

smoky cabin air recirculated and blown by fans back into the cabin. The reason for recirculating air, according to one jet manufacturer, is to make passengers feel more comfortable by raising the humidity—purely from their own body water. Otherwise, humidity can get uncomfortably low, especially on long flights.

"I find it just amazing," said one FAA worker, "that the way airlines cut down on weight is by taking off life rafts and cutting down fresh air. Think of the things they don't take off—the 250-pound liquor carts, for example. You can serve drinks without the carts. And most of the partitions in the cabin, like between first class and coach—those are purely decorative. They must weigh quite a lot, but they stay. And the thick, colored carpeting on the walls.

"Someone ought to take another look at the priorities operating here." ●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 150

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DeCONCINI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide payments under Government health plans for services of qualified mental health specialists.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DeCONCINI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide that community mental health center services shall be covered under part B of medicare and shall be a required service under medicaid.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to authorize the President to allocate supplies of crude oil and petroleum products during a severe petroleum supply shortage.

S. 1698

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), and the Senator from California (Mr. HAYAKAWA) were added as cosponsors of S. 1698, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide preferential treatment in the admission of certain children of U.S. Armed Forces personnel.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

STANDBY PETROLEUM ALLOCATION ACT OF 1981

AMENDMENT NOS. 592 AND 593

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. BRADLEY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1503) to authorize the President to allocate supplies of crude oil and petroleum products during a severe petroleum shortage.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

AMENDMENT NOS. 594 THROUGH 610

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. McCLURE submitted 23 amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 4035) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.

(The text of the amendments and remarks of Mr. McCLURE appear elsewhere in today's RECORD.)

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, November 3, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs will conduct hearings on the proposed pipeline that would transport natural gas from the Soviet Union's Yamul gasfields to Western Europe. The project poses significant dangers for the NATO alliance and raises serious questions for U.S. foreign policy. The hearings will focus on what would be an appropriate and effective U.S. response to this danger, including the role for U.S. export controls.

Witnesses will include representatives from the relevant Government agencies, as well as experts on energy and security matters and Soviet affairs. Currently just one morning of hearings is planned, with the possibility of holding further hearings at a later date, should circumstances warrant it.

Mr. President, this is a very serious matter, one in which several of my colleagues and I have taken a great interest. The notion of diversifying energy supply by going from the Persian Gulf to the Soviet Union is like embracing Mu' ammar Qadhafi in order to reduce reliance on the ayatollah. I just do not feel that the Europeans realize the danger, at least not sufficiently. At the same time, any effort to prevent the project from going through, if that effort is to be successful, must come from a strong, high level, consistent, sustained, and coordinated policy by this Government that includes the offer of alternative sources of energy to the Europeans. The Western Europeans must have reliable sources of energy, and that means that they cannot become dependent upon their enemies to get it. The Banking Committee hearings should go a long way to further the progress in conducting such an effective U.S. policy.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public the scheduling of a public hearing before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider Senate Joint Resolution 111, consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas. The hearing will be held on Thursday, November 12, beginning at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements for the hearing record should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, room 3104, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

For further information regarding this hearing you may wish to contact Mr. Gary Ellsworth of the committee staff at 224-7146.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1981

● Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from the Senate yesterday during consideration of S. 1196, the foreign assistance bill. Meetings with several groups of constituents in Connecticut prevented me from casting my vote on final passage and several amendments which were offered. I would like to announce for the record that had I been able to vote, I would have voted aye on final passage of the bill, because I believe on balance it represents an important step to meet the international obligations and pursue the foreign policy of the United States.

On the matter of assistance to Chile, I oppose the outright repeal of restriction on assistance to the Chilean Government and thus would have supported the motion to table the Helms unprinted amendment No. 502 and the Percy substitute, No. 503.

Senator HATFIELD's amendment No. 518 expresses a legitimate concern for the stability of that region and the human rights record of the Zia Government; consequently I would have voted to approve the \$100,000,000 deletion.

Finally, I would have opposed Senator HELMS' amendment No. 509 dealing with Zimbabwe as it would be disruptive of our efforts to assist and establish good relations with that young nation. ●

HARRIS POLL ON CLEAN AIR

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the Clean Air Act is one of the landmark environmental statutes enacted during the last decade. The 1970 law marks the commitment of this country to the achievement of healthy air. Our national commitment was reaffirmed in 1977, when Congress enacted clean air amendments to fine tune the law.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works will soon begin to consider amendments to the Clean Air Act. Before this process begins, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent Lou Harris poll.

