

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 18

JULY 16, 1974 TO JULY 22, 1974

(PAGES 23309 TO 24532)

| Year | Re ceipts | Outlays | Surplus (+) or deficit (-) | Debt interest |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1960 | 75.7 | 74.9 | + .8 | 5 |
| 1961 | 75.2 | 79.3 | -4.1 | 9.3 |
| 1962 | 79.7 | 86.6 | -6.9 | 9.5 |
| 1963 | 83.6 | 90.1 | -6.5 | 9.3 |
| 1964 | 87.2 | 95.8 | -8.6 | 10.0 |
| 1965 | 90.9 | 94.8 | -3.9 | 11.8 |
| 1966 | 101.4 | 106.5 | -5.1 | 11.6 |
| 1967 | 111.8 | 126.8 | -15.0 | 12.2 |
| 1968 | 114.7 | 143.1 | -28.4 | 14.6 |
| 1969 | 143.3 | 148.8 | -5.5 | 15.7 |
| 1970 | 143.2 | 156.3 | -13.1 | 17. |
| 1971 | 133.7 | 163.7 | -30.0 | 20.0 |
| 1972 | 148.8 | 178.0 | -29.2 | 21.6 |
| 1973 | 161.4 | 186.4 | -25.0 | 22.5 |
| 1974 ¹ | 181.8 | 199.5 | -17.7 | 24.2 |
| 1975 ¹ | 201.4 | 221.3 | -19.9 | 29.4 |
| 20-yr total | 2,200.4 | 2,429.5 | -229.1 | 300.4 |

¹ Estimated figures.

Source: Office of Management of Budget and Department of the Treasury.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman and the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, for the committee's action in including \$2,158,000 in the fiscal year 1975 agricultural appropriations bill for the Soil Conservation Service for the development of a planned flood control and water supply project for the Pocatalico River Basin in West Virginia.

As the chairman knows from the evidence which was presented to the committee, there presently exists an urgent need to develop sources of water supply for the communities of Walton, Sissonville, Pocatalico, and Gandeeville, W. Va., which are located in the Pocatalico River Basin.

These communities formerly obtained their drinking water from the Pocatalico River. However, this river experienced several pollution problems starting in 1967, and the water quality has steadily, and irreversibly, deteriorated since that time.

The total cost of this project will be \$3,568,000, of which \$1,161,000 was provided earlier this year in the supplemental appropriations bill, and the balance is being provided in the pending bill.

I urge the departmental officials to move ahead with this project as soon as possible in order that these communities may be able to obtain their supplies of drinking water locally.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to address one provision in particular in the bill before the Senate today, the fiscal 1975 Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations Act.

Permit me to begin by expressing my gratitude for the outstanding leadership provided by Senator McGEE and the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee in their report on H.R. 15472.

This measure contains a section which I believe to be vital to the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities in the field of water pollution control. I refer specifically to the section authorizing the use of water and sewer funds appropriated under Public Law 92-73 and extended under Public Laws 92-399 and 93-135, but impounded by the administration, for lake restoration pro-

grams under section 314 of the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments.

The United States is blessed with 100,000 small- and medium-sized lakes, resources which provide an unparalleled variety of opportunities for recreational and scenic enjoyment. Boating, swimming, water-skiing, hiking, fishing, and camping are but a few of the activities the American people look for in vacations and in weekend trips to nearby lakes.

Yet because of the very advantages they provide in sparkling water, plentiful fish, and natural scenery, thousands of fresh water lakes are today endangered.

Mounting population and pressure for open space have often resulted in excessive, unwise, or improper development. Without proper sewage treatment, many lakes have been subjected to overloading of nutrients from municipal wastes. Erosion and run-off in both urban and rural areas have also threatened lake water quality.

As a result, lakes in virtually every State in the country are suffering from accelerated eutrophication or premature aging. Excess growth of algae and weeds and a decline in the quality of fisheries are symptomatic of advanced eutrophication. If this process continues unchecked, lakes will become clogged; they will choke for lack of oxygen; and eventually they may die.

