

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

18-YEAR-OLD VOTE AMENDMENT
IS TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RAN-
DOLPH'S CONSTANT CRUSADE

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, early this year Congress took a major step toward perfecting the American system of democratic government. The submission to the States of the constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18 is an affirmation of our belief in this Government and our confidence in the younger citizens of this Nation.

The 18-year-old vote amendment also must stand as a monument to one Member of this body who has championed it for nearly three decades. The senior Senator from West Virginia and chairman of the Committee on Public Works (Mr. RANDOLPH), has introduced legislation to lower the voting age since 1942 when he was a member of the House of Representatives.

Senator RANDOLPH did not pay mere lipservice to securing the vote for this important segment of our population. It has been a serious undertaking with him, and he worked diligently for its passage. This year his dream of congressional approval came true, and we are near to broadening the horizons of democracy as State legislatures give their assent.

Senator RANDOLPH's native State of West Virginia, by action of its legislation on Wednesday, April 28, became the 25th State to ratify the constitutional amendment he authored.

Mr. President, the vision and determination of Senator RANDOLPH in this crusade of 27 years has been given widespread recognition. One of the most eloquent tributes to his success in this cause was paid by an editorial in the *Charleston Gazette*, the largest newspaper in Senator RANDOLPH's State.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

GENERATION GAP BRIDGE BY RANDOLPH BEST
YET

A proposed constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18 years is finally on its way to the states for ratification—and this milestone stands as a great tribute to the efforts and determination of West Virginia's senior United States senator, Jennings Randolph.

Randolph first introduced a resolution to franchise 18- and 20-year-olds in 1942, as a member of the House of Representatives. He has done so since at every opportunity, gaining a little ground each time over the years while living through disappointment after disappointment. Finally, on his 11th try, he achieved success.

The Senate adopted his resolution (SJR7) on March 10 by unanimous vote. The House followed with its approval last Tuesday by a

vote of 400 to 19. The proposal now needs ratification by 38 state legislatures to become the 26th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Five states gave approval within a day of completion of congressional action and, on the basis of sentiment expressed during the recent session, the West Virginia Legislature will act favorably at the first opportunity. It seems a foregone conclusion that younger people will have full voting rights before the 1972 elections.

This goes beyond the old argument that those old enough to fight for their country should be old enough to vote. As Sen. Charles H. Percy, R-Ill., pointed out, the contention that young people are ill-informed about public affairs may have had some validity at the turn of the century, when only 6 per cent were high school graduates at age 18. "But," he added, "in the year 1971, when 81 per cent of all Americans have graduated from high school by the age of 18 and when nearly half of the 18-, 19- and 20-year-olds are college students, young Americans have the education and the maturity to participate fully in our political process."

Clearly, this landmark achievement in behalf of young Americans stands as a memorial to the West Virginia Democrat, who started the fight at age 40 and tasted victory at age 69. Sen. Randolph's efforts were given full recognition in the Congress.

During debate on the resolution, senator after senator, Democrats and Republicans from all parts of the country—Cranston and Tunney of California, Cooper and Cook of Kentucky, Jackson of Washington, Mondale of Minnesota, Williams of New Jersey, Griffin of Michigan, Dole of Kansas, Allen of Alabama, and many others—rose to extol Randolph's efforts as "Father of the 18-Year-Old Vote."

Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., went beyond the 18-year-old vote issue and reviewed Randolph's congressional career as one "in the forefront of very far-reaching legislation" in both the House and the Senate.

"Sen. Randolph," said Bayh, "has been an effective advocate in the formulation and enactment of numerous programs of vision which have as their aim the betterment of our society . . ."

"The meaningful programs in health, education, training, public facilities, pollution control, and environmental improvement, which have been fashioned through the dedicated efforts of Sen. Randolph, reflect his philosophy and are impressive."

He then reviewed some of Randolph's achievements, ranging from his sponsorship of the Appalachian Regional Development Act to the Randolph-Sheppard Act, which provides gainful employment for 3,400 blind persons, and added:

"Among public officials, he is probably the one most aware of the importance of a soundly developed road program to provide the nation with the safest and most efficient means of transporting people and goods . . ."

Sen. Marlow W. Cook, R-Ky., capped off the long tribute to Sen. Randolph in these words:

"Mr. President, with all due respect to all people who have worked in this of recent vintage, I really hope that someone in the country after this measure passes does the senator from West Virginia the honor of referring to this as the Randolph Amendment."

To this we say amen, and add our salute to the senior senator from West Virginia and to the Randolph Amendment. Much has been done toward bridging the so-called generation gap.

AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY
FACING A CRISIS

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the crisis facing the American textile industry, due to the flood of cheap textile imports into this country primarily from Japan, is especially grave in my State.

The textile industry is the second largest in Alabama, employing 42,200 people drawing an annual wage in excess of \$200 million.

However, both figures are being reduced daily, because the damage is already being done. Hundreds of Alabamians have lost their jobs or are on the short time work schedules, because of the import problem.

After 2 years of foot-dragging on the question of voluntary quotas in trade negotiations between the Governments of Japan and the United States, a group of Japanese industrialists have presumed to speak for their Government and come forth with a ridiculous proposal, which has been rejected by all segments of the industry in this country.

The proposal, which bypassed any limitation on imports by products or by fiber, has been rejected by the President of the United States, Governor of Alabama, Alabama Legislature, all U.S. Senators and Representatives from Alabama and many from other States, American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Alabama Textile Manufacturers Association, and textile labor organizations throughout the country.

The deep concern that Alabamians feel about this situation was expressed eloquently and forthrightly in Senate Joint Resolution 16, adopted by the Alabama Legislature on April 8, 1971.

The text of that resolution follows, and I urge my colleagues to read the same and consider the very real plight facing one of this Nation's most important industries:

JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE RESOLUTION ON
TEXTILE IMPORTS PASSED IN THE ALABAMA
LEGISLATURE APRIL 8, 1971

Whereas, Within the last several years the situation in the American textile industry has become increasingly acute and particularly so in the Southern states where the production of cotton and the manufacturing of cotton products constitute the very life blood of this area; and

Whereas, Hundreds of Alabamians have lost their jobs or are onto short time manufacture and the foreign competitors who flood our market and force thousands of our citizens completely out of work and market their textiles and apparel under conditions that are illegal in the State of Alabama and in the United States; and

Whereas, The government of Japan has offered a most unsatisfactory proposal to restrain, unilaterally, its textile-apparel exports to the United States; and

Whereas, The Japanese proposal has been rejected by the President of the United States, by the Governor of Alabama, by many members of the Congress, including the Senators and Representatives from Alabama, by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, by the Alabama Textile Manufacturers Association, by numerous newspaper editorials and by many others; and

Whereas, The textile markets of the United States are virtually wide open to foreign imports while many of the major exporters to this country tightly protect their own markets against our textile exports; and

Whereas, The American textile industry pays its employees approximately two dollars an hour more than the industry of Japan, with the gap being even wider between this country and some other Asian Nations; and

Whereas, The Alabama Legislature and the people of Alabama are not willing to see these terribly unfair conditions continue to weaken one of their most important industries which together with its supply and related industries over the years have been good, responsible corporate citizens; and

Whereas, These unfair conditions largely have been created by a combination of policies of our Federal Government. Now, therefore;

Be it resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, both Houses thereof concurring, That the Legislature of Alabama respectfully requests the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power through legislative and administrative action to see that order is restored to the chaotic international textile and apparel situation.

Be it further resolved, That the Legislature of Alabama expresses to the Alabama Congressional Delegation and to other members of the Congress, who continue to work for a solution to this problem, deep appreciation for their dedication to this vital effort.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each member of Alabama's delegation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Secretary of Commerce, to the Secretary of State and to the Clerks of the respective Houses of the United States Congress.

ROTARIAN MAGAZINE STRESSES ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS—AUTHOR STATES CHALLENGE TO MAN

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the United States recently observed the second Earth Day. I am gratified that this day, set aside to recognize the threat to our environment and to rededicate ourselves to its improvement, is becoming a meaningful part of our national calendar.

The world in which we live did not become contaminated overnight, and it will not become clean with the wave of a hand or the speaking of a few words, or even another law. The task before us is monumental.

