any noticeable extent. I suppose they were out to show the world that they were every bit as good as before, and they were doing it with success. A couple of the men who had lost legs drove standard shift cars with hand controls rigged up so they could use the clutch. Others were satisfied to drive cars with auto-

matic transmissions. In no way did their conditions prevent them from having a good time on off-duty hours. Some went to the Non-Commissioned Officers Club to drink a few beers during the evening while others went out on dates or to one of the two post movies Walter Reed offers.

One sergeant however, whom I'll call Dave, became unusually bitter about his situation.

"Say, Dave" I said once, "what do you plan to do with yourself when you get out of this place?"

"Nothing," he answered in a monotone.

"Nothing!" I exclaimed. "And just how do you think you can get away with doing nothing for the rest of your life. The only way you can do nothing is if you live in the soldiers' home or something."

"It'll be easy," Dave said. "With the disability I'll be getting from the Veterans' Administration and the Social Security I can draw if I don't work, I can make almost five hundred dollars a month, tax free. Why should I do anything when I can make that kind of money doing nothing?"

"But don't you think you'll get tired of just sitting around after a while?" I asked.

"I doubt it, but if I do, I might consider going to work."

Dave's attitude was not the standard one at Forest Glen. Most of the men had jobs already lined up and waiting for them upon their return home. Others planned to go back to school and send Uncle Sam the bill.

During my stay at Forest Glen I only knew of one other amputee besides myself who was not injured in Vietnam. I think most of the people I met naturally assumed I was from Vietnam and I became quite tired of telling them that I was a veteran of the nation's highways, and not Vietnam. Also, they didn't seem impressed when I quoted statistics which revealed more people by far are killed on the highways than in the war. Each man from Vietnam seemed to enjoy telling about the particular incident in which he was injured, and none was resentful if asked to explain how he was injured. It was an underlying sense of pride—almost as if the men were begging to be asked about their combat experiences.

Sometimes it was a little overdone. On Tuesday nights, every television in the place without exception was tuned into "Combat." The show was watched with reverence. I couldn't blame them for watching it, but everybody knew who was going to win every week, and after a while it became a bore.

Julie Mae
MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. VIGORITO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks many people have said many things about the recent conflict in the Middle East. I would like to enter into the RECORD my brief feelings on the entire development.

It is clear that the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba by President Nasser and the stationing of Arab troops along its border forced Israel to take the action it did in self-defense of its frontiers. It is also obvious that the Israel Army and Air Force richly deserve the impressive victory they have won.

What is less clear is the future action which must be taken to bring the Middle East to peaceful existence once and for all. Now that the conflict is over, the Arab nations must recognize that Israel,

July 12, 1967

H 8606

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

like any other nation, has its right to exist and the right to demand guarantees of territorial integrity. Israel is an independent state and should be able to enjoy the recognition due such a state. For this reason, its borders should be secured so that never again will it have to mass troops to defend its frontiers.

Freedom of passage in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba should be guaranteed not only to Israel but to all nations of the world, and the final settlement of its boundaries should include the recognition by the Arab countries of these borders.

Finally, Israel has undergone, despite its military victory, a serious economic dislocation. I hope it will be the policy of this Government to extend to the country all possible economic assistance.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON PROVIDES NEW LIFE FOR THE TEACHERS CORPS

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a recent ceremony in Philadelphia, President Johnson signed into law a bill that extended the life of the Teachers Corps. He declared:

This idea was so sound that it withstood the fiercest buffeting and the strongest challenge.

He is right. The idea of the Teachers Corps is based on a notion as old as American itself; namely, that knowledge is the key to progress and greater human understanding. And the Teachers Corps is a new and exciting program that will help to improve the standards of classroom learning in hundreds of American communities.

The teacher has always been the indispensable link in the chain of acquiring a good education. This link is being strengthened by the 1,200 Teachers Corps members—and hundreds of others who will be enrolling in the program in the years ahead—who are providing, in the President's words, "a basic building block for our schools and for our Nation."

President Johnson should be deservedly proud of the Teachers Corps and its accomplishments.

As one who has supported this program from its inception, I share the pride of the President and my fellow citizens in a program that is helping to light the lamp of knowledge for thousands of schoolchildren.

VAN DEERLIN OFFERS TRASH CONTROL BILL

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to substantially expand the Federal program for assisting cities and States in the disposal of solid wastes. My bill is modeled on a

measure introduced in the other body by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

The problem of solid wastes—those items which have lost their usefulness or appeal but not their physical bulk—is assuming enormous dimensions in this country. We are generating about 400,000 tons of trash a day, or roughly 4 pounds for every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Unless we find some practical means of disposing of this refuse, our urban areas could turn into massive junk yards, choked with unwanted consumer goods, industrial wastes, and worn-out buildings.

My bill would authorize a Federal expenditure of \$810.8 million over the next 5 years for the planning and construction of large scale disposal projects. This large sum should be measured against the \$2.5 billion we would otherwise have to spend during the next decade just for the disposal facilities needed to keep pace with the expected annual increase in the sheer volume of our trash.

The U.S. aid would be offered only for projects which met the highest standards of engineering, health protection, and pollution control.

Throwing away the 800 million pounds of solid wastes that Americans generate each day without polluting the air, the water, and the land on which our health and lives depend is an extremely complex challenge, one for which we still do not have all the answers. Our legislation should help provide at least some of the solutions.

I might add that this bill has been endorsed by the city of San Diego, which I have the honor to represent. The San Diego Utilities Department, recognizing the urgency of the problem, is already engaged in research to determine whether useful byproducts can be created from the controlled burning of municipal refuse.

ADDRESS TO INDIANA HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

(Mr. HAMILTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I addressed a conference of Indiana hospital trustees and administrators sponsored by the Indiana Hospital Association.

This group has provided many excellent examples for the rest of the Nation through many and varied efforts to improve the quality, efficiency and economy of medical care in Indiana.

The national need for these improvements was the topic of my remarks to this group. I include these remarks in full in the RECORD:

We are concerned today with the progress of a health care system in America which is gargantuan, complicated and expensive.

