

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 4

FEBRUARY 20, 1970, TO MARCH 2, 1970
(PAGES 4247 TO 5596)

reach one million to 1,200,000 barrels per day by 1980.

Turning now to the situation East of the Rockies in Districts I-IV, we expect product demand to grow from about 12.3 million barrels per day in 1970 to 16.5 million barrels per day in 1980. As most of you know, this total product demand is supplied from a variety of sources: U.S. crude production, crude imports from Canada, crude imports from overseas, and product imports from overseas. Production in the larger producing states, Texas and Louisiana is prorated and at the present time these states are not producing at capacity.

In developing forward policy for the United States, it is important to have a realistic understanding of the maximum potential productive capacity of Texas and Louisiana. While this type of estimate is difficult to make and there really isn't adequate information to justify precise forecasts, I believe oil production in Texas and Louisiana production cannot be increased more than one million barrels per day at the present time, if proration were abolished.

I suspect a number of people in government presently have too optimistic a view of the surplus productive capacity in Texas and Louisiana. I also believe they do not fully appreciate the likelihood that total U.S. production East of the Rockies will be declining at an annual rate of 300,000 barrels per day by 1980 unless attractive incentives are offered for encouraging the finding of new reserves.

If total demand in Districts I-IV increases at the three per cent, or about 300,000 barrels per day per year, and if total production in these states peaks out in 1972 or 1973 at about 8.5 million barrels per day as seems likely, there obviously is a big oil supply gap that will have to be filled by a combination of overseas imports, Canadian imports, and North Slope oil. In 1973, when we would hope to have facilities for bringing North Slope oil East of the Rockies, we would expect that gap to be 2,200,000 barrels per day and to increase to 5,800,000 barrels per day by 1980.

At this point in time, I don't think anyone can say just how much of the gap each of the three supply sources will fill. Obviously, the need is enormous and each supply source should obtain a reasonable share of the market. The foregoing rationale has been based on the assumption that tax and import policy questions currently being deliberated and debated by the government will result in a gradual liberalization of import quotas and modestly higher Federal Income Tax costs for the industry as a result of reducing the depletion allowance.

With respect to the depletion allowance, I believe there is a widespread misconception as to the relative benefit of the depletion allowance to the members of the petroleum industry and the consumers of oil products. Today major integrated companies produce more than one half of all the oil produced in the United States. Competition among the thirty or so companies that account for this production has taken the form of very tight pricing of petroleum products with the result that the low tax costs obtained by the companies from using the depletion allowance have been passed along to the consumer in the form of lower product prices.

It would be hard to find a more competitive business than petroleum marketing. No one oil company dominates the market. Standard Oil of New Jersey, the largest company in the business, produces 8.9 per cent of U.S. production and sells 11.3 per cent of petroleum products.

If the depletion allowance is some sort of loophole or windfall for petroleum companies, it would have to show up in the per cent earned on employed capital. Since petroleum company earnings are low by the standards of many other industries, obviously the American consumer has had to be the beneficiary. It follows, therefore, that if the

depletion allowance is reduced and tax costs are increased, the higher cost of doing business will have to be passed along to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

The depletion allowance today is admirably suited to the purpose for which it was intended. It has encouraged the finding of oil and, in the process, it has resulted in low, reasonable product prices for the consumer and it has not generated unreasonable profits for the petroleum companies.

With respect to the import quota system, I cannot over-emphasize the need for our nation to produce a substantial portion of its petroleum requirements domestically. We must assure the certainty of supply not just for national defense purposes but also to protect this country's economic security.

Seventy-five per cent of our total current energy needs are provided by petroleum and natural gas. They not only power our transport and heat our homes but they light our cities, run our factories, and move our armies.

