

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

U.S. Congress.

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 13

MAY 16, 1973 TO MAY 29, 1973

(PAGES 15853 TO 17214)

(c). Section 307(c) also requires that, after approval of a state coastal zone management program by the Secretary of Commerce (NOAA), any applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity affecting the state's coastal zone, must include in his application a certification that the activity complies with the state program. Subsequently, it is required that the state be notified and the license or permit cannot be granted unless the state concurs, or unless the Secretary finds it is consistent with the Act, or that the activity is necessary for national security.

Section 306, pertaining to giving approval to a state management program, is operative, notwithstanding the absence of funds and a state may develop a coastal zone management program and the Secretary of Commerce may approve it in order for the other benefits of the Act to be available.

12. Notwithstanding the availability of state grant funding, the Secretary of Commerce (NOAA) has authority and responsibility to review state coastal zone management programs.

13. Section 311 pertaining to an Advisory Committee is in effect regardless of the appropriation or availability of funds for the states.

14. The Annual Reports, required of the President to Congress on the administration of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, will be made, notwithstanding the availability of funds for grants to the states.

15. The absence of funding at this time or any later date does not affect the ability and duty of the Secretary of Commerce to adopt necessary rules and regulations under Section 314 of the Act.

At this time, draft guidelines for Section 305 of the Act (development of state programs) have been circulated for comment to appropriate Federal agencies. After these comments have been received and incorporated, when appropriate, it is expected that the regulations will be published within the next month.

16. The failure to request funds and possible later unavailability thereof for the limited periods specified in the authorization Section of the Act does not affect the expiration dates for such authorizations as stated in the Act.

17. In the event the expiration dates of periods specified for fund authorizations in the Act go by, without the States having received that federal financial participation for the full periods contemplated, the Administration is unable to state whether or not it would request an extension of such authorizations.

18. The Administration is unable to state whether it is possible it would not request the further authorization mentioned above.

19. The Administration is also unable to state whether it would support such an extension of the authorization.

20. The Administration is further unable to state whether it might oppose the extension of such authorizations by vetoing legislation extending the same.

21. The Administration does not now plan to request, or oppose, legislation extending an extension of the authorization periods.

22. If no funds are made available to the states within the periods specified in the authorization section and the same is not extended, it is true that the situation insofar as federal financial support of state coastal zone programs is concerned, is the same as if the President had vetoed the Act instead of signing it on October 27, 1972.

This situation is hypothetical, however, and the Congress, first, would have to pass the necessary legislation.

The Department of Commerce has been guided by specific provisions of the bill and, when necessary, its legislative history.

The Department has also considered the general rules of statutory construction which seek to give meaning and purpose of all the

provisions of legislative enactments and to reconcile them with other laws.

In particular, the Department has recognized the directives of the National Environmental Policy Act which, in Section 102, declares:

"The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible—the policies, regulations and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act. . . ."

Consistent with that declaration and general rules of interpretation, this Department will seek to give meaning and effect to every portion of the Act, notwithstanding the availability of funds for grants to states at any particular point in time for any reason.

The above does not, of course, take into account any changes in the Act which the Congress might determine to make in the future.

THE LESSONS OF VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Vietnam is a conflict which divided our Nation and left wounds which will take many years to heal. But it has also left us with many lessons which are ours to learn.

This Nation is not a policeman for the world. We have enormous military might, but it must be used wisely and sparingly if it is to be effective.

The Congress cannot remain silent while this—or any other President—takes this country deeper and deeper into armed conflict. Yet, it is clear that the administration's current policies in Cambodia are leading us into unwanted and undesirable commitments to the preservation of the current leadership of that country. The lessons of Vietnam tell us of the dangers of escalating involvement in the affairs of other nations—no matter what the pretext.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject by our distinguished colleague, Senator MONDALE, which appeared recently in the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CAMBODIA: TUNNEL AT THE END OF THE LIGHT
(By WALTER F. MONDALE)

WASHINGTON.—As the last U.S. soldier left Vietnam, most Americans believed and hoped that the event signaled the end of our military involvement in the longest, costliest and most divisive war in our history.

But in only a matter of hours it was clear that despite these hopes for peace we were still at war. U.S. planes still were flying bombing missions over Cambodia in an effort to prop up the besieged and unpopular Lon Nol Government, and there were warning signs that our commitments to the Thieu regime in Saigon might result in renewed U.S. military action.

The irony is inescapable: twelve years after American forces first were committed to Vietnam in the name of protecting a friendly but vulnerable government, once again a President of the United States, entirely on his own, is using U.S. military force in a foreign country with absolutely no constitutional authority for doing so.

The sense of having been through all this before is overwhelming. Haven't we learned anything in the last decade from our initial mistake—from the human suffering, the incredible destruction, the cost to the American spirit? Have we failed entirely to learn the two fundamental lessons of those tragic years' (1) that it is beyond our national ca-

capacity to affect the ultimate outcome of a foreign struggle that is essentially indigenous in nature, and (2) that it is only at great cost to this nation that a President ignores the Constitution of the United States?

