

U.S. CONGRESS

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 5

MARCH 9, 1971, TO MARCH 16, 1971

(PAGES 5461 TO 6806)

As Secretary of Defense, I seek your understanding and your support for our new Strategy and want to assure you that I will continue to work with this Committee and other Committees of the Congress to advance the goals we share in common in seeking to serve the best interests of the American people.

A RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIBLE ALTERNATIVE TO PROTECTIONISM

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, on February 17, I had the honor of cosponsoring along with seven other Senators the International Trade Act of 1971.

I feel this act is extremely significant as an attempt to answer—responsively and responsibly—the frustrations and fear which lie behind much of our recent protectionist sentiment, while maintaining an emphasis on expansionary trade policies to serve the coming decades.

I invite the attention of Senators to a number of editorials which were written in support of this concept. While none of us are wedded to every clause of this bill, we do feel that it at least presents a model and an alternative toward which to focus what ought to be the mutual concerns of business, labor, the consumer, and those industries fearing growing import competition.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials, published in the New York Times, the Washington Star, and the Scripps-Howard newspapers, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 24, 1971]

TOWARD FREER TRADE

Congressional debate over the nation's foreign trade policies could take a decidedly constructive turn this year. The opportunity is provided by the introduction of a forward-looking trade bill by a bipartisan group of senators led by Democrats Mondale of Minnesota and Harris of Oklahoma and Republican Javits of New York.

Last year, discussion of trade policy was dominated by demands for protectionist measures from a variety of industrial and labor groups. The administration followed a wavering course, the President speaking broadly about the beauties of free trade but calling for textile quotas. The bill that emerged from the House Ways and Means Committee and won House approval would have legislated quotas on both textile and shoe imports, and would have made it easier to clamp quotas on many other foreign goods. The champions of free trade, including almost all the nation's economists, were on the defensive throughout, winning only when the restrictive bill died in the final Senate logjam.

The protectionists will be back at it in the new session, possibly making an early attempt to tack the dormant bill onto a piece of "must" legislation, like the Social Security increase. But at some point in the inevitable legislative maneuvering, Congress should give careful thought to the approaches recommended by the free-trade bloc of senators.

The new bill shifts the emphasis to efforts to expand, rather than contract, America's international commerce, by such means as giving the President more power to combat unfair trade policies of other countries. Our exporters would receive tax advantages, and

steps would be taken to increase trade with Eastern Europe. At the same time, American industries and workers would get additional protection from unfair foreign competition, and would receive easier aid in cases where competition has caused suffering.

Probably the technical changes in our trade laws require further study. The administration should join in the search for positive alternatives to the protectionist measures that have threatened to involve us in a trade war and to hurt our diplomatic standing around the world. And Representative Mills' Ways and Means Committee should take a fresh look at the provisions it espoused last year, including in the equation our impending recovery from a recession that has spurred the protectionist cause.

The free-trade senators have given their colleagues a chance to raise the level of debate about the nation's traditionally enlightened role in world commerce. The arguments now should revolve around the merits of expanding trade, rather than the supposed necessity of isolating our markets.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 22, 1971]

NEW TWIST ON TRADE

With so much pressure being exerted on behalf of special-interest trade legislation, it comes as something of a surprise that a new trade bill has been introduced with the interests of the consumer in mind.

A group of free-trade senators led by Fred R. Harris, D-Okla., Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., and Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., are backing a proposal which would:

Require the President and the Federal Tariff Commission to consider the impact on consumers before imposing import restrictions on foreign products.

Give the President new power to reduce tariffs on foreign goods if similar concessions are made on American products sold abroad.

Expand the President's power to retaliate against countries which indulge in dumping, subsidization and other unfair trade practices.

Offer additional Federal aid to workers and companies seriously hurt by foreign competition.

The proposal—which also would authorize carefully controlled trade agreements with communist countries—is intended to encourage foreign trade rather than restrict it.

This contrast with the protectionist trade bill in the last Congress which proposed import quotas on textiles and shoes, fixed quotas on oil and possible limitations on other products.

Basically, the United States stands to lose if trade barriers go up around the world. Our exports exceeded our imports by \$2.7 billion last year.

The bill introduced in the Senate the other day deserves special commendation.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1971]

REGAINING THE TRADE INITIATIVE

The Mills bill, the most protectionist trade legislation since the disastrous Smoot-Hawley Act of 1920, was blocked in the last session of Congress by a determined group of liberal traders in the Senate, aided by the Senate logjam resulting from Senator Long's folly in seeking to couple Social Security liberalization, welfare reform and trade.

Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee has now reintroduced his bill, complete with import quotas on textiles, shoes and—via a trigger mechanism—a long list of other goods.

Aware of European warnings of "inevitable reprisals," Mr. Mills appears to lack ardor for his own measure. And the Nixon Administration would prefer less protectionist

legislation, although the President is still determined to make good on his commitment to the textile industry to restrict Japanese imports. The White House continues to see the Mills bill as a useful bargaining weapon in its effort—unsuccessful to date—to get the Japanese to accept "voluntary" textile quotas.

