

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 4

FEBRUARY 23, 1967, TO MARCH 6, 1967

(PAGES 4227 TO 5572)

There is no necessary correlations between dosage and effects.

"The nominal dose is 250 micrograms—less, in pure form, than would fit on the head of a pin," he says. "But we have observed chronic effects from doses as small as 100 micrograms."

LSD—lysergic acid diethylamide—is a compound involving one of the principal ingredients of ergot, a fungus that grows on rye.

PERIL IN MANUFACTURE

It can be made by someone with just an elementary knowledge of chemistry—although some of the bad effects may be resulting from unknown extraneous substances that are introduced during the process of amateur manufacture. Pure LSD can have drastic physical effects. A massive experimental dose killed an elephant.

Last year LSD was banned by the Federal Food and Drug Administration, and in California and some other states its sale, or possession by nonprofessionals, is considered a crime.

Dr. Ungerleider described its impact as follows:

"LSD has been called a consciousness-expanding drug. In fact it is quite the reverse. It decreases one's ability to select and pay attention. Therefore it decreases conscious functions. Sensations do become intensified. Perception, however, is not enhanced, and visual and auditory acuteness are not revolutionized but rather are distorted."

Of all of LSD's effects, the worst may be none of the violent aberrations but a very subtle one: a seemingly permanent dulling of users' objective judgment and its replacement by purely subjective values. This effect has been noted by observers as widely separated professionally as psychiatrists and law-enforcement officers.

A distinctive effect of LSD is the "missionary" zeal it engenders in users to get others to join them. Some habitues will insist on giving away handfuls of impregnated sugar cubes or capsules that, at the going rate of several dollars a dose, represent considerable money.

Suppression of LSD is impeded by a number of other factors different from those applying to long-established drugs. These include:

Its relatively easy procurability.

Technical difficulties it presents to regular law-enforcement operations.

The possibility that it has constructive applications.

Its association with the reputedly sponsored religio-esthetic "psychedelic" movement.

AUTHORITIES STUMPED

A survey of law-enforcement agencies in Los Angeles, the nation's second-largest metropolis, indicates that LSD use has authorities stumped.

A user cannot be readily detected. The effects can either be less obvious than, or indistinguishable from, other intoxicants such as alcohol, marijuana, barbiturates or heroin.

Since LSD was outlawed last year the Los Angeles police department and the Los Angeles county sheriff's office have referred about 100 LSD arrests to the District Attorney's office. Of these 100, prosecutions have been prepared in 27 cases, but none has gone beyond the preliminary hearing stage. There is no record of any prosecutions elsewhere in California.

Burnell Blanchard, Southern California director of the State Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement, painted this picture:

"I could tie up every agent in this office—30 of them—just on LSD. We haven't been able to aim at the situation from a user standpoint at all, and I suspect the other law-enforcement agencies haven't either."

"We've been going after sellers. And we can only give LSD a certain amount of at-

tention. Since last June our marijuana seizures exactly doubled over the previous six months, in terms of quantity, and there was a 70 per cent increase in the number of defendants."

Drug arrests of adults have risen to nearly 25,000 a year among California's 20 million residents. About 40 per cent of the arrests are marijuana cases. About half the LSD use that has been coming to light has been coupled with marijuana.

"This LSD problem is a serious one," said Mr. Blanchard, an official of national repute who has been in drug-law enforcement for 25 years. "Our insane asylums are going to be filled if the young people continue to use it."

No specific means has yet been found for neutralizing the effects of LSD. At the U.C.L.A. clinic, the most effective medicines in severe cases of derangement have been several of the so-called "major tranquilizer" drugs. Following that, psychiatric treatment is indicated.

Even the optimum law enforcement against LSD, says California's Attorney General Thomas Lynch, is "only a partial solution to the problem." Beyond that, Mr. Lynch thinks, there is need for a great educational effort to expose hallucinogens as fraudulent escapism.

"We have in every large student community," he says, "what has been described as a 'head culture'—the drug users who reject the social consciousness of their contemporaries and seek a more passive way out of modern dilemmas."

