

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 7

MARCH 29, 1971, TO APRIL 1, 1971

(PAGES 8259 TO 9468)

American radio manufacturers. Imports of radios did not become significant until 1956, yet by 1964 imports accounted for more than 58 percent of the home radios sold in the United States. Now only about 8 percent of the radios sold in America are made in the United States.

A similar situation is occurring in the sale of phonographs. Significant imports began in 1967, reached one-third of the American market within 2 years, and now are running around 40 percent of U.S. phonograph sales.

And in the field of magnetic tape recorders for home use, less than 10 percent are now made in the United States.

This startling progress by the Japanese has not come about simply because of any superior technology or the providing of better products. It has come about because the Japanese Government sanctions, encourages and finances trade practices which are prohibited in the United States and which are contrary to international trade agreements.

Japanese television sets and other products have been sold in the United States at less than fair value because the Japanese Government provides export subsidies and incentives. The Japanese Government also provides import and investment restrictions to protect their home market for Japanese manufacturers.

In other words, the Japanese people themselves have had to pay more for television sets than Americans have had to pay. The Japanese Government effectively prevents American-made television sets from entering the country.

Shortsighted Americans frequently ask:

What's wrong with this? Why shouldn't Americans benefit from the purchase of low priced Japanese television sets.

The answer, of course, is that the Japanese dumping practice is illegal, will cost Americans thousands of jobs, and will be deleterious to the United States in the long run.

The cutrate pricing is intended only to establish the newer Japanese manufacturers in the market and to kill off American competition. When imports monopolize the market, then the importers set the prices as high as the traffic will bear. Should American industry try to reestablish itself, the importers can drop their prices just long enough to starve out any new threat.

We frequently hear the argument that world trade should be absolutely free and unfettered, that each nation should produce what it produces most efficiently and should purchase from other nations the products which can be manufactured most efficiently in the other nations.

Like all pat theories, this one has to be qualified with a lot of "if, ands, and buts."

Under this theory, all labor intensive items would be imported to the United States. The \$1.60 per hour minimum wage is 10 times the going wage in many nations of the world.

Theorists also ignore the fate of jobless Americans.

Even if we should buy this theory, it presupposes that there will not only be free but fair trade internationally.

Through dumping a nation can artificially establish itself as the one which can provide a product the cheapest in another nation. When the nation which practices dumping has the market clearly sewed up, then it can raise prices to a profitable level and moves on to steal the market in another nation.

Dumping this way involves the playing of one market against another. Japanese taxpayers and consumers in effect subsidize the exporting of television sets to the United States; once the American market is captured, the Japanese can raise prices here so that Americans subsidize lower prices in other target markets.

This can go on in industry after industry; and if the Japanese can play the game, so can other sophisticated trading nations.

Eventually, of course, there is an awakening. Consumers who thought that they were beneficiaries of some great gift, find that they are victims of a vicious system. This manipulation of the American economy by powerful foreign sources is causing severe repercussions already, and it will get worse unless action is taken quickly.

If America cannot compete in a highly technical field like the manufacturing of television and other electronics equipment, just what can we compete in? Just what industries are there left for the vast number of Americans?

There are several courses of action that can be taken by the United States.

One approach would be a reevaluation of our international trading agreements.

Another course is the one I am suggesting today. It is a reaffirmation of the principles of free but fair trade. It would give American industry the means to fight back against unfair and illegal trade methods being used by foreign manufacturers.

This bill provides an effective remedy for injured industries. More important, it creates a powerful deterrent to violation of fair trade principles.

Mr. President, I am confident that American industry can compete in its own market and in the world market if the game is fairly played.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill that would give antitrust status to the Antidumping Act of 1916.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1477. A bill to designate the Kettle River, in the State of Minnesota, as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Departments of Agriculture and Interior released on March 29, 1970, and criteria for the selection and recreational rivers to be added to the national wild and scenic rivers system.

The guidelines adopted by the Secretaries of the two Departments supplement policies set forth in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, Public Law 90-542, to preserve and protect outstanding freeflowing rivers and immediate adjacent lands. The wild rivers guidelines read:

To provide river-related outdoor recreation opportunities in a closely-adjacent primitive setting. Land access generally is restricted to trails or infrequent roads, and public use and other resource management facilities must harmonize with their surroundings.

As I reviewed these guidelines, I became impressed that the Kettle River, one of Minnesota's fine untouched and beautiful rivers, meets the criteria for the wild rivers classification.

