

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 33

DECEMBER 28, 1970, TO JANUARY 2, 1971

(PAGES 43589 TO 44876)

integrity of fine steel; compassionate; just; and so much more.

For countless deeds of immeasurable worth, and for a whole man dedicated to all men, we are proud to join our fellow citizens in saying, "Thank you, Senator."

#### GOOD JOB, SENATOR

On that election night in 1957 when Ralph Yarborough was first elected to serve as United States Senator, a local lobbyist visited the Yarborough Headquarters where a crowd of jubilant supporters were celebrating the victory. Later in the evening he told members of the Capitol Press Corps:

"It was amazing. There wasn't a big shot down there—nothing but people."

Throughout his 13 years in Washington, where memories are often notoriously short, Yarborough never forgot that he was "the people's Senator." The legislation he authored, sponsored or fought for was always in the best interest of all the people—not the rich or powerful special interest groups greedy for personal-gain legislation.

As one of "the people," I was proud to "welcome home" Senator and Mrs. Yarborough at the Tuesday night appreciation dinner. The "big shots" were there, too, this time—but they were the kind of big shots who share the Senator's concern for the needs of the people.

It was a proud and happy occasion for "the people"—proud and happy despite the election defeat—because it gave them a chance to say, in person, "Good Job, Senator Yarborough!" I can only echo that sentiment, Senator, for all the voiceless people you represented so untiringly.—Claire Jones

#### 'BY HIS DEEDS . . .

Some of Sen. Ralph Yarborough's accomplishments in his thirteen years in the United States Senate:

#### EDUCATION

Co-Author: National Defense Education Act.

Author: Bi-Lingual Education Act.  
Author: Professors' Emeritus Act.  
Senatorial Author: Yarborough-Carey Education Media Act.

Co-Author: Library Extension Act.  
Co-Author: Higher Education Facilities Act.

Co-Author: Vocational Education Acts of 1963 and 1968.

Co-Author: Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Author, Co-Author, or Principal Sponsor of every major educational bill to be passed by Congress since 1958.

#### HEALTH

Actively supported the Drug Industry Act which prevents such drugs as Thalidomide from being allowed on the American market.

Author: Community Mental Health Centers Law.

Author: Hospital Construction and Modernization Act.

Author: Migrant Health Act.

Author: Allied Health Manpower Training Act.

Author: Schools of Public Health Act.

Author: Medical Libraries Assistance Act.

Author: Regional Medical Programs.

Author: Communicable Disease Control Act.

Author, Co-Author or Principal Sponsor of all major health bills to pass Congress since 1958.

#### CRIME CONTROL

Active supporter of every crime control bill to pass Congress since 1957.

#### CONSERVATION AND PUBLIC WORKS

Author: Padre Island National Seashore Park.

Senate Author: Guadalupe National Park.

Senate Author: Alibates National Monument Act.

Principal Author: Big Thicket National Park and Amistad Dam Recreation Bill. (Now pending.)

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Yarborough helped obtain funding for dams, waterways and harbor and channel projects all over Texas.

Author or Working Co-Sponsor of all major conservation bills to pass Congress since 1958.

#### POLLUTION CONTROL

Co-author: Clean Air Act.

Co-author: Air Quality Control Act.

Co-author: Water Pollution Control Act.

Principal Author: Bill to plan U.S. participation in 1972 United Nations Conference on Human Environment. (Pending.)

#### AGRICULTURE

Yarborough has been Author, Working Co-Sponsor, or Active Supporter of all major and conservation measures since 1957.

Yarborough is a member of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

#### VETERANS

Author: Cold War G.I. Bill.

Author: Bill to build 760-bed Veterans Hospital in San Antonio.

Author: amendments which increased Veteran's benefits under G.I. Bill.

Author of Working Co-Sponsor of all major veterans bills affecting education and hospitalization to pass Congress since 1958.

#### SPACE

He has actively worked for all major space authorizations and appropriations since 1958.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

Working Co-Sponsor: Medicare and Medicaid.

Active Supporter: Housing for the Aged.

Active Supporter: 15% increase in Social Security.

Active Worker or Co-Sponsor of all major legislation to expand and improve Social Security.

#### TAX REFORM

He was working Co-Sponsor of Amendment to increase personal income tax exemption from \$600 to \$1,000 (Congress compromised on \$750.)

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

He supported the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

He co-authored bills which launched the War on Poverty program. He voted for the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Because of his profound belief in the concept of neighborhood schools, Yarborough voted against busing as a means to achieve school integration.

#### THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN TRADE POLICIES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the protectionist trade bills of the 91st Congress are dead, but the forces of protectionisms, I very much fear, are merely dormant.

