

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 1

JANUARY 18, 1972 TO JANUARY 25, 1972

(PAGES 3 TO 1240)

The memoranda are embarrassing, no more. For the most part, the minutes reflect the discussion of men trying to find out what is going on, and seeking to decide what best to do about it. The President, they are advised, is angry at India for its aggressive action; he wants "a tilt toward Pakistan." There is much talk of the futility of the United Nations. One detects sympathy for the plight of the emerging nation of Bangladesh; it promises to become "an international basket case." The conferees come to no particular decisions. They agree to prepare certain papers for the President. Their discussion is candid, spontaneous, unreserved.

Subsequent to these private meetings, the White House was publicly to assert its neutrality in the India-Pakistan war. Obviously the White House was not neutral. This was self-evident to every editor and critic in the country.

It is a fair surmise that every government in history has taken public positions inconsistent with its private wishes. Diplomats know this.

What matters, to repeat, is the leak itself. This is not to be compared with the action of the Washington Post last month in blowing Henry Kissinger's cover as the source of a recent backgrounder; that was no more than an ill-mannered breach of professional rules. Neither is it to be compared with Daniel Ellsberg's clandestine distribution last spring of the aging "Pentagon Papers." Ellsberg was then out of the government.

We must infer, in this instance, that someone still employed at the very highest levels of confidence—someone holding top secret clearance, with access to other memoranda of immense importance—has wantonly violated the trust reposed in him. This goes beyond disloyalty; it sails close to the windward edge of treason. What other documents one must wonder, has this person secretly copied? Where will he peddle them next? This is the alarming aspect. Anderson thinks it "funny," but then Anderson would. It is not funny at all.

AN ADMIRABLE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a most admirable program on behalf of American youth has come to my attention, and I shall enter a brief outline of its aims and goals in the Record.

A quarter-million-dollar "Help Young America" program has been announced by David R. Foster, president of Colgate-Palmolive Co., as a major 1972 campaign by that company to help five of America's leading youth groups reach their current goals.

The Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., Boys' Clubs of America, Girls' Clubs of America, and the Camp Fire Girls will share in the \$250,000 contribution following a national vote to be conducted by the company in early 1972. These groups have a combined membership of more than 9 million.

Mrs. Richard Nixon has accepted the honorary chairmanship of the "Help Young America" program, and Joseph H. Blatchford, Director of Action, which includes both VISTA and the Peace Corps, is national chairman.

The "Help Young America" program marks the first time that these five leading youth groups have joined into a single youth promotion effort. In announcing the program Mr. Foster stated:

The Colgate-Palmolive Company is pleased to initiate this cooperative program between

American business and American youth. Our aims are common—to help our young people help themselves to a better America. Too often the progress potential of our ambitious youth is lost sight of today, amid the concern for the problems of this generation. We, at Colgate, hope that this program will help lead these young people to achieve a better tomorrow. We want, also, to focus national interest on their needs and to suggest new avenues for others to follow in supporting the goals of young America.

These stated 1972 goals of the youth groups are:

Boy Scouts: "To help today's boypower become tomorrow's manpower."

Girl Scouts: "To help more girls in their growing-up years."

Boys' Clubs: "To help guide 1,000,000 boys."

Girls Clubs: "To open more club centers for girls."

Camp Fire Girls: "To help more girls become better citizens."

Mrs. Nixon commended Mr. Foster and the Colgate-Palmolive Co. for "this innovative and sweeping approach to the encouragement of constructive youth activities," and applauded the concept of uniting the five groups in a common effort. She said:

Most significantly, because each participating organization is given the opportunity to grow and expand through its own creative powers at its desired pace, I am especially impressed with this very kind of freedom—one which encourages increased initiative within a young person's personally chosen group while contributing to the vitality of the entire society as well.

I feel that such an innovative program as this one conceived by the Colgate-Palmolive Co., merits our every recognition because it points up the vital role enlightened business leadership can play in our society. Hopefully, it will be an example to other major corporations to contribute to our Nation's social needs by way of similar programs.

SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON—PROMOTER OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today I speak in recognition of a distinguished Senator from my neighboring State of Wisconsin—Senator GAYLORD NELSON.

As the founder of Earth Day and author of many other legislative proposals relating to environmental protection, Senator NELSON has truly been one of the leaders in the effort to make environmental quality a part of the national political dialog in this country.

The success of his efforts is evidenced by a number of legislative concepts the Senator originally introduced, which have subsequently been enacted into law. For example, he was the first to propose, in 1966, that the Federal Government provide 90-percent funding for local and regional sewer construction. This past year the Senate finally adopted a formula which provided up to 80-percent public money for sewer construction in the water pollution control amendments.