Nothing less than total commitment by all people is necessary to reverse the pattern of abuse and waste that has brought us to the edge of environmental disaster. To act properly we must be well

informed. Consequently, I am pleased to see that many thoughtful and informed individuals continue to discuss the environment in a variety of media.

The Rotarian magazine, which is circulated throughout the world, has done a commendable public service by devoting a substantial portion of its May 1971 issue to the environment.

Among the excellent articles in this issue is one by Lord Ritchie-Calder, the British educator and author, who discusses perceptively how man created the environmental crisis and what we all can do about it.

This article clearly states the problem we face and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

PLANET EARTH: RENEWING THE OPTIONS

(By Ritchie Calder, credited with "giving contemporary science a sense of direction and social purpose." Lord Ritchie-Calder is an author-educator who has worked around the world for the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Born in Scotland, he now lives in England.)

The cancer of pollution threatens man's lease on his world, but now there is hope for renewal because "waste is discarded wealth".

A quarter of a million years ago, or thereabout, *Homo sapiens* took a lease on Planet Earth. He shared the tenancy with his fellow-lodgers: the beasts, the birds, the fishes, the insects, the micro-organisms, and the whole of plant-life. His, however, was a special contract with nature because he was now Thinking Man.

Without fang or claw, beak or talon, fur or feather scale or carapace, naked to his enemies and to the elements, he had been, of all the creatures of the Earth, the least likely to survive. He had overcome those deficiencies by evolving a conceptual brain and developing finger-skills. He could not out-wrestle nor outstrip his natural predators, but he could outreach them with clubs and spears and slings. He made fleshing tools to strip them of their pelts to clothe his own nakedness. He tamed fire, which terrified the other creatures, to heat his caves and cook his food. To that extent he had mastered his environment, because with clothes and heat he could overcome his climatic restraints. He had leased the planet because he could migrate and settle, from the tropics to the Arctic.

Later, from being a hunter he became the domesticator of animals, decoying, taming, and breeding them. As the pastoral nomad he drove his flocks and herds in search of water and of seasonal pastures. He concerted with nature. Then from being a food-gatherer he became a food-grower. He discovered that the seeds of certain grasses were nourishing but he also discovered that if those seeds were scattered they would take root and grow and that they would grow better if the soil were delved to receive them and better still if they were properly watered. So he became a tiller and irrigator, settling in the alluvial plains of the rivers and creating a self-sufficiency of food for his family and his domesticated animals. He also discovered efficiency in the division of labor and that some of his kind were more proficient than others in contriving tools, making pots, building houses, weaving baskets from rushes or clothes from finer fibers, or making wheels to lighten his haulage. So the craftsmen were sustained from the surpluses of the tillers. So were the priesthoods which had to inter-mediate with the gods who were the embodiment of elemental nature, sending lightning and floods, pestilence and earth-convulsions as reminders to Thinking Man that—no mat-

ter how ingenious he might be in modifying his environment—there were two parties to the contract and that nature was still paramount.

The temples became the entrepôts, the tithe barns of farm tributes to the gods; the traffic in those farm goods produced trade with other communities and when direct barter became too cumbersome, tokens of exchange had to be created; so money was invented. Then money became a commodity in itself to be traded by the money-lenders, the money-changers, and the credit-bankers. Accessible wealth exposed communities to marauders. So protection was necessary and warrior-kings and soldiers and conquering dynasties came into being.

This, the growth of cities, we call "civilization" but the whole superstructure, the craftsmen, and their auxiliaries such as miners, the priesthood, the tax-gatherers, the bazaar-traders, the import-export merchants, the financiers, the soldiers, and the feudal systems and imperial adventurings of kings—all depended on the labor of the tillers and the soil which they husbanded.

Cities brought their own problems. Thousands of years ago there were the consequences of overpopulation (congestion within the city walls); "urban renewal" (that polite admission of slums); infections and contagions; sewage disposal and trash collection (so that archaeologists find the miniaturized version of our present pollution problem in the succession of cities built on the midden-heaps of their predecessors). In Mohenjo-Daro, the Indus civilization of 5,000 years ago, there was the equivalent of our non-returnable containers; beside the remains of drinking-booths where drinking water was sold, there are huge spoil-heaps of broken cups, strongly suggestive of some sanitary ordinance, which required that they should never be used twice.

To supply the increasing demands of the cities, agriculture had to be intensified. More and more areas had to be irrigated. In Egypt and Mesopotamia and in the Negev Desert in Israel, there are the remains of the first public utility—master canals, administered and maintained by overlords, from which the farmers drew their irrigation water for their fields. Those canals have a somber warning for our present times because civilizations collapsed with their failure. Great cities stand isolated in the desert sands because water-courses were diverted or neglected. Alexander the Great, master of the whole then-known world, died in 320 B.C. at Babylon of malaria. The over-elaborate canal system had been mismanaged and the Euphrates had turned the area into a marsh where the malaria mosquito bred.

Ancient civilizations flourished and died of their excesses or their effiteness. Their ziggurats and pyramids vaunted their material achievements and now stand as the tombstones that mark them only as historical incidents. Those civilizations, however, were local. They had their place and their time and were succeeded by others.

Today, our civilization is global. By our own achievements we have reduced our world to a minor planet—Planet Number Three in the solar system—round which a man-made satellite can circle 16 times a day; on which no place is more than a few hours away by jet-propulsion, a few minutes away by inter-continental ballistic missile, and a split-second away by radio; and on which 3,600,000,000 people today and twice that number by 2000 A.D. have to contrive to live together. Whatever happens anywhere reverberates everywhere. Our mistakes are writ large on a world-scale. For example, when atmospheric bomb-testing was deemed militarily expedient, the nuclear powers—all of them—pushed the test-sites for their superbombs as far away from their own heartlands as possible. They claimed that the radioactive fall-out would be

"safely" localized; that was, the fall-out from the fission-detonator of the fusion bomb. But it was confidently assumed that the fusion products would be dissipated in the stratosphere. In those experiments, which turned the biosphere—the living-space—into a laboratory, the assumption was wrong. The H-bombs certainly punched their way into the stratosphere, beyond the troposphere which is the climatic "ceiling" and the radioactive gases dispersed into the void. But two mistakes were made: radioactive krypton—which is a gas—decays into radiostrontium that is a particulate, which will gravitationally descend; furthermore, the troposphere is not continuous; there is the polar troposphere and the equatorial troposphere and there is a gap. Through that gap the radiostrontium reentered our weather system and was swept around the world. The radioactive chickens came home to roost, to be deposited by rain on the heartlands of the perpetrators—but everywhere else on earth as well. Radiostrontium is a man-made analog of calcium, the bone-builder, and the human body does not distinguish when, as in the case of growing children, it needs bone-building material. Thus every young person who grew up when bombs were being tested in the atmosphere has in his or her bones radioactive strontium. It is not medically sinister nor significant, but it could have been if there had not been the test ban treaty which deterred at least the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and the U.K., if not the French and Chinese.

We are all familiar with the story of DDT (now under legislative restraint) and how it was found in the flesh of penguins in the Antarctic, where no DDT had ever been used. It could only have got there from wash-out of northern farmlands, carried by rivers into the ocean current-system. And we know about mercury in tuna fish—a panic-stations reminder of all mercury which for all those years has been used to prevent the growth of molds in pulp and paper-making and which by reckless effluent even reached mercury-susceptible deep-sea fish. In Britain, the authorities proudly claimed that they had reduced the amount of sulfur dioxide to insignificant proportions at ground level only to be reproached by the Norwegians because Britain's sulfur dioxide from tall chimney-stacks was attacking their forests—hundreds of miles away.

Pollution, in those terms, knows no boundaries. We are all in it, one with another.

Homo sapiens, Thinking Man, ensured the survival of his species by interfering with nature. He modified the environment. He ransacked the natural resources. He cut down forests to get his timber or the clearances for his homesteads. He broke the plains. He manipulated river systems. He built his cities to give him his self-contained environment. He quarried the rocks and mined the lithosphere to get his metals and his fuels. Throughout the millennia he did some of this recklessly and produced local and regional catastrophes, like the man-made deserts produced by erosion and disastrous floods caused by the destruction of forests and vegetation which had once filtered torrential rains into the well-springs. Without the forest cover, those rains scoured off the soil as silt into the rivers and the naked rocks shed the water to overflow the river beds.