He continued:

"They devote energy and ingenuity to taking 'trips,' which they equate with 'experience.' This is ironic, because a 'trip' is the antithesis of experience—it is a flight from reality. Our goal must be reversing the retreat from reality within the student community."

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there are still those who believe that air pollution is a problem about which only the very largest cities in our Nation need to be concerned.

This is certainly not the case. Our growing metropolitan areas have just as much at stake in the fight against polluted air as does New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles. For, if we are able to place effective controls on the problem now, perhaps these developing cities will not be faced with air pollution in the threatening proportions that presently engulf our largest urban centers.

We need more public awareness—more public concern. It will not arise overnight. But it will be the result of continued efforts by a great number of people over a long period of time. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] has been in the front ranks for many years leading the fight against air pollution.

I ask unanimous consent that an address by Senator NELSON to the National Conference on Air Pollution on December 13, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AIR POLLUTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 13, 1966

As a boy growing up in a small town in northern Wisconsin, I fell in love with the out of doors—of which we seemed to have so much back in Clear Lake.

To a boy, the trees seemed wondrously tall,

the hills seemed very high, the waters seemed deep and pure, and the wildlife seemed magically mysterious.

It came as a shock to learn that these wonderful features in our great out of doors were all being threatened by the very progress which we had been taught in school to anticipate with such great expectations. It seemed impossible that anything done by man could actually destroy that wide world of nature. But I have been seeing it happen every day since then.

The biggest thing of all in this world out-doors was the sky. It was the sky I always thought of when they first taught us the meaning of infinity. It was the open air we always wanted to escape into.

Who could have foreseen the day when man would be on the verge of turning the very air we breathe into poison?

But that is the problem we are here today to consider in this historic conference.

Partly because of my background the urgent need for preserving some significant part of our world of nature has preoccupied me throughout much of my service as a state legislator, as Governor, and as a United States Senator.

Through the past decade of work in this field, I have come to the conclusion that the No. 1 domestic problem facing this country is the threatened destruction of our natural resources, and the disaster which would confront mankind should such a destruction occur.

Air pollution is just one part of the massive threat which faces our resources, all across the country and all around the world.

The same powerful forces which create the crisis of air pollution are also threatening our fresh water resources, our woods, our wildlife, and the scenic beauty of the nation. These forces are the rapid increase in population, industrialization, urbanization, and scientific technology.

It is now entirely conceivable that these forces set in motion by man will prove so powerful and so irreversible as to destroy the natural environment we have known in the past, and even to threaten the future of life on this planet.

More than any other public problem with which I am familiar, the threat to our natural environment poses a challenge to our system of self-government.

There is a real question as to whether this nation, which has spent some 200 years developing an intricate system of local, state and Federal government to deal with the public's problems, will be bold, imaginative and flexible enough to meet this supreme test.

Our governmental system survived two World Wars. It appears fully equal to compete with Communism in the struggle for world leadership. But will it be adequate to cope with our own hell-bent drive to destroy our resources?

Before we talk about what government must do to control air pollution, let us just review for a moment what government has already done—or at least what it has allowed to be done—to our environment.

In northern Wisconsin, and in much of the nation, we destroyed our forests. Our own northland once had 200 billion board feet of white pine, one of the greatest concentrations of wealth anywhere in the world. We wiped it out in an eyewink of history and left behind 50 years of heartbreak and economic ruin. Forest fires raged through the slash left behind by the loggers. Crystal clear trout streams silted in. Hundreds of thousands of acres of land became tax delinquent, and local units of government faced economic chaos.

Then we destroyed our rivers. Our cities and our developing new industries converted many of them into sewers, killing their fish, ruining them as a recreational resource, threatening the health of those who use them as a water supply.

At present we are destroying our lakes.

Our small inland lakes are being ruined by overdevelopment and by septic tanks, and our mightiest bodies of water such as the Great Lakes are being slowly and steadily destroyed by municipal, industrial and ship-board wastes. Lake Erie is almost gone, the pollution of southern Lake Michigan has been branded practically irreversible.