Also, the Senator from Wisconsin was the first to propose tough emission standards for automobiles as a means of controlling urban air pollution which would be largely incorporated into the Air

Quality Amendments of 1970, and restrictions on the discharge of wastes into the oceans, as well as a long-term, \$800-million program of low-interest loans for otherwise healthy businesses that were adversely affected by water pollution legislation, which were made part of the Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1971.

Lastly, the Senator played a significant role in the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. This legislation has forced the stoppage of a number of Federal projects on the basis of environmental considerations and has been instrumental in bringing environmental impact into the Federal planning process.

Recently, Environmental Quality magazine had an exclusive interview with Senator NELSON where he discussed the evolution of the environmental movement and commented on the issues which have formed the basis of the escalating national debate on environmental quality. I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTERVIEW: SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON

(NOTE.—The founder of Earth Day, Senator Nelson is the leading environmentalist in the U.S. Senate. His activities are uniquely conservation-oriented, including the sponsorship of numerous bills for protection of America's natural resources. Recently, EQM's Washington Bureau Chief Mary Sanderson visited Senator Nelson for an interview in his offices at the nation's Capitol.)

Working to preserve the environment has been a life long career for you, Senator Nelson. What influence in your life caused you to become so actively involved?

Well, I grew up in northwestern Wisconsin, a relatively isolated area not far from the Minnesota border, where the heavy intrusion of civilization has yet to mutilate and destroy the rich farmland, forests and lakes. The woods, the fields and the lakes were my home and the village of Clear Lake with only 700 population was almost like living in the country. It wasn't until I left that area to go to college in California that I discovered the majority of the people in the country lived in a depressing environment, rapidly deteriorating, and continually spreading.

Today the environment is one of the major political issues. What do you think is the major breakthrough that made ecology a national concern?

There is no question in my mind that the major breakthrough was Earth Day, in the Spring of 1970. It represented the first opportunity for the public to display its concern about the status of our environment. This concern had been growing for more than a decade.

Senator Nelson, it is well known that you were the founder of Earth Day. How did you conceive of the idea?

As it turned out, literally tens of millions of people participated in Earth Day, from grade school students to elder citizens. The best part of it was that Earth Day was a non-political, grassroots' demonstration. All we did was supply the idea and all across the nation groups became involved in their own way.

For several years I had been wondering how to convince the political leaders of the country that the status of the environment was a critically important matter, and that the people of the country were in fact deeply interested. In the summer of 1969, while in Santa Barbara at an environmental confer-

ence, I read an article that mentioned the Vietnam "Teach-Ins," held on numerous campuses two or three years previously.

It occurred to me then that one way to demonstrate the public interest in this issue would be a nationwide environmental teach-in. After returning to Washington, I spent a month developing the concept and then announced the plan at a speech in Seattle on September 20. The media carried the story and the response was immediately favorable. Sometime after that I invited Rep. Paul (Pete) McCloskey of California to join me as a co-chairman, and Sydney Howe of the Conservation Foundation to be a member of the Executive Board.

Who else worked with you on Earth Day?

The three of us selected the balance of the Board and created Environmental Teach-In, Inc., as a non-profit, tax-exempt organization and established a national office. Then, a month or so later, after interviewing a number of college students, we selected Denis Hayes, a Harvard graduate student, to manage the national office which functioned as a clearing house and information center. Hayes and a talented group of young people who worked with him began responding to the heavy flow of requests for information that were coming in. Everyone had his own ideas and we didn't have to sell people on the idea of Earth Day. There was virtually automatic acceptance from the beginning.

What was the most significant achievement of Earth Day?

The objective of Earth Day was to make the environment part of the political dialogue of the country, and that is what happened. Earth Day was a massive nationwide demonstration that showed the political leaders of the country that there was a genuine grassroots, deeply-felt interest in the environmental issue, that crossed all political lines and all age groups.

It was my conviction that nothing significant could be accomplished until the politicians understood this. In other words, the issue had to become a part of the political dialogue of the nation before we could hope to accomplish anything. It has now become part of the political dialogue and that is, in my judgment, the most significant environmental event in the history of the movement. Until that happened, the environmentalists would continue to gather and talk only to each other for the next 50 years, as they have in the past 50.

Do you think that the political impact will be lasting?

Yes! Earth Day marked the birth of a new issue that is here to stay. It is a strange phenomenon, however, that during the whole germinating period of this environmental concern the politicians, the establishment, the press and the media were, for the most part, quite unaware of what was happening. But, you can be sure there will never be another political campaign like the one in 1968, when not one of the three candidates for President considered the environment an issue worthy of a major speech. It is nothing short of remarkable how rapidly this issue has been thrust into the politics, the conversation and the literature of the country.

