

big cities will need to go to car pooling, rapid transit, and staggered work hours in order to meet the standards. It was stated that certain sections in some cities may have to be closed to motor traffic during certain periods of the day. Insofar as I can observe, the nation received this announcement without batting an eye, as if no one really expected any of these awkward and grossly inconvenient things to happen.

Moreover, we have been told that just to meet the 1975 particulate standards in seven large cities will require an additional volume of gas equal to 15 percent of the total consumed by the Nation. At current levels of consumption, this is 3.3 trillion cubic feet per year, and there is virtually no prospect that this much additional gas can be made available to these localities by the specified means. In every case, the major concern of gas companies and distribution companies is now upon protecting existing firm residential and commercial commitments—at a cost, if necessary, of industrial and plant loads. Yet, the sales push permeates many cities to get people to use gas to condition their houses, including favorable rates for these large economy-size consumers.

The newspapers are well along with their seasonal warnings about the potential shortage of electric power to meet peak demands this summer. We have been reading these warnings every summer for at least the past three years. Meantime, all during the winter months, we read advertisements urging us to take advantage of low, off-season installation rates to put central air conditioning in our houses.

I have the distinct impression that somebody isn't getting the word.

The word is simply this: We have decided that it is worth whatever it costs to clean up our air and water and garbage dumps and junkyards. It is going to cost a bundle, and not one American in ten thousand is as yet even remotely aware of that fact. In Fairfax County, Virginia, the estimate for the cost of sewage treatment is forecast to rise from the present \$50 a million gallons to \$230 a million gallons by 1974. This is nearly a four-fold increase over a period of three years, and the users of the service will pay for it, as they should. But I wonder just how many householders in Fairfax County have taken the trouble to sit down and work out the dollar cost of the increase in their sewage bills they can expect over the next three years.

We happen to have a price tag for this particular reform. We do not, as yet, have comparable data on the additional cost of electricity, of motor fuel, of car maintenance, of taxes, both direct and indirect, of home heating, of virtually every item that is grown, mined, or manufactured in the United States. We shall know a great deal about these cost increments in 1980. It would be helpful if we know more than we do about them in 1971. These costs will be discernable not only in the prices and taxes we pay, but also in terms of employment, and payrolls, in levels of personal comfort and convenience, in trade balances and dollar flows abroad, in the degree to which we become dependent for our energy supplies upon sources over which we have no control.

Ironically, these environmental costs will be dramatically evident in their impact upon other goals which are the object of other equally worthy causes. One illustration will suffice. The money cost of environmental programs will impinge directly upon some of the most basic outlays the typical family must make to sustain itself: Upon what it must pay for water, for electricity, for home heating, for for sewage and waste disposal, for taxes, for gasoline and maintenance to the vehicle which is the breadwinner's transportation to and from work. These expenditures are essential, not discretionary. Unlike the

progressive income tax, the added costs do not differentiate according to ability to pay. To the more prosperous residents of Westchester County, these increments may be more of an annoyance than a burden. But in Harlem, where a fourth of the residents are on some kind of public assistance, the studied efforts of programs designed to bring a measure of relief to the hard-pressed families there may be subverted by the added costs assessed against their basic necessities. Let's not kid ourselves: The costs of rescuing our environment will be heavy, and they will fall with singular force upon the poor and the disadvantaged. We need to do some sober thinking about how we intend to deal with the poignant aspects of this unintended fallout upon so large a portion of our fellow Americans.

The legitimate costs of environmental preservation and rehabilitation will be heavy enough once we begin to feel their weight. We can afford these. But what troubles me deeply are the costs which are not legitimate, and which represent charges incident to frivolous and capricious acts arising out of ignorance, irrationality, and a misguided excess of missionary zeal. We cannot afford these.

All over the Nation we are witness to a rising tide of opposition to the construction of essential facilities for the extraction and transport of minerals; for the generation and transmission of electrical energy; for the processing and fabrication of a thousand things needed by people. Some of this is legitimate, and we have created adequate mechanisms through laws and courts and regulatory boards for the satisfactory resolution of valid differences. But in providing these mechanisms, we have facilitated—indeed, we have almost invited—lawsuits and complaints by individuals and groups who previously had no standing before adjudicating bodies, and whose claims to relief may rest on nothing more substantial than a professed concern for the environment. Laws are being proposed whose effect will be to frustrate, delay, and even prohibit operations which were once thought to be in the general public interest. Those of you who are on the Natural Resources Committee are aware of the bill now before Congress which would require the cessation of all strip mining in the United States within six months after its passage.

The effect of this bill, if passed, would be to reduce coal production by one-third, and employment in the coal mining industry by more than 20 thousand workers. The groundswell caused by the precipitate shutdown of a third of the Nation's coal mining industry would demoralize the electric power industry, and impact upon the economics of a dozen states. I do not expect the bill to be passed, but the mere fact that such a measure could be introduced at all by the national legislature says something significant about the temper of our times.