Although the Federal Government has since the mid-1960's devoted increasing resources to water pollution problems, America's fresh water lakes have not received the attention they deserve. In fact, the most fragile part of our aquatic ecosystem has received virtually no protection or help from the Federal Government.

Unlike rivers, lakes have only a limited capacity for self-cleansing. If they are subjected to harmful pollutants or to an overdose of nutrients or sediments, the delicate balance that permits natural lake renewal may be permanently destroyed.

Nonetheless, Federal funds and enforcement authority traditionally have been targeted toward interstate rivers rather than on lakes that are commonly located within a single State. Although more recent legislation has firmly established the eligibility of lakeshore communities for Federal sewage treatment grants, limitation on the availability of Federal funds have placed most small, lake-based villages on the bottom of the priority list for assistance. Finally, even if construction grants for municipal treatment facilities could be obtained, this would represent only the first step toward reclaiming a lake that is endangered by pollution. Land use controls and costly rehabilitation techniques such as flushing, inactivation of nutrients, destratification or dredging must often be employed to return a lake to its natural condition. Neither State nor local governments possess sufficient resources to bear the full cost of effective lake cleanup programs.

Is there a national interest in safeguarding America's small lakes? Con-

gress answered that question with an unequivocal yes in adopting section 314 of the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments. In this provision, which I authored with the cosponsorship of more than 50 Senators of both political parties, the Congress authorized a new program, the first of its kinds, specifically designed to protect fresh water lakes. Section 314 authorizes Federal grants for up to 70 percent of the cost of projects designed to clean up lakes and to keep them clean.

Over the past year and a half, primarily as a result of administration foot-dragging, the Clean Lakes Act has remained only an on-paper law with no regulations or funding to carry it out. The administration has never requested appropriations to provide a penny of the \$50 million that was authorized in fiscal 1973, and they opposed congressional initiatives to appropriate any of the \$100 million that was authorized in fiscal 1974.

Notwithstanding the administration's opposition, the Congress is now in the process of earmarking \$75 million to carry out a clean lakes program in fiscal 1975. Although this represents only half of the \$150 million authorization for lake restoration activities in the current fiscal year, if fully committed, it would permit a meaningful first step in the effort to safeguard America's fresh water lakes.

Nearly 1,500 lakes in 40 States across the Nation have already been identified as in need of some type of help. In Florida, State and local officials are desperately seeking Federal assistance to implement restoration programs on lakes like Lake Apopka. Along the shore of Lake Apopka there are today signs posted by the Orange County Health Department declaring it a health hazard for people to swim or fish in the water. By stopping pollution at its source and draining the lake, it could be made suitable for body contact sports.

In south-central Minnesota, the city of Albert Lea is similarly seeking funding to rehabilitate Albert Lea Lake, a 2,600-acre fresh water resource that could provide recreational opportunities for surrounding communities in Iowa as well as Minnesota.

If clean lakes funding were available, the State of Maine might use such assistance to institute a monitoring program that would serve as an early warning system on water quality problems in 44 of the State's most popular recreational lakes.

Michigan might similarly use these resources to help some of the 1,625 lakes that have been classified by the department of natural resources as eutrophic.

The delays experienced so far in getting action on behalf of fresh water lakes have greatly increased the need to launch a substantial program in the current fiscal year. For each year that we fail to take the steps necessary to safeguard endangered lakes, the probability grows that even more costly restorative measures will be needed in the future. And for those lakes that are already suffering from serious water quality problems, the likelihood grows that

they may be permanently lost to pollution. The cost of continued inaction, measured in the destruction of irreplaceable lake resources, is more than this Nation can afford or should be asked to pay.