Homo insapiens, the Unthinking Man of today, can prevent the survival of his species by the universal holocaust of a nuclear war from warheads which, at the ready, contain the radioactive equivalent of 70 tons of TNT for every man, woman, and child on earth. He can swamp the planet with offspring, making more and more demands upon resources and increasing the extent of pollution to the point of starvation or self-extermination. He can go on with his present processes of spewing chimney-sewage into the atmosphere or flushing toxic effluents

into the living-waters of the rivers and oceans. He can interfere with the sunlight and the photosynthetic process by which our food is produced. He can change the climate so that fertile areas will become arid because the rain-belts have shifted. By digging up or pumping up the hydrocarbons from the geological vaults in which they were locked all those millions of years ago and letting them loose from chimneys and automobile exhausts he can increase the "greenhouse effect" by which the carbon-dioxide layer above the surface of the earth confines the convection heat so that the fixed ice of the glaciers and the continents would melt and raise the level of the oceans. He can be destroying fresh-water and the fresh air on which our survival depends. On *Spaceship Earth* we would be encapsulated under conditions with which space medicine could not cope.

There are those who say that the lease is running out. I prefer to say that we can renew our options. As one of those who has been called a "Prophet of Doom," I am aware of the dilemma: How to alert people to the portentous truths without scaring them into a sense of impotence, or fatalism? Apathy has been described as "The fear of being afraid," the "I-don't-want-to-know" syndrome. But if we are to stir up men-of-affairs into doing something, we have to stir up the people who have the votes. This has been done pretty successfully. All major western countries have now set up Departments or Ministries for the Environment. They are enacting statutes, applying restraints on the self-evident abuses, and financing research to an extent far greater than heretofore. "Environment" is a band-wagon word.

But I have discovered in talking about the population explosion—3,600,000,000 now and 7,000,000,000 in 2000 A.D.—that noughts become hypnotic. The figures are too big to grasp and individuals feel helpless. The same thing can happen with environmental problems and people will lapse. That was brought home to me when the editor of a U.S. journal asked me to write an article on pollution and cancelled it because his editorial board had decided that "pollution was last year's subject."

"Pollution," I have said, "is a crime compounded of avarice and ignorance." Avarice, because of the reckless use of resources and the destruction of amenities and the environment for the sake of quick profits, and ignorance, because most people do not bother to find out and anticipate what the effect of their activities is likely to be. Ignorance is no longer any excuse because we have been alerted to the hazards, not only to our localities and to our own personal convenience but to the whole biosphere on which the survival of mankind and of all our fellow-lodgers depends.

I do not withdraw that indictment nor any of the apocalyptic warnings I have uttered but I have changed my posture. I offer the slogan "Waste is wealth." Pollution means mismanagement, incompetence, and the squandering of real wealth. The old saying in Lancashire was "Where there's much, there's brass." (Where there is filth there is money.) This was used to justify the grime, the squalor, and the slag-heaps as the signs of abounding prosperity in the 19th Century. (This was as cynical as the boast in Wyoming, "We cut out the steak and we throw away the steer.") What we now properly call the quality of life was ignored and so were the social costs. Those were disregarded in the interest of competitive price or of dividends. Britain was disfigured (as so much of America has been) by the wealth it was supposed to be creating.

I once made a documentary film which featured eight miners each of whom had spent 50 years in the pits hewing coal: 400 years among them at the coal face and of that 360 years' effort had gone up the chimneys

as smoke. When coal was cheap (except in terms of human lives and suffering) we thought we could afford inefficient combustion which blackened our cities and industrial centers with soot. When Britain was burning its coal in this way the Germans were treating it as what it is—a source of chemicals—and founding their great dye-stuff and drug industries.

Waste is discarded wealth. It is simply a failure to recognise the valuable materials we are throwing away. For example, germanium is the basis of the modern transistor industry. It is a rare and expensive metal. We have been pushing it up the stacks in flue-dust all those years. It was like hoarding money in a chimney and we are now recovering it. Or take a more spectacular example: The atom bomb which was first exploded in the desert of Alamogordo and later destroyed Hiroshima, was produced from the waste-tips of Katanga, in the Congo. There when radium was the produce they were after, the uranium was thrown away as tailings but when the bomb became feasible that waste was shipped secretly to the United States to become the basis of the "Manhattan Project."

Or take another example: Fleming, Florey, and Chain—in Britain—discovered penicillin, an exudation of the mold, *penicillium notatum*. For this, the mold had to be grown and fed. In their early days at Oxford University, they grew this mold in milk bottles and bed pans on nutrient produced in a brewery in the East End of London and trucked through the bombing raids. Florey and his colleague Heatley crossed the Atlantic in convoy to try to persuade U.S. corporations to undertake the mass-production which Britain, beleaguered in 1940, could not provide. At the Fermentation Laboratory of the U.S. Department of Agriculture at Peoria, Illinois, they discussed how the molds could be produced in bulk from an abundant source of nutrients. The head of the laboratory asked whether cornsteep liquor would do. He had a vested interest because cornsteep liquor was a problem. As the waste of the starch and distilling industries, it was a menace. It was a rich nutrient which even in those unregenerate days could not be thrown into the sewers or the streams because micro-organisms would flourish on it and therefore it had to be expensively treated to make the effluent safe. It certainly would do! It became the means to deep-culture penicillin which, incidentally, gave the U.S.A. a great technological advantage in the commercial development of antibiotics.

Consider another aspect: we hear a lot about "thermal pollution," that is, the waste-heat from power-stations which raises the temperature of rivers and streams and the sea to the upset of the environment. But it could, with foresight, be turned to lucrative advantage. At Hunterston on the west coast of Scotland, there is one of Britain's biggest power stations. The "thermal pollution" has been trapped in basins to provide what promises to be a profitable form of fish-farming. My own opinion is that it would have been even better if they had located the power station on one of the sea-lochs not much farther north where hopeful experiments in increasing the yield of sea fish were tried, by fertilizing the loch to increase the phytoplankton. It worked. The fish were more abundant and could have been fattened up but the water in the inlet was colder than the open sea and the fish migrated. They would have stayed to be husbanded if they had been given a bit of "thermal pollution." In other words, with more imagination in citing projects and including "pollution" in cost-benefit studies—not as a liability but as a potential asset—we could preserve the quality of life and still have economic advantages.

It needs, however, a new approach: not of saying "We can make money by making pol-

lution and then make money by treating it." There is a need for recycling, but recycling as an afterthought is, to me, both cynical and sinful, because any industrialist embarking on a new process should know in advance not only what they are getting as their finished product but what they are vomiting out as fumes or effluent. The cycling should be pre- as well as post-. I was with the directors of a great, diversified, chemical combine at a demonstration of the recovery of rare metals and fine chemicals from sludge which had caused amenity outcries. I reminded them that what this unit was throwing away other departments of their combine were buying expensively from somewhere else.

Prevention of pollution is a matter of money. If concerns want quick dividends they take short-cuts, which are as reprehensible as putting cheap steel into a skyscraper. But the customers, who become the "public" protesting about pollution, must also recognize that if they want lots of things cheaply they must pay the social costs later on. This has been the bone of contention in all regulation of pollution. Industrial concerns say "if you impose those precautionary charges on us, you will price us out of the market, because our competitors abroad are not under such restrictions." Indeed, the only possible solution will have to be international, enforceable standards. It is not impossible. We have built international safeguards into industrial atomic energy so that they are a first-cost which every operator has to meet and is common to all his competitors everywhere in the world.

I have a more draconian proposal: I would make concerns not only responsible for their initial waste-products but for their products when they become waste. I have prophesied that our civilization will "go out not with a bang but a raspberry ripple"—we shall be smothered in non-returnable containers. If automobile manufacturers, tire-manufacturers, and dispensers of goods in plastic containers were compelled ultimately to dispose of them, this would take care of the cast-off cars, the tires in copses and gullies, and the indiscriminate litter—but we also would compel the makers to realize the wealth they are wasting. They would have to think in advance, in the making of their products, how they could find use for the elements they contain. The ingenuity they would need to cope with the products which have gone to waste would help to recover the wealth that is in that waste. And they would be agreeably surprised.

After all Nature, with which we have to negotiate fresh options and a new lease on this planet, practices "Conservation of Matter." Why should not Homo sapiens?