My point is that the enthusiasm and elan of a worthwhile cause is in danger of overreaching the proper objective of its concern. We want a revival of some values that have temporarily been lost in the rush to achieve our present levels of material well being. We want clean air and clear streams. We want an end to ugliness and stridency. We want reminders around us, within sight and sound, of the fact that we are kin to every living thing, closely or remotely. We want the time and the space to sit in quiet meadows, to walk by sunlit waters, to look upon the desert glory after a spring rain, to stand in awe at the work of wind and water upon the weathered face of the earth over geologic time.

We want all these things, and we shall have them. But we must not abandon or postpone the important goals that depend upon our steadily increasing production and use of food, fuel, and fiber. For the simple truth is that we shall have to go on building

power plants, drilling oil wells, opening mines, laying pipelines, building and operating factories and mills and ships, and do so at a rate which is responsive to the ever-increasing demands that will be made for the goods and services they provide. There are now 205 million of us, and even at the lowest birthrate in our history, there will be 300 million Americans to be fed, clothed, housed, and otherwise cared for by the turn of the century, and it cannot be done with cottage industries and 40-acre farms.

Last month President Nixon spoke to the imperative necessity for an expanding energy supply to sustain our economic growth upon which our aspirations for a better quality of life for all Americans depends. On no other occasion in our history has an American President addressed an entire message to the subject of energy. This one fact speaks far more eloquently of the importance of an adequate, secure supply of energy than anything I could possibly utter.

The President devoted much attention in his message to plans and programs for clean energy—for accelerating the development of the breeder reactor, or gasifying coal, for control of sulfur oxide emissions. He also dealt specifically with the central problem confronting electric utilities, calling attention to his proposals now before the Congress to provide administrative measures to facilitate long-range site planning for power plants. Throughout his message, the President noted the inter-relationship between energy and the environment. He devoted an entire section of his message to the need for an integrated energy policy and the administrative apparatus to put it into effect. This done, energy considerations can be handled through a mechanism congruent to the one established to deal with environmental problems.

By implication, the President has stated the case I wish to make today. Within the stipulation that we must continue to expand our production of goods and services, certain trade-offs and choices are possible for the protection of the environment. The performance levels that we demand of our producing and consuming activities can be adjusted to accommodate reasonable expectations of technological advances. We can work around the hard spots. We have the time and the resources which permit this flexibility in our approach to solving our problems.

But as between the basic objectives of continued economic expansion and environmental protection, we have no choice. Both goals are possible. Both are essential. It remains for us to proceed, in reasonableness and good faith, along lines of action designed to bring both within our reach.

So I would like to close with a plea for reason, for perspective, for an approach to our problems at manageable levels of emotional intensity by all participants in what is in essence an adversary process.

But adversaries need not be enemies, and when they must share the benefits derived of common resources, they cannot afford to be. Obstruction and intransigence and self-righteous uptightness can bring us nothing but trouble and grief. My message is that we can rescue the environment and still produce the material means to honor the claims of those other causes which have also been advanced in the hope of a better quality of life for our people. The costs are within our capacity to pay, provided we choose wisely among the courses open to us.

#### SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY—A BACKWARD STEP REVERSED

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, on May 3 I called to the attention of the Senate a provision of the final social

services regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which had the effect of denying social services to any elderly person not receiving public assistance.

This change had been made between the time the regulations were published for comment on February 16 and the publication of the final regulations on May 1.

I was very pleased to learn from HEW today that the regulations will be modified so that elderly persons who are potential assistance recipients will be eligible to receive those services designed to enable them to remain in their homes and avoid dependence on institutional care.

Although I am still of the opinion that the definition of a potential elderly recipient contained in the final regulations is unnecessarily restrictive, certainly the first order of business is to assure that that definition is an effective one and that services can be provided to those who meet it.

#### S. 1090—THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I support the public broadcasting authorization bill we passed yesterday, but I regret that I did not have an opportunity to comment on this legislation. I would like to make a few comments today.

The funds dispensed annually by CPB serve a most worthy and crucial purpose in strengthening and upgrading the programming quality of public television and radio stations across the country. Swift enactment of this legislation is essential if funds are to be available in time to salvage the coming program season for public television. An article which appeared in the Washington Post 2 days ago underlines the seriousness of public broadcasting's financial woes. The article indicates that, at current funding levels, public television will suffer a 75-percent reduction in new programming for the 1973-74 season and that reruns of old programs will have to supplement the rest of the schedule.

But, Mr. President, while I wholeheartedly support the provisions of this bill, I would feel remiss in failing to bring to my colleagues' attention some inadequacies of the legislation in facing squarely the present status of public broadcasting. Adequate financing of the public broadcasting system is but one of the serious unresolved questions facing the system. Two other matters are at least equally grave: How to guarantee that programming decisions are insulated from governmental influence and how to distinguish between the proper role of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the proper role of local stations in making programming decisions.