This poll should be given serious attention as we debate clean air issues in this body. It indicates that an overwhelming majority, 80 percent, do not favor any relaxation in existing Federal regulation of air pollution. An equally significant aspect of the poll is the fact that not a single major segment of the public wants environmental laws relaxed, whether you look at large city residents, young people, women, groups categorized by income, professionals, white-collar workers, union members, Democrats, Republicans, those over 65, or those who voted for Ronald Reagan.

Mr. President, this is a powerful message. As Mr. Harris states, the results speak for themselves. He summarized the message of his poll results in the following way:

By any measure, they add up to a powerful message to Democrats and Republicans alike here in Congress: renew the Clean Air Act and don't do anything to it that would in any way make the air dirtier than it is now. While the public thinks that some regulation in other areas ought to be relaxed or even abolished, they will oppose vehe-

mentally any measure that might have the effect of reversing some of the environmental gains that have been made in the last ten years.

The American people are willing to make sacrifices in many areas to stop the miseries and ravages of inflation and an economy that is out of joint. But they will not tolerate any reductions in environmental clean-up efforts—and will regard such cuts as threatening the very quality of life in this last quarter of the twentieth century.

I am not an expert on this legislation nor on the subject of environmental regulation, but I can tell you this: this message on the deep desire on the part of the American people to battle pollution is one of the most overwhelming and clearest we have ever recorded in our twenty-five years of surveying public opinion.

I ask that Mr. Harris' testimony be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

Mr. President, I urge all Senators to read the results of this poll. They can be a valuable guide to us in the coming months.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS HARRIS

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to be here today. I wish to note that I am here not as a partisan for or against the Clean Air Act or specific amendments that have been or may be proposed to it. Instead, I appear here at your invitation to relate to you and the Committee the results of a poll our firm has just conducted on this issue. This survey was not conducted for any private or public interest, but instead is part of the Harris Survey, which appears in over 200 newspapers across the country. Indeed, portions of this survey appeared this morning in those newspapers.

Before I discuss our latest findings, however, I'd like to review briefly the history of American public opinion on environmental issues. As late as 1967, people were by no means very concerned about pollution or committed to cleaning up the environment. By 46 to 44 percent, the public opposed paying \$15 more per year in federal taxes in order to finance air and water pollution control. Concern about the environment was then centered largely among the younger, more affluent, college-educated, and suburban sectors of the population. But public concern over air and water pollution took hold in earnest as the country entered the 1970s.

In 1971 Americans listed pollution control as a national problem second only to the state of the economy—ahead of the war in Vietnam, crime, and social unrest. Seventy-three percent reported significant levels of air pollution in their communities, and in a sharp turnaround from four years earlier, a 59-34 percent majority said they were willing to endure higher taxes of \$15 per year to curb air and water pollution, even as public willingness to pay higher taxes for other federal programs was declining. Clearly, concern over pollution had become a national issue—no longer just a cause for a select few.

As the 1970s progressed, and the nation was beset simultaneously by a deep recession and serious shortages of energy, the public recognized that efforts to solve the energy crisis and reduce unemployment might conflict with attempts to clean up the environment. Yet, as we found in 1975, an overwhelming 3 to 1 majority opposed cutting back on anti-pollution standards and controls in order to obtain more jobs or more energy.

Instead, with typical American confidence in our ability to solve our problems in a pluralistic way, the public said that they

thought we could continue efforts to clean up air and water pollution and at the same time find both more energy and a way to turn the economy around to ease unemployment. I should note here that an increasing number of Americans say they would favor going slow on the imposition of new environmental controls—but not the relaxation of existing standards—if they were convinced that this would help our energy problems.

So today, after a decade of the Clean Air Act and 9 years of the Clean Water Act, public concern for both aspects of environmental pollution remains high. As has almost always been the case, water pollution is considered a slightly more serious problem, in light of reports of toxic spills and the possible presence of carcinogens in drinking water. However, efforts to control air pollution also enjoy strong support.

Our latest results, which are attached to my testimony, show clearly just how committed the American people are in their resolve not to cut back or relax existing federal standards on air pollution. We gave people we interviewed across the country three overall choices on what should be done by this Congress about the Clean Air Act: should it be made stricter than it is now, should it be made less strict, or should it be kept the same as it is now?

The largest single group, a majority of 51 percent, want to keep the Act without change. But another 29 percent opt for making the act even stricter, while no more than 17 percent want it made less strict. This means that by 80 to 17 percent, a sizable majority of the public nationwide does not want to see any relaxation in existing federal regulation of air pollution.

