

May 14, 1969

They should investigate the industries and see what they dump into the bay, individually, like dyes or some kinds of chemicals, and if they don't revise their methods, they should be fined.

EUGENE J. SWANN, fireman. I definitely think they should. There's so many things that are a thermal threat to the bay. At certain times of the year the fish are attracted to that hot water that is poured into the bay by power companies and at certain times they are not.

I think the state should take a hand to find a way to control the various companies and find out what type of chemical is used by the power companies. The water isn't a threat, but I think the chemicals that are in it are.

TIMOTHY HOFFMAN, fireman. I think they ought to start with the larger companies and industries instead of picking on the small person all the time.

They contribute more to it than the average person and I believe they should be the first ones to be stopped. I think the state should exert more control on the industries if it's possible. I don't know, somehow.

Won't be long, you won't be able to get a hard crab out of there, if this keeps up.

MARVIN MEYER, clothing store owner. Definitely. There probably are laws on the books and if they were enforced, I think that the biggest part of pollution would stop.

TONY RETTALIATA, student. Well, you can't go swimming anymore. I guess the only thing you can do is write the congressman and let him know—talk to him if you can.

I think the state should make the industries control the pollution and fine them if they don't. And they should have inspectors go around and check to make sure they're doing it.

MRS. RICHARD WEIBEL, housewife. Why can't the industries solve the problem among themselves? I think the state should lend a hand, but as far as doing it entirely, no.

I think the men that own these industries have their rights but I do think something should be done.

WILLIAM H. JOLLY, telephone company employe. I certainly do. It's not even fit to swim in.

It seems like our crab population was down last year, whether this is a biological, cyclic condition or not, I don't know.

I've been fishing in the bay for about 20 years and see more dead fish every year. I think something should definitely be done.

I wish I knew what the industries have to do to combat the problem. I'm quite sure there are people who do.

DAVE LUBER, assistant bank manager. Yes; they should be enforced more and they should also make them stronger, as indicated in the series this week.

Anybody that has access to the bay—the city sewage plant, industries, power companies—should revise their methods.

They should start thinking before they do it, instead of thinking about the dollar all the time.

MRS. DONNA ASQUITH, cosmetologist. Definitely. Because I think it's ruining our seafood industry.

Not only that, it's harming our beaches, for people who can't afford to go to private country clubs or pools.

OPPOSITION TO THE LOTTERY PROPOSAL

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, it seems that President Nixon has misunderstood the threat to freedom and equity which conscription poses to America. The President has proposed to reform the draft through a lottery. I submit that such a proposal is not reform at all but only a random distribution of inequity. Substituting Lady Luck for Gen-

eral Hershey will not alter the fact that some young men are forced into service and denied their individual liberty while others escape any military duty. An attempt to reform the draft is somewhat like trying to reform slavery—one does not reform inequity, one abolishes it.

Patching up the draft will not necessarily move us toward an all-volunteer Army. The continuation of a peacetime conscription serves as a case in point. Though the draft had served its usefulness, the impetus of bureaucratic machinery and its effect upon the American public has continued to perpetuate an outmoded Selective Service System. Similarly stopgap lottery system will only postpone the necessary transition to an all-volunteer military. As long as the incentives for voluntary enlistment are not improved, the undemocratic principle of the military draft is further entrenched in our society.

This proposal will only prolong the alienation of our youth and prohibit us from achieving a greater realization of freedom for all. The dehumanizing forces in our society must be halted if we are to regain youth's confidence and participation in our democratic system. Delaying promised action to end conscription is certainly not the answer to such a pressing issue.

THE GRANT CONSOLIDATION ACT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, President Nixon recently submitted a message to the Congress, in which he proposed legislation which would give the President power to initiate the consolidation of closely related Federal assistance programs, and to place consolidated programs under the jurisdiction of a single agency. I believe that the President's proposal constitutes a sound and reasonable approach toward resolving the vexing problems created by the presently fragmented and uncoordinated Federal grant-in-aid system.

The major problem of the Federal grant-in-aid system revolves around the question of how the Federal Government should structure its services delivery system so that the benefits thereof effectively reach the target areas and individuals in as efficient and economical manner as possible. We are all too familiar with past history in this area; it is a history replete with examples of waste, inefficiency, and unfulfilled needs. It is a history which bears witness to the inadequacies inherent in a system whereby the Federal Government attempts to meet social and economic needs without fully taking into account the practical realities of the situation.

In his message to the Congress, President Nixon aptly summarized the present situation when he declared:

As grant-in-aid programs have proliferated, the problems of delivery have grown more acute. States, cities, and other recipients find themselves increasingly faced with a welter of overlapping programs, often involving multiple agencies and diverse criteria. This results in confusion at the local level, in the waste of time, energy and resources, and often in frustration of the intent of Congress.

The accurateness of the President's description can be truly appreciated by con-

sidering the problems and frustrations facing a mayor of a fair-sized city, who has dedicated his administration to bettering the lot of his community. During the course of his administration, the mayor would invariably turn to the Federal Government for financial and technical assistance. Much to his chagrin, he would be greeted with a plethora of Government grant-in-aid programs, and both he and his programs would be buried in administrative detail and bureaucratic redtape.

As my colleagues in the Senate know, the scenario I have just described is unfortunately not a figment, but a reality. The more than 600-page catalog of Federal assistance programs published by the Office of Economic Opportunity is mute testament to the deplorable state of affairs we all know exists.

