

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 30

DECEMBER 4, 1970, TO DECEMBER 10, 1970

(PAGES 39929 TO 41104)

Closely tied in with the Veterans of Foreign Wars organization is that of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States made up of wives, sisters, and daughters of members who belong to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Women who served in any of the female components of the Armed Services are also eligible to join the Auxiliary to the V.F.W. if they meet the overseas requirements. They participate in many of the community activities sponsored by the parent organization and through their own efforts have liberally donated funds for the maintenance of the orphans' home and have financed many community projects of their own. They have eased the loneliness and the discomfort of ailing veterans by visiting and entertaining those who are hospitalized. The Auxiliary also sponsors an essay contest for school children and awards winners financial help to further their education.

WASHINGTON AREA HIGHWAY POLICY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I would like to reiterate today my belief that Congress should not try to dictate highway policy for the Washington metropolitan area.

I strongly support the provisions of S. 4418, the Senate version of the 1970 Federal-Aid Highway Act, relating to freeway construction in the District of Columbia. S. 4418 does not require the District government to build any particular freeways. On the contrary, the bill would repeal section 23 of the 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act, the section which directed the District government to build the Three Sisters Bridge and to study the North Central Freeway and other proposed roads.

Section 23 represented the type of congressional intervention in local highway matters which would not be tolerated by the voters of any State. We cannot ever repair the damage this section has done to sensible planning and sound transportation development. Repeal of section 23, however, would be at least symbolically a step toward congressional self-restraint.

On the same grounds I am opposed to any new legislative efforts to direct, require or compel the District government to build the North Central Freeway or any other specific highways. The entire Federal-aid highway program has been based on the principle that decisions about specific roads and routes should be made by the individual States.

The District of Columbia should not be an exception to this rule.

I am particularly concerned about continuing efforts to hold the Metro system hostage to freeway construction. Metro is urgently needed. It is the first alternative to choking automobile congestion in the Washington area, and represents an unprecedented degree of regional cooperation and a massive regional financial commitment. Congress has repeatedly approved the Federal share of this vital project. I will continue to do everything I can to secure the local funds for the Metro system, free of any strings, ties, or conditions.

Mr. President, the transportation problems of the Washington area are very complex. Concerned citizens and elected

officials in the Maryland suburbs are currently reevaluating their own transportation needs and priorities, and the future of the Maryland connector to the proposed North Central Freeway is now very much in doubt. Given this situation, the North Central Freeway—if constructed at all—could turn out to be useless to use.

Congress should not bulldoze any freeways through the Nation's Capital. Rather, we should give full support to the mass transit system which the people of the region so clearly need and want, and should encourage the kind of coordinated planning which can bring a regional resolution of the region's highway needs.

THE THREAT OF PROTECTIONISM TO THE AMERICAN WORKER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the most pernicious myths about protectionism is that it helps the American worker. As the story is told, the worker stands to gain by cutting out competition from abroad, making his job more secure or even recapturing some of the foreign employment which went into those imports.

In fact, protectionism has been and always will be, clearly against the best interests of the American worker. And the protectionist trade bill before us now, far from preserving jobs or "protecting the worker," will cost him dearly in higher unemployment, reduced income, and even further inflation.

One need only look back to the dark days of the 1930's and the treacherous Smoot-Hawley tariff to see what a worldwide trade war can bring about. In a trade war, like any other war, there are no winners—only losers. And a bill which would destroy the civilized rules of international trade and invite wholesale retaliation upon American exports cannot help but usher in such a war.

The American worker is the most productive—and competitive—in the world. Our total exports are now running at an annual rate of some \$43 billion—up from \$21 billion before the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Some 3 or 4 million American jobs depend upon this enormous volume of exports. The Department of Labor has estimated 2.7 million jobs attributable simply to the export of merchandise. Agriculture Secretary Hardin estimated some 730,000 jobs from agricultural exports alone. And a very recent study by Dr. Anne Kruger, a professor of economics at the University of Minnesota, has calculated over a million jobs just in manufacturing directly or indirectly attributable to exports.

Dr. Kruger's calculations, for example, show 87,000 export-generated jobs in the iron and steel industry; 134,000 in transport equipment; 79,000 in fabricated metal products; 53,000 in chemicals; 138,000 in electrical machinery; 149,000 in nonelectric machines; and so on—including 47,900 jobs generated by exports in the yarn, textile, and apparel industry.