An awakening of millions of Americans to the dangers of these bills—the emergence of vigorous Senate opposition to a reenactment of the Smoot-Hawley debacle—and the last minute Senate logjam all combined to turn aside legislation which would have ushered in an inevitable and disastrous trade war.

But I am not so certain that such good fortune will prevail in the year ahead. The economy continues its downward plunge—always an inviting climate for self-defeating but politically attractive trade barriers. The textile industry, in the face of all facts to the contrary, continues to claim great injury due to imports. The negotiations with Japan continue at an impasse, hampered by in-

transigence on both sides. And most important, the President persists in supporting quotas on textiles in spite of this year's near tragic lesson which should prove beyond any doubt the impossibility of giving quota protection to a single industry as part of a political payoff while denying that protection to dozens of other equally or far more deserving industries.

It is for these reasons that I think we must take sober stock of the disaster we so narrowly averted this year and of the positive steps which must be taken now to avoid a repeat—with a less happy ending—of the situation next year.

#### NEW TRADE LEGISLATION

First of all, we must seize the legislative initiative in proposing a responsive, forward-looking trade bill in the next Congress. Only a vigorous, expansionary offensive in the trade field can ward off the protectionist bills which inevitably lurk in the congressional wings.

Those of us who opposed this year's protectionist legislation must respond now by providing a model of the kind of trade legislation which can meet the legitimate problems of our domestic industries and the need for an expansion of American export opportunities.

The escape clause must be liberalized in order to meet the objectives for which it was created in the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. None of us deny the occasional harsh reality of injury due to foreign competition. Higher tariffs and perhaps even quotas may at times be part of such relief. But we cannot loosen up the escape clause to the degree that we saw this year. Nor can we afford to tie the hands of the President, as these bills did, in the determination of appropriate relief.

Adjustment assistance, too, must be made more responsive to firms and workers in industries whose competitive edge is declining. The purpose of adjustment assistance is to protect the livelihood of the worker and promote the kind of adjustments needed to find new skills, new products, new techniques, and new markets without throwing up trade barriers and denying to all countries the benefits of regional specialization.

We must move forward in the elimination of some of our own remaining trade barriers, particularly the nontariff barriers in which our hands are little—if any—cleaner than many of our major trading partners. The utterly indefensible American selling price system which the House voted, to its credit, to eliminate should be the first to go.

And we must pass legislation not to overthrow the civilized rules of international trade—the GATT—but to strengthen our bargaining hand within those rules and to enable us to protect and pursue our legitimate interests in international trade negotiations. Europe, the Common Market, British entry, and the Common Agricultural Policy, for example, pose enormous problems for American trade. It is to these problems that our efforts should be directed, rather than to a preoccupation with Asian imports and the admittedly indefensible but steadily improving trade policies of Japan.

## USE EXISTING REMEDIES

In the meantime, the administration must begin to achieve some of these ends with the tools it already has on hand. Tragically, much of the impetus for protectionist trade legislation has stemmed not from the inadequacy of the laws now on the books but from the inadequacy of their administration. We could move aggressively, now, within the international rules of trade to force an end to unfair foreign competition and undue foreign restrictions on our own exports.

Under article XXIII of the GATT, we are given retaliatory power over countries which maintain illegal quotas against our products. I urge the administration to use this great bargaining lever in forcing a reduction of illegal foreign barriers to our trade.

Under the Antidumping Act, we can impose special duties on products which enter the United States at prices below those prevailing in the exporting country. The recent case against the Japanese TV's was an example of successful use of this device, but it has not been the potent weapon which it could be.

Under the Tariff Act of 1930, the President can impose countervailing duties to protect against unfair competition from subsidized foreign exports. Given the frequency of this complaint among those who urge U.S. trade barriers, it is strange that so little use has been made of this authority. If the law is truly insufficient, let us strengthen it. If, as I suspect, it has simply gone unused, let us seize upon this perfectly legal and legitimate weapon and use it to eliminate the obvious inequities of foreign export subsidies.

Under section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act, duties can be raised and, for agricultural products, quotas levied against nations which impose illegal restrictions against our products. Again, here is authority—legal and on the books—to get at the very problems which the protectionists are using to support their demand for U.S. trade barriers that would invite legal retaliation against us and simply exacerbate whatever problems may exist.

Mr. President, I cite these various devices to illustrate the great range of options open now to our administration if it is truly serious about meeting the legitimate grievances of our own industries and workers allegedly suffering from unfair foreign competition or trade barriers. It is time for the United States to move aggressively to defend its interests in international trade negotiations. We do need to bring pressure to bear upon nations who have lagged behind our lead in the trade liberalizations of the last decade.