THE 23D ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Iz Silver, has expressed much better than I could some thoughts we should remember in commemorating the 23d anniversary of Israeli independence. I am, therefore, very happy to put his remarks from a recent editorial in the News Tribune into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

People around the world have looked with pride and amazement at what Israel has done for herself in these few short years. I think it is indeed a tribute to this

small nation that she has also gone out to other nations that are less developed, and has offered them a helping hand.

The article follows:

NOTES ISRAEL'S PROGRESS, AID TO OTHER COUNTRIES

One of the astonishing things about the infant state of Israel, on its 23rd anniversary as an independent nation and faced with its own critical needs and problems, is the impressive aid it is giving to other developing nations, especially in Africa and the Far East.

Each year more than 1,000 trainees from these nations receive instruction in technical skills at Israel's agricultural schools, hospitals and scientific institutions. In addition, some 500 Israeli experts have visited 80 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Mediterranean basin, offering on-the-spot training courses and assistance in industrial and rural development.

Joint companies for construction, water supply and irrigation, shipping and foreign trade have been launched in Asia and Africa. An Israeli architect, in partnership with an Ethiopian, established the first architectural firm in Addis Ababa and helped organize a faculty of architecture at the University of Ethiopia, which has already trained 20 full-fledged architects and numerous draftsmen.

Israeli experts have been entrusted not only with the construction of public buildings and industrial plants in Ethiopia, but also with the development of fisheries, geological surveys and engineering schools.

Some of these projects are sponsored by the Israeli government; others are undertaken jointly with U.N. and other international bodies; many are the private undertakings of Israeli business firms.

Israel is in a unique position to offer guidance and technical assistance to developing nations, since many of the problems these nations face, Israel has been forced to solve.

Because Israel has been forced to rely on science for the development of its limited resources, it has pioneered in the use of synthetic materials and in the extraction of metals and chemicals, as well as farm products, from its reluctant soil, abused and despoiled for a thousand years or more.

In a world that is faced with population explosions and exhaustion of natural resources, the Israeli experience, forced upon it by circumstances, may well be of universal significance and in some instances has already proved so.

ISRAEL SILVER,

Executive Director, Jewish Community Council, Perth Amboy.

EXPANSION OF STRATEGIC WEAPONS BY THE SOVIET UNION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Staunton (Va.) Leader of April 27 contained an excellent editorial on the subject of the expansion of strategic weapons by the Soviet Union.

The editorial notes that there is a danger that Russia may be using the SALT talks as a cover for greatly increasing its missile systems.

I hope that the SALT talks will be successful, but I believe that we must be watchful and take care that we do not permit the deterioration of our strategic

capability while the negotiations are in progress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled, "Is There Any Alternative?" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The editor of the Staunton Leader is E. Walton Opie.

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

IS THERE ANY ALTERNATIVE?

Two men prominent in the federal government, one in the Executive Branch and one in the Legislative, have voiced new warnings that Russia is still expanding her capabilities for nuclear destruction of the United States.

This country is undoubtedly dangerously behind in defenses against intercontinental ballistic, multi-headed missiles. Our retaliatory power seems no longer adequate as a deterrent with the Soviet building such capability for smashing our ICBM silos that a first-strike could be decisive. Is that the real objective of the persistent Russian missile building while engaging politely in the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT)?

In the face of the statement by Secretary of Defense Laird that the U.S. now has evidence of Russian involvement "in a new and apparently extensive ICBM construction program", can we afford to doubt the information from our intelligence sources?

Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., a potential presidential candidate next year who has a realistic outlook on Russia's military might and Communist global ambitions, has given some actual figures on the new Soviet missile construction program. Whether or not he has sources of dependable information other than Sect. Laird's is a question which makes the situation no less sinister.

Sen. Jackson said his data shows Russia could deploy 70 huge missiles this year with "more destructive power than the United States has in its entire land-based Minuteman ICBM system". Recalling news last month of a new generation of Communist missiles, he declared: "We have now learned that construction of this system is moving ahead at a rapid rate." Sect. Laird has reported similarly, but expressed hope of "convincing progress" by SALT.

These talks at Vienna, opined another Administration official, "are going nowhere but down", and have "narrowed the time in which we can negotiate from a stand-pat position".

The Pentagon credits the Soviet with 300 multi-headed SS9s deployed already, packing enough power to knock out 95 per cent of our 1,000 Minutemen in silos. Wouldn't that crush our once vaunted retaliatory deterrent power, or could our nuclear-powered, missile-firing submarines fulfill that role? Soviet strategists must be placing faith in their new missile program to more than counter-balance our Poseidon missiles, some of the underwater carriers of which would be tracked and either destroyed or rendered harmless by Russian subs.

Sect. Laird is reported to be hesitant, even in the face of such considerations as the above, about recommending Congressional approval of counter-action, further than the limited provisions of the military budget for fiscal 1972, in order to restore our deterrent position. He has said that without some genuine progress by SALT, it will be necessary for him to do so. The cost would run into billions of dollars, but what alternative is there?

Americans should not forget the treachery of Japan in making the secret naval movement and the sneak Pearl Harbor attack while negotiating in Washington for a Japanese-U.S. detente. The Communist regime in Moscow is capable of equal treachery.

A BILL TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL DENTAL CARE FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1971

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, which I formerly introduced in the 90th and 91st Congresses, to provide additional dental care for dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services.

I want to call to the attention of my colleagues that employees in private industry are beginning to receive the kind of dental care benefits that the Subcommittee on Dental Care of the Armed Services Committee proposed for military personnel. I think it is high time that we offer similar benefits to our men in the Armed Forces. To explain the situation in greater detail I am inserting the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 7:

UNIONS PUSH FOR DENTAL COVERAGE IN PACTS FOR TWO REASONS: HIGH COSTS, BAD TEETH
(By Timothy D. Schellhardt)

CHICAGO.—Bill Appling has put off getting a new set of false teeth for four years because he can't afford them. But come July, the 42-year-old International Harvester Co. employe will get his dentures. What's more, his wife, Delores, will be fitted with a new set of uppers, his 14-year-old daughter, Dionne, will have her teeth straightened, and his son, Glen, 10, will have several cavities filled.

The total dentist bill should approach \$2,500, but Mr. Appling isn't too worried. That's because his union, the United Auto Workers, last January negotiated a labor contract under which International Harvester will pay about 70% of the dentist bills of its 40,000 employes and their families. The plan goes into effect July 1.

"Denticare" as it's called, is one of the newest and hottest employe benefits being demanded—and won—by unions across the country. In the past few years, prepaid dental insurance has been negotiated by the Teamsters, Machinists and several public-employe unions. The agreement between the UAW and Harvester—the biggest single plan written so far—increases to more than 10 million the number of Americans who now have some sort of dental coverage.

That number should grow substantially in the near future. "Of all the fringe benefits we seek this year, dental insurance heads our list," says a top official of the Communications Workers of America, which this year will negotiate contracts covering more than 500,000 employes. Dental benefits are expected to be high on the list of demands of the Steelworkers this summer, and Machinists Union officials say they will be pushing this year to cover the 80% of their one million members not covered at present. The UAW says it will press hard for dental insurance in its 1973 talks with the major auto and farm-implement makers.

TOOTHACHES AND HEADACHES

The union push for dental insurance is hardly surprising. Since 1939, dental costs have climbed 56% while the cost of living in general has risen 38%. The American Dental Association estimates that the average family without dental insurance will spend \$90 this year on dental bills, up 50% from seven years ago. Many families will spend much, much more. It costs \$800 to \$1,500 to have a child's teeth straightened, and a common filling

costs about \$8.50 now, compared with \$5.75 only 10 years ago.

Now that the federal government seems on the verge of offering some health insurance unions have been seeking from employers, the unions are turning more attention to winning dental coverage from employers. In addition, dental coverage is seen as an attractive benefit for the younger workers who are making up a growing proportion of the industrial work force.

"Our younger members aren't much attracted by big pensions, but dental bills are a big headache. For many of them, dental costs are as high as their medical bills," says Pat Greathouse, a UAW vice president.

The movement toward company-paid dental insurance is expected to affect more than just the worker's pocketbook; it also promises to make his teeth better. Although they get relatively little attention, dental disorders are among the nation's leading health problems. The ADA says that less than half the population now gets "adequate" dental care. The Surgeon General's office estimates that one child in four has teeth so poorly aligned that chewing causes facial disfigurement and that four of every five Americans over 14 years old have gum trouble.

