

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 23

OCTOBER 21, 1969, TO OCTOBER 28, 1969

(PAGES 30643 TO 32004)

housing codes we drive these families from pillar to post, sharpening their frustrations and planting the seeds of violence.

As the League of Women Voters reminded us in the aforesaid report:

"The importance of housing cannot be overemphasized. To the individual, housing is important because it affects his health, his well-being, and his ability to function effectively in society. To the community and to society, it is important because the area in which there is the most deteriorated, dilapidated, over-crowded and is sub-standard housing coincides with the areas of the greatest crime, disease, and discontent".

Thus, duplex style public housing for the larger families are absolutely essential in America and the turnkey method makes it profitable for private industry to seek out the land, develop and construct the building.

Very truly yours,

NELSON HOWARTH,
Mayor.

IMPORTANCE OF ARMS LIMITATION NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) made a thoughtful speech last week in New York on the importance of arms limitation negotiations. To promote the likelihood of this objective, Senator MUSKIE urged a moratorium on American development of the multiple independently targetable vehicles, the so-called MIRV's.

Senator MUSKIE's proposal is a constructive addition to the national dialog about the ways to achieve peace, at home and around the world. I commend Senator MUSKIE's remarks to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

In paying tribute to Meyer Weisgal and the Weizmann Institute, we are honoring the spirit of Israel: courage in the face of danger, tenacity under continuing pressure, and humanitarian concern in spite of the demands of war.

Israel is more than a patch of real estate in the Middle East. It is a dream come true and a challenge to all those who believe in freedom and the rights of man. It deserves our continuing support in the preservation of its freedom and independence.

In one of his last speeches at the first session of Knesset in Jerusalem in February, 1949, Dr. Chaim Weizmann said:

"Let us build a new bridge between science and the spirit of man. Where there is no vision the people perish. We have seen what science leads to when it is not inspired by moral vision . . . All my life I have tried to make science and research the basis of our national endeavor, but I have always known fully well that there are values higher than science. The only values that offer healing for the ills of humanity are the supreme values of justice and righteousness, peace and love."

The Institute which bears Dr. Weizmann's name is a testament to his wisdom and vision. Amidst a virtually continuous period of war and near war, the Institute has devoted its energies and resources to the betterment of life for all mankind. Yet, while the Institute applies science to improve the human condition, too much of the world seems preoccupied with harnessing technology to develop newer and more destructive weapons.

Since the end of World War II the United States and the Soviet Union have engaged in

competition to develop more powerful armaments.

No one questions that—under present circumstances—military power is an essential part of our security system; but there is a point where preoccupation with purely military strength may diminish rather than increase our security. I believe we are at that point.

We are already involved in a new cycle of an ever more costly and perilous competition for nuclear superiority. At the same time, we and the Soviet Union have within our grasp a way to restrain this competition and to reassert a saner ordering of our national priorities.

We rationalized development of a MIRV system as a response to a limited Soviet ABM system and its possible expansion. The Soviets, in turn, started development of a MIRV system to insure parity in intercontinental missile systems for themselves. We moved to develop an ABM system in response to the Soviet moves to develop and deploy MIRVs. And so the arms race continues, unrelated to the real security of either nation.

While the development of MIRV will not alter the strategic stalemate between the Soviet Union and the United States, it can make it less and less possible to reach a nuclear arms control agreement.

At the present time, we and the Soviet Union can, through our own surveillance systems, tell with great accuracy the number of missile launchers the other has in place. But we cannot detect the number of warheads fitted inside a single missile. Thus, if MIRV missiles—with their multiple warheads—are deployed, it will be virtually impossible to achieve genuine arms control arrangement without detailed on-site inspection rights.

If we can achieve a ban on testing and deployment of such multiple reentry missiles, both nations, on their own, could police the testing of such missiles. Halting the final testing of such missiles is, therefore, crucial to reaching a self-enforcing agreement with the Soviets to bar their deployment.

Early last summer Senator Brooke, supported by myself and forty other Senators, proposed that a mutual moratorium on MIRV testing and deployment be negotiated with the Soviets as soon as possible. At the time of the Brooke proposal, it appeared that after a series of delays by both powers, the Soviets and the United States were about ready to commence such talks. The talks have not begun, and no dates have been fixed.

A strategic stalemate exists between the United States and the Soviet Union today. Neither nation can launch an attack on the other without bringing on its own destruction. Neither nation can realistically hope to break this stalemate by developing a new generation of nuclear weapons. Each nation has the capacity to match any weapons developed by the other. Both sides tend to react to the potentialities as well as the actualities of action. It is precisely this cycle of action and reaction which fuels the arms race.

In spite of this fact, the public has been allowed—even encouraged—to believe that somehow there is safety in ever growing weapons strength and that it still means something to be ahead numerically in nuclear weapons.

These are assumptions which must be challenged if we are to slow down the arms race, contribute to a reduction in international tension and apply our resources to the restoration of our society.