President Nixon's proposed Grant Consolidation Act would resolve, in large measure, the present problems associated with the delivery of Federal assistance programs. The President is seeking to mold the many programs, the diverse criteria, and the multiple agencies into a rational, productive, and efficient system within which promises and performances can be matched to the benefit of our people and our Nation. I welcome his initiative and applaud his efforts.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 301, the Speaker had appointed Mr. McClure of Idaho, as a member of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2718. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk;

H.R. 4229. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid;

H.R. 4239. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States so as to prevent the payment of multiple customs duties in the case of horses temporarily exported for the purpose of racing;

H.R. 8644. An act to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots;

H.R. 8654. An act to provide that, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, individuals who were illegally detained during 1968 by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall be treated as serving in a combat zone;

H.R. 10015. An act to extend through December 31, 1970, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum;

H.R. 10016. An act to continue until close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap; and

H.R. 10107. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally twice by their titles and referred to Committee on Finance:

May 14, 1969

H.R. 2718. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk;

H.R. 4229. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid;

H.R. 4239. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States so as to prevent the payment of multiple customs duties in the case of horses temporarily exported for the purpose of racing;

H.R. 8644. An act to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots;

H.R. 8654. An act to provide that, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, individuals who were illegally detained during 1968 by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall be treated as serving in a combat zone;

H.R. 10015. An act to extend through December 31, 1970, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum;

H.R. 10016. An act to continue until close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap; and

H.R. 10107. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 33) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, without surrendering my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is a bill—H.R. 33—to provide for U.S. participation in the amount of \$480 million over 3 years in the second replenishment of funds of the International Development Association.

It is a bill which in one form or another has been before the Congress since April of 1968. In other words, for a variety of reasons—some good and some not—we have in effect been avoiding our international obligations in the area of peaceful, as distinct from warlike, cooperation.

The proposal before us today incorporated in H.R. 33 derived in part from an initiative of the U.S. Government—not to mention the fact that the entire institution of the IDA owed its origin in large measure not merely to the U.S. Government but to the U.S. Senate. Our executive branch representatives as long ago as 1966 took a lead in beginning long and difficult negotiations among 18 developed member countries of the IDA for a second replenishment of the Association's resources. Perhaps those concerned—although many of them rather tough-minded bankers—were a trifle naive when they originally contemplated a total contribution of almost \$1 billion from the United States over a three-year period. Or perhaps they were being more sanguine than events permitted about the chances of ending the war in Vietnam and bringing U.S. military expenditures under some form of control. In any event, the original request has been scaled down to just about half the original amount. Even so, the United States has been the main reason for a situation in which no less than three tentative deadlines for action have been missed since June of last year.

Fortunately, however, the other industrialized countries—notably our European friends from whom we are so used to castigating for parsimonious attitudes toward defense expenditures—have taken a forthcoming and responsible attitude toward the need for the developed countries to help the less developed nations of the world. As an instance, the Netherlands acted last evening to make its first installment available to the IDA, even though the replenishment agreement has not become operative.

Indeed, 12 of the 18 scheduled contributing countries to the IDA have already completed action and are all in various stages of making contributions available to the IDA, even though the United States by failing to act has prevented any formal ratification of the second replenishment plan. In this connection, particular praise should be given to the Canadians, who have pledged and made available for use their entire 3-year contribution of \$75 million. Almost all the other 11 countries have given final approval to use of their first year's allotment. In addition, the Association has been able to use the \$75 million transferred by the World Bank last fall from its fiscal year 1968 net income. The IDA in fiscal year 1969 thus has had available over \$200 million in resources, when in fact it looked for a time as if the Association virtually would have to close its loan window for at least an interim period while waiting for the U.S. Congress to make up its mind.

Mr. President, I see no need to go into a description of what the IDA is, what it does, and what it means to the underdeveloped countries and to the future of the international community of nations. This kind of material is available in both the committee hearings and the committee report on the bill. Moreover, this will have been the third time—or, rather, the fourth time, counting the

Monroney resolution of 1958—that the Senate has considered the role and the merits of the International Development Association.

Today I prefer, and indeed consider it imperative, to emphasize a more general question; namely, the sense of values maintained not only in this body but in the country at large. It is being noted repeatedly in this Chamber that the U.S. Government is primarily responsible for the domestic welfare of our people and that we really cannot afford to spend money abroad. Personally I have very great sympathy for the proposition that we have become overextended internationally and that we have been paying too little attention to urgent domestic needs. But this kind of argumentation does not mean that we must be stampeded into some kind of headlong retreat from our obligations abroad, and especially from the idea of creating a peaceful community of nations in the world. The very odd thing about this argument is that it always seems to be trotted out when we are considering relatively modest sums for peaceful purposes, but seldom gets much attention when we are dealing with enormous expenditures devoted to warlike purposes.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee had occasion during the most recent hearing on this bill with the new Secretary of the Treasury, David M. Kennedy, to ask whether the total sum of \$480 million requested over a 3-year period from the United States for the IDA would do more than keep the war going in Vietnam for something short of a week. The answer is that this total sum is actually less than we spend on the average in one week of fighting in Southeast Asia.

I do not know how people can argue that we can afford an annual \$80 billion defense budget but not the sum of \$160 billion a year for IDA lending in each of the next 3 years. What in the world do people think we are spending armaments money for if it is not for international, as opposed to purely domestic, purposes? The greater portion of these defense expenditures admittedly are made within the United States. At the same time, we must not overlook the fact that approximately half of our past contributions to the IDA have also been spent in the United States, even without any tied-loan provisions being involved.

This brings me to another subject which needs to be emphasized in terms of this pending proposal. For once, the United States has demanded and received special treatment from its allies among the developed countries who are joining with us in this effort to help the poorest countries of the world. There is contained in the second replenishment agreement a complicated formula which assures that there will be no balance-of-payments impact on the U.S. position at least until the middle of 1971, and a rather modest effect annually thereafter.

Frankly, it gives me considerable pleasure to see a document which has a subtitle which refers to "Special Arrangements for the United States." I wish