Stripminers and bulldozers are destroying our natural landscape. Pesticides, now being used at the rate of 700 million pounds a year, are spreading all across the land and the water, poisoning the soil, killing fish and wildlife, and posing a potential threat to human health. DDT is being found in reindeer and in penguins and its concentration is soaring as it progresses up the food chain—from water, to plants, to fish, to birds and presumably to man.

And now the very air we breathe!

Our factories, our automobiles, our public incinerators and our homes are filling the air with noxious gases and dangerous particles of pollutants at a terrifying rate.

Automobiles alone are discharging enough carbon monoxide to pollute a blanket of air 400 feet thick, six miles wide, stretching from New York City to Los Angeles.

Our coal burning furnaces alone are discharging enough sulfur dioxide to pollute a similar blanket of air, 400 feet high and from coast to coast, 15 miles wide.

Thousands of deaths have officially been traced to air pollution, and many thousands more were almost certainly caused by it. Polluted air is causing or aggravating bronchitis, asthma, emphysema, and lung cancer. It is making people more susceptible to pneumonia. It is making it hard for elderly persons to breathe, and it is interfering with the delicate systems by which the human body filters out irritants and makes use of the vital ingredients in fresh air. It is making it difficult for pilots to see the ground as they fly in to our greatest cities.

Our scientists tell us that air pollution does some \$10 to \$12 billion damage every year. It damages farm crops as much as 100 miles from the source of the pollution. It blights pine trees, kills orchids, damages orange groves and grapevines and ruins spinach. It corrodes metals, weakens fabrics, discolors paint, etches glass, cracks rubber, and spreads its filth over everything. It turns white snow black, and it soils wash on the line before it even can be worn.

These are the things we can see with our eyes, breathe with our lungs and feel with our hands. But up there in the once blue sky, concealed behind a blanket of smog, things are happening which no average person can detect.

A Cornell University scientist, Dr. LaMont Cole, testified before our Senate Interior Committee on my bill to authorize research into ecology—the relationship of all the different elements in our environment. Dr. Cole said:

"Man is burning fossil fuel at an ever increasing rate, and it is probable that more than half of the fuel ever burned by man has been burned in this century. One result of this is to release carbon dioxide into the atmosphere more rapidly than it can be taken up by green plants or dissolved in the oceans and eventually precipitated. . . . It appears probable that the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere has increased by at least 10% since the turn of the century.

"Atmosphere carbon dioxide (Dr. Cole continued) is believed to have drastic effects on climate, and there are now diametrically opposed hypotheses as to what effect this change may have. One hypothesis predicts that world temperatures will increase and melt the icecaps from Greenland and Antarctica, thus raising sea level and drastically altering the world's coastline; for example, all of Florida would be under water. The other hypothesis contends that precipitation, including snowfall, will increase so much that glaciers will start to advance and bring on a new ice age."

The scientists also remind us that this orgy of fuel burning—which strokes the fires of American industries and powers our autos and planes—is using up oxygen at an accelerating rate. Again, Dr. Cole of Cornell University testified:

"The only reason the earth's atmosphere contains oxygen for us to breathe, and with which to burn fossil fuels, is that oxygen is constantly being given off by green plants. If we reach a point at which the rate of combustion exceeds the rate of photosynthesis, the oxygen content of the atmosphere will start to decrease. Almost a year ago I made an intense effort to estimate how near we are to the balance point which will signal the end of expansion, of our present type of industrialization, but satisfactory data of the necessary sort do not exist. I suspect that we are close to the critical point, but I shall not try to defend this opinion."

Scientist after scientist offered similar testimony at our Ecology Bill hearings. For instance, Dr. Bostwick H. Ketchum, president of the Ecological Society of America and associate director of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution testified:

"In the long run, the very survival of mankind may depend on what we do today and in the near future to use and exploit our environment."