I am, therefore, reintroducing legislation to designate the Kettle River, in the State of Minnesota, as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system. Community involvement will be sought in considering this legislation. Interested citizens and the surrounding towns should be consulted on the nature of any program affecting the Kettle River.

Congressman BLATNIK introduced a companion bill in the House last May when I first introduced this measure, and he is reintroducing his bill today.

The Kettle River is located in east-central Minnesota. In a State which is becoming increasingly urbanized, the Kettle Basin is roughly 60 to 75 miles from the Twin Cities and about 50 miles from Duluth. It lies between two major metropolitan areas which generate increasing demand for access to water and outdoor recreation—trails, canoeing, and fishing.

Thus, more than half of the population of Minnesota—over 2 million people—could reach this fine wild, scenic, and recreational river by an hour's drive over a good interstate highway.

During the 1960's, the Minnesota Department of Conservation authorized the Kettle as a canoe route. This designation tells much of the potential of the Kettle for river-related outdoor recreational opportunities in a primitive setting.

The Kettle River is a fascinatingly wild and picturesque river. The constantly changing topography and forest cover provide an ever-changing scene. The river has rapids interspaced with long pools, providing a challenge, as well as a chance for relaxation and quiet reflection, to its visitors.

The glacial geology of the area, as reflected in the river, is also a point of interest. Moraines, glacial outwash plains, gorges, kettle holes, and caves exist along the river, primarily the result of glacial activity.

The area is rich in history. Remains of the lumbering activity of the 1850's and 1860's; quarrying at Banning and Sandstone; forest fires and the birth of St. Croix State Park add great historical interest to the river corridor.

Wide varieties of wildlife roam the river corridor. Deer, beavers, muskrats, herons, and hawks all make their homes within the river basin.

Fishing is excellent, especially for wall-eyes, sturgeon, and small mouth bass. Northern pike, red horse, suckers, and even trout, mainly in the Pine River and Willow River tributaries, are also fished in the river.

The Kettle River has its headwaters in Carlton County and flows in a generally north to south direction, passing

through Pine County and into the St. Croix River some 53 miles away. It flows through and over several types of surface and subsurface geology.

The Kettle basin is largely in the central and northern part of Pine County, but headwaters are partly in Carlton County and to a lesser degree in Aitkin and Kanabec Counties. There are some farms, but roughly two-thirds of the basin is forested. Pine County, in 1964, included nearly 2,000 farms, predominantly in the southern part, outside the Kettle basin. Forest industries are important, but there is no national forest.

In addition to the St. Croix State Park near the mouth of the river, Banning State Park, a tract of about 2,700 acres, near Sandstone, was added in 1963. One or more of these parks provide access to the Kettle.

By nature it is an excellent recreation area, not yet overdeveloped. Pine County, in the mid-1960's, contained five hotels, six motels, and 19 resorts. The area is thinly populated and has not begun to reach its recreational potential.

There are 17 homes located along the river's edge, although only five may be seen from the river. Two of the five are old farmsteads while the remainder are homes which have penetrated the wilderness setting. Fourteen bridges and two trestles cross the river.

There are developed access points at miles 21, 33, 40.5, and 47; however, access is also possible at other bridge crossings. There are no developed campsites on the Kettle River.

Approximately 26 miles of the Kettle River are already in public ownership of one form or another. The Gen. C. C. Andrews State Forest abuts on the east side of the river from mile 13 to mile 15.2. The undeveloped Banning State Park abuts both sides of the river from mile 24.2 to mile 30.8. The Sandstone Game Refuge abuts the east side of the river from mile 31.5 to mile 40.5.

Chengwantan State Forest and St. Croix State Park abut the river from mile 42.6 to mile 51. Other stretches of the river are within the municipalities of Kettle River, Rutledge, and Sandstone. Finally, the State and county own small parcels of and on the river which have not been declared parks, game refuges et cetera.

This description can hardly touch upon the actual beauty of the Kettle. It is a truly magnificent river which deserves the protection of the wild rivers system.