The environment is an issue that is here to stay because the environment is here and its quality is measurably and visibly deteriorating at an ever accelerating pace. Now, for the first time, the issue is in the political arena, and is a necessary part of the political dialogue between political parties and among candidates for office from the courthouse to the nation's Capitol. Without this kind of political status, meaningful action on a broad scale was simply impossible.

Are you satisfied that Earth Day had sufficient impact on political leaders to successfully turn the environmental awareness into legislative reality?

I think the results speak for themselves. In the last half of the 91st Congress, far

more environmental legislation was considered, and more important legislation passed, than in any comparable period in the nation's history. Just a very incomplete list includes:

The toughest Clean Air Act in history was signed into law requiring manufacturers to clean up the internal combustion engine by 1975.

The Environmental Protection Act passed requiring every Federal agency to file careful studies and reports on the possible environmental impact of their programs.

Dramatic restrictions on the use of DDT and other persistent pesticides were enacted.

In a series of dramatic events, a proposed jetport for the Florida Everglades was halted and the Corps of Engineers was forced to insure the wilderness area would have an adequate supply of water.

Excuse me, Senator Nelson, but you didn't include the defeat of the SST in your listing. Don't you think the issue made defeat of the SST possible?

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to forget the SST. That vote to stop funding for two prototype supersonic transport planes marked the first major crunch in the battle to come between those who believe that quality in American life is more important than development for the sake of development, or exploitation for the sake of exploitation.

Regardless of the merits of the issue, the great significance of the House and the Senate vote was that the environmental issue was the deciding factor. It marked the first time in any country that a major, ongoing technology was voted down on environmental grounds. In the long pull, the most significant thing about the vote is the strong indication that henceforth in this country we intend to crank the environmental test into the process of our decision making.

If Earth Day was such a successful event, why did you think it necessary to develop an Earth Week this year?

I felt Earth Week was necessary to sustain our effort. The objective was to step beyond the one-day spectacular that Earth Day represented. I wanted to have a period of time set aside each year to inventory the progress of the past year and to plan for the next; a time set aside for the nation, the media and the environmental groups to pay special attention to the issue. In particular, my objective was to set aside a period when all the grade and high schools could bring to fruition their education efforts of the year.

Although there seems to be genuine, wide-ranging concern demanding that the environment be cleaned up, many are also beginning to argue that the price of cleaning up the environment will be too expensive. Is this true?

To begin with, the environmental clean up will take a \$20 to \$25 billion annual investment over the current spending level. That equals about one-third of the defense budget or about what this country is annually wasting in Vietnam.

Yes, the price of cleaning up the environment will be expensive, but not cleaning it up is a price and a sacrifice in the quality of life that no society can afford to pay.

Under the absurd economy of pollution status quo, dirty air does \$13 to \$15 billion in property damage in the United States annually. Yet, for \$7.5 billion, or half the damage cost, some 80 percent of the problem could be eliminated.

Or, if the air pollution levels in major urban areas were reduced by 50 percent, the country would save an estimated \$2 billion in health bills alone.

Water pollution does an estimated \$12 billion in property damage each year, not considering the immeasurable loss of a Lake Erie, or a wetland, or an estuarine area or the productivity of the ocean itself.

The list is endless . . . billions lost in wasted resources and solid waste problems,

strip mining destroying whole regions, pesticides poisoning other forms of life.

You have introduced an environmental package of bills and resolutions in the Senate this year. How did you pinpoint which areas you wanted to cover?

Well, as you know, the bills cover a wide range of subjects from ocean dumping to funds for mass transportation to recycling to a comprehensive testing of food additives. Congress is going to be the major battle ground on all the environmental issues, and I was attempting to provide Congress with a broad, if not all-inclusive range of environmental issues.

I have been dealing with a number of the proposals for some time. As you know, the legislative process takes time, from the date an idea is conceived, drafted and introduced, to the time when Congress gets around to considering and passing it.

For example, I introduced the first legislation on DDT in the Senate about five years ago. I couldn't get any sponsors in the Senate or in the House to go along with the idea of banning DDT, because it was considered to be the miracle pesticide. Over the past five years, however, the dangers of this chlorinated hydrocarbon have become known, and the possibility of banning DDT grows ever nearer. This is also true of detergent legislation which I introduced 7 or 8 years ago and other environmental proposals.

In your environmental agenda, you emphasized the need for strip mining legislation. What does your bill propose?