"HEALTHIEST TEETH AROUND"

The results of poor dental care can go far beyond a simple toothache. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare says that in 1968, the last year for which figures are available, an average of more than 10,000 men and women stayed off their jobs every day because of dental disorders. Bad teeth can lead to serious health complications. Bacteria from an infected tooth can be swallowed, resulting in painful throat infections, back and shoulder pains and even blood poisoning that can bring about death.

Regular trips to the dentist can stave off most dental agonies, and all evidence indicates that people with dental insurance are more likely than others to go regularly. The authority for this is no less than the ADA, which in 1962 instituted a prepaid dental program for 200 of its employes. In 1969, a typical ADA employe's family of four had \$475 of dental work done, more than five times the amount spent by families without dental insurance. "Before the prepaid plan, our employes' teeth were as bad as everyone else's. But now we certainly think we've got the healthiest teeth around," says Duane Moen, director of economic research for the association. The association favors dental-insurance programs.

If dental coverage is to expand greatly, it will have to be through collective bargaining, insurance officials believe. Public interest in individual policies has been low, primarily because the premiums are high. An individual policy for a man with a family can cost \$75 to \$420 a year, depending on breadth of coverage. In addition, most individual policies require the policyholder to pay a sizable deductible amount before receiving benefits, and even then all costs usually aren't covered.

Few insurers even offer individual plans. "Dental disease is practically universal, and most individuals can tell quite clearly what their dental needs are before seeking insurance. Only when we spread the risk among many people, such as a group, is it worth our while to write the business," says one insurer.

MANY PLANS AVAILABLE

At the company level, too, dental care plans are expensive. Harvester's program is expected to cost \$5.5 million to \$5.8 million annually, or about \$140 for each employe. The plan will pay all charges for examinations, including teeth-cleaning every six months, for surgical repair of dentures and for surgical treatment of diseased gums. For other dental expenses, including filling cavities, Harvester will pay 75% of the costs, except those related to teeth straightening, dentures and bridge-work (other than surgical repair), where the

reimbursement will be 50%. There is a \$750-a-year limit on most benefits for each person and a \$500 lifetime maximum on teeth straightening costs.

The Harvester dental plan is written by Aetna Life & Casualty Co., one of more than 50 insurers who write the business. The nation's Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans, which provide medical coverage for about 45% of the population, have started writing dental insurance for their group subscribers. A prototype plan, begun last May by a joint Blue Cross-Blue Shield organization in New York, covers almost 200,000 persons, served by more than 6,000 dentists. Other "Blue" plans cover about 40,000 subscribers.

Group packages also are written by the Delta Dental Plans Association, a dentist-operated organization sponsoring insurance through state dental societies. The nonprofit Delta contracts now cover about three million persons in 29 states. Union-negotiated dental plans got their start through a Delta plan written in 1951 when the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union got dental benefits in its West Coast contract.

Some smaller companies provide dental care for employes through company health clinics.

Dentists generally like the plans, but some complain about the paperwork it causes and about slow payments from insurer. "Three or four of my patients now have healthy teeth, but I haven't been paid for months for their dental work. These delays can really hurt a guy just starting his practice," says Dr. Robert G. Thomas Jr., a suburban Chicago dentist who began his practice last year.

GEORGIA SHERIFF'S ASSOCIATION EXPRESSES SUPPORT FOR J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, much controversy has arisen in our Nation during the past several weeks surrounding the service of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, an outstanding American who has served his country with honor for a long period of time.

Many of my constituents have expressed strong support for Mr. Hoover, as have many constituents of my fellow Members from Georgia. One of the Associations that serves our people best is the Georgia Sheriff's Association, and here is correspondence received from the Honorable D. Lamar Stewart, secretary-treasurer of that group, and sheriff of my home county of Dougherty.

The correspondence follows:

APRIL 20, 1971.

HON. DAWSON MATHIS,
Congressman, Second District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We the members of the Georgia Sheriff's Association would like to commend the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his great contributions to Law Enforcement. Let this be a matter of record that we support his actions and methods.

We have all learned and benefited from him and his Department and wholeheartedly support him all the way.

Sincerely,

D. LAMAR STEWART,
FBI National Academy, 22d Session,
Secretary-Treasurer, Georgia Sheriffs Association.

SOVIET SA-5'S

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1971, Mr. Joseph Alsop, hardly one of my favorite columnists, reporting from Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.—the headquarters of our Strategic Air Command—brings to our attention the fact that the Soviet Union may well have 1,200 ABM launchers operational in addition to the 64 launcher Galosh ABM system already operational around Moscow.

Mr. Alsop points out that the Soviet surface-to-air missile, No. 5—SA-5—when integrated with the huge "Henhouse" radars, of which the Soviets have around half a dozen under construction, would, according to Strategic Air Command analysts, "make an ABM system protecting most of the other Soviet industrial centers, additional to Moscow which is protected by the Galosh system."

Dr. John Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, has alluded to this possibility by stating that:

If the SA-5 system is given information from the large ballistic missile acquisition and tracking radars, then it could have considerable capability in making successful intercepts of incoming ballistic missiles.

It is well to remember that this intercepting cannot be detected by means of aerial observation.

Recent information released yesterday by Secretary of Defense Laird revealing that the Soviets are going ahead on the construction of four more Galosh complexes in addition to the four already operational would lead most reasonable people to believe that if the SA-5 anti-missile system, which compliments the Galosh system, is not yet operational the Soviets have every intention of making it so.

Secretary Laird also indicated that the new Galosh sites would probably utilize an improved interceptor missile. The fact that the Soviets had been testing this new interceptor for 2 years was reported in the Secretaries' Defense Posture Statement for fiscal year 1972 so as the deployment of the new missile should come as no surprise. The statement follows:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

During the past two years testing of what appears to be an improved GALOSH missile has been noted. Such a missile could be available as early as this year. It has a controlled coast capability and restartable engine providing a high degree of flexibility in countering a variety of threats.

During this past year research and development related to a new ABM system continued.

These developments, as well as the now familiar news that the Soviets are starting to build a new and extensive SS-9 type missile system, are additional confirmation of the trend brought to light in the supplemental report submitted by seven members of the Presidents Blue Ribbon Defense Panel.

The report states:

The evidence is reasonably conclusive that the Soviet Union is planning precisely these capabilities (1. an offensive first-strike capability against our means of delivering retaliatory missiles and 2. a defensive capability of protecting much of its heartland from such U.S. missiles (e.g. Polaris) as survive the preemptive strike.) This is not to say that a preemptive first strike is intended, but rather that weapons systems which are needed ONLY (panels emp.) for such a purpose are being deployed.

Our self imposed restraint, which Secretary Laird correctly characterized as "near moratorium," is fast destroying any hope of stability, based on relative strategic capabilities, at the level of central nuclear war, while at the same time opening up whole new areas of the world to Soviet conventional force aggression by making U.S. retaliation for any act less than direct attack on the continental United States more and more incredible as the Soviets gain unchallenged nuclear superiority.

The first prerequisite for maintaining stability at the highest level of possible nuclear conflict is to prevent the Soviets from acquiring the means necessary to lower our second strike retaliatory capability below a threshold acceptable to themselves. War, especially a one act war taking place mainly on the American continent, becomes more and more probable the closer the Soviets come to being able to achieve a favorable decision through war.

Since a successful Soviet first-strike capability consists of their combining counter force offensive systems, such as the SS-9, and ballistic missile, and other, defensive systems in a coordinated effort to lower the retaliatory damage we are able to inflict on them to a level they consider acceptable, Mr. Alsop points out:

If this is true (SA-5 having an ABM capability), as the SAC analysts believe, the upset in the balance of nuclear strategic power is already far greater than the worst pessimists suppose outside the government's secret chambers.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 12, 1971]

WHAT IF THEY'RE WRONG?

(By Joseph Alsop)

OMAHA, NEB.—"And what if the estimates are wrong?" That is the question you find yourself asking, over and over again, if you come to the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command. Here the whole world balance of power is concentrated, as it were, in a single converted but still old-fashioned U.S. Army post.

The journey to Offutt Air Force Base was made to get the facts before the Senate's annual storm in a cave of winds over the next appropriations for American antiballistic missiles. And the journey raised the fairly worrying question above recorded for reasons of the utmost grimness.