At its best this system is spectacular. At its best it can apply the research that produced the Salk and Sabine vaccines to eliminate the terror of polio.

At its best it can mobilize to cope with disasters like your almost miraculous achievements during the night of the coliseum explosion.

This health care system has prolonged life

by 20 years within the last 60 years. Today it is making an unprecedented assault on health problems—vaccines, antibiotics, modern drugs, life saving devices like plastic heart valves prolong life and prevent its erosion.

Not all of my remarks on health care system today will be complimentary. But whatever I say is said in the full recognition that this system at its best is the finest in the world, and that you who participate in it have an impressive record to stand on.

STRESSES IN THE SYSTEM

All of us would agree, I think, that our health care system shows disturbing signs of stress and strain.

So long as the United States stands 10th in preventing infant deaths, 14th in deaths from diabetes, 13th in deaths from heart disease, 5th in overall deaths, and 8th in prolonging life.

So long as chronic disease is a way of life for millions and whole segments of the population do not receive medical attention with any degree of thoroughness.

So long as 100,000 people die of uremic poisoning, partially because treatment is too expensive,

So long as 50% of all children under 15 have not visited a dentist,

So long as measles kill 500 children each year and cervical cancer kills 8,000 women, your work and mine is undone.

1. Costs

The expense of health care represents a very grave stress in the system.

The study by Dorothy Rice for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare entitled "Estimating The Cost of Illness," calculated that health care and the lack of it, cost the nation \$93.4 billion in 1963.

This includes \$34.3 billion for the direct costs of the system (hospitals, physicians, drugs and insurance) and \$59.2 billion in such indirect costs as the loss of productivity during illness and the premature deaths.

We could reasonably expect this estimate to be substantially higher now.

Last year Titles 18 and 19 began eliminating the economic barriers to help care for two very large groups of the population—the elderly and the poor. This adds to the costs of our health care system too.

I know you are very much aware that the daily charges in hospitals rose 16 1/2% last year on a national average. This was the single most inflationary component of the consumer price index. Physicians fees rose, again on the national average, 7.8%. This was the greatest annual increase since 1927.

In 1950 the average cost per day in the hospital was \$14.40. In 1965 it had tripled, more than \$45.

These statistics do not measure all the costs of the system. Few families in the great American middle class have any effective defense for the costs of a major illness. These families cannot meet the economic demands of a child of leukemia, a father with a disabling heart disease, a mother whose life depends on the availability of an artificial kidney.

The costs of the system often forces these families to dispose of their assets, to liquidate their insurance and retirement programs and even to take their children out of school.

2. Resources

Another source of great stress and strain in the health care system is the shortage of resources. This is a very frustrating problem. We have found it is really much easier to find the money for new hospitals than it is to find the people from janitors to administrators to staff them.

Many of you are aware of that from your personal experience.

In Washington we are told in hard statistics that within the next decade, the nation will need a million new health workers. To meet the requirements for new doctors, we

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Behold, the Lord our God has shown us His glory and His greatness, and we have heard His voice out of the midst of the fire; we have seen this day that God does talk with man and that He lives.—Deuteronomy 5: 24.

O God, our Father, we thank Thee for the gift of a new day fresh from Thy hand. Help us to use these hours to live cleanly, to labor industriously, to love wisely, and to keep our spirits elevated to high levels of thought. May we have the strength to overcome our difficulties and the courage to carry our responsibilities with honor and with uplifted hearts.

Sustain us in every effort to make a better world and to bring good will to all the children of men. In the midst of this day's work assure us of Thy presence and let the light of Thy wisdom fall upon our pathway. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 5. An act to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

(Mr. RESNICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, today, July 12, is going to go down in the annals of congressional history, for today for the first time the House Committee on Agriculture passed a resolution disassociating itself from my remarks about the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. Speaker, you have been here many years, and you know what an unprecedented action this is. Now, my charges that I have made will be fully aired. I do not want to take the time now to discuss them, but I will in a special order when this session is over. I would point out at this time that this resolution was passed, and the majority of the members of that committee are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, so the question which must be raised is: Is this a committee of the House, or is

this a committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation?

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to speak on this.

THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH IN THE CONGRESS

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the Committee on Agriculture is without any precedent during the time I have served in the House. I think, indeed, that it is a dangerous precedent when a Member of the House of Representatives cannot question the activities or the standing of a powerful Washington lobby without running the risk of having the committee on which he serves adopt a resolution disassociating themselves from his statements and characterizing what he said as a "personal attack." This constitutes an inhibition upon the right of free inquiry by Members of the Congress about which we should all be concerned.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my surprise that the Committee on Agriculture should feel called upon to take such action. If any Member disagrees with the remarks of the gentleman from New York, regarding the Farm Bureau, he has this forum in which to state his disagreement. But the adoption of a resolution by the Committee on Agriculture, it seems to me, is a very poor precedent.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE RE- PORT ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIA- TION BILL, 1968

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Thursday, July 13, to file a report on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1968.

Mr. MINSHALL reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]?

There was no objection.

CLIFFORD L. ALEXANDER, JR.: A MERITED APPOINTMENT

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has named an outstanding

young Negro American to be Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—Clifford Alexander, Jr.

Those of us who have observed Mr. Alexander's performance as a White House aide during the past 4 years, know him to be a capable, dedicated and effective public servant—wise beyond his years.

I first met him in Brooklyn some years ago. I quickly learned to respect his ability and wide knowledge. He has a natural knack of genuine cooperation with his fellow man.

Mr. Alexander has served with great distinction as Deputy Special Council to the President. There is every reason to believe that he will be equally as effective as head of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. Alexander knows well that equal employment opportunity is a key factor in the Negro's quest for true equal rights in the United States. His dedication to this cause is beyond question. His tact, good sense, and experience will help him to fulfill the objective of this vital Commission.

I wish Mr. Alexander well. He is assuming a difficult post, one that will demand the best of his talents and abilities. He will be in the vortex of the struggle for civil rights—and will be expected to act firmly, but fairly, to all concerned.