This is one of the most urgent items on the agenda. We must enact a tough statute with firm deadlines setting environmental controls on all surface mining and requiring land reclamation. I have introduced this legislation in three Congresses. In this Congress, I also introduced a bill to prohibit strip mining for coal. This bill poses the question whether reclamation is anything more than wishful thinking, particularly in mountainous areas.

Is this country willing to trade away the future of whole regions and their people just to provide the supposed easiest and cheapest way to answer a resource demand? In the meantime, the deep gouges of all present strip mines, if put together, would total a 1,500,000 mile-long trench 100 feet wide.

In spite of all the warnings about pesticides, their use increases daily. Your pesticide control bill, considered a model, was introduced for the second time this year. How was it received?

It was better received than ever before. For this is the first time Senate hearings were held, and the number of Senate co-sponsors has increased significantly, including several key Senators from agricultural states that are heavy users of pesticides. There is a growing awareness that fundamental reforms to require all pesticides and pest control devices to be thoroughly tested for their environmental and health effects are necessary before they are released on the market. The fact of the matter is that the indiscriminate use of pesticides has been an agricultural, economic and environmental failure. The chemical companies have continued to reap billions of dollars from unwary farmers who have paid for ever more expensive pest control programs which in the long run are self defeating. As pests develop greater resistance to a pesticide, larger doses are used. Finally, an entirely new pesticide must be developed and the frustrating and costly circle starts anew.

Is there an alternative to the use of pesticides?

Yes. We are now trying to establish pilot field projects for research on a variety of crops to control agricultural and forest pests by integrated biological-cultural methods. This means that these pests are controlled by nature primarily, utilizing beneficial

predator insects and parasites of harmful insects. This method has worked and is working. Everett Dietrick, for example, operates an insectary in Riverside, California, and has been providing insect management service to farmers in the Coachella Valley for 11 years. Letters to my office attest that the crops are of high quality and quantity, and are showing better profit margins than those in the same areas which continue to use sprays on the same type of crops. A number of farmers and entomologists throughout the country are turning to biological controls, but the effort suffers from inadequate funding and lack of effective leadership. Our legislation proposes financing a series of pilot projects to demonstrate integrated pest control on a variety of crops.

Some of your other legislation already in this year's proposed bills would place our untapped coastal oil reserves in a National Marine Mineral Resources Trust. What is the purpose of this?

The oil spills of the coast of California and the Gulf of Mexico have been disastrous environmental events, providing that in our present state of ignorance about the ocean environment, we are taking grave risks in exploiting it now. If we keep accelerating this exploitation pace, we will be drilling 3000 to 5000 new undersea oil wells each year by 1980. Then, as the President's Panel on Oil Spills reported in 1968, we can expect a Santa Barbara-scale disaster once a year.

What should the government do regarding continental shelf lands it has already leased for oil?

We should stop drilling new ocean oil wells until we develop the technology to prevent future Santa Barbaras and until we need the oil, and my proposal would do this.

In the first place, the Federal government is entitled to adopt comprehensive environmental protection plans for all the outer continental shelf, which is owned by the U.S. public. That is one thing we can do in order to avoid making the same mess of the sea as we have of the land. And the states should do the same thing for their undersea lands.

And in cases where we know it is dangerous to extract the oil, as in the Santa Barbara Channel, we must simply buy up the leases. The price we would pay would be an extremely wise investment in the future of one of the most vital resources on earth—the sea itself, with all its productive life.

Senator, you paint both a depressing and optimistic picture about the environment as a potent political issue. Are you optimistic?

Yes, I am optimistic in that we have witnessed unprecedented accomplishments in public environmental awareness and in the areas of political and legal activities, such as in the growth of public interest environmental law firms and the growth of numerous environmental groups active in nearly every community. But these successes must be measured in the context of the vast, complex and pervasive national and global environmental events of the past few years. They must be measured as beginnings, as we pose the question, do we have to destroy tomorrow in order to live today. The answer to that question must be no.

Obviously the answer is more complex. It strikes at the most vital center of the traditional American belief about unlimited abundance, "progress" without end and a limitless frontier with an inexhaustible supply of expendable resources. It is time we started managing our resources in recognition of the fact that there is no such thing as "unlimited abundance" nor is there a "limitless frontier."

SUPPORT OF SPACE SHUTTLE PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I was pleased with the President's decision, an-

nounced during the congressional adjournment, to proceed at once to develop the Nation's space shuttle program. I am convinced that this is a logical progression based on the solid foundations of our past technological achievements.

Many words have already been written and spoken by proponents for, and opponents of, further space exploration and development, and doubtless there certainly will be more in the future.

