

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 8

APRIL 1, 1970, TO APRIL 10, 1970

(PAGES 9923 TO 11270)

to at least two commercial applications: "farming" such sea creatures as lobster in these areas, and developing winter resorts around such artificially created warm water.

Many scientists believe much more cultivation of sea animals and plants in limited areas—such as the Chesapeake Bay oyster beds—will be necessary to feed the world's expanding population by the end of this century. They also predict that "aquaculture" will be a multibillion-dollar business by then.

SUDDENLY, A SHARK

Scientists working in this field learn to expect the unusual. On a recent voyage of the *Search Tide* in the Gulf of Mexico, for example, a group of engineers were in the water preparing for an experiment when a 40-foot whale shark appeared in their midst.

One of the engineers, Robert Bradley, impulsively grabbed the shark's dorsal fin and was pulled aboard the animal's back by the momentum. Clad only in orange swimming trunks, the engineer rode the gyrating shark for several minutes until the fish, its curiosity about the operation satisfied, dived and fled. Mr. Bradley and the others, unhurt by the incident, continued the experiment.

Great emphasis is placed on experimental and development work in the oceans because, as one engineer explains, "We have about reached the end of our rope in existing technology" in many fields.

Oil companies, engineers say, can use methods essentially land-based for removing petroleum on the ocean bottoms at depths of about 400 feet or less. But many potentially rich oil fields lie at depths of 600 feet and more, and so new means of tapping the deeper sources are being developed.

One big aerospace firm that has evolved such a system is the Lockheed Missiles & Space Company. Its proposed operation consists of a series of unmanned steel "cellars" over wellheads, connected to a central control station, also unmanned, on the sea floor. Oil would be pumped from there to a surface or shore pickup point.

Plans call for repair work to be done by technicians in a small diving capsule, which would be clamped to the top of the "cellar" during the work. Four oil companies are participating in the development, and the system is expected to be pumping oil by autumn.

UNDERWATER DIAMOND MINES

Other firms at work on oil-producing equipment include another big aerospace company, North American Rockwell, and Ocean Science & Engineering, Inc. The latter, a Washington, D.C., firm, is one of many small businesses in oceanographic work. It has expanded since its founding in 1962 into such activities as underwater mining for diamonds off Africa and a shipyard in California.

The search for better oil-retrieving devices is considered all the more urgent because of the outcry over recent incidents involving oil pollution along the U.S. coastline.

Many oceanographic firms have felt the pinch of cuts in the U.S. Government budget, and dozens of companies have posted losses. At least one big firm, which entered the field about five years ago, lost about 5 million dollars.

But the risks have been well worth it for many companies. Lockheed, for example, pumped more than 10 million dollars into oceanographic work. Recently, it won a U.S. Navy contract for a deep-diving vehicle to rescue crews from submarines. The program may eventually be worth about 200 million.

The company believes that work on the vessel could lead to a civilian submersible capable of operating at 20,000 feet, placing 90 per cent of the ocean bottom within reach.

Elmer P. Wheaton, Lockheed's vice president in charge of the program, says it was natural for the aerospace firm to enter the

oceanographic field because the company's technological resources were adaptable.

A NEW AGENCY?

The field is opening up so fast, Mr. Wheaton believes, "It is within the realm of possibility that Lockheed will some day work as much in oceanography as in aerospace."

As the pace of underwater work quickens, many scientists have become advocates of a bigger U.S. Government hand in encouraging business and protecting the public's interests. A White House-appointed commission on marine science recommended in 1969 that a National Oceanic Atmospheric Agency be set up. No action has yet been taken.

U.S. businesses, meanwhile, are exploring the oceans as fast as their resources will allow. Even companies that have not yet turned a profit on their investment in such work are hopeful about the future. Says one manufacturing executive:

"We haven't made any money in this yet—but we will. There are billions to be made in this market, and at least we've got our feet in the door."