In my own State of Minnesota, in fact, a 1967 chamber of commerce study esti-

mated 38,000 jobs in manufacturing and 34,000 in agriculture attributable directly or indirectly to exports.

It is these workers—their jobs, their income, and their families—which we would jeopardize by overthrowing the international rules of trade and inviting a trade war with the rest of the world.

There is no way for other nations to buy from us if we do not also buy from them. There is no way for us to drastically cut back on their sales to us—in "what they do best"—without their having to cut back on our sales to them—of what we do best.

Perhaps we can rob Peter to pay Paul. We can, at a cost, close off foreign competition from industries which are becoming progressively less competitive on the world market. But let us look at the cost—to the American worker.

First of all, such a shortsighted approach jeopardizes the established procedures which we already have for dealing with dumping, foreign export subsidies, and other unfair and illegal acts of foreign competition. It goes around our procedures, consistent with the international rules of trade under the GATT, which have been set up to give protection or compensation in those cases where trade liberalization has resulted in proven injury to American workers or businesses. By rejecting such procedures, a trade barrier bill virtually precludes those legislative and administrative steps which are so necessary to improving and strengthening our antidumping, tariff adjustment, and other laws for the defense of the American worker.

We must aggressively defend our industries and our workers from unfair competition. We must do so better than we have in recent years. And there is room in such a defense for tariff and quota protection when other remedies have been exhausted. But to pass a bill in utter defiance of all existing procedures and of the international rules of trade is to throw away what chance we might now have for such progressive and responsive remedies.

Second, a preoccupation with protectionism ignores the fundamental structural problems which lie behind any industry losing its competitive edge in the world marketplace. It assumes that a trade barrier can maintain the industry for all time in the form it is today—or perhaps was 10 years ago. It even virtually discourages imaginative long-range steps to correct the problem through diversification, regional development, retraining, and other adjustments which are desperately needed to maintain the productivity of the industry and its workers.

As Victor Reuther, of the United Auto Workers, said:

Protection is like heroin. The first few shots really lift your spirits. But when you begin to build up tolerance, you need more. Pretty soon you live for that fix. You're hooked—and probably out of work.

I do not think for a moment that we can ignore the deeply disturbing and very human problem of unemployment—in any industry and for whatever cause. We cannot place slogans such as "comparative advantage" or "free trade" above

the plight of our workers. But to assume that the solution to their problems lies simply in a wholesale erection of trade barriers is to do a profound injustice to the complexity of the problem and, I think as well, to the workers themselves.

Third, we must look at the inevitable unemployment in industries which in fact are competitive in world markets and for that very reason will stand to bear the brunt of foreign retaliation.

Are we somehow less moved by the specter of lost jobs and income in export manufacturing? Is the Congress or the President now to become the broker, playing off a quota here for a job there? The very thought of trading one man's job for another's is repugnant to me—and I think to anyone. But even in this frightful numbers game, the worker will lose.

In manufacturing alone, there are 144,000 more jobs dependent upon exports than there could possibly be if all manufactured imports were choked off and those goods now produced by American workers. By figures of Dr. Kruger, we put seven highly productive export-dependent jobs on the block for every six jobs we could possibly protect or recapture by choking off imports.

What is more, the potential loss in income through a trade war is even more devastating. The average wage in key exporting industries such as machinery, engines and turbines, transportation equipment, and chemicals is more than half again as high as the wages paid in those industries now seeking quota barriers. To penalize a worker for his productivity hardly seems like a fair approach to any trade problem—real or imagined. But that, in effect, is what a trade war does.

Finally, the American worker suffers as a consumer. Last month we saw inflation once again zoom up—to an annual rate of over 7 percent. I do not want to belabor the economic policy argument at this time. That the average worker just got another chunk robbed from his paycheck before he even got it out of the envelope is by now an old story. But how, then, can anyone talk of "protecting" the American worker with quotas which are going to put another \$3 to \$4 billion a year on his shoe and apparel bills alone? Who is really being protected by a bill which would "lock in" an oil quota system at estimated yearly cost to the consumer of \$5 to \$7 billion? This is, in fact, a viciously anticonsumer trade bill we have before us—one which will put a regressive tax of over \$66 a year on the average American family, and probably even more on the lower-income worker who relies so heavily on imports to clothe his family.

The American worker is a consumer, perhaps above all else, and I fail to see the economic protection in a trade bill which can only fan the fires of inflation, rob the weekly paycheck, and fall most heavily upon those least able to pay.

