

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 9

APRIL 13, 1970, TO APRIL 21, 1970

(PAGES 11271 TO 12656)

(strangely unused) has been the legitimate recourse of universities since 1209.

More importantly it means that at freshman orientation, whatever form it takes, the administration should set forth the ground rules—not belligerently but forthrightly.

There is room within the university complex for basic student participation but there is no room for slobs, disruption and violence. The first obligation of the administration is to lay down the rules early, clearly and positively, and to attach to this statement the penalty for violation. It is profoundly simple—and the failure to state it—in advance—is the salient failure of university administrators in this age.

Expulsion is a dreaded verdict. The administration merely needs to make it clear, quite dispassionately, that expulsion is the inevitable consequence of violation of the rules.

Among the rules, even though it seems gratuitous, should be these:

Violence, armed or otherwise, the forceful occupation of buildings, the intimidation by covert or overt act of any student or faculty member or administrative personnel, the occupation of any university property, field park, building, lot or other place, shall be cause for expulsion.

The disruption of any class, directly or indirectly, by voice or presence or the destruction of any university property, shall be cause for expulsion.

This is neither new nor revolutionary. It is merely the reassertion of an old, accepted and necessary right of the administration of any such institution. And the faculty should be informed, firmly, of this reassertion, before trouble starts.

Suppose the students refuse to recognize expulsion, suppose they march, riot, strike? The police? No. The matter, by prearrangement, publicly stated, should then pass to the courts.

If buildings are occupied, the court enjoins the participating students. It has the lawful power to declare them in contempt. If violence ensues, it is in violation of the court's order. Courts are not subject to fears, part of the action. And what militant will shout obscenities in court with contempt hanging over his head?

This is a country full of decent, worried people like myself. It is also a country full of people fed up with nonsense. We need (those of us over 30, tax-ridden, harried, confused, weary and beat-up—to reassume our hard-won prerogatives. It is our country, too. We have fought for it, bled for it, dreamed for it, and we love it. It is time to reclaim it.

THE CLEAN LAKES BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on April 8 I introduced a clean lakes bill designed to revitalize the fresh water community lakes across the country which are in danger of becoming clogged by pollution.

It is important that action is undertaken to save these lakes before it is too late because many are now suffering from advanced eutrophication and may soon be lost forever.

I am happy over the wide support that my clean lakes bill has received. Twenty-six Senators have joined me as a cosponsor of S. 3697.

In addition, the legislation has received editorial support from two of the major newspapers in my home State, Minnesota—"The Land of 10,000 Lakes."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the St. Paul Dispatch of April 10 and the Minneapolis Star of April 13 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch, Apr. 10, 1970]

CLEAN LAKES BILL

A federal approach to cleaning up our lakes is necessary to eliminate the administrative complications involved where large bodies of water—the Great Lakes, for example—border two or three states and jurisdictional problems arise. There is also the problem of coordinating the financing of the cleanup.

These are two of the reasons why Congress should seriously consider a \$1.5 billion clean lakes bill introduced by Sen. Walter Mondale, D-Minn. A bill similar to Mondale's is to be introduced in the House shortly by Rep. Henry Reuss, D-Wis. The Senate bill covers a four-year span and has four main provisions:

Federal grants of 65 per cent would be allowed for building treatment plants which discharge their effluents into a nearby lake or tributary.

Federal grants of up to 80 per cent would be allowed to help dredge lakes, improve shorelines and remove algae.

Fines and court injunctions would be employed to enforce water pollution standards.

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other federal agencies would assist in implementing the program.

Mondale noted that more than 100,000 fresh water lakes in this country are in danger of becoming uninhabitable for marine life because the beds are filled "with sludge and debris."

And that is probably an understatement. One only has to take a drive past many of our own state's 10,000 lakes and view the surface to imagine the kind of destruction that is going on down below.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Apr. 13, 1970]

MONEY FOR CLEAN LAKES

Sen. Walter Mondale has introduced a "clean lakes" bill which, at least in its basic purpose, deserves to pass. The bill recognizes the need to attack lake pollution—particularly on small, community lakes—with action programs over and above the authorized research efforts, demonstration projects and standard sewage treatment plant grant programs.

The bill would provide \$900 million over four years beginning in fiscal 1972 for programs of chemical treatment to control weeds and algae, dredging of lake bottoms to remove decaying sludge and other pollutants, recovery of overgrowths of algae, recovery of trash and other materials from waters and shorelines and grading and planting of shorelines.

It also would provide \$600 million for an increase in the federal share in sewage treatment plant grants for plants which discharge into lakes. These latter grants, however, probably could be better spent in many cases to divert sewage plant effluent to rivers where possible, or the bill should spell out in more detail the high level of treatment which ought to be required for continued discharge into a lake.

But the essential thrust of the Mondale proposal—to provide substantial money for specific lake rehabilitation programs—remains valid and we hope it can win approval.

CONSERVATION OF THE NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY—ALASKA'S GREATEST RESOURCE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I speak today on a subject of tremendous impor-

tance to my State of Alaska. Alaska's history has been romantically colored with the excitement of the great turn-of-the-century gold rushes. It is now enjoying another such romantic episode with the discovery of "black gold" on the North Slope.

But throughout these times, the real industry of Alaska has been, and continues to be, fishing. In fact, until last year fishing was far and away Alaska's leading industry. In 1968 the value of fish caught was \$217,544,000 compared with \$187 million for oil and gas. And the fishing industry is growing. Production in 1968 was more than double 1960 production.

But, most important, fishing is Alaska's biggest private employer. In the bush areas of my State, it is often the only means of earning a cash income.

I raise these points because there now exists a threat to the fishing industry of my State of Alaska. It is not clear how major a threat it is, but it is clearly there. I am referring to the preparations now being made by certain private companies in South Korea to send a fleet, including a 9,400-deadweight-tons "mother" ship and 30 catches, into the North Pacific salmon fishery.

This fishery has been extensively protected and nurtured back to health after disastrous over fishing in the 1920's and 1930's nearly destroyed it. It has taken the cooperation of Canada, Japan, and the Soviet Union, as well as ourselves to bring this miracle about. It would be a tragedy of major proportions if that fishery were now to become the target of fishing fleets which have no regard for the conservation techniques that must be used if the fishery is to continue under the sustained yield principle. It would be an economic disaster to my State if the fishery were to be destroyed.

Concern in my State has reached major proportions. I have received many letters and telegrams urging the United States to take action to prevent the Koreans from fishing the North Pacific for salmon. Our Government has spoken to the South Korean Government and received assurances that the South Koreans will not license the fleet to fish for salmon. The Republic of South Korea gave us the same assurances last year, but unfortunately, they were to no avail. We are now working and will continue to work on a resolution on this particular problem.

But to focus on this one incident is to ignore the real potential for disaster that exists in our present policy toward our coastal fisheries. The United States only recently—and to some, reluctantly—agreed to the contiguous fishery that extended our jurisdiction over the fish resources of our coast to a point 12 miles off our coasts. But the salmon, which spawn in Alaska's rivers, go many miles beyond this artificial limit designed by man to be the extent of the fishery.

I, therefore, wish to call to the attention of the Senate a resolution of the Dillingham advisory board to the Alaska Board of Fish and Game. The resolution specifies the course of action that I would like to see the Nation take. It is entirely consistent with our present