It was Mr. Nixon's decision to seek legislated textile quotas that opened the Pandora's box for quota protection for other industries. The White House hopes to avoid a rerun of last year's fiasco by making a deal with Japan that would eliminate compulsory textile quotas from the trade bill. Even barring that, it hopes through Tariff Commission action to blunt the support of the shoe industry for import quotas.

Whatever the outcome of the moves, it is obvious that the American oil industry intends to cling to its highly restrictive import quotas, the steel industry to its voluntary quotas and the textile industry to its demands for one kind or the other. Other industries are bound to demand similar protection unless the Administration makes a real fight for liberal trade policies.

Tired of waiting for the Administration to match its actions to its liberal trade rhetoric, three Senators—Harris of Oklahoma, Javits of New York and Mondale of Minnesota—are planning to seize the initiative by introducing a trade bill of their own. Their bill would give the President authority to bargain for mutual reduction of both tariff and nontariff barriers; it would increase his ability to retaliate against unfair trade practices by others, and it would aim at building a more effective program of adjustment assistance for firms and workers hurt by rising imports.

Just as foreign governments helped to slow down the drive for American protectionism by threatening retaliation last year, they could now augment the effort for a renewed United States liberal trade initiative by showing their readiness to respond in kind.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. BROOKE, Mr. President, one of the least conspicuous Presidential commissions presently operating in Washington is the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Charged with the responsibility of planning and implementing a nationwide celebration of our 200th anniversary, the Commission has offered its plan to the Nation in its report submitted to the President on July 4, 1970. It is now in the process of implementing these plans in a way meaningful to all Americans.

Mr. Kevin Phillips' recent article published in the Washington Post outlines the unique opportunities presented by our national bicentennial. The Commission is actively seeking the advice and guidance of everyone in carrying out its mission. I hope that Mr. Phillips' piece will offer a clear understanding of the dimensions and importance of our 200th anniversary commemoration.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

BICENTENNIAL CHANCE

(By Kevin P. Phillips)

President Nixon's decision to spend \$800 million to employ 225,000 welfare recipients in public service jobs is a good beginning, but it is not enough. This country needs—

and can greatly profit from—additional public employment.

Nor is it necessary to resort to make-work. Few decades in our history have offered the opportunity that the 1970s do for a massive, yet useful public works and employment program—a Heritage Works and Projects Administration (HWPA, if you will) geared to preparing for the nation's Bicentennial in 1976.

Right now, the potential of the multi-billion dollar Bicentennial is not being realized. In its early stages, Bicentennial programming was caught up in the windstream of the urban and poverty-profiteer talk about festivals of the "Living Process of Urban Development" and the like. The original plan of Philadelphia, the principal Bicentennial city, called for putting hundreds of millions of Bicentennial dollars into 76 "neighborhood action" programs centered in minority group areas. That was dropped last year, and the blacks are angry. The President of the West Philadelphia NAACP, the Rev. Wycliffe Jangdharrie, has threatened to block the celebration "in every manner short of bombing the buildings or site" unless the neighborhood money is restored.

For both cultural and economic reasons, the Bicentennial opportunity is too precious to dissipate in this manner. Philadelphia will be presenting the President with a new Bicentennial proposal in April, and Mr. Nixon should take the occasion to rethink the entire planning for 1976.

The Bicentennial can serve America better, and provide a base for large-scale, public employment, if it is given a new thrust—securing, repairing, and cataloguing our national heritage. From Maine to California, there are historic sites and buildings to be restored and repaired; old villages, factories, farmsteads and ports to be researched and then reconstructed as they once were; wild rivers, national parks and scenic areas to be improved or cleaned up; and historic books and guides to be written to catalogue every facet of Americana—local history, architecture, folkways, ethnology, agriculture, industry—for the nation's 200th birthday.

At present, there is no exhaustive, up-to-date guidebook to these many aspects of America. The WPA compendiums produced during the Nineteen-Thirties, only a beginning even in their day, are now increasingly obsolescent. What better occasion for a new "national catalogue" effort than the Bicentennial?

In many ways, technology is hurtling our society away from the past at an ever-increasing rate, and old buildings, artifacts, folkways and recollections must be preserved and reconstructed now if we are ever to do so. Historical societies and volunteer groups cannot bear the brunt alone.

Launching a major federal effort to recapture our physical and cultural past would have many corollary benefits. First, it would provide important skilled employment for many of the engineers, researchers, academicians and other professional persons thrown out of work by the current economic slump. Second, it would provide many construction jobs, plus unskilled labor opportunities, across the nation. And young people, the age group most affected by unemployment, could profit—not just in dollars—by spending time in a National Heritage Corps that worked on everything from rebuilding old forts and villages to cleaning up polluted riverways and improving the national parks system.

Furthermore, it would be logical to spend a fair portion of the money in Appalachia, from Maine to Georgia. The Appalachian region, in general, is not just among the poorest sections of the United States; it also happens to be the historically rich frontier of the struggling young nation of 1776. By redevelopment of the old villages, forts, handicrafts, folkways, byways, parks and

scenic vistas of the area, Appalachia would receive a badly needed infusion of cash plus the basis for the only profitable industry its resources and location can support—tourism.