RADIOACTIVE DISCHARGE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, many citizens are justifiably skeptical of the present Atomic Energy Commission standards regulating radioactive discharge.

In my home State, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency is involved in a controversy because it is seeking to tighten the AEC standards governing discharges into the Mississippi River from a proposed nuclear powerplant.

The AEC, in defending its standards, discounts the criticism as irresponsible or uninformed.

However, two of the leading critics of the current radiation standards—Dr. John Gofman and Dr. Arthur Tamplin—are neither irresponsible nor uninformed. These eminent scientists have been members of the professional staff at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore, Calif., an installation which is under contract to the AEC.

As critics from within, these two men have argued that the present AEC standards are so dangerous that they could lead to thousands of additional cases of cancer each year.

In an editorial page column in the April 2 edition of the *Washington Evening Star*, Judith Randal discusses the case incisively.

She concludes that the Nation needs to examine the situation more closely.

I also believe that we should examine these AEC standards. As I have announced previously, I support the State of Minnesota in its fight to strengthen the radiation regulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Evening Star*, Apr. 2, 1970]

NUCLEAR PLANTS AND YOUR HEALTH

(By Judith Randal)

Until about a year ago, Drs. John Gofman and Arthur Tamplin, the former a physician with an advanced degree in medical physics and the latter a biophysicist were content to stick to their Geiger counters and microscopes at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore, Calif.—one of several

scientific installations under contract to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Then a call came from Washington drawing their attention to an article in "The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," written at the height of the anti-ballistic missile debate by Dr. Ernest Sternglass, a University of Pittsburgh health physicist.

I charged that nuclear tests already had increased the incidence of cancer. And it predicted that generations of children yet unborn would be affected by atomic weapons experiments, past and future.

The AEC wanted Gofman and Tamplin to rebut Sternglass' conclusions. This was easy to do, because Sternglass had proceeded from incorrect assumptions.

But, as the California scientists dug deeper, they indeed found cause for alarm. They became particularly concerned about unrestrained growth of the nuclear electric power industry.

Says Gofman, "They wanted a whitewash and asked us to produce one by submitting a critique of Sternglass to a prominent scientific journal, and our own analysis of the dangers to an obscure one. We told them they could go to hell."

The Californians' quarrel with the AEC stems from two sources: First, they object to safety standards set by the Federal Radiation Council, a government regulatory body; and, second, they point to recent findings by many scientists that exposure to apparently innocuous levels of several environmental factors can present a new, combined danger that is many times greater than the sum of its parts.

Scientists call this "synergism" and point out that unless the result is dramatic, as with thalidomide, it may go unnoticed until it is too late.

Returning for a moment to the Federal Radiation Council, Gofman and Tamplin argue that its standards are set for the convenience of the AEC. There is some justification for this claim.

The setting of dangerously high levels for occupational exposure in uranium mines is an example. The Federal Radiation Council set a supposedly safe level for this industry, but the council's standard was disputed by individual scientists in this country as well as by the highly respected International Council on Radiological Protection. Two years later, there was a fourfold increase of lung cancer among men working in these mines.

Now the demand for electricity is growing three or four times faster than the United States population, and in the next 30 years an increasing share of this demand will have to be met by atomic energy.

The Federal Radiation Council has set permissible levels for exposure of the general population to radioactivity at 1.7 rads a year—a small amount, says the AEC. In fact, a scientist at a cancer meeting last week termed it "ridiculously low."

Gofman and Tamplin counter that it is too high by a factor of at least 10. They cite many studies—such as that of the uranium miners—as evidence.

"They can discredit us 100 percent, say we're agents of the Martians or anything," says Gofman, "but they can't argue with the published literature."

Gofman and Tamplin concede that danger to the general public today from exposure to radiation from atomic reactors is not great, because there are so few reactors around and because even .17 rad (the Gofman-Tamplin proposal) is not reached anywhere.

