

this advancement has also come a new potential for endangering lives and property and causing adverse environmental effects. With additional Federal regulations, I believe that we can minimize these dangers.

MEETING OUR ENERGY NEEDS

One of the highest priorities of my Administration during the coming year will be a concern for energy supplies—a concern underscored this winter by occasional fuel shortages. We must face up to a stark fact in America: we are now consuming more energy than we produce.

A year and a half ago I sent to the Congress the first Presidential message ever devoted to the energy question. I shall soon submit a new and far more comprehensive energy message containing wide-ranging initiatives to ensure necessary supplies of energy at acceptable economic and environmental costs. In the meantime, to help meet immediate needs, I have temporarily suspended import quotas on home heating oil east of the Rocky Mountains.

As we work to expand our supplies of energy, we should also recognize that we must balance those efforts with our concern to preserve our environment. In the past as we have sought new energy sources, we have too often damaged or despoiled our land. Actions to avoid such damage will probably aggravate our energy problems to some extent and may lead to higher prices. But all development and use of energy sources carries environmental risks, and we must find ways to minimize those risks while also providing adequate supplies of energy. I am fully confident that we can satisfy both of these imperatives.

GOING FORWARD IN CONFIDENCE

The environmental awakening of recent years has triggered substantial progress in the fight to preserve and renew the great legacies of nature. Unfortunately, it has also triggered a certain tendency to despair. Some people have moved from complacency to the opposite extreme of alarmism, suggesting that our pollution problems were hopeless and predicting impending ecological disaster. Some have suggested that we could never reconcile environmental protection with continued economic growth.

I reject this doomsday mentality—and I hope the Congress will also reject it. I believe that we can meet our environmental challenges without turning our back on progress. What we must do is to stop the hand-wringing, roll up our sleeves and get on with the job.

The advocates of defeatism warn us of all that is wrong. But I believe they underestimate this Nation's genius for responsive adaptability and its enormous reservoir of spirit.

I believe there is always a sensible middle ground between the Cassandras and the Pollyannas. We must take our stand upon that ground.

I have profound respect for the enormous challenge ahead, but I have even stronger respect for the capacity and character of the American people. Many of us have heard the adage that the last letters of the word, "American," say I can. I am confident that we can, and we will, meet our natural resource challenges.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, philosophically, the problem with Congress and the programs advanced by the party responsible for the legislation, reminds me at times of the treatment of a patient who, if he has a headache, would normally take one or two aspirins, but the congressional solution is to give him the whole bottle.

If it is desirable that he get more sun lamp treatment, instead of the prescribed 10 minutes or 20 minutes, he is kept under the lamp all day. It is the overprescribing for the ills—sometimes presumed ills—of the Nation which puts us in the bucket in which we find ourselves; namely, we are appropriating a lot more money than we are taking in, and we are even above the administration's deficits in its budget proposals by \$11 billion for this year, and for the coming fiscal year some \$27 billion. The money just is not there.

It is difficult because, as I said yesterday, we are all responsible. We voted for these things last year, and some of us will vote for them again. When they come before us after a veto, and the veto is not sustained, we go through the debt ceiling by our own legislation, and we contribute to inflation, which we collectively deplore. Then we face a congressional tax increase, which we always call "tax reform."

These are alternatives that have to be faced, and it is perfectly proper to say that we need to do some of this and some of that, for those; but if we overprescribe for the ills of the American people, we do not cure them; we simply make them a lot sicker.

This is the situation I think we ought to face.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Republican leader has just taken off on a flight into the wild blue yonder.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. That is what I said Congress was doing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, make it singular rather than plural. But I would point out that what this Congress has done—both Democrats and Republicans together—has been to reduce the President's budget request over the past 4 years by \$20.2 billion. That is what Congress did to the President's budget requests. During the same 4 years, the executive branch of the Government has created a deficiency of about \$104.3 billion.

So I think that what Congress has done is something for which we should give ourselves a little credit. We should not become the whipping boy or remain the whipping boy for all these allegations made about what spendthrifts we are, how we are throwing money away like a sailor, when the record will bear out the figures I have just given.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The trouble with figures is that they can be made to justify each of our arguments. The fact is that when Congress reduces the President's budget, it usually takes it out of the defense items and says we can get along with less, because we do not need as much security as we have. But the figures cannot be controverted when we see what Congress does by the end of the session. Yes, Congress reduces specific budget items here and there and in other places, but it also adds to the requests of the President many times more.

There is a theory up here that you can

cure anything by throwing money at it and that if the President recommends something, the best way to convince the voters that you are for it more than he is to double the recommendation.

I can only say that when Congress appropriates \$261 billion and the President's request is for \$250 billion, that is \$11 billion more than the President requested.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President, I think, he did not want us to double him on the social security figure; but once the bill was passed, he signed it and sent out notices. I understand, under his signature, which gave the impression that it was his doing and not that of Congress.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I think every President has sent out notices on social security or other matters over his signature. That is the way they are signed.

The President did recommend increases in social security, but he recommended that they be geared to the cost of living; and again Congress said, "We will up the ante." Of course, in upping the ante, we have increased the social security taxes in turn, which also is reflected in the total budget.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My recollection is that in addition to the 20-percent increase which Congress voted for and which the President signed, a cost-of-living factor also is included. I may be wrong about that, but that is my recollection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. The Senator is right. My point is that that is what the President recommended—the cost of living and some current increase in the social security payment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not use my 5 minutes, so I will yield to the Senator my remaining 3 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ANTIHIJACKING AGREEMENTS

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Secretary of State this morning, in referring to the United States-Cuban hijacking agreement, indicated that this country is exploring the possibility of the same kind of agreement with Algeria.

I express the hope that wherever countries have been acting as asylum for hijackers, similar agreements be sought in order that the incentive for hijackers to grab money, endanger people, and escape to another country can be removed by leaving them nowhere to go.

THE CEASE-FIRE IN LAOS

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, with regard to the cease-fire in Laos tonight, I am glad that that has