I commend President Johnson for the wisdom of this appointment. Mr. Alexander has well earned the President's confidence and respect. His appointment is a hopeful sign that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will have a key role to play in the progress we seek for all Americans.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has once again shown his deep interest in equal rights for all Americans by nominating as the new Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, his own Deputy Special Counsel, Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., of New York.

Those who know Mr. Alexander personally, recognize that he is not only a highly able qualified young man who has already served his country in a number of distinguished positions, but that he is also a warm and considerate human being.

Cliff Alexander is one of those new breed of young men who entered public service with a selfless devotion to improve the quality of our national life and strengthen the institutions of democratic life.

The President made a fine choice when he brought Mr. Alexander to the White House staff some 3 or more years ago.

He has now made another excellent choice in naming him as the new Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

H 8531

July 12, 1967

This nomination is not only a gain for equal opportunity and civil rights. It is a gain for government as a whole.

We welcome Clifford Alexander to his new responsibilities, and we wish him well in the future.

And we compliment the President on the quality of his appointments.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the subject matter of the appointment of Mr. Alexander as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

KREMLIN'S DETERMINATION TO BECOME DOMINANT POWER IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. FARBSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the relentless efforts of the Soviet Union to rebuild the bellicose spirit and warmaking potential of the Arab States testifies to the Kremlin's unabated determination to become the dominant power in the Middle East.

At this very minute, Arab leaders, acting under Soviet advice, may be conspiring in Cairo to resume the war in the Middle East, while Soviet warships lie at anchor in Arab ports as testimony to Russian-Arab solidarity. Meanwhile, throughout the Arab world new armies and new air forces are being trained with modern Soviet equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that our Government has not made its own policies in the Middle East as clear as they might be. I am apprehensive that an Arab miscalculation might once again bring tragedy down on their heads, but with much more grievous consequences for the entire world. If such a tragedy ensues from the current Russian-Arab machinations, it will be the Soviet government that is to blame.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our President must speak out publicly in unmistakable terms, even though he may have done so privately, that this country will not tolerate a resumption of Arab aggression in the Middle East. I believe that our Government must warn the Soviet Union in the most solemn fashion that it will hold the Russian policy responsible if there is a renewal of hostilities. I believe that President Johnson should convey to Premier Kosygin his intention to thwart any effort by the Soviet Union to take over the Middle East, either directly or through Arab puppets.

The Kremlin is mortgaging Arab lives and fortunes to its own nefarious policy designs. We must make it clear that we will not consent to Israel's defeat to satisfy Russian ambitions. The situation is now growing as dangerous as it was last May. Before it is too late, the Presi-

dent must caution the Russians not to lose their heads. The Soviets are playing a most dangerous game and the President must inform them that they cannot win.

EXTENSION OF THE U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was unavoidably detained in my office with constituents during the vote on H.R. 10805, the bill to extend the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission until 1973. This independent, bipartisan Commission has made many, very valuable contributions to furthering the cause of racial understanding and, therefore, I am strongly in favor of its continuation.

CONCENTRATION OF OUR NAVAL STRENGTH IN ONE PLACE

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to see in the July 4 issue of the San Diego Union of San Diego, Calif., a picture of six U.S. aircraft carriers in the harbor and shipyards at Long Beach. One nuclear weapon or device of even small dimensions, delivered by air or submarine to this one harbor, would break the back of the carrier force of the U.S. Navy.

There were six carriers in the same harbor early in 1956. At that time I spoke in opposition to the concentration of carriers in this fashion. The then chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. Vinson, also spoke in opposition to this kind of concentration of our naval strength. Although the Navy never would admit it was wrong in concentrating these fighting ships in one place, I thought we had some private assurance that this would not occur again.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Navy will disperse these carriers immediately and that such a concentration will never again be permitted for this is an open invitation to another Pearl Harbor.

ARAB-ISRAEL SITUATION

(Mr. DICKINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the pleasure of having Mrs. Sidney C. Shinbaum, president, Council of Jewish Women of Montgomery, Ala., and vice president, National Women's League of America, call on me to express her concern over the Arab-Israel situation in the Middle East. Accompanying her were Mrs. Sol Hertzog, regional president of Hadassah and Mrs. Abe Walter, past regional president of Hadassah, both of Memphis, Tenn.

In our discussion, I asked Mrs. Shinbaum what she wanted me, as a Member of Congress, to do since Congress itself

would have little, if anything, to do with the terms of any armistice or treaty between Israel and the Arab nations, nor would Congress have much, if anything, to do with the United Nations role in premises, and based on prior experiences, it is not likely that the State Department will consult with the Congress as to the role the United States should play in bringing about a permanent solution to the problems confronting Israel, Egypt, and the other Arab States.

I was given a list of five points that Mrs. Shinbaum feels should be the basis of any truce or permanent armistice. These five points are:

First. The recognition by the Arab nations, once and for all time, of the existence of the State of Israel and its right to be a free and sovereign nation.

Second. The recognition by all parties that the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba constitute an international waterway.

Third. That the Suez Canal be open to Israel vessels.

Fourth. That the Arab nations accord to American Jewish business firms and Americans of Jewish descent the same rights and privileges accorded to other Americans.

Fifth. That Israel and her warring neighbors settle the details of peace in face-to-face confrontation.

I agree that these points are sensible and sound and should certainly be the basis of any settlement. To this I think it should be added that the entire city of Jerusalem be treated as a single unit with ready access by all people at all times and that it should never again be divided by any boundaries, real or imaginary. I, for one, feel that the actions Israel took were justified and necessary for its preservation. As a matter of fact, if it had been left up to some of our fuzzy thinkers in the State Department and the United Nations, Israel would have continued talking until Nasser and the other Arab nations were in a position to strike the final blow which might have led to Nasser's promised annihilation of Israel as a people and a state.

The courageous people of Israel should know and, indeed, all people should know, that neither the State Department nor the United Nations reflects the unanimous opinions of the non-Jewish people—either within or outside of Congress.

SUPPORT FOR ACTION OF THE PRESIDENT IN SENDING CARGO TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT TO THE CONGO

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the action of President Johnson in sending the three cargo transport airplanes to the Congo.