But as atomic power plants grow in number and size, exposure levels will creep up unnoticed and, the California scientists insist, eventually the Radiation Council's 1.7 rad limit will be approached.

At that time, they fear, pressure to raise the permissible limit may be just as great

as the periodic pressure on Congress to raise the ceiling on the national debt.

Even if existing standards remain in effect, they say, what the law now allows could lead to 15,000 to 32,000 more people each year developing cancer than at present, to say nothing of the genetic damage which may accrue to future generations.

Yet citizens who object to the construction of a nuclear reactor find themselves up against the AEC a tax-supported agency which is both regulator and promoter of atomic energy for civilian use.

In short, it would appear that this nation needs to examine how much added electrical power it really requires.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING OF SMALL CHILDREN

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, quickly, before the unexpected situation passes, never to return, I want to voice my approval of an editorial published in the Washington Post.

The editorial voices strong opposition to a scheme for massive psychological testing of children between ages 6 and 8 years old. The purpose of the tests would be to detect criminal potentialities in these children.

It is said that this proposal elicited some passing interest from someone in the administration. Perhaps. But now that the weather is warm, the baseball season has started, and the surf is up, there are ample distractions for men and women who might otherwise be distracted by the sheer novelty of the proposal to make the world safe from 8-year-olds.

I trust that the proposal will not survive the witty dissection administered by the Post today. I hope the Post can make a habit of what it has until today avoided like the plague—being good-humored and correct. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1970]

DR. HUTSCHNECKER'S MODEST PROPOSAL

Unlike Jonathan Swift, who formulated "A Modest Proposal for preventing the Children of Poor People in Ireland from being a Burden to their Parents or Country," Dr. Arnold Hutschnecker does not suggest that the rich should devour the children of the poor by way of solving the nation's social problems. Rather, he merely suggests that the state begin a massive psychological testing program on all 6- to 8-year-olds (to unearth "delinquent character structure") and provide a series of correctional measures for those who flunk, including ultimately "camps" for such young people as resist the state's benevolent ministrations and turn out to be—despite them—"hard-core." That and the fact that, unlike Dean Swift, Dr. Hutschnecker does not seem to be kidding, are the principal differences between these two works of art, one of which is to be found between the covers of any reputable collection of British satire and the other of which turned up in this newspaper last Sunday in an article by Robert Maynard.

Since a covering note to Secretary Finch makes plain that both Mr. Nixon and his assistant John Ehrlichman take the proposal seriously ("The President asks your opinion as to the advisability of setting up pilot projects embodying some of these approaches"), we will refresh your memory as

to what it's all about. Dr. Hutschnecker picks up where the Eisenhower Commission on Violence left off—prematurely and incompletely, in his opinion, since the commission observed that, "only progress toward urban reconstruction can reduce the strength of the crime-causing forces in the inner city and thus reverse the direction of present crime trends." Dr. Hutschnecker disagrees:

"I would like to suggest another, direct, immediate and . . . effective way of attacking the problem at its very origin, by focusing on this criminal mind of the child."

He thereupon cites some projective psychological tests which are the subject of considerable controversy and reservation among psychologists so far as both their potential use and abuse are concerned, and from this scanty material fashions his modest proposal.

Because "delinquent tendencies" can be predicted from tests "even at the age of six," Dr. Hutschnecker contends that what is wanted is a comprehensive testing program. Those children in whom government detected "violent and homicidal tendencies" would get treatment and guidance and finally, if they failed to respond, a place in Camp Hutschnecker-by-the-Sea. There they would be supervised in "group activities" by psychologists, psychiatrists, and "pschomeds" who had been trained with the help of government loans. Dr. Hutschnecker, ever looking on the bright side of things, maintains that in or out of camps even the most intractable adolescents can be redeemed. "There are Pavlovian methods which I have seen used effectively in the Soviet Union."