As I have emphasized, the crisis of air pollution is seriously complicated by the fact that chemical changes occur in the atmosphere which we understand only slightly and which we have little power to control or even detect. This is true with relatively simple pollutants such as automotive exhausts. Think of the implications for air pollution in nuclear testing!

Two years after water in the western Pacific was contaminated by radioactive fallout, clams were found to contain fantastic concentrations of the radioisotope Cobalt-60. Scientists tell us that Cobalt-60 is not produced by atomic fission. It must have been produced by the action of radiation on some chemical in the water. These findings involving Pacific Ocean clams showed that dangerous new chemicals can be accumulated in the tissues of animals up to several million times the concentration in the surrounding water.

In the light of such findings, think of the implications for our environment if we were to adopt the suggestion to use nuclear explosions to dig a canal across Central America.

Let us take a brief look at what our governments are presently doing about air pollution.

Many of our cities and some counties have developed local air pollution programs. These started out as "smoke control" programs. We know now that the problem is much more complex than controlling local smoke. Relatively few states have strong anti-pollution programs.

The Federal government's role in air pollution consists of making grants to local air pollution agencies so they can operate their own programs, pretty much as they please.

The Federal Clean Air Act as amended this year makes \$46 million available for the fiscal year ending next June, and \$70 million for the following year. The states presently are spending slightly over \$5 million for air pollution control programs, and communities are spending about \$15 million.

While leaving full responsibility for air pollution control programs at the state and local level, the Clean Air Act did put the Federal government clearly in charge of reducing automobile exhaust pollution. It authorized Federal standards for systems to control auto exhausts, beginning with 1968 models.

To anyone familiar with state and local government, I think the shortcomings of our present national air pollution control program should be obvious.

Air pollution is a massive problem of the greatest urgency. It is utterly unrelated to

traditional political boundaries. It can be nation-wide, even world-wide, in its effects. It taxes the technical knowledge of our leading scientists. Clearly, this is one public problem which cannot simply be left to local government to handle as it sees fit.

Many of our air pollution problems are regional in nature. The boundaries of regional air pollution problems are determined partly by geography, partly by the patterns of air movements, partly by the pattern of urban sprawl.

The most obvious regional air pollution problem is the New York City, New Jersey, Connecticut area. What can the suburban communities in New Jersey and Connecticut do about the mushroom-like cloud of pollution which often envelops Manhattan and all but obliterates the sun on some occasions?

What can city air pollution authorities in Chicago do about the suffocating pollution pouring out of steel mills in that giant, three-state industrial complex at the southern end of Lake Michigan?

The No. 1 reform needed in our national air pollution program is the immediate development of regional governmental authorities to fight air pollution on the scale that it occurs.

Our present Clean Air Act offers financial incentives to so-called regional programs. But the mere linking up of two communities, which is sufficient to qualify under the law, does not create a regional program. We need regional programs involving several cities and several states—boundary lines drawn to suit the air pollution problem which exists, not to conform to other lines of the map. These regional programs should encompass an entire geographic area which has a common air pollution problem.

If offering financial incentives does not get this job done, then the Federal government should have the authority to establish the regional units which we need, made up of representatives from existing units of government.

A regional program involving the great industrial complex of Chicago, Gary, Hammond and Whiting, Indiana, would provide an excellent model for the development of a truly coordinated and comprehensive air pollution control and waste disposal system.

In addition to regional air pollution control units, we need to take another step forward and give the Federal government authority to set air quality standards and emission standards.

Few communities have the facilities to develop proper standards. And private industry should not be faced with widely differing standards from city to city. This creates the old problem of competitive disadvantage and encourages some industries to threaten to move away if tough standards are set.

The rationale for Federal standards on auto exhausts is that cars move from state to state, and the problem is the same everywhere. But the smoke from a huge electric generating plant in New Jersey moves into New York just as autos do, and the problem of controlling such emissions is the same regardless of where they originate.

Next we must admit that despite the increase in our recent authorizations, our financial support for air pollution control is still only a fraction of what it ought to be.