What apparently happened in the Congo was that white mercenary members of the Congolese Army mutinied, resulting in racial tensions which threatened not only to jeopardize the security and safety of the people in the Congo but also threatened to exacerbate race relations in that part of Africa.

July 12, 1967

S 9475

not engage in biological and chemical warfare against himself and his environment. Health and well-being—and those of future generations—are at stake.

"Health experts have repeatedly pointed out that grave, delayed physical manifestations can result from repeated exposure to concentrations of environmental pollutants so small that they do not make one ill enough to send him to the doctor. Environmental pollutants can have cumulative effects, especially because they accumulate in certain tissues and organs. These effects can take delayed forms such as cancers, emphysema, and reduced life span, and they can even extend to following generations."

The problem of graphically perceiving these kinds of violence is importantly one of dealing with a mass phenomenon: that is, our ability to adjust psychologically to a deteriorating environment while physiologically we cannot. For example, our cities are smothered with polluted air and we adjust but our lungs do not. The forces that stand in the way of restoring the quality of our environment have led us to trade at best an immediate benefit for a deferred tort. If for no other reason than an aesthetic one, we should have rejected this ugliness around us. When a people can be deprived of such fundamental aesthetic gratifications, they have been deprived of a most basic sensitivity with which they are endowed.

How can sensitivity be recovered, endowed with normative strength and knowledgeable content? Answering this question is obviously a large order, but I should like to make a few suggestions and then follow with some specifics.

First, it is important to realize that the exponential growth of technology in the postwar period has contributed something qualitatively new. There has emerged a growing capability to program technological innovation given an adequate provision of men, resources, and organization. Technical solutions can be developed as a fairly predictable result of conscious policymaking. "Inventing the technological future" is no longer a utopian or fictional phrase.

Second, by far the most unyielding obstacles to a safer environment are the old greeds and frailties in modern garb. The struggle to defend, maintain and amplify economic power and bureaucratic position goes on, as it has throughout history, and nourishes the truncated vision and institutional stasis that are our collective bane. Sometimes, as in the case of the safety of cars, drugs, meat, the role of particular corporations looms largest. Other times, there is a convergence of callousness, as in the tragic case of mining companies, Government agencies and industry-indentured unions who permitted unknowing miners to be exposed to deadly radon gas and the fate of premature death by cancer.

Third, a key procedural improvement would be a shift in the burden of proof of safety levels from the users and consumers of a product and process to the manufacturers and distributors of them. The outcry of industry and Hill and Knowlton to the contrary, this country is in its infancy as far as rigorous pre-marketing safety testing of products and processes and full disclosure of relevant information are concerned. The corporate system of partial and partisan control of information crucial to evaluation of products and risk identification cannot be reconciled with democratic control of matters that touch us all.

The recent General Electric color television case is illustrative of the deficiencies in business and government that prevent prompt foreseeing and forestalling of hazards. On May 18, 1967, General Electric released an ambiguous and misleading statement that some 90,000 color TV sets produced between June 1966 and February 1967 "may emit soft X-radiation in excess of desirable levels". The company announced a

program to modify these sets which were already in their purchasers' homes. On the same day, the national center for radiological health of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, issued a statement which could be dubbed as an adjunct P.R. assurance for G.E. The "no need to worry" tone of the G.E. statement was recounted along with the declaration that studies made by the NCRH of several television sets (but not, as it turned out, G.E.'s offending ones) during the past six months did not give rise to concern. NCRH's director, James G. Terrill, Jr., concluded the statement by saying that he had no evidence to suggest what any television sets have "excessively exposed viewers of television sets".

Such a whitewash did not satisfy Representatives John Moss and Paul Rogers. Under their prodding a different story began to emerge. Mr. Terrill began to show concern. By June 7, out came the admission that the X-ray leakage beam gave off levels ranging up to 8,000 MR/hour at a distance of 7 inches from the defective tube, compared with the limits of 5 MR/hour recommended by the national council for radiation protection and measurement. That same day, Mr. Terrill sent a private memorandum to the center's regional representatives to advise any worried inquirers to turn off their set and not use it until it is checked and modified. This advice was not contained in the press release to the public on May 18, or in any other subsequent statement by the center.

NCRH's first specific knowledge of the G.E. problem was said to be on April 10, indicating that the center was in no rush to protect the exposed people. In fact, it did not even inform the upper echelons of its own department, General Electric, on the other hand, discovered the excessive radiation leakage last fall. (Sources in the television components industry were aghast that such a defect could pass quality control from the outset.) The company did not want to make public its tragic failing until its hand was forced months later by the reluctant center, under decisive prodding by several New York State agencies and finally the New York Times. It turned out that 154,208 sets were produced with this excess X-radiation leakage. While G.E. was pondering its corporate image month after month, adults, children and infants (whose parents often put them near the TV set so they can watch both) were absorbing these deadly emissions and many of them still are until a G.E. repairman comes to fix them. The defective television sets, incidentally, had received the stamp of approval from the underwriters laboratory. And the electronic industries association had up to May continually ridiculed any suggestion that television sets may have an excessive radiation problem. The entire episode, and its continuing existence, does little to inspire confidence in one of the largest corporations in the world or in a government organization called the national center for radiological health.

A far more widespread radiation hazard from diagnostic and therapeutic radiation is most persuasive to the point that the absence of public safeguards in the midst of alarming knowledge is endemic and not episodic.

The following facts are drawn from studies by Dr. Karl Morgan, Director of Health Physics at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory:

Medical exposure accounts for about 90% of all exposure of the U.S. population from man made sources of ionizing radiation.

The average dose to the gonads in the U.S. today from medical radiation is as much as 100 times the average dose from radioactive fallout.

Diagnostic radiation (medical and dental X-rays) doses in the U.S. are much higher than those obtaining in other modern, industrialized societies. The average dose in the U.S. is 10 times higher than that of the

United Kingdom, 4 times than that of Japan, and 15 times higher than that of Norway.