We have a unique opportunity to slow the arms competition. The strategic stalemate and the costs of further weapons develop-

ment make an agreement restraining the arms race attractive and in the self-interest of the United States and the Soviet Union alike.

If we fail to seize this opportunity, we can, in fact, jeopardize our national security. The diversion of resources from human needs to unnecessary weapons development is a tragic waste. At the same time, as weapons grow more complex and numerous, it becomes ever more difficult to establish adequate safeguards against the risk that such weapons may be unleashed by accident or miscalculation. The question is whether we are taking the initiatives we might take to reduce the pressures for new weapons development and avoid these consequences. Unfortunately, forces are now in motion which can undermine our chances for achieving a nuclear arms control agreement with the Soviets. The decision to proceed with the deployment of the ABM was a setback, but ever more serious is the fact that both the United States and the Soviet Union are rapidly developing the capacity to deploy multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles—so called MIRV—missiles which can carry several warheads and launch them at separate targets. The MIRV-ABM development is a classic example of arms escalation which results in less, rather than more, national security.

There is some evidence that the Russians are not anxious to talk about substantive armaments control agreements with the United States until they have resolved their border dispute with Communist China. We should not let such delays prevent us from acting to keep MIRV missile development from jeopardizing chances of reaching an arms limitation agreement.

Let the United States unilaterally postpone the testing of all our multiple reentry missiles for a period of six months, announcing that we will not begin testing thereafter unless the Soviet Union initiates such tests.

It should be clearly understood that such a suspension in MIRV testing is not proposed as a step toward unilateral disarmament. It is not proposed as a unilateral commitment never to test MIRV. It is proposed as a meaningful step to stimulate mutual efforts by the United States and the Soviet Union to control the escalation of nuclear weapons systems before it is too late.

If the Soviet Union ignores our gesture and goes forward with testing their multiple reentry missiles, or if they expand the scope of their ABM system, we can promptly resume our own MIRV program. Since the time needed to complete our development of the MIRV is far less than it would take the Soviets to construct a massive ABM system, and since a six-month moratorium would not provide significant lead-time for the Soviets, a moratorium on testing our multiple reentry missiles would not involve any appreciable risk to our security.

Ralph Waldo Emerson observed over a hundred years ago: "Every act, every thought, every cause is bipolar, and in the act is contained the counteract. If I strike, I am struck. If I chase, I am pursued. If I push, I am resisted."

As in the case of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the road to peace may require the United States to take the first step on its own. Hopefully, the Soviets would, in response to our action, act with similar restraint. If they did respond, and the two countries moved into the strategic arms limitation talks, the question of the MIRV and ABM systems could be taken up in the context of mutual efforts to reduce the level of terror.

To reverse Emerson's thought: "If we lead, the Soviets may follow," recognizing that the interests of their own people are served if man can be pulled back even one step from the brink of nuclear confrontation.

In this Twentieth Century the United States and the Soviet Union must break through the terrible cycle of distrust which breeds distrust, of action which produces reaction, of new weapons which beget newer weapons.

The overriding reality of our time is the interdependence of the human condition. Man has wrested from nature the power to make this earth an uninhabitable wasteland or to make it a fertile planet.

History demonstrates that conflict and hostility between nations is not immutable. Accommodation and compromise are possible. Our problems are man-made and can be solved by the imagination and wisdom of man.

I am not suggesting that national rivalry and hostility can be ended in our lifetime. At this moment it would be utopian to hope for the end of all conflict with the Soviet Union. However, we can realistically seek to remove some of the danger from the conflict when, to do so, is in the self-interest of each.

As Adlai Stevenson once wisely counseled: "We must never fear to negotiate with the Soviet Union, for to close the door to the conference room is to open a door to war."

The time has come to embrace a broader vision of the route to peace.

Let us look beyond our missiles and military alliances and make the pursuit of arms control and reduction in the size of national military forces the heart of our national security objectives.

Let this nation demonstrate not only prudent concern for its military defense but also leadership in moving the world away from the infamy of war.

GREAT SALT LAKE OIL SHALE AMENDMENTS AID TO MAJOR INDUSTRIES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I applaud the action taken a few days ago by the Committee on Finance in approving depletion allowances for oil shale and minerals in the Great Salt Lake. This is farsighted action indeed, and I express the appreciation of my State as well as my own to the committee.

It is no secret that in our highly industrialized economy we have a pressing need to find new sources of oil, minerals, and other raw materials. While I am not an alarmist, I wish to point out to the Senate that many sources of foreign oil are in a very questionable status at this time. It behooves us as a nation therefore to develop all of the potential oil reserves available to use within our own borders. It has been estimated that the oil shale deposits in the intermountain area of Utah, Colorado and Wyoming represent one of the greatest oil reserves in the world. Yet it is of no value unless it can be developed and a way found ultimately to market the oil. The Finance Committee action has taken a major step in that direction. It gives to the oil shale developers an equitable tax position in relationship to other industries which are constantly in search of new oil resources. It represents in this case a 15% depletion rate for oil extracted from shale. If accepted by the Senate—and I urge that it be adopted—then the developers of this vast resource can go to work now to meet the demands that are increasing yearly and which will reach staggering proportions by the year 2000.