In brief, the analysts of the Strategic Air Command are rather firmly convinced that the Soviet Union already has an extensive and efficient antiballistic missile system disguised as part of its anti-aircraft defenses. In this matter, moreover, SAC analysts are supported by most Defense Department analysts, including the department's able chief scientist, Dr. John Foster.

It is a strange feature of our era that issues of potential life-and-death significance are quite often debated in private, in the most secret chambers of the government. In this instance, the issue of "SAM-upgrading," as the problem is called, is known to have been given nearly 30 hours of close, consecutive study by the director of Central Intelligence Agency, Richard Helms.

Any issue requiring that amount of desperately hard homework by a man in the position of the director of the CIA can only be an issue with potential life-and-death significance. And who on earth, outside the government's most secret chambers, has ever heard that such a problem as "SAM-upgrading" so much as exists?

But for the very reason that it has potential life-and-death significance, it is well for more people to understand the nature of the problem. The problem begins, then, with the Soviets' deployment of approximately 1,200 defense ballistic missiles of unusual size and power, which our people call "Tallinns" or "SA-5s."

As the designation "SA-5" should indicate, these Tallinns were originally classed as anti-aircraft missiles, in the same series as the SA-2 and SA-3 that the Soviets have deployed in Egypt. The question whether the Tallinns really belong in this series was what engaged Director Helms' attention so many hours.

There are three facts of great importance that bear upon this question. In the first place, incoming ballistic missile warheads, greatly slowed by their descent and incapable of evasive maneuver, are actually rather easier to knock down with missiles than are properly flown and equipped bombing-planes.

Secondly, the Tallinn is an exo-atmospheric missile. In other words, with a range of 100 miles, it also reaches an altitude of 100,000 feet. This is somewhat above the atmosphere in which airplanes fly. Thirdly, in most parts of the Soviet Union where Tallinns are deployed, they are duplicated, as it were, by SA-2 missiles, whose anti-aircraft character is beyond dispute.

Thus the Soviets have today 1,200 missiles which can be ABMs masquerading as anti-aircraft missiles. This is of course in addition to the acknowledged ABMs of the type known as Galosh, deployed only around Moscow. That is by no means the end of the story, however.

The 1,200 plus-or-minus Tallinn missiles could not possibly be used as ABMs, without a complex system to give them the needed radar-targeting and radar-guidance. This is where the huge "henhouse" and "doghouse" radars come in, which the Soviets have also been deploying for some time.

These vast radars, over 100 feet high and as large in area as a couple of football fields, again appear to be superfluous, like the Tallinns' power to reach outside the atmosphere, except on one condition. That condition is that the radars are intended to be married to the Tallinns. This would make an ABM system protecting most of the other Soviet industrial centers, additional to Moscow which is protected by the Galosh system.

If this is true, as the SAC analysts believe, the upset in the balance of nuclear-strategic power is already far greater than the worst pessimists suppose outside the government's secret chambers. The untruth of the SAC analysts' conclusion is meanwhile stoutly maintained by most of the government's civilian analysts.

These are the same people who first maintained that the Soviets' giant SS-9 missiles were not aimed at our Minuteman system, and then repeatedly argued that SS-9 deployment would soon be stopped. They took five years to admit that other error, so the track record is not reassuring.

THE NIGHTMARE OF A
FIREFIGHTER

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1971, I reintroduced a bill to provide Federal death and disability benefits for all policemen and firemen killed or disabled in the line of duty—H.R. 5235.

While hearings were held on his bill during the 91st Congress, no hearings have yet been scheduled by the Judiciary Committee during this Congress.

In connection with my proposed legislation I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the April 29, 1971, edition of the New York Times. This article by Dennis Smith, who himself is a fireman in the south Bronx of New York, dramatically illustrates what it means to be a fireman today.

I strongly feel the article highlights the never-ending and often lonesome job of our firefighters. All too often their heroic actions are taken for granted with little or no notice. Perhaps this article will provide some impetus toward early passage of this vital legislation.

THE NIGHTMARE OF A FIREFIGHTER

(By Dennis Smith)

Every fourth year or thereabouts the city's Department of Personnel gives notice that the filing period for the fireman's examination is open. I read such a notice recently, and a plethora of remembrances danced through my mind. I have been a firefighter for eight years, but I remember the day I filed for the exam as clearly as a king remembers his coronation, or a cardinal his elevation.

There were no budding trees to see as I walked the seven blocks from the dispossessing tenement I called home to the Lexington Avenue subway, but as I passed the firehouse on East 51st Street I felt an excitement that was once again the excitement a poet would feel upon viewing an acre of exploding crocus. There was a chromed numeral attached to the grill of the fire engine, but I saw William Carlos Williams's figure 5 in gold, ecstatic that I would soon be a part of the whining sirens and clanging bells.

I would play to the cheers of excited hordes—climbing ladders, pulling hose, and saving children from the waltz of the hot-masked devil. I paused and fed the fires of my ego—tearful mothers would kiss me, editorial writers would extol me in lofty phrases, and mayors would pin ribbons to my breast.

It was a summer Saturday when I took the test. Eight thousand men competed for 2,000 jobs. The fireman's test is traditionally the most difficult of all tests for the uniformed services—more men apply for it than any other, but since there are fewer jobs the examiner makes the test harder to pass.

The day of appointment came, and the swearing-in ceremony was brief. After a few gratuitous and banal remarks by city officials about courage and dedication I was given the 3-inch Maltese cross which is the badge of a firefighter, the majestic shield of the lower-class diligent. I had made it.

Now, eight years later, the romantic visions have faded. I have climbed a thousand ladders, and crawled Indian-fashion down as many halls into a deadly nightshade of smoke, a whirling darkness of black poison,

knowing all the while that the ceiling may fall, or the floor collapse, or a hidden explosive ignite. I have watched friends die, and I have carried death in my hands. With good reason have Christians chosen fire as the metaphor of hell. Each fire is an ontological lesson for me, for what could be more fearful than the slow, agonizing crisping of skin, the searing of the lungs until the throat passage closes? There is no excitement, no romance, in being this close to death.

The National Safety Council has told me that firefighting is the most hazardous occupation in the United States—more hazardous than underground mining, or quarrying, or construction. There is nothing glamorous in my profession. I live in a country where the rate of death from fire is twice that of Canada, four times that of the United Kingdom, and six and a half times that of Japan. Twelve thousand persons died by fire in this country last year, over 300 in New York City. An average of eight city firefighters are killed in the line of duty each year. I live with these facts by going to funerals.

After each fire in an apartment, or a business, I sit exhausted on the dark slate of tenement stoops, or at a cobblestoned curb. My nose walls are coated with soot, and I spit the black phlegm of my trade. I am only 31, but I feel 50. Men pass by and ask how I feel, but I just nod to them. I don't feel like speaking. I feel like I have climbed a mountain, and I bask in the silent personal satisfaction of victory. And then I wonder if the price firefighters pay for the victory is worth it. Is this brutal self-flagellation, this constant ingestion of poison, this exhaustion, this aging worth it? Firefighting is a job. It is not a spiritual vocation. Hundreds of years have passed since medieval ascetics whipped themselves for glory. No, it is not worth it. At the end of the year the sanitation man's W-2 form has a higher figure typed into the amount earned space, and prison guards reap the same benefits.

Yet, I know that I could not do anything else with such a great sense of accomplishment. After a fire not long ago I sat in the vestibule of a tenement. A mother and a child were rescued by firefighters, but an 18-month-old girl was lost. A man came down the stairs, and sat next to me, the dead child on his lap. His face was covered with grime and the dark spots of burned paint chips. As we waited for the ambulance to come, he said over and over, "Poor little thing, she never had a chance." I looked up at his eyes, they were almost fully closed, but I could see they were wet, and tearing. The corneas were red from smoke, and light reflected from the watered surfaces, making them sparkle.

I wish now that each man who intends to file for the coming fireman's test could have seen the humanity, the sympathy, and the sadness of those eyes, for they explained why we fight fires. I was a part of that man sitting in a tenement hall, and together we were a part of all firefighters everywhere.

Dennis Smith is a fireman in the South Bronx, and is the author of "Report From Engine 82."