An editorial entitled "The Space Shuttle," published in the Washington Post of Friday, January 14, 1972, properly makes the point that this is the year of decision whether the United States goes ahead with a sensible, long-range, well-planned, and properly financed space program or whether this country will allow Russia to take over space by virtue of default by the United States.

Mr. President, 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:

THE SPACE SHUTTLE

With the President's announcement that he will support NASA's request for funds to develop a space shuttle, you can bet on a confrontation in Congress this year not unlike last year's battle over the supersonic transport. Senator Mondale, for example, has already called the President's decision "another example of perverse priorities and colossal waste in government spending." To be sure, Senator Mondale has tried unsuccessfully in the past to eliminate planning funds for the space shuttle from the budget, but the attempt to kill the program, in the House as well as in the Senate, will be far more vigorous this year because this is the point at which a real choice can be made.

The choice involves, in large measure, the kind of space program the United States will have in the future. A decision to build the space shuttle would mean this country's proceeding to develop both manned and unmanned space equipment as recommended a couple of years ago by the President's Science Advisory Committee. A decision not to build the shuttle at all or to postpone a start on it for several years would almost certainly mean that the country would go out of the manned space business before the end of this decade. Thus, many of the arguments heard in the next few months will sound like reruns of the SST debate. However, the issues are quite different.

The space shuttle is a vehicle designed to deliver a cargo of men and equipment into earth orbit and then be flown back to earth for use again. It would be employed to supply floating laboratories, when and if they are developed. It could also be used to service, repair, set in place and retrieve satellites like those now in orbit for communications and other purposes. In addition, it might have military uses about which NASA does not speak, since the shuttle is a joint military-civilian project. Finally, its development would provide some of the technology required for manned exploration of other parts of the solar system.

The justification set forth for starting to build the space shuttle now combines technical and economic factors. A perfected shuttle would reduce the costs of each space launching since the same craft could be used over and over; eventually, the booster rocket would also be flown back to earth and reused, further cutting costs. At the same time, one shuttle could place several satellites in position, thus reducing the number of launches. (The United States has sent up around

700 satellites in the last 10 years and the Air Force puts up a new one every couple of weeks.) According to the spacemen, this aspect of the shuttle alone would make its development worthwhile. It would increase costs in the next few years but cut them sharply in the 1980s and '90s. The opponents of the shuttle, on the other hand, dispute NASA's economic analysis, claiming NASA has underestimated shuttle costs and overestimated long-run savings.

The second basic justification for starting the program now rests in the role of man in space. The spacemen see this as a great future field, with men in laboratories conducting all kinds of scientific work and, eventually, going in spaceships to explore other parts of the solar system. They claim that without the space shuttle, the American manned flight capability will have to be given up about the middle of this decade because of the high costs of the Apollo missions and that once given up, this capability will be hard to retrieve at a later date. For their part, the opponents think man does not now have, and may never have, a legitimate role in space; rather, they believe that machines can be designed to do whatever jobs need doing at a cost far less than that involved in maintaining a manned space capability. The President's committee said two years ago that no one knew enough to predict accurately what man's role in space ought to be and until more is known the decision should be left open.

After these two principal arguments come others, which you will be hearing this spring. On the one hand, it will be argued that the nation's industry needs the technological spur of this space program to maintain its place in the world, that the country needs the jobs the program would create, and that the Russians will take over space if the United States stops now. On the other, it will be said that this program is only a gimmick to save the aerospace industry and that there is little or nothing of practical value to be learned from space research.

None of these arguments on either side is error-free since the major ones rest on projections into the future which are exceedingly difficult to make and others rest on basically undemonstrable assumptions about the quest for knowledge. Part of the difficulty springs from the fact that no one can know what space-based research will discover. Is the key to the hydrogen atom and thus to unlimited energy out here, as some scientists think? Will the world some day need to import minerals from space to sustain life here? Will man have to be in space to accomplish things such as these or can machines do them all? Above all, where does this kind of program fit in a national budget that cannot provide for doing all the things at home that ought to be done?

It is owing to questions like these that this year's debate over the space shuttle will be quite different in character and significance from last year's debate over the SST, although they will bear some superficial resemblances. The standards applied to a project which involves scientific research and military considerations, as does the space shuttle, must be somewhat different from those applied to a project, such as the SST, which involved only another way to move people from place to place.

LEGISLATION AFFECTING PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on December 15, 1971, my administrative assistant, Frank Cummings, delivered an address to the 17th Annual Conference of the National Foundation of Health, Welfare, and Pension Plans, giving an overview, worthy of the consideration of every Senator, of the problems which have