

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 10

APRIL 23, 1970, TO MAY 4, 1970

(PAGES 12657 TO 14096)

is also under intensive investigation at the present time. The U.S.-Japanese and European export coal trades and iron ore imports from South America also offer opportunities for economical transport in large dry bulk carriers.

Since most of our present ports are inadequate to handle ships of more than 50,000-80,000 tons, we must consider the need for building entirely new ports, probably offshore in deep water, to handle these steadily growing bulk trades. I read with interest just recently of a proposed multi-purpose island facility in Delaware Bay that would handle supertankers of up to 250,000 deadweight tons and all kinds of bulk cargoes, both inbound and outbound. Such facilities might have many uses—as combined sea and airports, making use of helicopters, hydrofoils, surface-effect ships, pipelines, barges and smaller ships to transfer passengers and cargo from the superships to their land destinations.

The problems of pollution posed by such facilities would have to be given the most intensive consideration, however. We can no longer afford to ignore the possibility of irreversible damage to our environment caused by installations of this type. President Nixon has made very clear his commitment to stop the pollution of our waters. In addition to submitting a \$10 billion Clean Waters Act to the Congress, he established earlier this month a National Industrial Pollution Control Council. Composed of top representatives of business and industry appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, the Council will advise the President and the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality on programs of industry relating to the quality of the environment. They will identify the problems, recommend solutions, and advise on governmental policies concerning environmental quality as they affect industry.

There is obviously a direct relationship between the national effort to reverse the damaging effects of pollution and the plans for expansion of industry and cargo handling facilities in port areas such as the Delaware River area. If it becomes necessary to establish port facilities in open waters of harbors or in the coastal zone, private industry groups, public agencies, and the Federal Government will have to work together to solve the problems that will result.

For our part, we have taken steps to join with the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Transportation in a study to be undertaken at the completion of the American Association of Port Authorities' study. Our objective would be to formulate a national position and to determine what efforts should be undertaken to solve some of the urgent problems posed by the superships.

A regional attack on the solving of such mutual problems is increasingly in use and has in many instances been spectacularly successful. Such an approach is particularly appropriate in the case of transportation, which—if an earlier, hard won knowledge of Latin is still of use—means "carrying across"—across boundary lines of cities, counties, states, and nations, and across the interfaces between one form of transport and another.

Once again I am heartened by the evidence that the Delaware Bay area is out ahead in its thinking about these problems. The recognition by the Governors of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware that transportation problems of all kinds are regional problems and must be handled on a regional basis, is, I believe, a far-sighted and statesmanlike attitude. While their appointment in 1968 of a Committee on Regional Development was directed initially to consideration of a comprehensive airport system for the three states, I believe their action implicitly recognizes the interdependence of all transportation in the area.

In the past the free competition of ports and of transportation modes has contributed to their growth and strength. Under the private enterprise system we have developed a transportation network second to none in its extent and variety. But we have been able to do so in part because we were big enough, with space enough and resources enough added to sufficient wealth to afford the duplication that sometimes resulted from uncoordinated promotional and regulatory policies. As greater demands are placed on these diminishing resources, transportation planning must be undertaken in full cooperation with other planning bodies, such as those concerned with land use and population growth.

The increased interrelation of every aspect of our lives involves us more and more in cooperative efforts for mutual goals. I believe that one such goal must be the maintenance and support of a Merchant Marine that will be adequate for our nation's trade and defense and that will serve our business and trading community more efficiently. It must be an integral part of our whole transportation system.

Our plans for the future will affect and be affected by your plans. Your plans will influence and be influenced by developments in other modes of transportation and by the plans of other ports and other regions. The plans of all of us will depend on the interlocking decisions of our customers. All of us—government, industry, labor—on sea, land, or in the port, can help or hinder each other. In the long run, we can help ourselves most by helping each other to provide the best and most efficient transportation system possible for this area and for the whole nation.