Perhaps as impressive as this overall division is the fact that not a single major segment of the public wants the environmental laws made less strict. Let me go through a list of key groups. Most in favor of not relaxing the clean air regulations are big-city residents (by 83-14 percent), young people under 30 (90-10 percent), women (82-13 percent), those with incomes between \$15,000 and \$25,000 (85-13 percent), professionals (83-15 percent), white collar workers (82-16 percent), union members (82-16 percent), Democrats (84-13 percent), political moderates (83-16 percent), and liberals (82-15 percent).

Now let me tick off another list of key groups: residents of the South (by 79-17 percent), residents of the West (80-17 percent), rural residents (77-19 percent), those 65 and over (73-22 percent), those with incomes \$35,000 and over (75-24 percent), those who voted for Ronald Reagan in 1980 (76-22 percent), Republicans (75-22 percent), and conservatives (76-21 percent). Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt about it: when you obtain such lopsided majorities on any issue, it is evident that there is a broad and deep consensus across the land.

In addition, we tested public attitudes toward six specific possible amendments to the Clean Air Act that we understand are being or may be considered by the Congress. Here are those results:

By 66-29 percent, a majority is opposed to relaxing "pollution standards to allow power plants to burn higher sulfur content oil and coal."

By 57-37 percent, a clear majority is also opposed to the federal government postponing "current deadlines for electric companies meeting power plant pollution standards." These results make evident that those electric utilities which are seeking any kind of relaxation of existing pollution standards are bucking public opinion. There is somewhat less opposition, although still a sizable majority, to postponing the imposition of new standards not yet in place.

By 61-34 percent, another big majority rejects the notion of relaxing "national air quality standards."

By a similar 61-36 percent, a majority would also oppose relaxing "regulations that protect national park and wilderness areas from air pollution."

By 58-38 percent, a majority is opposed to relaxing "current auto pollution standards."

Finally, by a closer 54-42 percent, a majority would oppose postponing "current deadlines for auto companies meeting auto pollution standards." Let me say that this last result indicates some sympathy by the American people with the plight of the American automobile industry. They are well aware that competition, especially from the Japanese, has caused severe hardship in that industry. But, as much as they would like to help the auto industry, people do not want to see delays in the industry meeting current deadlines on air pollution standards. Such relief, a majority feel, will have to come elsewhere.

The last piece of evidence from our surveys I would like to introduce here deals with an issue that has been much debated in connection with the Clean Air Act: the matter of putting cost considerations on EPA clean air standards. Here is the question we asked:

"The Clean Air Act does not permit the consideration of costs when setting standards for the protection of human health. The Reagan Administration is considering asking Congress to require that pollution standards designed to protect human health be relaxed if the costs are too high. Do you favor or oppose relaxing pollution standards affecting human health, if the costs are too high?"

By a resounding 65-32 percent, a substantial majority says they are opposed to any constraint on human health standards on cost grounds. It should be noted that Westerners are most strongly opposed (by 72-28 percent). Other groups strongly opposed are young people under 30 (by 72-27 percent), women (70-26 percent), those with incomes between \$15,000 and \$25,000 (70-28 percent), and white collar workers (69-31 percent).

But it should also be noted that over 60 percent of the residents of the Midwest, the South, and the East, as well as union members, independents, and political moderates all share this view. The closest divisions are among Republicans, who oppose cost constraints by 56-42 percent; conservatives, who feel the same by 56-41 percent; those who voted for President Reagan (by 56-41 percent); and those with incomes over \$35,000 (by 55-41 percent). These are relatively close divisions, but the key fact is that majorities of every group oppose any effort to put cost constraints on environmental regulations that protect human health.

In many ways, Mr. Chairman, these results speak for themselves. By any measure, they add up to a powerful message to Democrats and Republicans alike here in Congress: renew the Clean Air Act and don't do anything to it that would in any way make the air dirtier than it is now. While the public thinks that some regulation in other areas ought to be relaxed or even abolished, they will oppose vehemently any measure that might have the effect of reversing some of the environmental gains that have been made in the last ten years.

The American people are willing to make sacrifices in many areas to stop the miseries and ravages of inflation and an economy that is out of joint. But they will not tolerate any reductions in environmental clean-up efforts—and will regard such cuts as threatening the very quality of life in this last quarter of the twentieth century. I am not an expert on this legislation nor on the subject of environmental regulation, but I can tell you this: this message on the deep de-