Can we risk the economic security of our country's future by becoming too dependent on foreign sources? Keep in mind that these foreign sources are subject to wars, both external and civil; to expropriation and to confiscation when companies refuse to amend contracts to include unreasonable or uneconomic demands. Gentlemen, I am not raising possible specters. All these actions have occurred within the last three to five years in countries which may participate in supplying crude oil to the United States, if total import restrictions are removed. The practical effect of the import quota system is that crude prices in the United States tend to stay at levels which encourage the exploration which is necessary to find new reserves. Adoption of any policy which turns the United States into a dumping ground for surplus foreign production obviously will decrease crude prices and equally obviously will eliminate the incentive for further crude exploration in the United States. Under these conditions, the oil industry would have no alternative but to sharply curtail crude exploration, converting existing operations to a liquidation basis and use the cash flow to diversify in other areas that are not subject to uneconomic regulation.

The East Coast of the U.S. already is heavily dependent upon foreign oil for much of its regular consumption. Today crude and product imports on the East Coast amount to 40 per cent of total demand. This amount could be greatly increased by 1980, if exploration were curtailed to a significant degree. Certainly interest in exploring in the Arctic regions would diminish significantly, if crude prices were reduced. The economic risk would be too great and large potential reserves would never be discovered, thereby hastening the day that the country would become dependent on foreign-source crude. Another negative effect of a crude price decrease is that the development of technology for converting shale, tar, and coal into oil would probably be eliminated because there is little likelihood of coming up with an economic process in a lower crude price structure.

Finally, with respect to prices, undoubtedly product prices would be lower at the outset, but in time they would rise as foreign taxes would increase and as the balance of economic power gravitated from the United States to the other countries on whom we were dependent for oil. In time, product prices in the U.S. would return to present levels, or perhaps even higher, as the U.S. lost its bargaining power.

Having reviewed with you the dangers of changing the environment surrounding the operation of the oil industry, I would like to state my belief that changes in national policy will be made by reasonable men and, therefore, I fully expect the changes to be reasonable. Thus, while we are sailing through a very stormy period, I believe that,

as the facts are better understood, government policy will advocate only modest changes in both taxes and imports. In that case, the industry can expect a short period of adjustment followed by renewed growth through its efforts to meet the expanding energy needs of the 1970's.

This is the kind of future for which Atlantic Richfield is preparing. We believe that it will be a bright one for any company that is working toward crude oil self-sufficiency, a balance between North American and overseas reserves, greater efficiency in its products operations and sufficient financial strength to meet the greater capital needs of the years ahead.

ENVIRONMENTAL TEACH-IN

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as the Nation moved into the 1970's, a new and frightening concern loomed large on the horizon—the degradation of our environment. The first national focusing on this problem will take place April 22, when an environmental teach-in will be held to begin the fight to restore the quality of our environment.

The problem has reached enormous proportions, with virtually every body of water in the United States polluted. One of our Great Lakes—Lake Erie—is, to all intents and purposes, already dead. Pollution of the others is going on at a rapid pace.

The last breath of perfectly clean air is reported to have been ingested in Flagstaff, Ariz., 6 years ago. The air in our cities is becoming increasingly laden with grit and noxious gases. The average person now breathes in 1.9 pounds of dirt each day.

To portray and dramatize the crisis, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) has called for a national environmental educational effort. As a result, hundreds of campuses, high schools, and community groups have enthusiastically demonstrated their interest by organizing teach-ins. An article by Senator NELSON explaining the purposes of the teach-ins and the role libraries can play in them was published in the February issue of American Libraries, the internal magazine of the American Library Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL TEACH-IN ON THE CRISIS OF THE ENVIRONMENT

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

The destruction of natural resources on this planet is going on at a fantastic rate. If we don't act now to correct the situation, the decade of the 70's will signal the end of man as a species.

Eminent scientists predict the death of our oceans as life-bearing bodies of water by the end of the decade. By 1980, also, we will be consuming each day the total water supply available in the United States, and will begin using and reusing water up to ten and twenty times a day. Clean air will be equally scarce. Deaths from cardiac arrests and respiratory illnesses will rise alarmingly on days when the wind takes a holiday and fails to chase the smog from the cities.

And then there is noise pollution. Psychiatrists tell us that noise is becoming increasingly suspect as a cause of neuroses. Geneticists are investigating the possibility that the noise from sonic booms is causing irreparable mutations in human and animal

populations. The quality of life in our overcrowded, under-financed cities is reaching crisis proportions.