STUDY OF ATTACK CARRIERS

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, today's Washington Post contains an interesting article by Bernard Nossiter, summarizing the results of a significant study on attack carriers prepared by the Defense Department's Systems Analysis Division.

This study determines, among other things, that a land-based tactical air wing costs \$163.4 million less per year than a sea-based wing and that there are an adequate number of overseas land bases available in Central Europe, Korea, and Southeast Asia. Thus, the study's principal finding is that "it is cheaper and more effective to use land bases for tactical air operations in areas of the world in which adequate overseas bases are available."

The conclusion of this DOD study is that since the present carrier fleet can be reduced to fewer than 12, we do not need to build any additional attack carriers at this time. This conclusion is consistent with the position taken by Senator CASE and myself before the Joint Armed Services Subcommittee on CVAN-70.

In my testimony before that subcommittee, I urged a delay in the funding of CVAN-70 until fiscal year 1975, at the earliest. Unfortunately, the subcommittee recommended funding for this new carrier in fiscal year 1971.

I hope that careful consideration will be given to the DOD report discussed in Mr. Nossiter's article. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1970]
PENTAGON STUDY SAYS FLEET CAN BE CUT;
REPORT DISCOUNTS CARRIERS

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

A secret Pentagon study concludes that the nation does not need any additional aircraft carriers and could safely cut its present fleet of 15 to fewer than 12.

The report, prepared in the Defense Department's Systems Analysis Division, calculates that each new carrier costs \$414.5 million a year to build, operate and support. In contrast, the construction, deployment and operation of the same number of planes at an overseas base costs \$251.1 million a year. Thus, a land-based wing saves \$163.4 million annually, or 40 per cent.

An unclassified, 56-page version of the controversial study has been obtained by The Washington Post as the House opened debate yesterday on a \$20.2 billion military procurement bill. It includes \$152 million for another nuclear carrier.

The principal finding of the study holds: "It is cheaper and more effective to use land bases for tactical air operations in areas of the world in which adequate overseas bases are available."

This rule, the document finds, applies to Central Europe, Korea and Southeast Asia. The paper says that requirements for the Middle East and Southern Europe are harder to estimate. But it argues that carriers in the Mediterranean as well as the North Sea would be highly vulnerable to Soviet bombers and submarines. Thus, "it is difficult to see a need for a large number of carriers in any single war."

Congressional critics of additional carriers have known of the existence of the Pentagon study for nearly a year but have been unable to obtain it. The unclassified version was discussed at the Brookings Institution last winter.

The study touches on the Navy's most sensitive nerve. Without carriers, much of the justification for a surface fleet would disappear and the Navy would be confined to essentially a submarine force.

Not surprisingly, the Navy has bitterly attacked the paper. The Navy's views are supported by all but one member of a subcommittee drawn from the two congressional Armed Services Committees. Last week they published a brief report urging the building of a third nuclear carrier.

The subcommittee report said that "even though the comparative costs of the various alternatives (land-based versus carrier wings) have been under study for some time by the Department of Defense, there is no agreed-upon position within the Department on this matter."

The legislators quoted Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as saying: "I don't regard any of these studies myself as being definitive and they certainly are not convincing to me as a basis for making a judgment as to the need for sea-based tactical air."

Apart from cost and vulnerability, the crucial points in the disputed study are these:

On the average, a land base can be set up and its planes ready to fly as quickly as a carrier and its support can steam into action. A land-based wing transported by sea can be deployed in Europe in 26 days; in Asia in 32 days. The study assumes that an additional carrier wing would be based half the time on the coast nearest a scene of combat and half the time on the farthest coast. Averaging these periods, a carrier wing can be deployed for Europe in 28 days, for Asia in 32 days.

Under ideal conditions, with the carrier wing based on the coast closest to an action, the vessel could be deployed in Europe in 11 days and in Asia in 15 days. But by flying a "bare base kit" in seven C-5A cargo planes

to a runway overseas, a land-based wing could be deployed in Europe in 12 days and in Asia in 18 days. The extra cost of using transport planes would be about \$140 million a year. This still leaves the land-based wing with a \$120 million advantage for a deployment virtually as rapid as the maximum speed for the carrier.