It is common practice in countries such as Cambodia, Thailand and Vietnam for chiefs of state to ignore or suspend provisions of their constitutions, as Lon Nol did in October, 1971. Now, tragically, ignoring our own Constitution is apparently becoming common practice in this country as well.

In March, 1970, one month before our forces invaded Cambodia, the Nixon Administration indicated that it no longer was depending on the Tonkin Gulf Resolution as legal authority for its Indochina activities. The sole basis claimed by the President was, instead, "the right of the President of the United States under the Constitution to protect the lives of American men."

But the last American soldier now has left Vietnam, and with him has gone whatever validity existed in the President's claim. Yet the bombing has continued every single day since then, increasing the possibility of new American prisoners of war.

The Administration has been trying desperately to justify its bombing policy. Its efforts have been imaginative but futile. The SEATO treaty commitment has been mentioned, but the Lon Nol Government has not altered Prince Sihanouk's 1955 decision to exempt Cambodia from the treaty's protection. A tenuous link has been offered between the President's mandate to make war and his re-election mandate, but surely this is not a serious point.

We have been told that the Cambodian Government has asked for our air support. State Department lawyers reportedly are working full-time to produce a rationalization, but so far they are reluctant to disclose it. Finally, the Administration has tried to rely on a tacit understanding of an ambiguous section (Article 20) of the Paris agreement—an agreement which was not even submitted to Congress for ratification—as justification for its actions.

Secretary Richardson says the bombing will continue until the Communists agree to a cease-fire. The number of competing insurgent groups fighting against Lon Nol—the Khmer Rouge, the Sihanouk government-in-exile, and other minor splinter groups—makes remote the prospect of a cease-fire, or even negotiations. Under this policy we could be bombing for years.

Mr. Richardson also said that "Our constitutional authority rests on the circumstances that we are coming out of a ten-year period of conflict. This is the wind-up. What we are doing in effect is to try to encourage the observance of the Paris agreements by engaging in air action at the request of the Government."

This rationale could be extended easily to involve us again in Laos and Vietnam as well as Cambodia. And it seems ominous that Mr. Richardson, in fact, refuses to rule out the reintroduction of American troops into Vietnam.

This legal legerdemain by the Administration is an open challenge to Congress to assert its constitutional responsibility and act to end our involvement in what constitutes—even according to the President's own reasoning—a new war. We no longer can permit the President's war-making powers to go unchecked and unchallenged.

The Senate now is considering a bill introduced by Senators Church and Case that would prohibit the re-engagement of U.S. forces anywhere in Indochina without Congressional approval. And, because of the urgent and immediate danger of our raids over Cambodia, I am introducing legislation to cut off funds for U.S. military activity in that country. Finally, the proposed war powers act will permit us to come to terms with the broader aspects of executive authority.

All these measures are necessary, in my

judgment, if we are to learn anything from the painful lessons of the past decade.

"If our bombing now continues in Cambodia," Senator Hittfield recently warned, "we will be on our way to making the Constitution of the United States the last casualty of this war." Avoiding such a constitutional tragedy—as well as further human tragedy—is now the urgent responsibility of Congress.

UNITED STATES NEEDS PERMANENT POLICY AND ORGANIZATION FOR LONG-TERM NATIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an article entitled "Toward a National Materials Policy," which appeared in World magazine on May 22, 1973.

The article announces the release of "Man, Materials, and Environment" by the NAS Study Committee on Environmental Aspects of a National Materials Policy. Its recommendations warrant the serious attention of every Member of Congress.

The article also notes that the report of the National Commission on Resources Policy to Congress and the White House, to which the NAS study contributes, is due next month. This is a report to which we all should give close attention.

While I support the important work of the Commission, I believe that it demonstrates a totally inadequate approach to the study and anticipation of major national growth and development issues. This country desperately needs permanent institutional arrangements for analyzing trends, rates of change, and interrelationships among important factors affecting America's future.

I will soon introduce the Balanced National Growth and Development Act of 1973. I believe it would go a long way toward meeting the need for a balanced growth and development policy for our Nation and providing the institutional arrangements necessary to make such a policy effective.

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

TOWARD A NATIONAL MATERIALS POLICY

At the end of next month, a group of seven men is due to submit to the White House and Congress a report of potentially great significance. The National Commission on Resources Policy, in an active lifetime of less than twenty months, has had the nearly impossible task of assessing the nation's and the world's resources (including energy), making long-range predictions as to their availabilities, and of providing recommendations in such broad areas as maximization of resource use; conservation and environmental protection; preferred technologies and research priorities; waste management and recycling; the use of incentives, penalties, and other control techniques; public education and the reshaping of values. An interim report last year focused on the nation's growing dependence on imports of raw materials.