There were about 140 million diagnostic X-rays performed in 1964. Dr. Morgan comments that "no matter how great the medical benefits derived from X rays, this is no justification of the fact that because of the use of poor techniques with obsolete and improperly operated equipment, many X ray exposures are ten or more times that needed for the best diagnostic results." He adds that not only could there be better X ray information with one tenth the dosage, but also such improvement could "prevent hundreds and perhaps thousands of children being born each year with mental and physical handicaps of varying degrees, the vast majority of which go undetected."

Deficient X-ray machines and poorly trained operators are so prevalent throughout the states that a serious federal appraisal of the adequacy of state regulation is in order.

New York City probably has the most active inspection program in the country. In 1961, over 3,600 X ray units in New York City were inspected and 92% were found defective. Many states either have no inspection or inspect machines infrequently. In 1965, the states reported that of a total number of 113,806 medical X ray units in use, only 25,174 were inspected. Nearly half of these were found defective and corrections were reported in only 7,713. California has not even finished its first round of inspections yet. Connecticut has only two inspectors for the entire state, one more than Indiana has for its people. The value of this inspection is lessened by the low standards of machine performance established and the obsolescence of machines. Shortages of competent personnel, can be gauged by the fact that in 1965 there were only 143 full time men working in X ray survey and control programs in the entire nation.

Situations are reported which sound bizarre but are actually not that uncommon. Professor Hanson Blatz, director of the New York City Office of Radiation Control cites X ray machines with inadequate lead shielding spraying daily doses on unknowing workers in other rooms of the building. Patients sitting in dental chairs are known to be exposed to radiation from eyeball to abdomen.

Operators of X ray machines are poorly trained in the majority of cases. Unfortunately, this lack of training includes members of the dental and medical professions. Most physicians receive very little training in radiology in medical school. At Yale Medical School, an institution with above average standards, students take one short course in radiology which deals solely with the reading of X rays. The students themselves admit that they feel inadequately prepared to deal with problems of radiation safety. With the recent exceptions of New York and Puerto Rico, no State requires the licensing of X ray machine operators pursuant to a proficiency examination.

Dr. Granville Larimore of the New York State Department of Health described the situation in his State: "We knew that a large number of these other people taking X rays were not really X ray technicians. They were nurses, secretaries, receptionists, medical assistants, and others working in the offices of private physicians. . . . For the most part their 'training' was limited to a few hours of instruction by a representative of the equipment manufacturers." "Unskilled operators", says Larimore, "often can expose the gonads of patients to as much as 100 to 200 times the amount of radiation necessary from a purely medical point of view."

Numerous authorities in radiation control agree that current levels of diagnostic and therapeutic radiation could be drastically reduced by newer equipment, simple retrofitting of older equipment, and competent operators, without impairing the medical and

dental professions' exercise of judgment. More readable X rays could be obtained with far lower radiation doses. Against the background of radiation studies, efforts to reduce doses are urgent, the more that is known about radiation impact on humans, the greater is the intolerance of any acceptable level of exposure. Any radiation exposure may cause some damage to the human body, either somatic or genetic. Exposure must be kept as low as possible.

What is being done about this situation at the Federal level? Why has the Federal Radiation Council remained aloof from the greatest emitting source of man made radiation in this country? What is the U.S. Public Health Service doing? What is the function of the quasi-official National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement? Why have the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Hospital Association, and the professional radiological organizations displayed so little concern with this problem? Why have the manufacturers of X ray equipment not been more aggressive advocates for selling safety? Just what are the inhibitions afflicting all these groups?

The most effective way to publicly air these questions and inform the public about the hazards in a sober manner is the congressional hearing. Fortunately, the years of waiting are at an end. There is a strong likelihood that both the House and Senate will open hearings on the subject shortly. Senator E. L. Bartlett (D. Alaska) has just called for hearings on a radiation safety bill which he and several other Senators have introduced. There will be the usual confrontation between the establishment and its challengers, the usual agony in getting information the public has a right to have, and the struggle of professions and groups to save face, and to remain free of any public restraints. The economic pressures and the State vs. Federal tensions will surface. Out of it all, hopefully, will come a resolution of conflicts and a strong Federal radiation safety policy. But the law, once passed, tends toward atrophy or contamination in its administration and enforcement under the constant hammering of special interests and their Washington law firms. So initial efforts must have follow-through, and for that to prevail, some portion of the citizenry must find continuing commitment.

ATTACK ON FARM BUREAU REGRETTABLE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in view of recent statements made during hearings by the House Subcommittee on Rural Development, on the floor of the House of Representatives and in subsequent news stories, I wish to speak in defense of the goals and activities of the Farm Bureau.

Having operated a cattle ranch in Wyoming most of my life, I am reasonably familiar with some of the problems and needs of agricultural people and the role the Farm Bureau has played in working to solve these problems and fulfill these needs.

As a Farm Bureau member, I have had occasion to observe at first hand the unique policymaking process through which the organization's members define their problems and collectively outline courses of action to solve them.

Certainly no one but the farmer or rancher himself is more acutely aware of the need for a better standard of rural living. It was a desire to improve their economic status which prompted Farm Bureau members across the Nation to promote the establishment of their own

insurance companies—companies which they would own and control, and which would fill an obvious need for adequate insurance coverage for the least cost. I see nothing wrong with this. The companies were founded and have operated openly and lawfully, and they contribute millions of dollars annually to the tax structures of various counties, States, and the Nation.

As a rancher in Wyoming, later as Governor of that State, and now as a Senator, I have worked with many Farm Bureau members to help improve the general condition of the agricultural industry so that it might best contribute its rightful share to the overall welfare of the Nation.

I have not agreed with every position taken by Farm Bureau members, just as I do not always agree with decisions made by the majority of the Members of this body; but on the whole, I have found the policies and activities of Farm Bureau to reflect reason, honesty, and integrity.

Certainly the very fact that Farm Bureau membership increases each year is a means by which to gage whether or not the activities of the leadership represent the thinking of the majority of members—for membership is entirely a voluntary matter, and those disagreeing with the actions or philosophy of the organization are absolutely free not to join, or to withdraw their support.