LOYALTY DAY AND LAW DAY

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, we salute the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Bar Association, for leading Americans in the observance of a special day of thankfulness for our sys-

tem of government and for observing respect for law as a measure of our freedom. This is a day for all Americans to vigorously reaffirm their faith in our Government and in their respect for law and order that has made and kept us a free people.

Loyalty Day and Law Day come at a time when the most cherished values of our Nation are being put to stern tests. It is a time when all of us should think deeply about our principles, reaffirm their importance, and bear witness to them in our lives. On Loyalty Day and Law Day, 1971, every American should pause to look within himself and put a measure to the depths of his beliefs. Let us act upon them, as Americans loyal to a cherished heritage of ordered freedom.

The observance of Loyalty Day and Law Day gives us a chance to stand up and be counted—counted on the side of our country, counted on the side of our fighting men, counted on the side of our democratic institutions of Government and our ways of dealing with each other in a tradition of fairness, of help for the oppressed, and of respect for the law under which we are able to have freedom of association and religion and speech.

The idea of a Loyalty Day observance was first discussed over 40 years ago by leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. These patriotic veterans of overseas military and naval service to their country believed that something should be done to resist the effect on the minds and emotions of millions of Americans of heavily publicized rallies, demonstrations, parades, and riots staged annually, under Communist auspices, each May 1, "May Day."

As formative plans for Loyalty Day were developing, an early leader of the Veterans of Foreign Wars said:

It was unthinkable to men who had served their country on foreign soil or in hostile waters that mass demonstrations in American cities, in support of the godless ideology of communism, should go unchallenged. If the Communists could stage parades in support of this atheistic way of life, why couldn't patriotic and loyal Americans stage parades and demonstrations emphasizing our democratic processes and the American way of life.

With such motives, the first Loyalty Day observances were held, at the beginning, in only a few places, and then throughout the country.

Law Day, sponsored since its first observance, by the American Bar Association in cooperation with local bar associations and other groups throughout the country, had similar reasons for coming into being as did Loyalty Day, although its origins were more recent. It was first established by Presidential proclamation in 1958. Its purposes are to foster respect for law, to increase public understanding of the place of law in American life, and to emphasize the contrast between freedom under law in the United States and governmental tyranny under communism.

Mr. Speaker, let us today and every day exercise our loyalties to our country and our respect for law that we shall remain free forever.

CONGRESSMAN McCLOSKEY ON
THE DRAFT

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the Armed Forces Journal chose this month to honor our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey) by reprinting in full his recent testimony before the Armed Services Committee on extension of the draft.

Although I personally favor the concept of an all-volunteer army, I think Mr. McCloskey's views are entitled to our respectful attention.

The Armed Forces Journal article is set forth below:

CONGRESSMAN McCLOSKEY ON THE DRAFT
(Testimony of Congressman Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., before the House Armed Services Committee)

I would like to state several reasons in support of continuing the present draft law pending further study.

By way of preliminary comment, I believe that the arguments over the continuation of the draft are distorted by reason of the current unpopularity of our Vietnam war policy. It is understandable that young men asked to kill a people whom they do not hate, in a cause in which they do not believe, might focus their hostility against the law which requires their service. I suspect, however, that the young men of deep sensitivity who have gone to Sweden and Canada or sought Conscientious Objector status, or willingly undergone jail sentences, would be the same men who, 30 years ago, memorized eye charts and traveled to Canada to enlist in Canadian forces rather than wait for American involvement in the war against Nazi Germany. In brief, I believe that it is the Vietnam war policy which causes today's protest against mandatory military service, not a sudden abandonment of the principle that a young man should serve his country for a short time during his youth.

It may be that I am biased in this regard, but it has always seemed to me that the privileges and freedoms of being an American citizen justify two years of service in times of war or threat to the national security.

Aside from these comments, I would like to suggest several specific reasons why the draft should be continued.

First, I have seen no persuasive evidence that reasonable young men will volunteer for combat infantry service despite substantial increases in pay and benefits.

Assuming an end to American participation in the Vietnam War this year, there will still be a peacetime need, in the foreseeable future, for a combat-ready highly mobile, conventional infantry force. It may be 16, 10, or only six infantry divisions, but whatever number of divisions is required, each man in each rifle company is going to have to be trained to a point of readiness and physical fitness which will permit him to go into combat on 24 hours notice or less.

We no longer have the privilege of a year's preparation of an American Expeditionary Force, as in World Wars I and II. Combat readiness in the 1970s requires readiness to do battle instantly, and this capability constitutes the sole reason for having a conventional army.

To be ready to survive in combat, and to do a creditable job as a combat infantryman an individual should have not less than 90

days, and preferably six months, of hard sustained training which includes arduous physical ordeals as well as a good share of the miserable weather conditions which usually characterize the areas where combat infantrymen are sent into battle.

This means that a potential combat soldier should be running 20 miles a day, climbing a 50-foot rope perhaps five times a day, and living a good part of his life either wet, cold, and miserable, or dehydrated, hot, and miserable.

Troop leaders owe their men this kind of training if they are to have a chance of survival when the shooting starts. Some members of this committee may remember the difficulties encountered by American infantrymen living the soft life of PXs and garrison duty in 1950 just prior to the Korean conflict. I believe it is fair to say that some American infantry units were butchered in the early days of the Korean War partly because of a paternal desire on the part of peacetime commanders to make Army life as comfortable as possible for themselves and their troops.

Comfort has no place in a combat infantry unit, particularly during training in peacetime.

This being so, what reasonable young man is going to give up a life of drinking beer with his friends, enjoying drive-in movies with his girl, and sleeping late on weekends in order to volunteer for the hard and rigorous life of running 20 miles a day, standing watch half the night, crawling through jungles, and generally being miserable?

There may be such reasonable young men in America today, but I haven't met any recently. There may be reasonable young men who will volunteer to see the world in the Navy or Air Force, but I have yet to hear of any of the 18- and 19-year-old friends of my children, or the 18- and 19-year-old sons of my friends who are volunteering for the infantry these days. Occasionally I hear of a young man who has volunteered for the Army or Marines, but on reviewing his situation, it generally turns out that he volunteered for the more arduous branch of service only because he was subject to the draft in the first place and wanted to test himself against the more difficult challenge as long as he was giving up two years of his life to the Service.

If reasonable men will not volunteer for combat infantry duty in peacetime, I suspect there is little benefit in seeking to attract unreasonable men to volunteer. There are men who love to kill, but it seems to me the nation is far safer when its Army is made up of reluctant citizen-soldiers than by men who take pride in being professional killers.

I have always thought it to be one of the great sources of strength of America that so many of our citizens have shared a brief exposure to the military Services. This has resulted in a common awareness in the civilian population that military leadership is not infallible. An ex-PFC or second lieutenant is probably more skeptical than most as to whether admirals and generals are capable of error in their recommendations as to where and when wars should be fought.

Our whole national concept and heritage that the civil authority should control the military benefits, it seems to me, by having the civilian leadership of the country knowledgeable about the military.

It would thus be a tragic error, in my opinion, to professionalize the lower ranks of the combat units, and thus lose the continuing benefits of cross-pollination and communication between the civilian and military communities. In this era of ever-increasing specialization, we may badly need full civilian understanding of the military and vice-versa. I have never seen a first-class military combat unit that didn't benefit by an influx of inquiring, challenging Reservists, nor have I seen a civilian organization

which didn't benefit by the wisdom and experience of those privileged to serve in combat or rigorous military duty.

In conclusion, I would like to suggest that congressional creation of an all-professional Army at this particular period in our history may do further damage to one of our basic national concepts—that an individual should be proud to serve his country.

The basic thrust of the all-volunteer Army proposal, as I understand it, is to alleviate the discontent over the draft, and particularly the inherent inequities which have surrounded a draft where only one-fourth of the eligible young men may be called upon to serve.

Granted that these inequities exist, I doubt that the nation is strengthened by hiring mercenaries to perform the more arduous services necessary to the maintenance of our liberties. If the goals of our country are worth fighting for, then we should not feel uncomfortable in asking our young people to participate in the fighting. If our goals in Vietnam are not worth fighting for, then I would suggest that we end our involvement in that particular war rather than abandon the concept of national military service as a minor obligation, well worth the privileges of American citizenship which it protects.

