

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 31

DECEMBER 11, 1970, TO DECEMBER 17, 1970

(PAGES 41105 TO 42328)

been married, has always lived at home and worked to support her mother and father. Miss Brown worked for the textile mill for more than 20 years. She has lived within walking distance of the mill and has never owned an automobile. When the mill closed, she looked elsewhere. There are no jobs nearby. There was a job available in a distant town, but Miss Brown cannot drive and had no transportation to the job. She is presently unemployed.

Let us take a look at another example. Mrs. Smith had worked in the textile plant for 19 years. Her husband still works there. He is one of the last 16 employees kept on for maintenance, but he knows his job will terminate soon.

Mrs. Smith has worked hard all her life to raise three children. Mrs. Smith managed to put a daughter in college. She is trying to help that daughter stay in college, but it is only because of a scholarship that she is able to be there at all. Here is what Mrs. Smith said:

I'm taking home \$51 a week at my new job. I drive 35 to 40 miles a day. At my job in the mill here, I was taking home \$100 to \$103 a week. Textiles is all I know, and it's hard for all of us in this town to adjust to other jobs. About 30 to 40 per cent of the people at the plant had a good amount of seniority. But most of all there were so many women here who made good livings. They were close to home and were able to cook supper after they got off work. Now I drive six people to my new job. It's late when we get home and have to start cooking. I wish there were some way we could get our plant back or get a good industry in this town.

Mrs. Smith insists that she does not want a handout. She said:

If you have ever been to Aragon, you know most of us here are pretty independent.

The Mrs. Smiths of my State do not want a handout. They do want guaranteed incomes. They just want an opportunity to work and make a living and be productive citizens. They have a right to feel that the government is on their side, and not working at cross-purposes to them.

It must have been ludicrous for people who have lost their jobs because of foreign imports to see the Congress enact a \$9.5 billion bill last Thursday for manpower training and to provide public service jobs for those who cannot find work in private industry.

I can see how this would be hard to understand, when the Government does not act to protect a basic American industry that is capable of providing thousands of more jobs, if given the chance.

Where is the logic in trying to protect the American worker with a minimum wage and then have him done out of a job because of unlimited textile imports from countries that produce goods at an hourly wage of 11 to 45 cents an hour, under conditions that would be illegal in the United States?

Where is the logic in putting through a multi-billion-dollar manpower development and make-work program when the government itself persists in pursuing a policy of job-destruction?

I hope that Members of the Senate will consider the forgotten American. I hope

Senators will not forget that the basic and overriding issue in this debate is jobs.

The Senate, to its great credit, has voted for the past two years in favor of American jobs on this issue. In 1968, the Senate voted 55 to 31 for import quotas on textiles. Last year, the Senate passed a similar measure, 65 to 30. These were strong votes that reflected deep concern for American jobs that are being swept away by foreign imports.

We have had a similar significant showing from the House of Representatives. This year a sizable majority, 256 Members, of the House signed bills calling for controls on textile and footwear imports.

Last Thursday night, on national television, the President of the United States said the key question on the trade bill is jobs. He said his primary concern is saving jobs in America.

That is my concern. That is the purpose of this legislation.

We have had a tremendous show of force and mounting concern about the import problem. The time has now come to stop just talking about protecting American jobs and just lamenting unemployment.

We have now an opportunity to do something about it. We can act through this legislation to protect millions of American jobs and an industry that is second only to steel in terms of national security.

I hope the Senate will do so.

LAKE POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the funding of section 5 of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, providing for research and development in lake pollution control, in the supplemental appropriations bill.

I have long been interested in these programs, and I appreciate the attention which the committee has given the budget request.

The report of the Senate Public Works Committee on the Water Quality Improvement Act stated, with reference to the inland lakes research provision:

The committee expects that funds to implement the provision of this new research directive shall be made available from the general section 5 authorization and that implementation of this area of research will receive a high priority.

Since this act was signed into law after the Interior Department's budget request was formulated and after the House had begun its work, neither the administration's request nor the House appropriations bill took into consideration this particular section authorizing \$65 million a year for this and the eight other research and development subsections.

In August, during the Senate committee and floor consideration of the public works appropriations bill, I joined with the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) and a bipartisan group of 15 other Senators in expressing concern that no funds had been requested for these vital programs.

I was most appreciative of the favorable comments of the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Subcom-

mittee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) in colloquy with Senator NELSON on the Senate floor during the August 21 debate.

The supplemental budget for the four new pollution control research programs in section 5 was sent up in September, requesting \$11,885,000, including \$1,985,000 for inland lake programs. For all of section 5, the U.S. water pollution control research and development program, \$65 million was authorized, and \$59,166,000 has been requested by the administration in the supplemental. I appreciate the committee's action in appropriating the full budget request for inland lakes, and \$59 million for all of section 5, and I applaud the Senate's approval.

I feel very strongly that our inland lakes are one of our Nation's most precious resources. I also feel that the problems of inland lakes have received insufficient attention to date, even compared to the attention which has been paid to the pollution of rivers and streams. This research and development authorization with the explicit provision for inland lakes research is a major breakthrough in this respect and represents the first Federal effort toward the needs of our Nation's community lakes.

The President's Council on Environmental Quality has called eutrophication—enrichment and aging—the Nation's single most difficult water pollution problem.