In short, Mr. President, I feel that anyone who is familiar with the many activities and fine accomplishments of this group could not help but admire the manner in which it works to better the lot of the farmer and rancher and society as a whole.

Farm Bureau policy is built from the ground up. It does not filter from the top down. It begins at the local community level and is developed by examination, discussion, and debate at the district, State, and eventually the National level.

Farm Bureau has nothing to fear from any investigation that is concerned with facts and truth.

John Mc THE PALESTINIAN REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, whoever tries to understand the Palestinian refugee problem reaches for the true nature of tragedy. For 20 years a just resolution of this problem has defied the best efforts of the United Nations as well as the individual efforts of many nations, including the United States.

Indeed, we have only to consider what has been the result of these 20 years of concern: during the Arab-Israel conflict which followed the partition of the Palestine Mandate in 1948, an estimated 750,000 Arabs fled from their homes in Palestine and took refuge in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and a small enclave of 140 square miles of barrenness known as the Gaza strip.

Today, after 20 years of dedicated effort by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency—UNRWA—and the investment of over \$400 million by the United States alone, the central facts are these: the original 750,000 Arab refugees now number 1.3 million, with over 720,000 in Jordan and almost 400,000 in

Gaza; in addition, 40,000 new refugee children are born each year; over one-half the total number of refugees are under the age of 20; the refugee birth rate is one of the highest, if not the very highest, in the world today; one quarter of a million Arab children are now awaiting a place on the relief rolls.

These statistics are sobering and shocking, but the condition of these people is even more disturbing. The refugees themselves remain barely preserved from starvation by the United Nations. UNRWA, the United Nations relief organization, is only able to provide each refugee with \$14 worth of food per year, approximately 4 cents a day. From my own observation—both in 1959 and now again from a visit from which I returned yesterday—these tragic people are hungry, miserable, embittered and impoverished, burdened with unwanted and uncared for children, numb and generally impassive, yet vulnerable to fanatical hate stimulated by those who hope for a triumphal return to a Palestine cleansed of Jews. Desperation has bred disillusion; misery has spawned hatred; and years of idleness and want have withered pride in labor. These are the ingredients of a vast human tragedy which, if understood, would shock the conscience of mankind. This, Mr. President, is a veritable seedbed for political violence, hate, and another war.

The refugee problem does not lie simply in the field of economics, even though the hard core of refugees is composed of unskilled farmers and laborers—indigestible commodities to countries such as Jordan, Egypt, and Syria, already saturated with unskilled and unlearned peasants. The problem is much deeper and in many respects has symbolized the basic Arab-Israel dispute.

Until the events of the past few weeks, the Israeli position on the repatriation of the refugees was readily definable. Israel's answer was the insistence that the refugee problem could only be dealt with as part of a peace treaty between the Arabs and Israel. This is now, in my view, neither appropriate nor enough.

As we are all aware, for the Arabs to subscribe publicly to a formal agreement with Israel has been impossible.

I am convinced by my experience and talks on this trip that the Arabs are as of now emotionally and politically incapable of a formalized peace agreement with Israel. Moreover, Israel has been reluctant to alter the demographic pattern of the country or to introduce a potential security threat by absorbing even a modest number of the refugees. For instance, in 1949 Israel first offered and then withdrew an offer to repatriate 100,000 refugees because it came to be regarded as a threat to permanence of the Jewish homeland, so long sought by a suffering and persecuted people.

To many Arab political leaders, the perpetuation of the misery of the refugees was a powerful propaganda pawn in a game directed at the extermination of Israel. To the more moderate leaders, the option of repatriation and return or compensation for property was an important article of faith. Perhaps more important, the rights and the plight of the refugees symbolized a surging quest

July 12, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

throughout the Arab world for not only justice for the refugees but for dignity and respect for the Arab.

Both positions were appealing—strong moral arguments were mustered for both. But whatever chance existed for sensible discussion and possible resolution of the refugee problem was destroyed by strident voices of hate and fear. Given this impasse, it is no wonder that peace in the Middle East has been shattered every 10 years by brutal and senseless wars.

And now there is a new and still larger refugee problem. As a result of Israel's stunning military victories, the nature of the Palestine refugee problem has been profoundly altered. In the aftermath of this war, Israel has suddenly found itself, virtually overnight, in the position of having "repatriated," so to speak, more than a half a million refugees. For a country that once withdrew an offer to repatriate 100,000 refugees the sudden responsibility of acquiring five times that many must come as a shock. Its effect, however handled, will be profound. Many may consider the presence of over a half million refugees within the area occupied by Israel as a danger to Israel. In one sense, this is probably true. But in my view, these unfortunate victims of conflict are both a responsibility and an opportunity for Israel. If Israel meets this challenge in a magnanimous way, as I believe she can, then gates to the Middle East, previously closed to her, may become open. And Israel's future is in the Middle East, with which she is now face to face as never before.

Mr. President, because the recent war has created such an entirely new situation for the Arab refugees and because it appears such a key to possible equations of peaceful coexistence in this troubled part of the world, I revisited the Middle East to see and learn and report. Once before, in 1959, I inquired into the administration of the refugee problem. After a careful look at the UNRWA problem, I then reported to the Senate that there were serious problems in the UNRWA program in Jordan because of the fraudulent and corrupt use of ration cards. This situation was particularly appalling because many refugees, primarily children who needed and deserved assistance, were denied help because of flagrant profiteering on the part of puny relief racketeering. Despite assurances from both Jordanian and American officials that an effective reform would take place, little rectification of the relief rolls has been accomplished.

I mention this problem of rectification of the refugee relief rolls because the same problem is still before us, and now that there are so many new or displaced refugees it is imperative that the available supplies be given only to those whose needs and eligibility have been properly certified.

I visited Beirut, Lebanon, where I spoke at length with Lawrence Michelmore, the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, and with prominent and official Lebanese. After leaving Beirut, I was fortunate enough to be the first Member of Con-

gress to enter Jordan after the war. While in Jordan, I spoke with the Prime Minister and other high officials and visited several of the temporary camps where an estimated 180,000 to 200,000 new refugees are kept in camps that defy description in misery and human degradation. Men, women and children are huddled on the hot and burning sand with but few meager possessions or clothing, many being without even a small tent or cooking utensils. There are no sanitation facilities and little water.