It is clearly time to act to improve our environment. It is clearly time to start working toward gross national quality, as well as gross national quantity. Toward this end, a national Environmental Teach-In will be held April 22, which will cut across the generation gap and political party lines.

The objective of the Teach-In is to mobilize the constructive energies of American youth in a massive effort to halt the polluting and ransacking of our environment.

The Teach-Ins will be shaped campus by campus by student initiative, and may take the form of symposiums, convocations, panel discussions, or a combination of these. They will vary with the university and the section of the country in which they are located. For instance, students at the University of California might want to discuss recent oil spills off the coast of their state; students at the University of Wisconsin might focus on the pollution crisis facing the Great Lakes; and students at Columbia University might well be most alarmed about the rapidly decreasing quality of life in major American cities. A national office in Washington serves as a communications and service center, and as an organizational stimulus for individual campus Teach-Ins.

The Teach-Ins, already being planned at one hundred and fifty campuses, will map out steps to protect our environment. They will present information, draw the issues, stimulate plans for action, and demonstrate a concern in this country for a livable world. Hopefully, they will set specific goals for the 70s, goals for a decade of national effort which will recognize the same priorities of expenditure as did the moon-shot effort of the 60s.

It is particularly appropriate that, by the 200th anniversary of the founding of this nation in 1976, we be well on our way to solving the problems of population growth, pollution and the degradation of our open space. The key to achieving this result lies in mobilizing the idealism, the motivation, and the energies of this student generation.

And this time we had better listen to what they have to say.

THE LIBRARY ROLE

There is a growing social awareness among librarians, and it is reflected on the book and record shelves and in the films and services available to library users. An escalating concern for fulfilling the rapidly changing needs of those who visit libraries—and of those visited by libraries—is evidenced in the special unit created eighteen months ago within ALA devoted to exploring the issues facing man and bringing them to the attention of the Association so that resources can be collected and developed.

There is concern voiced by many involved with libraries that there was an overconcentration in the past decade on physical expansion and the acquisition of materials, to the detriment of efforts to make the library resources available and to show the public the uses to which the resources might be put.

The national Environmental Teach-In of April 22, of which I am cochairman along with Congressman McClosky, presents an excellent opportunity for libraries to help insure the success of a crucial endeavor, by bringing the traditional services of the library fully to bear on a single problem, in cooperation with the myriad interest groups motivated by the Teach-In.

The libraries will be able to offer trained staff and collected materials that will help in the gathering of background materials and as guides to sources of information needed for local inventories. The bibliographic skill of libraries alone can increase the effectiveness of the Teach-In immeasurably. In addition, the lesser known facilities and skills of libraries in the field of

media materials selection and distribution can provide the Teach-In with a broad selection and visual aids for the presentations they wish to develop for community use. Many libraries are equipped to supply meeting facilities, display space, and exhibit areas, and have staff or access to individuals trained in providing these services.

One specific service which can be of tremendous importance is the setting up in libraries of displays, in which the address and phone number of the Washington office of the Teach-In are prominent. The Environmental Teach-In, Inc. is located at Room 600, 2100 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. The phone number is (202) 293-6960. The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the Teach-In is an educative, nonprofit organization. Libraries especially might want to get on the mailing list of the Washington office in order to receive environmental materials which will help them serve their local patrons. Enterprising libraries might want to arrange for speakers to address library users on what they can do to fight environmental despoliation.

Demonstrating their ability to meet such a concentrated effort to inform the public will give libraries the opportunity to perform a significant service and to show their potential force in the community. No more dramatic or urgent challenge has come forward to date to test the rising social awareness of the profession. All libraries and librarians, both as citizens and professionals, have a stake in the future of their environment, and it is fortunate that the investment in the growth of libraries on the federal, state, and local level will enable them to make a significant contribution to our national awareness of a serious ecological and sociological problem.

RESTRICTIVE REAL ESTATE COVENANTS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, there has been a bit of talk here and there in the news media concerning the use of restrictive real estate covenants, particularly in connection with the nomination of Federal Judge G. Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court.