The Bicentennial is not just a great moment, but also a great opportunity for America, and the President should seize it and utilize it to the full.

WILLIS TOBLER—THE DEAN OF THE AGRICULTURAL LOBBYISTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, too often the word lobbyist invokes visions of smoke-filled rooms and little brown bags bulging with money, but this is far from the truth. I have always felt that special interest groups as well as just plain citizens have a right and a duty to inform Members of Congress regarding the impact that a particular piece of legislation will have on them. In fact Congress rarely errs because these groups provide too much information, but can make a mistake because too little information is available as to how a particular measure will affect a given segment of our society.

To my mind, the epitome of the helpful, unassuming, and effective lobbyist is a gentleman it has been my pleasure to know since my early days in the Senate. His name is Willis Tobler, and he is a legislative adviser to the National Milk Producers Federation, a role he assumed after many years as the organization's legislative director.

An article appearing recently in Dairy news, the publication of a New York dairy cooperative, tells just why Mr. Tobler is so effective. The article is simply an interview with this dean of agricultural lobbyists. In it, Mr. Tobler makes clear that to be persuasive a lobbyist should present all pertinent facts, pro and con, know the subject matter, avoid a hardsell approach, and not mix business with pleasure. If more Washington lobbyists followed this advice, Congress would work more efficiently in the interests of all the people, and the business of lobbying would have a better reputation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

AN INTERVIEW WITH DEAN OF AG LOBBYISTS,
WILLIS TOBLER

(By Jim Atkins)

(Willis Tobler of the National Milk Producers Federation is known as the dean of agricultural lobbyists on Capitol Hill. For many years he headed up lobbying operations for the Federation, and now is a legislative advisor to National Milk Producers Federation. No man knows more about farm legislation than Tobler.)

ATKINS. How long have you been a lobbyist?

TOBLER. For almost 30 years. I started out with the American Farm Bureau Federation and, in 1949, became legislative representative for the National Milk Producers Federation.

ATKINS. We hear and read a lot about lobbyists and their influence on Congress. What about it?

TOBLER. They do have some influence—not so much as individuals but primarily because of the organization or group that they represent. Depending upon his facts and the manner of presenting such facts, a lobbyist

as an individual does have some influence in achieving the objectives of his employer either for or against some legislative issue. However, it is the "grass roots" power that really has the influence in Congress. The lobbyist is the conduit through which this influence is directed.

ATKINS. Just what is your style of lobbying?

TOBLER. I use the person-to-person "softsell" approach. I spend as much time as possible in personal visits with members of Congress—many times with no reference to any legislative issues. I do not wait until I have some issue to discuss before I make a visit. Before I can be effective, I must have the trust and confidence of members of Congress. I get their trust and confidence by telling them the whole truth. I try to present all pertinent facts, both pro and con, with the hope that my arguments are persuasive in carrying out my responsibilities.

ATKINS. What legislative victory are you most proud of? I know you have had a part in every farm bill passed by Congress over the past 25 years. But can you mention just one or two of the top ones?

TOBLER. One of my biggest satisfactions was winning an increase in dairy price support under the Eisenhower Administration while there was a Democrat-controlled Congress. Nearly everyone said it did not have a chance. But we got it.

Another thrill was in connection with the school milk program. Since 1954, the program has always been extended for periods of two, three, or four years. Recently, however, efforts were made to kill the program by refusing to provide any funds in the budget.

It was an exhilarating experience to have been a part in succeeding in obtaining not only an extension of the program but to make the authority permanent. Furthermore, following this victory and securing funds to operate the program, statements were made that only poor children would be eligible for the one-half pint of milk under the program, leaving "near-poor" children discriminated against and set apart. In other words, the program was to one of welfare instead of nutrition as in the past. After many weeks of silence, an announcement was made that the program will continue under the funds appropriated to be operated as in the past. A fight long to be remembered.

ATKINS. What changes have you seen over the past 30 years?

TOBLER. The biggest change, involving the Congress, is the tremendous decline in the number of rural congressional districts. According to a recent study, only 31 districts out of the 435 in the House of Representatives are rural-defined where 25% or more of the population in the district live on a farm or in small towns of less than 2,500 people.

To pinpoint the situation, the study further shows that in the House Committee on Agriculture with 34 members only 20 are in districts where 10% or more of the population are farmers, with the remaining 14 less than 10%. This situation means that in order to pass major farm legislation it must have some appeal to the urban members of Congress. Although the agricultural segment of our economy is not all powerful as in the past, it still has considerable influence—it just has to work harder and be more united.

ATKINS. What advice do you have for lobbyists?

TOBLER. Let us say suggestions instead of advice. Know your subject matter. If there is some item or fact that you do not know—admit it—but get it. Do not use a high-pressure approach—the "softsell" is much more effective. Be seen. The more time spent on the Hill, the more you will be recognized, maybe not always by name, but so that a member of Congress will stop to chat a moment with you as you walk through the Capitol Building and congressional office buildings. Do not mix