In Israel, I spoke with Israel leaders such as Abba Eban, the Foreign Minister, and Ted Kolley, the mayor of Jerusalem, and others. I also visited the now virtually empty Jericho refugee camp on the west bank of the Jordan and later inspected the vast refugee area in Gaza, a vast concentration camp on the sand, if you will.

I returned from my conversations with Arab and Israeli leaders and from my visits to refugee camps with one dominant impression, it was that a willingness on the part of Israel to deal with the refugee problem in a magnanimous and humane way could be a small—but enormously critical—step toward peace in the Middle East. I believe that this is true regardless of the political future of the newly occupied areas. Indeed, I am convinced that the refugee problem and a political settlement in the Middle East are so tightly entwined that a political settlement is impossible without progress on the refugee problem.

I think this connection between the refugee problem and a political settlement is realized in Tel Aviv, however dimly at this moment, and perhaps also in the Arab countries. Let there be no mistake, Israel has taken on an enormous responsibility in assuming over 500,000 refugees—that is a number which represents roughly 20 percent of Israel's entire population. In the United States, a comparable action would be for the U.S. Government to suddenly acquire 40,000,000 basically untrained, unlettered, and fearful new citizens. Thus, for better or worse, Israel will never quite be the same if it assumes responsibility for these refugees.

Over the next few months, Israel faces a number of important decisions that could affect the whole future of the Middle East. I refer to the immediate problem of handling the some 180,000 refugees from the west bank of Jordan who fled into east Jordan during fighting, and to the other thousands in the valley and in Gaza who did not flee. The whole world is now watching how Israel will handle this first test of its declared policy to approach the refugee problem in a humane and magnanimous fashion. Thus far, despite Israel's assurances that it would allow refugees to return to their homes over the Jordan River between July 10 and August 10, both the planning and execution of this commitment have been unfortunately inadequate. After talking to Arab and Israel officials last week, I came to the conclusion that planning was insufficient and that something needed to be done if the refugees were to return in an expeditious fashion. On the basis of my own observations, I there-

fore urged Jordanian and Israel officials to facilitate the return of these refugees to their former camps on the west bank. UNRWA officials have also urged such a return. Also, on July 8, I sent a cable to President Johnson and to the Secretary of State Dean Rusk, which I will read to the Senate at this time:

Mr. President, have made inquiry into new refugee problem cause by Mid-East War. Visited Beirut to confer with Commissioner-General of UNRWA, Jordan and Israel. In Jordan I spoke with Prime Minister and visited temporary camps where some estimated 180,000 new or displaced refugees from Jordan West Bank are in condition of human suffering that defies description.

Upon my own I have urged Jordanian officials to insist that these refugees return to their former camps on the West Bank. Jordanian officials agree. UNRWA officials have urged such return. Israel has announced permission for their return beginning July 10. Unfortunately conditions for return not yet adequately clarified. Israel high officials inform that conditions have been detailed to Red Cross but just two days before stated time Jordanian Government has, to my knowledge, not been informed through any authorized channel of the conditions of such transfer.

Today I have visited the Jericho refugee complex in the West Jordan area. Camps are virtually empty, with only 3,000 to 4,000 of original 75,000 refugees remaining. Camps are in condition, far far superior to present plight. Sanitation facilities intact. Humane considerations require return to these and other camps.

In my unofficial talks with Israeli officials I have stressed and will continue to stress:

(1) Whole world will be watching anxiously for good faith performance pledge to allow innocent refugees to return in an orderly, humane manner.

(2) Assurances appear necessary that refugees will be permitted to receive remittances or other funds sent by relatives working in other Arab countries and that said relatives, with proper identification and control, will be able to visit families.

I have communicated these personal convictions to both Israeli and Jordanian officials.

Please be assured I have emphasized I speak only as an individual Senator with a deep interest in this human problem. Ambassador Barbour has also emphasized the importance of the foregoing points in numerous conversations and has extended to me the most hospitable cooperation.

Perhaps compassionate treatment of these victims of conflict could smooth the path to conditions of peaceful co-existence in this distraught area.

Reports since then have unfortunately indicated that my misgivings about the state of planning for the return of the refugees were justified. On Monday, July 10, the first day of the return period, the Associated Press reported that hundreds of refugees came to the Allenby Bridge in hopes of returning to the west bank of the Jordan. According to this report, they were turned away. They were turned away, as I understand it, not because of Israel's intention to keep them out, but because arrangements through the International Red Cross and by the two countries concerned had not been completed. I regret this delay and the very obvious human suffering it has caused. At the same time, I have every confidence, on the basis of my discussions with Israel leaders, that the situation will be remedied and that most of the refugees who wish to return will be permitted so to do.

July 12, 1967

Mr. President, I cannot over emphasize the importance of what happens over the next few weeks and months in Israel's dealings with the Arab refugees. If Israel should live up to its promise to repatriate the Arab refugees by investing in the economics, in the agriculture and in the industry of the refugee areas, and in the rehabilitation of the people into productive enterprise, the cause of peace in the Middle East will be greatly advanced, or so it seems to me. I believe the world is of one mind with regard to humane treatment of the refugees. This consensus for compassion just might be the easiest, if not the only path, to de facto, though undeclared, formulas for peaceful relations in the Middle East. If Israel should be able, not only to care for these innocent victims of the conflict in the Middle East, but actually to improve their lot, then I think that there is real hope of a gradual development of working agreements between some of the Arab states and Israel. Perhaps a permanent structure for peace in the Middle East will not come until there has been a series of de facto working agreements between Arab and Jew. In any event, I think an overall political settlement is impossible until these smaller steps have been taken.

I urge that all parties concerned look at the refugee problem in these terms. For my own part, I will support an increase in the U.S. contribution to UNRWA relief activities if Israel and the Arab countries show good will in the treatment of the refugees.

As I said, the next few months will be critical to the future of the Middle East.