In all honesty, we should admit that the use of such legalisms is by no means confined to the South, nor to those who are represented as being not equitable, just, and fair minded in their approach to civil rights.

Since the Supreme Court declared such covenants to be unenforceable, many people have overlooked their existence, treating them as dead letters with no basis in law.

Indeed, some distinguished Members of the Senate have lived in houses covered by such covenants. The Chicago Tribune took note of this fact on Saturday, February 21, 1970, in a front-page article entitled "Bare 16-Year Racial Curb on Humphrey's Home as a Senator." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

BARE 16-YEAR RACIAL CURB ON HUMPHREY'S HOME AS A SENATOR

Washington, Feb. 20—Hubert Humphrey, who has criticized the nomination of Judge G. Harold Carswell to the Supreme court, lived in a house with a restrictive racial covenant for 16 years while a United States senator.

Real estate records of suburban Montgomery county in Maryland outside the capital

show Humphrey finally entered a disclaimer on Sept. 23, 1964, 27 days after he was nominated as the Democratic party's 1964 Vice Presidential candidate.

Humphrey bought the property on Dec. 27, 1947.

M'GOVERN CASE SIMILAR

Ten days ago, the Democratic policy council of which Humphrey is chairman, urged the Senate to reject Carswell's nomination. Any man named to the Supreme court, the council said, "must be devoid of any record of racial bias, intolerance or discrimination."

The same racial covenant that applied to Humphrey's home applied to the home of his neighbor, Sen. George McGovern (D., S.D.). McGovern bought his home in 1957 with the covenant and sold it last September still subject to the covenants of record.

In McGovern's case, his office said the purchaser was a Negro.

McGovern has not announced a position on Carswell. He has said he is inclined to vote against Senate confirmation of Carswell, but wants to look at the final report before making up his mind. McGovern has not attacked Carswell for having a racial covenant on a lot his wife sold four years ago in Florida.

CARSWELL SIGNED PAPERS

Mrs. Carswell sold a bayfront lot near Tallahassee for about \$4,800. Her husband was a federal judge at the time. Among the dozen covenants written into the deed for the property by the original seller of the land to Mrs. Carswell was one restricting ownership and occupancy to "members of the Caucasian race."

Judge Carswell signed the sale papers.

President Nixon was not aware that the Carswells had sold the lot in 1966 with the "white only" restrictive covenant when he nominated Carswell for the Supreme court, the White House said on Feb. 14.

In Humphrey's case, Otis H. Garvin in 1946 put a restrictive covenant on two groups of lots known as "Rock Creek Knoll" in Montgomery county. The restriction stated that:

"None of the lots above can be sold, leased to or occupied by any person of Negro blood except as to occupancy by domestic servants while employed on the premises by the owner."

CALLS COVENANT INVALID

Garvin sold the lots to Mrs. Dorothy Belfiore in April, 1946, subject to that covenant. In May, 1947, Mrs. Belfiore sold the lots to Joseph Gweraert, a Montgomery county builder. Humphrey bought the property from Gweraert.

On Sept. 23, 1964, after being nominated for Vice President, Humphrey and his wife, Muriel, filed this affidavit to the deed:

"After consultation with counsel, the undersigned want to make clear that as purchaser and owner, they do not consider themselves bound by any covenants or restrictions under the laws of the United States. Undersigned expressly disclaim liability under the covenant recorded April 16, 1946, in liber 1009 at folio 445, among the land records of Montgomery county of Maryland as follows:

"None of the lots above can be sold, leased to or occupied by any person of Negro blood except as to occupancy by domestic servants while employed on the premises by the owner."

SIGNED BY HUMPHREYS

"The obligations this covenant would exact are contrary to the public policy of the United States of America, have been declared unenforceable by the United States Supreme court, and are morally wrong, as well as offensive to the undersigned."

The affidavit signed by Humphrey and his wife was witnessed by V. W. Kampelman.

In January, 1967, the Humphreys sold the home to Lee C. White, and his wife, Mary. White was an aid to President Kennedy. White said his deed to the property is clear of any covenant.