I think it is absolutely clear that the interests of the American worker lie in fair, forward-looking trade policies which can meet the legitimate problems of import competition while continuing

to reward the magnificent productivity of the American worker through ever-expanding export markets.

A protectionist trade bill will lead to a worldwide trade war which can only jeopardize the jobs of 3 or 4 million workers and farmers, cost billions of dollars to the consumer, and throw away whatever bargaining power we might have had in crucial trade negotiations with Europe and Japan over the next decade.

It is time, perhaps, to stop talking protection. The protection in the pending quota bill is more like extortion.

I believe that the proposed legislation would be disastrous to the American worker, and I only hope that this threat is realized before the floodgates are opened and a tragic and unnecessary war is underway.

SENATOR MILLER'S KEYNOTE ADDRESS AT WATER POLLUTION SYMPOSIUM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) gave the keynote address on December 1 at the water pollution symposium during the 63d annual meeting of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, in Chicago.

In his address, Senator MILLER outlined the developments of our national policy on water pollution control and the actions the Federal Government is taking, especially in grants for construction of pollution control facilities and in research programs. He gave a good idea of the enormous problem of the disposal of both municipal and industrial waste.

He also called attention to the growing problem of the socioeconomic impact of cost sharing in water pollution control, especially the extent to which the cost should be borne by the people through taxes and to what extent by these people as consumers.

Those who are interested in the subject of water pollution control can obtain an up-to-date orientation by reading Senator MILLER's address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF U.S. SENATOR JACK MILLER

First I wish to commend the American Institute of Chemical Engineers for sponsoring this Water Pollution Symposium.

A review of the various topics being considered here cannot help but reassure those of us in government and the general public that your profession is moving dynamically, if not glamorously, to help our national policy to be achieved.

That national policy was formulated in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, in which it was stated that it is the "Policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research to devise and perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes which are not susceptible to known effective methods of treatment, and to provide Federal technical services to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities, in the formulation and exe-

cution of their stream pollution abatement programs."

This policy rests on recognition by the Congress of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the abatement of stream pollution.

The Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956 made permanent the national water pollution control program begun in 1948.

The Water Quality Act 1965, which I participated in drafting as a member of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution Control in 1963 and 1964, established the Water Pollution Control Administration and the procedures for determining and enforcing water quality standards. It also added another facet to our national policy. We made it clear that water quality standards to be developed should not be designed to merely lock in present uses of water or to exclude other uses; that they should not become a device to insure the lowest common denominator for water quality. Rather, the quality and productivity of our water resources are to be enhanced.

The Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966 authorized \$6 billion for federal sewage treatment construction grants running through the year 1972 plus \$25 million annually for five years specifically for grants and contracts for research, development, and demonstration of advanced waste treatment and water purification methods; also, for development and demonstration of new or improved methods of joint treatment systems for municipal and industrial wastes.

Finally, the Water Quality Act of 1970 provides for research relating to the discharge of so-called "hazardous substances" into streams and enforcement procedures which extend to federal agencies and federal licensees, such as urban renewal projects, and power plants licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Power Commission. Any applicant for a Federal permit or license to construct or operate any facility which may result in any discharge into the navigable waters of the United States must now provide certification from the State in which the discharge originates that such facilities or related activities can be expected to comply with applicable water quality standards. Problems of acid and other mine drainage pollution are also covered by this new law, as is pollution by vessels and offshore facilities.

From this capsule review, you can see that the laws of the federal government have moved rapidly and comprehensively towards achievement of our national policy. And the laws and regulations of state and local governments have been moving too, I might add.

Inseparable to the success of our water pollution control programs is the financing. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 provides for writing off the cost of a certified pollution control facility acquired or constructed after December 31, 1968, over a period of 60 months. This, of course, will generally enable taxpayers to recoup the cost over a shorter period of time than through depreciation deductions. However, it does not mean a real tax cut in the long run—such as the investment tax credit did, for example.

The major financing problem concerns federal appropriations for grants to states and municipalities. The size of the problem is staggering. There are nearly 13,000 sewer communities containing nearly 70 percent of our nation's population. Seven percent of these have no sewage treatment at all, and only 40 percent of all treatment systems are currently adequate. Over 1,000 communities outgrow their treatment systems every year. These figures are based on an inventory of municipal waste facilities made in 1968.

The Secretary of Interior early in 1968, pursuant to a directive from the Congress,