It should be stated at about this point that Dr. Hutschnecker himself is a physician and that his credentials as a diagnostician of the nation's psychic ills are rather slim. He has not let this fact get in the way of his publicly administered group therapy, however: only last summer Dr. Hutschnecker was promoting in *Look* magazine his universal pass-fail system for grading the mental health of prospective public servants and issuing them a kind of sanity card as proof against—well—who knows what? At that time he also came up with some highly imaginative, if politically suspect, psychological descriptions of public figures (not Mr. Nixon) whom he of course has never treated.

So Dr. Hutschnecker lacks the two credentials that might have justified in some degree the interest the White House has shown in this document: he is not a satirist and he is not a specialist in the subject on which he made his sweeping recommendations.

Among his other shortcomings we would include what Arthur Godfrey once perceived in Julius La Rosa as a certain want of humility, and we would also cite his gross indifference to the delicate relationship that exists and must be preserved in these matters between the government and the citizen, and between "predictive" concepts of crime of any kind and the actual committing of crime, which is what we punish people for or treat them separately and specially for. Finally, in a somewhat less-thunderous vein, we would commend to Dr. Hutschnecker's attention the inferences of Drs. Gesell and Ig in the section called "Six Years Old" of the classic work, "The Child From Five to Ten." Some of our best friends are 6-year-olds, and we have no intention of smearing them as a group. But the implication is strong that what with one thing and another, generally speaking, and in terms of decorum, all 6-year-olds are criminals. We don't want to be too flibberty-glibbet: the few truly sick and hurt can be helped by special care, and for those who are trapped in the horror of our urban slums, we think the Eisenhower Commission was doing just fine in its diagnosis without Dr. Hutschnecker's addendum. For the rest of the world's wanton 6-year-olds there is nature's special cure: turning 7.

U.S. ACTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS: THE SAME IN 1963 AS IN 1970

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the international protection of human rights has been a matter of grave import for many years. Six million Jews were murdered by Nazi Germany. World reaction to this monstrous crime against humanity resulted in the United Nations Convention on Genocide. The concern over genocide spread into other areas of human rights, resulting in the United Nations conventions or protocols on forced labor, slavery, the political rights for women, and the protection of refugees.

A letter to the editor of the *New York Times* in December, 1963, expressed grave concern that—

Fifteen years since the adoption of the Declaration of Human Rights little has been done (by the United States) to act upon its terms.

The letter, written by Phil Baum, director of the Commission on International Affairs of the American Jewish Congress, was printed in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* and *Aborigines Friend* in January of 1966. The text of the letter was followed by the succinct comment:

Up to the time of going to press, this situation has remained, unaltered.

It is now April 1970, almost 7 years after Mr. Baum's excellent letter, and more than 4 years after it appeared in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*. And still, "this situation remains unaltered." There has been virtually no action by the United States in the field of international protection of human rights. The situation must change—humanity demands that it do so immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Baum's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE UNITED STATES AND U.N. HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Members will recall the statement by the late President Kennedy, published in the *Society's Annual Report* for 1963-64, calling on the U.S. Senate to ratify three international conventions on human rights. The conventions were on slavery, forced labour and the political rights of women.

In December 1963 the following letter appeared in the *New York Times*:

Status of Human Rights—Benefits Seen if United States Ratifies U.N. Conventions

To the Editor of the *New York Times*:

On 10th December, at the invitation of the U.N. Economic and Social Council the United States is to join with other countries in the world in inaugurating Human Rights Week and in celebrating the fifteenth anniversary of the adoption of the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights.

In the past these events typically have been restricted to innocuous ceremonial displays. Rarely have they been of genuine significance either to the communities in which they have been held or to the issues to which they have been directed. This year it is imperative to use this occasion for a precise appraisal of the status of international human rights and of the opportunities that have been taken—more often missed—by our own country to contribute toward their enhancement and improvement.

The fact is that the United States has not