A major contribution to the work of the commission is a 100,000-word report by a Study Committee on Environmental Aspects of a National Materials Policy assembled by the National Academy of Sciences. Its "Man, Materials, and Environment," released in advance of the commission report, is wide-ranging and unequivocal. It asks for no

less than a constitutional amendment "declaring that the right of an individual citizen to a safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing environment shall not be abridged." It asserts that the use of materials will double and then double again over the next thirty to forty years; some materials will become exhausted and others decline in quality, with the result that more energy will be required for extraction and ever-increasing stress will be placed on the environment. It calls for open-minded re-examination of our belief that natural resources can be used in whatever amount is evoked by public demand for goods and services and by producers' efforts to expand their markets.

The NAS Study Committee comes out strongly for effluent and emission taxes as "the primary instrument" in the reduction of pollution from stationary sources. It recommends the imposition of fixed standards only where a critical health problem exists or—in the absence of a federal effluent tax—where states compete with one another as pollution havens.

Other recommendations of the study committee:

Mining and lumbering should be prohibited unless the land can be repaired by proper disposition of the spoil and revegetation. Exploitation on public lands should require a performance bond.

To reduce waste and litter, container manufacturers should be required to meet design standards for packaging, much as auto manufacturers are required to meet emission standards by a given date. Outright restrictions are the only alternative.

The costs of using recycled materials should be computed after adjusting for the net benefits to the environment and the reduced costs of handling solid wastes. Also, a system should be explored for imposing a tax on virgin materials at the point of extraction—a tax that would be rebated when recyclable materials are returned to an acceptable depository.

To avoid collision with other industrial powers bidding for environmentally attractive resources in short supply, such as low-sulphur petroleum and liquid natural gas, the United States should hasten to collaborate with other nations in finding "orderly and equitable marketing arrangements."

No materials policy will be effective without a policy on population.

The NAS Study Committee was not, of course, under the kinds of political pressures that the commission is subject to, and the latter is under no obligation to accept the NAS study. Nevertheless, the fact that the commission did not delay its publication is encouraging, and there is some evidence that the commission and its staff have achieved a broader perspective as their work has proceeded. As is so often the case with governmental commissions, the most important figure is the chief of staff, James Boyd, sixty-eight, who has been director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, vice-president of Kennecott Copper, and president of the Copper Range Company. Environmentalists were less than happy with his appointment, but Boyd and his staff of twenty professionals have exposed themselves to all points of view (they conducted forums at eight universities), and they've now begun to sound like environmentalists.

Also on the commission, chaired by Jerome L. Klaff, a Baltimore businessman who buys and recycles scrap, are two knowledgeable scholars, the political scientist Lynton Keith Caldwell and the physicist Frederick Seltz, president of Rockefeller University. The other members are drawn from government, industry, and labor.

It has been more than twenty years since the United States assessed its materials policy. This was the famous Paley Commission report, produced during the cold war when

the nation was preoccupied with military defense. As Boyd has said, "This is the first [commission] to be motivated by a desire to promote the quality of life on a long-range basis rather than reaction to immediate strategic defense needs."

The report due on June 30 will be an important document. At the moment the signs are mildly favorable that it will be a good one.

A VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION FROM THE SEA GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article that appeared in the March issue of Sea Grant, published by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The article points out another valuable contribution by scientists under the federally assisted Sea Grant program at universities throughout the country. Dr. W. C. Walter, College of Pharmacy at the Medical University of South Carolina, is participating in the drive to cure leukemia by examining the effect of the excretions of amaroucium—or seapork—against cancerous cells. Dr. Walter is beginning from scratch in his research of these sea animals, and his findings illustrate another valuable resource to be found in the seas and on offshore waters and underscore the need to continue studies of the marine environment.

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

SEA PORK HOLDS PROMISE

(By Anne Moise)

The Medical University of South Carolina is seeking the help of the sea and Sea Grant in its fight against leukemia.

Extracts of the marine organism Amaroucium have been found to act against tumors in lymph glands. W. G. Walter, College of Pharmacy, is directing his Sea Grant research toward finding which chemical elements of this organism are acting on the tumors. His investigation should provide information on the types of agents effective against cancer, and the related chemical treatments for this dread disease.

Amaroucium—or sea pork—is not the first natural substance Walter has examined. He has been submitting organisms to the National Cancer Institute (NCI) for screening for a number of years.

In this case, sea pork is a common (though little known) animal. Colonies of the animals may be seen as pinkish-orange or gray clumps on the beach. Often these fleshlike colonies wash up after a storm or a flood tide. It was Walter's curiosity when he found these strange organisms while he was walking on the beach that caused him to examine them more closely.

STARTING FROM SCRATCH

The only research conducted on Amaroucium is so old and incomplete that Walter and his assistant have had to virtually start over from scratch, even to the extent of updating and preparing a classification.

Each specimen of sea pork is first cleaned and foreign debris removed. It is then weighed, measured, numbered, and a sample section preserved for identification. The remaining portion of the colony is either processed immediately or frozen. The date and location of the specimen's origin are also logged.

Sea pork extracts then are sent to NCI for screening. So far, the substance has proven active against two common tumors.