But, Mr. President, let us use the great authority which we now have to force fairness from other nations. Let us not degrade our magnificent record on trade by stooping to barriers and quotas which fly in the face of all economic reason.

## TEXTILES AND SHOES

Finally, we must find a way to resolve the problems—real and imagined—of the shoe and textile industries.

The problems of the shoe industry are due for an administrative decision in the immediate future, and the President

has promised a comprehensive program to deal with the difficulties faced by this industry. In light of recent studies, I doubt whether quota protection will or should be advanced as the "solution." But certain firms and segments of the industry are ailing, and the Government owes them some responsive action.

The question of textiles is purely political—but perhaps that is the most difficult question of all. There is no doubt that the industry has failed to make any credible case for injury. In fact, it is significant that they have steadfastly refused to submit a case for escape clause review.

In fairness to the industry, they have been encouraged by the Administration into believing that quotas were not only possible but justifiable. Particularly in times of great economic difficulties—totally unrelated to foreign competition—it is not surprising to find an industry convincing itself that quota protection would be a good thing.

But a political deal kept alive by the anxieties of workers in a recession economy is not the stuff from which world trade policies should be developed.

The first thing we must do is to get out from under the thumb of our own textile industry in the attempts to reach a negotiated settlement with Japan. There is no doubt that the industry has done everything possible to sabotage any feasible settlement under the realization that such a settlement would mean the end of their chances to get legislated quotas. When I made this point on the floor a short time ago there was an outcry of denial from many of my colleagues, but I hope that Secretary Stans' news conference of December 23, reported in the press on December 24, should dispel any lingering doubt about the stand and the role of the textile industry in these talks. And it is perfectly clear that until the President declares his political debts paid in full and ends the charade of advocating quotas on textiles only, there will be no settlement.

Mr. President, we can, I am convinced, reach an accord with Japan if both sides—ours included—give a little and stand up to their domestic industries in behalf of a rational world trade policy.

At the same time, I propose that the question of textile imports be referred to the Tariff Commission—as any case should be which claims injury, and especially one which is apparently claiming injury greater than that felt by any other industry. Whatever facts and recommendations are then put forth by the Tariff Commission can form the basis either of a negotiated settlement if one has not yet been reached, or a Presidential determination of appropriate remedy as is standard in such cases, or needed legislation if it does appear that existing authority is incapable of relieving the problems of that industry.

## ADMONITION TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. President, we have been subjected to what may yet turn out to be an expensive lesson. I hope it has been learned well by the administration. But I also hope that it has been learned as well by our major trading partners.

To these nations—to their governments, ambassadors, and trade negotiators—I say: Put your houses in order before the tide of protection peaks again, because there may be no stopping another time.

Unless trading policies of other nations are turned around—and I am speaking primarily to the European Community and primarily of their agricultural trade policies—there will be a worldwide trade war. How it will start or what nation will precipitate it I do not know. But all will lose.

We cannot sit by—I cannot sit by—while our farmers, the most productive in the world, suffer from increasing discrimination at the hands of the common agricultural policy of the European Community. Many European governments reacted with fear and righteous anger to the prospect of a protectionist trade bill from our country. Their fear and anger may well have been justified, but their righteousness was not. They are in no small way responsible for the disaster which was very nearly upon us, and I hope they will now see the need for pursuing more equitable and sensible trade policies themselves.

And my warning must also apply to the Japanese. Those of us in the liberal trade community can hardly continue to admonish only our own administration for its capitulation to political pressures while the Japanese Government continues to be manipulated by its own "textile-industrial complex." There are lessons from this past year for the Japanese, as well, and I hope they will take heed.

Generally, I think that postmortems are best left to football games and bridge hands. But I do not think the death of the 1970 protectionist trade legislation should go unnoticed. Only great effort and more than a little luck kept us from enacting dangerous trade legislation this year.

Next year, the forces for progressive and expansionary trade policies must take the offensive. With the continued support of citizens and farm groups, workers and businesses, and with clear leadership from the administration, I think we can not only avert a trade war but also respond to the remaining problems of international trade and the legitimate grievances of American workers and industries.

## ON THE DEPARTURE OF ALBERT GORE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this is a nostalgic week of farewells in the Senate, as we pay our respects to departing colleagues. In each case, I have found it hard to say goodby, but in no case has the task been more painful than that of ALBERT GORE.

For 32 years, ALBERT GORE has faithfully served the people of Tennessee in the Congress, 14 of them in the House of Representatives and 18 in the Senate. He, himself, sums up his service with only three lines in the latest edition of the Congressional Directory. His admirers cannot leave it at that.

Someone has described ALBERT GORE as a Senator in the grand tradition, one