In my State, we have substantial need for these programs to reduce pollution and eutrophication in the community lakes around which many of our towns and cities are built. In Minneapolis and many other communities, hundreds of thousands of citizens and their children live beside endangered community lakes. We have several research programs underway under the auspices of the State Pollution Control Agency, universities, and other agencies. The researchers have told me of their hopes for such programs as shore line management, algae harvest, and control of eutrophication. These programs need to be better supported and expanded to meet the increasing need.

I also urge continuing support of the proposed 5-year, \$20 million Great Lakes demonstration programs in pollution control, of which this year's committee figure of \$815,000 is a beginning. As Minnesota and other States gear up to meet increasing pollution, the full 5-year figure, and perhaps more, will be needed to preserve the largest body of fresh water in the world.

In April I also introduced the Clean Lakes Act of 1970, which would increase operational grants for pollution control for inland lakes, through aid for: waste treatment facilities, eutrophication prevention, shoreline improvement, Federal technical assistance, and Federal assistance in enforcement in affected lakes. I will look forward to cooperating with the Public Works Committee in our further efforts to protect and improve our inland lakes.

I ask unanimous consent that a table on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL WATER QUALITY ADMINISTRATION PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1971 SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

(Dollars in thousands)

	Current program		Extension of current program		New program		Total	
	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount
Research and development:								
Sec. 5(i), Oil pollution	4	\$1,400			13	\$5,100	17	\$6,500
Sec. 5(j), Vessel wastes	1	300	5	\$1,300			6	1,600
Sec. 5(l), Pesticides	8	700	36	3,000			44	3,700
Sec. 5(h), Lake pollution	22	1,400	2	1,985			24	3,385
Sec. 12, Hazardous materials	1	100	6	1,100			7	1,200
Sec. 14, Acid mine wastes	10	1,200			9	2,300	19	3,500
Sec. 15, Great Lakes	1	2,900			1	15	2	2,915
Sec. 20, Alaska villages	11	1,200					11	1,200
Planning, assistance, and training:								
Sec. 5(g)(1), Operator training	11	220			7	1,028	18	1,248
Sec. 5(g)(2), Manpower planning	3	160			1	72	4	232
Sec. 5(l), Pesticides	1	20			10	500	11	520
Sec. 5(m), Estuarine and oceanographic	9	400	10	500			19	900
Sec. 11, Oil pollution	8	100			49	670	57	770
Sec. 12, Hazardous materials	3	100			25	335	28	435
Sec. 13, Vessel wastes	1	20	2	150			3	170
Sec. 15, Great Lakes					4	800	4	800
Sec. 16, Undergraduate training					1	345	1	345
Sec. 21, Federal activities	65	1,158	77	600			142	1,758
Sec. 109, Financial study					3	300	3	300
Sec. 18, Training								
Enforcement: Sec. 11 and 12, Oil and hazardous materials					14	100	14	100
Executive direction and support: Sec. 22, Administration	148	2,000	30	200			178	2,200
Total	307	13,378	168	8,835	137	11,565	612	33,778

Supplemental: 305 positions, \$20,400.

FEDERAL WATER QUALITY ADMINISTRATION SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

(In thousands of dollars)

	Research and development		Planning, assistance, and training		Enforcement		Executive direction and administrative support		Total	
	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount
Oil and other hazardous materials	19	\$6,200	74	\$1,005	14	\$100			107	\$7,305
Sec. 5(1)	13	5,100							13	5,100
Sec. 11			74	1,005	14	100			88	1,105
Sec. 12	6	1,100							6	1,100
2. Vessel wastes	5	1,300	2	150					7	1,450
Sec. 5(j)	5	1,300							5	1,300
Sec. 13			2	150					2	150
3. Training			9	1,445					9	1,445
Sec. 5(g)(1)			7	1,028					7	1,028
Sec. 5(g)(2)			1	72					1	72
Sec. 16			1	345					1	345
Sec. 18										
4. Federal licensing and permit certification			77	600					77	600
Sec. 21			77	600					77	600
5. Pesticides	36	3,000	10	500					46	3,500
Sec. 5(l)(1, 2)	36	3,000	10	500					46	3,500
6. Great Lakes	1	15	4	800					5	815
Sec. 15	1	15	4	800					5	815
7. Mine wastes	9	2,300							9	2,300
Sec. 14	9	2,300							9	2,300
8. Lake and estuarine and oceanographic pollution	2	1,985	10	500					12	2,485
Sec. 5(h)	2	1,985							2	1,985
Sec. 5(m)			10	500					10	500
9. Financial study			3	300					3	300
Sec. 109			3	300					3	300
10. Executive direction and support							30	\$200	30	200
Total	72	14,800	189	5,300	14	100	30	200	305	20,400

¹ Also includes support for sec. 12.

WHAT EXPORTS MEAN TO THE 50 STATES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the fear of nearly every economist and businessman—not to mention millions of farmers and workers—is that a protectionist trade bill will do severe damage to our exports.

We have known for some time that these exports are running now at an annual rate of nearly \$43 billion, but we have had difficulty in translating this

figure to something meaningful with respect to the individual 50 states.

Now, however, we have fresh data to point to the contribution which manufacturing exports make to each State. Together with the recent data from the Department of Agriculture showing the State-by-State value of agricultural exports, these figures can provide a vivid demonstration to any Senator of what exports mean to his State.

I hope this gives cause for every Senator to consider how far he wishes to

go in jeopardizing these millions of dollars worth of agricultural and manufacturing exports to a short-sighted cause of protectionism.

I ask unanimous consent that the data for manufacturing and agricultural exports from the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Census be printed in the RECORD.

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