Land-based and sea-based planes could make about the same number of flights per day in the first three months of an engagement. Thereafter, the land-based craft would be flown 30 to 100 percent more frequently because carriers must be withdrawn for repairs.

Some carriers—from two to five in the two oceans—are still necessary, largely to "show the flag" and to serve as an earnest of intentions. However, "it is nothing but a myth" that the Navy requires three carriers for each one deployed. This "myth" is based on a belief that sailors can't be kept away from their families for a long time.

Yesterday, House critics of the \$20.2 billion military weapons bill decisively lost their first two skirmishes. An amendment by Rep. Otis Pike (D-N.Y.) to strip \$200 million sought by the Pentagon as "contingency funds" for claims made by Lockheed Aircraft on the C-5A was beaten, 90 to 48. Another amendment by Rep. Jeffery Cohelan (D-Cal.), to prevent placing multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles (MIRV) on land-based missiles, was defeated, 85 to 39.

Today, the House resumes voting on the measure. Among other things, it will consider an amendment to eliminate the \$152 million for a third nuclear carrier.

A central feature of the Systems Analysis study is its breakdown of the comparative costs for a carrier and a land-based wing. It assumes that both will use the same number of planes and it divides the investment cost—the cost to build the ships and planes—over their estimated useful life to derive an annual cost. This is added to the operating cost to obtain the total expense. The cost categories compared are these:

Aircraft—the operating costs for land and sea-based are the same. But the investment cost of the land-based wing is \$14 million a year less because the accident rate for carrier-based planes is higher.

Base—Building and operating a carrier is \$55.9 million a year more expensive than buying and running a base that can be transported in ships or by air to a runway overseas.

Defenses—The destroyer escorts to defend a carrier cost \$58.5 million more annually than the missiles, anti-aircraft batteries and security forces to defend a land base.

Logistics—Supply ships and destroyer escorts needed to service a carrier run \$35 * * * problem exists, it could be solved by assigning carriers to "home ports" abroad or by rotating men in and out of deployed ships.

NBC-TV PROGRAM "POLLUTION IS A MATTER OF CHOICE"

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, NBC-TV recently broadcast a program about the environment entitled "Pollution Is a Matter of Choice."

The program focused clearly on the nature of the dilemma that America faces as we try to organize ourselves and to make the decisions to enhance and protect our environment.

The decisions each of us will have to make are effectively portrayed in the NBC White Paper.

Reporter Frank McGee and writer-producer Fred Freed showed an intelligent and sensitive insight into the problems of environmental contamination.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program appear in the RECORD at this time.

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

NBC WHITE PAPER: POLLUTION IS A MATTER OF CHOICE

McGEE. We know about our murderous machines. We know about the environment they are murdering. We have heard all the apocalyptic prophecies. We know all the terrible statistics. We believe them. There's no more room for argument. The danger is real.

But we also know we cannot turn back the clock. We live in an industrial society. We need what it produces.

This program is about the real options that are open to us. About the real choices before us.

McGEE. This is where we begin. This is Machiasport, Maine.

Seemingly a world away from the blighted cities our technology has built. But what is happening here, now, to these people . . .

The decisions they are facing, may tell us some important things about our hopes of reclaiming our polluted landscape.

We know about the beauties of Maine: The tourist eye view. But it's not quite the same if you live here, have to make a living here.

The people who came here, 300 years ago, to make this nation, saw nature as the enemy.

Here it still is. It threatens man's survival. He has to fight it to survive. That's why he built his machines, to help him survive.

In America, we've always believed in "progress". Technology would make us free.

That's deep in our culture: Western, Puritan, American.

It's how we created this nation.

We learned to control some of nature with our machines. And that control made some of us rich, and most of us comfortable. We have more "things" than anyone else ever had.