FOOD FROM THE SEA—PART II

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the mineral and biological resources of the sea are exceedingly great and the use made of them by the nations of the world, while important, does not approach full use. Use of the full potential of the sea for the benefit of mankind is a goal which will be attained, if at all, many years in the future. Before that happy day arrives, there are many questions that must be answered. Some are biological, some are explorator in the sense that inventories must be made as an essential first step, and some are legal.

The harvest of oceanic resources within the territorial limits of any country that borders the sea will be controlled by that country. I think it is safe to assume that the long-term welfare of such a country will assure proper management of its coastal resources. Proper management of the resources of the high seas, however, is something else. It has been truly said that everybody's responsibility is nobody's responsibility. Nowhere is this more obvious—and more pregnant with danger for the resources—than in the area of management of the resources of the high seas.

At a meeting of the FAO Committee on Fisheries held early this year in Rome, Italy, Dr. Wilbert M. Chapman presented a paper entitled "The State of Ocean Use Management." In it he discussed at some length some of the problems of management of the high seas resources. Dr. Chapman's paper was interesting to me, and it was most illuminating

in that it brought into focus some of the problems we will face in the future.

I believe that this paper should be read by everyone who shares my concern for our country's future use of the ocean's resources. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STATE OF OCEAN USE MANAGEMENT
(By Dr. Wilbert McLeod Chapman, for presentation to the second session of the FAO Committee on Fisheries, Rome, April 24, 1967)

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great honor to be asked to address this assembly. From what I say later on you will see the importance which I attach to the deliberations of the Committee on Fisheries.

I have had the pleasure of meeting on international fishery affairs with nearly all of you on other occasions over the past thirty-odd years either in these halls, or at other meetings elsewhere in the world. Often this has been as a member of a delegation of the United States, and sometimes as an individual acting in the role of an independent expert. It is necessary to state quite flatly at the beginning of this address that I am here today as a very independent expert. I have no idea that what I have to say will be in agreement with policies of the United States Government or that of any other entity with which I am associated professionally.

Mr. Jackson has asked me to speak today on the state of ocean use management in the world, the possible impact on this of the several forces clustering around the United Nations resolution of 8 December, 1966, on "Resources of the Sea," the moving events and the forces at work on these matters internally in the United States, and elsewhere in the world, and related matters.

This is, to coin a phrase, a wriggling mass of very lively worms, and upon closer inspection each worm is found to have a head on both ends full of sharp teeth ready to snap off prodding fingers. It is therefore with some trepidation that I began my prodding, and take care to absolve the United States Government or anyone else, from blame for what I will say. After careful examination and long study I do not know what United States policy, if any, is on very many of these things anyway.

SOME OCEAN USE INTERESTS IN THE UNITED STATES

It is useful at first to enumerate some of the several forces at work in this field of international relations, particularly in the United States, so far as they can be separated from each other and dealt with independently. Among these are:

1. The nuclear powered submarine

The chief thing about the nuclear powered submarine is that once it goes below the surface of the ocean and is lost track of there is no existing technology by which it can be found again until it wants to be found. Loaded with its armament of nuclear tipped Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles it is capable of doing great damage even to the innermost reaches of the largest land masses.

I will say no more on this sensitive subject save to say that the problem navies have in detecting and catching submarines is not conceptually dissimilar from that which fishermen have in detecting and catching fish. Both wish to lower their cost per ton of catching, and both require about the same sort of information and understanding of the ocean environment with which to do so.

The navies have greater funds and research capabilities at their service than do the fishery people, or anyone else dealing with the ocean, and a major factor in the present stir over the use of the ocean derives from spin-offs of new knowledge of the ocean derived from this source of research support which are now reaching the civilian economy.

2. The weather

A wag said a generation or two ago, that everybody talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it. This is no longer the case. The state of the weather has become so important in the total operation of our present complex societies that it requires to be capable of prediction beyond the current theoretical limits, and modified beneficially when and where possible. It is now apparent that the atmosphere in which the weather occurs forms with the ocean one integrated heat engine in which most of the energy although ultimately deriving from the sun, comes into the atmosphere as effective force indirectly from the ocean.

Having understood this fact it then becomes necessary to learn how the ocean reservoir energy enters the atmosphere and affects its movements before the weather can be predicted with much better precision, or anything much can be done about it. But it is just exactly that 71% of the earth's surface covered by salt water where there are the least weather stations and observation points. The enormous expanses of the South Pacific are the largest reservoir of solar energy on this planet. The effects of its energy fluxes on planetary weather are bound to be considerable, but we know the least about this piece of water that we do of any ocean, and very little, indeed, about the energy fluxes within its complex structure, or between it and the atmosphere. Nor do we have observation stations in it yet to find out.

The same is largely true of the South Atlantic, the southern Indian Ocean, and the boundaryless seas of Antarctica. The southern hemisphere is the water hemisphere where the most of the energy to drive the atmosphere is received and reservoir, but the observation points to keep track of the energy fluxes that drive the air and make the weather are mostly on land in the land hemisphere of the North. So are the meteorologists.

It is obvious that the meteorologists must get to sea, they must go south, and they must establish observation points in the ocean. This is a matter of such moment that our government has been restructured, by a combination of sea and air activities within the Department of Commerce into the Environmental Science Services Administration, in order to deal with this problem more effectively. This is not the end yet of restructuring the United States Government to achieve this objective, and similar activities are being undertaken in other governments. This is having an impact on the World Meteorological Organization, and through this on the problems with which we are dealing today.

In essence it is no longer possible for oceanographers and meteorologists to keep, or be kept, separately in their respective ivory towers. It turns out that they are studying different aspects of the same thing, the ocean-atmosphere heat engine, and neither can understand its part until they work together. It also turns out that their customers who pay the bills want them both to come down out of their ivory towers and begin producing useful results.

As an underlining of the last comment, the United States Navy has felt that its need for advanced atmospheric and oceanic weather predictive capabilities was so urgent that it could not await these adjustments in the civilian sector. Accordingly, it has established its own analytical and predictive service respecting ocean air and weather on a world wide basis. From this the fisheries