The committee report on this bill presents strong and solid arguments in support of the legislation, but unfortunately events have outdated the report. Over the past weeks, there have been repeated reports of political pressure brought to bear upon the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and meanwhile the stations and CPB remain at loggerheads over who should call which shots.

On April 13, the Board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting voted to table a compromise measure which had been arduously hammered out with representatives of the Nation's 234 public television stations. The compromise would have sealed the terms of a partnership between the licensee's organization—the Public Broadcasting Service—and the Corporation in sharing decisionmaking responsibility for the national public television system. The CPB Board's vote to defer action on the compromise precipitated the abrupt departure of the Board President, Mr. Thomas Curtis, who charged that he could no longer vouch for the integrity of the CPB Board. Mr. Curtis said that Board members had been contacted by the White House on the eve of the vote and had been pressured to vote against the compromise. These charges of improper pressure have since been denied by the Office of Telecommunications Policy and the exact nature and propriety of communications between the executive branch and the CPB Board on this matter are in dispute. But Mr. Curtis, a former Congressman from Missouri who is known by many Members of this body, is a man of honesty and integrity and a man not given to making wild charges. Whatever the nature of the contacts between the executive branch and the CPB Board may have been, Mr. Curtis quite evidently felt the Board's independence had been seriously violated and, he, therefore, felt he could not in good conscience continue as Chairman of the CPB Board.

Mr. Curtis' resignation and subsequent charges have sent tremors of apprehension throughout the public television community. Mr. David Ives, the very distinguished president of Boston's public television station, WGBH, stated on April 26 that WGBH stood ready to refuse sizable program production grants from the CPB if the station became convinced that the Corporation Board has been subject to improper political influence from the executive branch. Mr. Ives, too, is a responsible and temperate man; he is not one to issue public statements capriciously. And yet, he has felt it necessary to spell out in the clearest possible terms his growing concern about signs that the executive branch of the Federal Government "may be trying to take over control of public television for its own ends."

One of the consequences of the turmoil has been to remove practically all of their public affairs programs including Washington Week in Review, Bill Moyers, and Bill Buckley, who announced that as of May 18, his popular public television program, Firing Line, may be offered on a syndicated basis to commercial stations.

Firing Line and these other outstanding programs will be financially out of reach of most public television stations which now can broadcast them weekly. While it is very clear that public broadcasting needs the increased funding levels provided in the legislation now before the Senate, it is equally clear that more is needed than money to correct the present disarray in Public Broadcasting's Corporation Board and the repeated—and, I maintain, erroneous—insistence of

the Board that operative control of the national interconnection system lies solely in its jurisdiction causes me great concern.

The Congress recognized that the Corporation Board, no matter how honorable its members may be, would be subject to inappropriate pressures. This would be true for the simple reason that they are appointed by the President. We attempted to create a decentralized system in which program production and program distribution would be in the hands of those at the local, rather than national, level so that these pressures would be minimized and local people would determine local needs free of interference. I believe this system worked well and I disagree emphatically with attempts by the Corporation to serve for itself more control over local stations.

Since recent events have exacerbated the gulf between the Corporation and the local stations, events occurring too late for us to take positive action on, I hope the House will be convinced to make as clear as possible that this system must be based on local control. Only by creating and maintaining true localism in public broadcasting can the system both effectively serve the people and protect itself from inappropriate political interference.

#### THE MEANING OF WATERGATE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most perceptive commentaries I have seen on the Watergate scandal is an essay by Mr. Hedley Donovan, editor of Time magazine, which appears in the May 14, 1973, issue of Time. Mr. Donovan's essay entitled "The Good Uses of the Watergate Affair" contends that there are constructive benefits that can be gained from the sad lessons of the Watergate affair. The author argues that in recent years the Presidency has been removed from needed restraints either by the Congress or by the American people.

"It may be that the greatest service of Watergate is to deflate swollen notions of the Presidency as well as Mr. Nixon," writes Mr. Donovan.

I agree with this observation and with the other points of this excellent essay.

I am also impressed by a thoughtful piece written by Mr. Stewart Alsop in the May 14, 1973, issue of Newsweek entitled, "War, Not Politics."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these two articles by Mr. Donovan and Mr. Alsop be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE GOOD USES OF THE WATERGATE AFFAIR

Some Americans—it might even be a majority—catch themselves in guilty sensation: they are glad about Watergate.

They should not feel guilty. Watergate could have highly salutary consequences.

To be sure, there are those who are pleased for reasons of petty partisanship or from a vulgar enjoyment of that dependable old theme, The Mighty Brought Low. But there are deeper reasons for taking satisfaction in the whole squalid affair.

Watergate has already destroyed a White House palace guard that "sheltered" the