If we calculate our losses to air pollution at \$10 to \$12 billion a year, would it not be worth some sizeable portion of that amount to conquer it?

But most important of all is our basic approach to all these threats to our environment. We must see them all as part of a common phenomenon with potentially ruinous consequences for our civilization. For 200 years we have plundered the resources of this continent, thinking that there always would be plenty more where they came from.

That is no longer true. Just as we have completely destroyed many species of wildlife, we now have it within our power to

destroy our rivers, our Great Lakes, and even the air we breathe.

As Dr. Sidney Galler of the Smithsonian Institution testified before the Senate Interior Committee:

"Throughout the history of the world various nations have risen and fallen in accordance with overexploitation and deterioration of their resource bases. If we are to avoid the same pitfall, we must provide a scientific foundation for conservation, development and effective use of our resources. It is essential to our survival as a nation to take effective action on these problems."

We need a broad new program of Federally supported ecological research. With our resources gradually disappearing, with our capacity to destroy the environment growing every day, we must know the impact on our environment of every step we take from now on.

We must know in advance that wiping out forests destroys the soil, ruins lakes and streams, even affects the climate and causes some agricultural crops to die. We must know that digging a canal to the ocean can admit sea lampreys and wipe out our lake trout fishery. We must know that phosphates in detergents will fill our lakes with fast growing algae.

If we are to do these things—if we are to save the natural resources of this land to sustain ourselves and future generations—then we must begin at once to develop the governmental programs and institutions which will accomplish that life or death goal.

SENATOR BREWSTER ON THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, because of the Vietnam war, because of statements by certain officials of our Government, because of a controversy over placement of the Federal Maritime Administration, the U.S. merchant marine is receiving some long-overdue public discussion.

There are indications that at long last an administration is going to propose a maritime program. I say "an administration" for in all fairness it should be noted that Congress has been waiting for administration maritime proposals for more than 20 years.

At any rate, the need for such a program is abundantly clear. As the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] put it in a recent speech, "Our fleet is a disgrace." Because of his experience as a key member of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Senator BREWSTER is eminently qualified to comment on the state of our merchant marine and to suggest remedies to correct this national disgrace.

Because of the national importance of upgrading our merchant marine, because of the Senator's expertise in this area, and because of the need for wide public discussion on this topic, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BREWSTER's address to the Port and Industrial Development Committee of the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the February 17 edition of the Baltimore News-American commenting on the Senator's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR DANIEL B. BREWSTER, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND, AT THE ANNUAL WINTER LUNCHEON, PORT AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, BALTIMORE JUNIOR ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, BALTIMORE, MD., FEBRUARY 16, 1967

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to appear today before this distinguished group. As I look around, I see old friends from every part of the maritime industry, and friends from other industries as well. We are all united by a common bond: a deep concern for the welfare of the port of Baltimore.

We also share a concern for the welfare of this Nation. And while the merchant marine plays a key role in the health of the economy of Baltimore, it also is vital to the best interests of the United States. We have at least two reasons, therefore, to promote a strong American merchant marine.

Given this audience, there is little need for me to go into the importance of the fleet to this port. Baltimore handled some 27 million tons of cargo last year, up 6 percent from the year before. One and a half billion dollars worth of goods came through the port. It ranks as the third largest in the country on a tonnage basis. (My own private criteria ranks it as the best port in the country, but that's partly prejudice!)

This port nets the city of Baltimore nearly \$700 million a year in extra income. It means jobs for 30,000 Marylanders.

It's easy to see how important the merchant marine is to Baltimore. It's sometimes a little harder to see how vital it is to the country. And that's precisely the problem—there aren't enough people who appreciate the vital role of the fleet.

It's not hard at all to say that jet planes are important. They are glamorous; they have sex appeal. So we will vote billions for jet planes. And we certainly should, for they are important in the commercial and defense effort of the United States.