But we began to lose control of the machines.

We began to run short of those resources we thought were endless. The skies and the rivers and the land began to disappear under the smoke and litter of our industrial waste.

The cities technology built were scarred with poverty, crime, racial violence.

It's easy to see why we are nostalgic now for places like Machiasport. But now that nostalgia is threatened.

Change is coming! Industry. Technology.

Why let it happen here? Why not preserve this place as it is now?

The answer, as we shall see in this next hour, is not easy, not uncomplicated.

Begin with this seemingly unrelated fact: we need oil in this country to run our machines.

LOUIS REAM. Total petroleum product demand in the United States is in 1970, going to be something like 600 million gallons a day.

Now that's a terrible figure to try to understand. Perhaps some prospective can be put on it if we understand that there are about 200 million people in the United States.

And this means that every man, woman, and child in the United States is in effect, consuming something like 3 gallons of petroleum products every day.

Over the decade, up to 1980, this will grow to about 800 million gallons a day.

McGEE. What has all this got to do with Machiasport, Maine?

We can find one part of the answer half way around the world, in Japan.

Because we need more oil, we need bigger tankers to carry it. Super tankers, displacing up to 300,000 tons, are being built in Japan. Because of this, Machiasport is being dragged into the affluent, polluted world the rest of us live in.

The reason is this. The super tankers need deep water ports.

This bay, at Machiasport, is one of the deepest on the East coast of the United States. One of the few that can accommodate the super tankers.

This is also part of the answer: a continent away on the north slope of Alaska . . . a great oil strike has been made.

The first tanker has broken through the ice of the Northwest Passage.

It could carry oil from the Alaska fields to the East coast. From the Alaska fields to Machiasport.

The oil companies see Machiasport as a great oil port of the future.

With the super tankers would come refineries, pipelines, petrochemical plants. The affluence of the age of technology.

And the pollution. Pollution that could destroy Maine's beaches, summer boating.

The lobster and shell fishing industries. Oil could pollute the land and air and water.

Why would anyone want to take a chance on that happening here?

ROY SPRAGUE. Well, because there's no work around here for nobody.

The little, the little lumber company up here, they keep going in the summertime but in the wintertime there no, there's nothing here to do. For the people that lives here. They have to struggle for a living. I know because I've struggled.

ALAN LOOK. Unless that oil refinery comes in, I don't look for any industry to come in because it costs so much to transport the stuff. And without a world port, we've got nothing.

NORMA WOOD. Do we, do we think enough of the scenery to give up a good living out of an oil refinery or another industry. Would we rather have the scenery or would we rather have food on the table.

McGEE. Why should anyone want oil in Machiasport, Maine? Because this is a fact!

Life outside the technological society is not so idyllic as it seems if you are a tourist. Fourteen per cent of the people in this county receive food surplus packages from the government because their income is below the poverty level. Oil would bring jobs . . . perhaps 3,000 in ten years.

New industry. Money for schools and roads. And pollution.

SONG

"Everybody talks about a new world in the morning.

New world in the morning, so they say.

I myself don't talk about,

A new world in the morning.

New world in the morning, that's today.

And I can feel a new tomorrow coming on.

And I don't know why,

I have to make a song.

"Everybody talks about a new world in the morning.

A new world in the morning, takes so long.

"I met a man who had a dream, he had since he was twenty.

I met that man when he was eighty one.

He said too many folks just stand and wait until the morning.

Don't they know tomorrow never comes.

And he would feel a new tomorrow coming on.

And when he'd smile,

His eyes would twinkle at them."

McGEE. In this county, there is no air pollution. But eleven per cent of the people are unemployed. The water is clean but two thirds of the farmers make less than \$3,000 a year.

There is no race violence. No organized crime. No ugly slums. But there is poverty. There is isolation. And for many, not much hope.

The young are leaving to go to live in the cities. The polluted, decaying cities, where the jobs are.