By Mr. HART (for Mr. MAGNUSON) (by request):

S. 1478. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, as amended, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) I introduce the Administration's Toxic Substances Control Act of 1971 and ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD remarks which he would like to accompany the bill, together with the text of the bill and the extensive communication of transmittal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to strengthen federal regulation of toxic chemicals. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I wish to commend the Administration for sending this proposal to the Congress. By doing so they demonstrate their recognition that further control of toxic substances is necessary to prevent the occurrence of unexpected adverse effects upon man and the environment. Lack of knowledge and control over toxic substances has caused us many problems in the past. Last year the Committee on Commerce, through its Subcommittee on the Environment, followed and investigated closely the disastrous mercury crisis. The Subcommittee learned that had closer scrutiny been given to the uses of mercury many years ago, the current crisis might have been largely avoided. We can only wonder how many other "mercuries" are waiting to be discovered.

Likewise, the current phosphate and NTA problem in detergents is indicative of gaps in our regulatory framework. Control of these substances in our waters must now come from the treatment of wastes or voluntary use restrictions with no direct regulatory control over the substances at the source, i.e., in the manufacture and use of detergents. As most waste treatment facilities are currently incapable of removing substantial quantities of chemicals like phosphates from waste water, it appears that further regulation of these substances is in order.

Mr. President, in sending this bill up, the Administration demonstrates its recognition of the need for what the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HARR) and I have called "technology assessment"—a thorough evaluation of second and third order consequences of new technologies prior to their introduction into commercial production. Since the central principle of the Toxic Substances Control Act essentially parallels that of our Commercial Technology Assessment Act, which we plan to reintroduce shortly, there may be some basis for considering these two proposals together in committee. In any case, the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on the Environment will hold full hearings on the Toxic Substances Control Act in the near future with the hope of reporting the strongest possible legislation. Historically, the Committee has taken the lead in protecting the rights of the consumer and pointing out the dangers of environmental degradation. The provisions of this bill will receive close scrutiny to insure that the final bill is fully adequate to protect the public health and the environment.

S. 1478

A bill the toxic substances control act of 1971

To amend, the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That: This Act may be cited as the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1971.

SEC. 2. The Federal Hazardous Substances Act is amended by inserting before Section 1 of such Act the following: "Title I—Hazardous Consumer Products."

SEC. 3. Such Act is further amended by adding after the aforesaid Title I, i.e., after

Section 18 of the Act, the following new Title:

"TITLE II—TOXIC SUBSTANCES

"SEC. 201. Policy. Whereas the American people are being exposed to a large number of chemical substances each year; and

Whereas among the many new substances constantly being developed are some which may be a danger to human health or the environment; and

Whereas the effective regulation of interstate commerce in such chemicals necessitates the regulation of transactions in such chemicals in intrastate commerce as well;

Therefore, it is the policy of the United States that new chemical substances should be adequately tested with respect to their safety to man and the environment; and

That adequate authority should exist to restrict the distribution and use of chemicals found to be toxic; and

That such authority over chemicals be exercised in such a manner as not to unduly impede technological innovation while fulfilling the primary purpose of this title to assure that such innovation and commerce does not endanger human health or the environment.

SEC. 202. Definitions.

"(a) 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

"(b) 'Chemical substance' means any organic or inorganic substance of a particular molecular identity or any uncombined chemical radical or element.

"(c) 'Manufacturer' means any person engaged in the production or manufacture of chemical substances for purposes of sale or distribution in commercial quantities, or an importer thereof.

"(d) 'Processor' means any person engaged in the preparation of a chemical substance for distribution or use either in the form in which it is received or as part of another product, as defined by regulations of the Administrator.

"(e) 'Restrict use or distribution' means to prescribe the amount sold to given types of processors, or to limit the type of processor to whom a substance may be sold, or to prescribe the amount which may be utilized by a given type of processor.

"(f) 'Byproduct' means a chemical substance produced as a direct result of the production, manufacture, or processing of some other chemical substance which is subject to the provisions of this title.

"(g) 'Environment' includes water, air, land, all plants and animals living therein, and the interrelationships which exist among these.

"(h) 'Animal' means all vertebrate and invertebrate species, including but not limited to man and other mammals, birds, fish, and shellfish.

"(i) 'Protect health and the environment' means protection against any injury to man and protection against any substantial adverse effects on environmental values, taking into account the public interest.

"(j) 'District Court of the United States' includes the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the District Court of the Canal Zone, and in the case of American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii, which Court shall have jurisdiction over actions arising under this title.

"SEC. 203. Restrictions on use or distribution.

PROPOSAL TO ADOPT RESTRICTIONS

"(a) For any chemical substance produced in commercial quantities, after evaluating all information developed by or otherwise provided to or made available to him, and after referring the matter to a committee in