"Duty, honor, country" remain the words which underlie the strength of our nation's Armed Services. Those who urge an end to the draft seem to suggest that there be an end to "duty" on the part of American citizens.

I suggest that the real problem today lies in attempting to equal "honor" with our present policies in Vietnam.

If Americans believe that national goals can be pursued with honor, I doubt that a forceful argument can be made that we should abandon the concept of duty to serve one's country.

DEMANDS OF THE VIETNAM VETERANS AGAINST THE WAR, INC.

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the recent appearance on Capitol Hill of a group calling itself Vietnam Veterans Against the War, Inc., has been variously described in the press and in the other media. For the most part, stories have lionized them and depicted them in the most favorable light.

From my observations they were a mixed lot—some fine young men with deep convictions and ably equipped to express their points of view—and others which no community would want to claim as its typical young service veteran.

Some made impressive appearances in their interviews and public expressions—others were reported by a Washington daily having a ball on wine, marihuana, and rock music at night and demonstrating with clenched fists and four-letter words by day.

I do wish to bring to my colleagues' attention and to the attention of my own constituents that the good appearance of some and the disreputable appearance of others, however, shown in the media, is not the basic consideration.

The really important question is what did this group of veterans stand for? Was it merely against the Indochina war?

Reports would have one think so. But a reading of the groups' demands shows some of them too far removed from mere disengagement in Vietnam. They would also ask for our veterans the same education, hospitalization, and rehabilitation benefits which our national veterans organizations have worked very hard for. No one can fault that position.

But examination of their other demands finds them far afield from Southeast Asia with proposals affecting the CIA which would emasculate our intelligence efforts around the world and imperil our national security.

Another would have Congress grant amnesty to all who refused to serve their country, undermining morale of the Armed Forces and doing a great injustice to all young men who served so honorably and courageously.

I submit herewith the demands of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, Inc.:

VIETNAM VETERANS AGAINST
THE WAR, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES: DEMAND FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS ON REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES OF VETERANS OF THE INDOCHINA WAR

Vietnam veterans against the war, on behalf of its members and all other people who have worked toward peace, place before the Congress of the United States the following demands:

1. The Congress enact legislation to necessitate the immediate, unilateral, unconditional withdrawal of all United States Armed Forces and Central Intelligence Agency personnel from the countries of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

2. The Congress enact legislation to terminate all funds appropriated for the continued presence of the United States Military, its Allies and the Central Intelligence Agency in the countries of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

3. The Congress enact legislation for the termination of all funds being utilized by the Central Intelligence Agency to support their illegal operations in Latin America, Africa, China, Europe, and the countries of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

4. The Congress refuse to grant the 200 million dollars requested by the Administration for the continued United States support of the corrupt military machinery of the illegal government of Cambodia.

5. The Congress enact legislation for the immediate repatriation with full amnesty to those men and women who are in prison or in self-exile by reason of their refusal to serve in the military.

6. The Congress convene immediate full public hearings into the charges of War Crimes committed against the people of Indochina as a result of official and de facto United States military policy in the conducting of the illegal war of aggression in the countries of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

7. The Congress allow the Vietnam Veterans who brought these charges at the recently concluded Winter Soldier Investigation to testify with full Congressional immunity at these public hearings.

8. The Congress without regard for domestic political consideration issue a statement to the American people that the only means of securing the release of American prisoners of War is through the immediate cessation of all acts of aggression against the countries of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, the immediate withdrawal of United States support in any form to the illegal, corrupt, government of

Thieu, Ky, and Khieu, and the immediate withdrawal of all United States and Allied Forces from the countries of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

9. The Congress enact immediate legislation to provide proper care and services for all patients in Veterans Administration hospitals.

10. The Congress enact immediate legislation to make available job training and placement in both the public and private sectors for every returning Veteran.

11. The Congress enact immediate legislation providing the necessary funding for the structuring and implementation of drug rehabilitation and psychotherapy programs for returning veterans of the Indochina War.

12. The Congress enact immediate legislation providing the funds and means necessary for the Veterans Administration to provide materials, services, and subsistence required by veterans in the course of their educational and vocational endeavors.

13. The Congress address itself immediately to the reordering of national priorities to serve the dire domestic, social, economic, and educational needs of all the people.

14. The Congress convene a joint session to be addressed by a member of our organization.

15. The Congress of the United States of America cease immediately acting in tandem with the Executive Branch and meet its responsibility under the Constitution of the United States of America to protect the interest of and safeguard the rights of all the people of the United States of America.

16. We demand these things as citizens of the United States of America and as the vehicles by which this illegal, immoral, criminal war against the people of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos has been carried out.

LEFT AND RIGHT: THE DIFFERENCE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, it is normal practice when a Member of this body sees a really interesting item in the public press to insert that article into the RECORD. Normal practice also dictates an elaborate introduction by the member to accompany that article.

However, when the article is by so brilliant a writer as James J. Kilpatrick, anything I could say would be gilding the lily. So, I simply commend the following article from Human Events of April 17 to the attention of my colleagues:

LIBERALS AND CONSERVATIVES: THERE REALLY IS A DIFFERENCE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The lecturer who visits American college campuses, speaking on current campuses, speaking on current political affairs, often encounters this question: How do you distinguish between "conservatives" and "liberals"?

A number of answers can be offered. This is one of them: The conservative, as a general proposition, tends to look upon society as it is; the liberal by and large, tends to look upon society as he thinks it ought to be.

When it comes to crime and law enforcement, the conservative begins with the pessimistic recognition of this fact, that the world is not populated exclusively by beautiful people.

What Aristotle long ago described as "the inherent evil in men" persists to this day. Unrestrained by law, the baseness of some men will find outlet in criminal conduct. It is the first duty of government, through its agencies of law enforcement, to protect the public safety by restraining these instincts and punishing their exercise.

Which is to say that conservatives, as a group, tend to support their local police, just as the bumper stickers say. Conservatives will not condone "police brutality," and they will insist upon protection of constitutional rights. But they will not regard the deadly serious business of law enforcement as a game of hide-and-seek or a kind of genteel minuet.

The liberal view, by and large, is quite different. Here the conventional wisdom regards the criminal as the unfortunate victim of society as a whole. The criminal is not really to blame for shooting the storekeeper; if society had provided the criminal a decent home and a balanced diet, the gunman would not have embarked upon crime. Because police are an agency of society, police therefore share in the fundamental guilt. So "off the pigs," just as the demonstrators say.

All this is over-simplified; there is never room enough to turn around in. The liberal attitude recently was dramatically exhibited here in Washington, where the morning Post, "with due deliberation and with considerate regard for the attorney general's objections," carried a lead editorial captioned, "What Is the FBI Up To?"

The editorial was the outgrowth of incident in Media, Pa., a few days earlier. Thieves broke into the FBI office and stole roughly a thousand papers; the criminals copied 14 of these and mailed the copies to the Post, as well as to others. Atty. Gen. Mitchell, fearing that publication would disclose the identity of confidential sources, asked that the Post voluntarily refrain from making use of the material. The Post on March 24 "reported the substance of the records, however, because we were convinced that it served the public interest to do so."

The editorial was a typical liberal assault upon the FBI. To the Post, the 14 documents exposed activity that "seems to us extremely disquieting." The FBI was insensitive to the poisonous effect which its surveillance has upon the democratic process and upon the practice of free speech. The Post was especially outraged at what the stolen documents revealed of the surveillance maintained "on a professor regarded as a 'radical.'"

Very well. This was not the first time the Washington Post has trafficked in stolen documents, and doubtless it will not be the last. Pass the point. To those of us on the conservative side, the disclosures as to "surveillance of the 'radical' professor" indicated precisely the kind of expert police work demanded by the real world we live in.

For the FBI was not watching the professor because of his political views. The FBI has reason to believe the professor might be in contact with two young women indicted for the slaying of a Boston policeman in a bank holdup in September 1970.

The difference, you see, is in point of view. Conservatives look at this particular affair and see the policeman slain, the bank robbed, the armed fugitives at large; we tend to think in terms of apprehending the slayers and bringing them to trial.

Liberals, by contrast, see a professor harassed, and they mourn "a government of snoopers in a nation of informers." Our concern, in this instance, is with the punishment of crime, theirs with "the suppression of dissent."

Don't let anyone ever persuade you, when it comes to contemporary liberals and conservatives, that there isn't a dime's worth of difference.