Let us not kid ourselves about the oil shale reserves. Without a depletion allowance, we cannot expect the industries involved to assume the tremendous economic responsibilities and risks involved. The allowances will also be an indication that Congress is willing to proceed henceforth with the necessary research and development to perfect the necessary extraction processes. If we can orbit the moon and experience in our living rooms the miracle of man walking on the lunar surface, I am very confident that the oil extraction process can be perfected.

I should also point out the tremendous economic development that this would bring to the States in the Intermountain West. In many ways they are geographically isolated, and oil shale and mineral developments will give to them a sound economic base.

I also urge the Senate to accept the Finance Committee amendment which I offered, allowing a 10- to 23-percent depletion allowance for various minerals extracted from inland saline lakes. For many years we in Utah looked upon the Great Salt Lake as a dormant body of water. But we now know it contains a vast mineral supply which must be extracted and developed, and it will go far in meeting the heavy demands of chlorine, sodium, magnesium, lithium, bromine, silicone, boron, potassium, and calcium. There is no question that the minerals in the Great Salt Lake are a depletable source; consequently, they must be treated as such. I call upon the Senate, when the bill comes before it, to be farsighted and to accept the amendments which I have offered and which the committee has wisely accepted.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Fair Tax Treatment," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of October 25, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FAIR TAX TREATMENT

As the Senate Finance Committee works on depletion allowances for various extractive industries in the tax reform bill, it took the wise step of approving an amendment offered by Sen. Wallace F. Bennett of Utah to apply depletion allowances extracted from the waters of Great Salt Lake. These would include chlorine, sodium, magnesium, potassium, calcium, lithium, bromine, boron and silicon.

Under an Internal Revenue Service ruling, the waters of the lake are considered a non-depletable ore body. The decision is debatable. For while, in a sense, the lake is "renewed" by runoff waters bringing in minerals from the shores, the history of the lake indicates it is a shrinking body that will eventually disappear. It is also obvious that the minerals in the lake are a "body of ore," though not, perhaps, in the usual definition of the term.

The Senate has already made a number of changes in the tax reform bill as passed by the House. This week, for example, it voted to cut the oil depletion allowance to 23 percent. (The present figure is 27½ percent; the House figure, 20 percent.) The committee also approved, without change, a House section designed to provide an incentive for finding ways of extracting oil from shale by granting a depletion allowance based on the value of the oil recovered, instead of the

shale. This means a substantial increase in the dollar value of the incentive. Utah, with its vast deposits of oil shale, should benefit materially from the long-range effects of the provision.

However, development of an oil shale industry is still some years away while development of a mineral extractive industry on the shores of the Great Salt Lake is already well under way. And this industry, in order to be fully competitive, should be given tax treatment similar to those industries which extract minerals from the earth.

When the House Ways and Means Committee began work on the tax reform bill in early 1969, the goal was final passage by the end of the year. The goal probably can't be met. First, the Senate Finance Committee must complete its version of the legislation. Then the bill goes to the Senate floor where numerous amendments are likely to be offered and approved. Finally, after differences between House and Senate measures are adjusted in conference committee, the bill must be approved by both chambers. As a consequence, there is no way now of predicting just what it will be like in its final form.

But this much is certain: An amendment made in Senate committee and retained by vote during consideration on the floor has an excellent chance of being retained. That is why the Senate Finance Committee did well to include the Utah senator's farsighted amendment. Committee approval at this time will go a long way toward assuring fair tax treatment for the new extractive industry on Great Salt Lake.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE CLEMENT F. HAYNSWORTH, JR., TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, before the Senator from Montana, (Mr. MERCALF) left to represent the U.S. Senate as a delegate at an International Conference of Legislators, he asked that I place in the RECORD an editorial together with the result of a poll of the New York University Law School faculty regarding Judge Clement Haynsworth's nomination to the Supreme Court. If Senator MERCALF were able to be here, he would have made this request himself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the article, both of which appeared in the Commentator of October 15, the student newspaper of the New York University Law Center, be printed in the RECORD. The article explains why 73 percent of the faculty is firmly opposed to Senate confirmation of the nomination of Judge Haynsworth.

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

[From the Commentator, Oct. 15, 1969]

INSENSITIVITY

Last November President-elect Nixon promised the country that the theme of his Administration was going to be: "Bring Us Together." The emptiness of that promise has never been more dramatically revealed than in the ill-advised nomination of Judge Clement Haynsworth to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Contrary to the protestations of Haynsworth's supporters, the confrontation now brewing in the Senate is not essentially a question of liberals versus conservatives. Even Senator Barry Goldwater is having second thoughts about supporting Haynsworth since receiving stacks of mail from con-