But, my friends, the merchant marine is just as important to the commerce and the defense of this Nation, even if it's not as glamorous. Jet planes roar off into the horizon, while *ships* get on with the hard work, delivering 98 percent of our cargo to Vietnam. Most of the American soldiers now in Vietnam got there by ship. And there weren't any foreign flag ships waiting to take them there. They had to go in American bottoms. Thank God that we had enough ships to carry them, even if they were rust-buckets and we had just barely enough of them.

I could go on and on in this vein, but perhaps it would be more to the point to recall a little history. Take a look at each of the major wars this country has fought. What was the state of the fleet?

Because we had allowed our shipping strength to decline in Colonial days, we found ourselves with virtually no fleet at the time of the Revolutionary War. We built a fleet for that conflict, but dismantled it immediately thereafter.

The pattern continued in later wars. America would let her fleet decline; a war emergency would arise; the American fleet would be rebuilt—usually too late to help very much in the war; and then the fleet would be allowed to decline again.

This happened in the War of 1812, the Civil War, the first world war, the second world war, and then Korea.

Clearly this is the situation which confronts us today. Our fleet is a disgrace. I venture to say that there is no other single item of equipment in use in the war effort that is as old as the victory ships which are used to transport men and equipment over there.

Can you imagine the furor if we equipped our men with 1943 rifles? or 1943 planes? But we use 1943 ships for our vital logistic efforts, and not an eyebrow is raised.

I could go on and on about the need for a strong fleet and a strong shipbuilding capacity. But you ladies and gentlemen are the last ones who need to be reminded about that. Let me talk, instead, about what the government can do concretely, to help the merchant marine and the Port of Baltimore.

The first thing we can do is to spotlight the condition of the merchant marine. As I mentioned before, the maritime picture has no sex appeal. It seems dull and drab in comparison with other programs which demand the attention of the Congress.

As a result, minimal attention is being paid to the situation. To remedy this, I have introduced legislation which would give the Commerce Committee of the Senate power to authorize such funds for the merchant marine as it thinks proper.

Senator Magnuson, chairman of the Commerce Committee, and Senator Bartlett, chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee, are both cosponsoring my bill. I would hope that we may get favorable action by the Senate at an early date. This is step number one to resolve the maritime crisis.

This legislation would give the committee a chance to evaluate in depth the needs of the merchant marine. If it develops that we need to construct a specified number of ships in a given year, then the money can be authorized. Operating subsidies, where appropriate, can also be voted. The critical fact is that, for almost the first time, the merchant marine would be getting the type of attention which it vitally needs.

Step number two is to map out a long range plan to build up and maintain our fleet. This Nation now has no merchant marine policy. We desperately need one.

The Merchant Marine Subcommittee will be holding hearings later this month to deal with this question. We intend to have the top administration officials who are concerned with the maritime up on Capitol Hill. Industry and union representatives will also testify. We will find out what kind of a policy they advocate, and why. And if the executive branch abdicates its responsibility in this matter, then the Congress will provide a strong maritime policy.

There are some indications that the administration is at least contemplating a forward-looking maritime policy right now. I have seen a copy of the informal position paper, currently circulating in the government, which suggests the construction of 720 to 960 ships over the next two decades.

It is hard to believe that this represents the official administration line. But it is at least encouraging that the executive branch is thinking about a substantial shipbuilding program.

I have my own suggestions as to what such a national policy ought to be. I have expressed them before, two years ago, in a letter to Alan Boyd, and I will be doing so again. As a bare minimum, three things ought to be done:

1. This country should begin right now to build 30 to 40 ships a year. They should be modern vessels, some of them bulk carriers.

2. This country should maintain its cargo preference policy, under which at least 50 percent of government cargo must be carried in American bottoms.

3. This country should have a pro-maritime policy, not an anti-maritime policy. We should not have a secretary of defense constantly sniping at the merchant marine. We should not choose the only nuclear-powered merchant ship in the United States as the place to chop \$3 million off a \$135 billion budget. We need a positive approach to the merchant marine.

There are other steps which the Congress can take to help the fleet and to help the port of Baltimore. We should certainly seize every opportunity to encourage foreign commerce, since 27 million tons of it move through this great port.