I am hopeful of prompt approval of H.R. 15472 so that we may begin the urgent task of safeguarding America's fresh-water lakes.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives in June passed H.R. 15472, and they included language authorizing the use of impounded water and sewer money for lake pollution control programs. However, in the House report the committee unfortunately included language which would appear to limit the use of the \$75 million involved strictly to grants for sewer systems. As the chairman knows, sewer facilities are only one small part of the task of cleaning up and protecting our lakes; and section 314 of the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act contained language which would permit the use of funds for a wide variety of methods, depending upon which would be the most effective in treating water quality problems of individual lakes. I am pleased that the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee makes clear that the \$75 million earmarked for clean lakes could be used for any of the techniques authorized under section 314. I would hope that the chairman would be prepared to hold to the Senate language in this regard when the conferees meet to consider this legislation.

Finally, I would like to address a technical point concerning the language in the House and Senate bills. In each case, the appropriations measure reads, "and \$75 million of these funds shall be available for transfer to the Environmental Protection Agency for grants for the clean lakes program pursuant to section 314 of Public Law 92-500."

I was concerned about why the bill read "shall be available for transfer," rather than "shall be transferred"; and I checked with both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees on this point. I was advised that a bill which read that the funds "shall be transferred" would be subject to a point of order in the House since this would have the effect of legislating in an appropriations bill. Nevertheless, I was advised by both the House and Senate committees that there is no doubt but that the committees' intent was to appropriate the \$75 million involved for clean lakes and clean lakes only.

It is my understanding and that of the Senate that in adopting the language on page 40 under the heading "Grants for Basic Water and Sewer Facilities" we are in effect reappropriating \$75 million in unused spending authority and transferring the funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Environmental Protection Agency for its use in carrying out section 314 of the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, over the past several years, I have strongly voiced my concern about our Nation's beef situation and the need to take positive action to protect not only the inter-

ests of consumers, but that of the livestock industry as well. We here in Congress are about to take such a positive step for, as you are well aware, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees have included \$6.7 million for the construction of the beef import quarantine station at Fleming Key, Fla.

This appropriation of \$6.7 million is an antiinflationary step designed to assist the cattle industry in providing a higher quality beef to consumers at lower prices. At this point I would like to briefly explain how we are helping to alleviate our beef problems by appropriating funds to build this animal import quarantine station at Fleming Key near Key West, Fla.

As authorized, this would be a maximum security station enabling us to import beef breeding animals directly from Europe while safeguarding our domestic beef cattle herds from diseases such as hoof and mouth disease, rinderpest, vibriosis, and other diseases.

Mr. President, this is the first type of quarantine station to be developed in the United States. Public Law 91-239, signed by the President on May 6, 1970, authorizes the construction of this station. Further, it authorizes the appropriation of such sums as are necessary to carry out provisions of this act. Congress appropriated in the fiscal year 1973 budget the amount of \$300,000 for the preconstruction planning of this project. This planning has been completed and since this is the first time that such a station is to be established some 16.1 acres have been provided for the site of this station so as to accommodate future expansion.

Cattle producers in the United States are facing a tremendous challenge in improving the quality of their herds. The phenomenon called "hybrid vigor" can help improve herd quality, but new bloodlines from foreign sources are necessary to accomplish this.

Some exotic animals have been imported and are being used in developing crossbred cattle herds, however, the process of importation at present has two major drawbacks. One is the length of time that it takes to bring an animal with desirable qualities into the United States through foreign quarantine stations and the other is the fact that the United States does not exercise control over the quarantine process.

While we realize that the foreign quarantine stations are making every effort to protect the cattle herds of the United States from imported diseases, we would be even more confident if our own people were in charge. In addition, to those drawbacks, the high cost of an animal that is imported through Canada or other countries, where the quarantine cost is \$5,000 a head and the quarantine period is 3 years, puts a major strain on our domestic cattle producers. Many of them cannot afford the \$35,000 to \$40,000 each animal costs to import in this manner.

There are three major benefits to the United States in having our own quarantine station. First, it would make it possible to import the extra breeding livestock necessary to expand and improve our herds. Second, cattle importation can be accomplished more economically and

third, the United States would be in control of the quarantine process. Imported bloodlines would help produce calves with increased weaning weights, smaller amounts of carcass fat, higher calf survival rates, and improved fertility of breeding animals. In dairy animals, additional imports would produce fertility, higher calf survival and an increase in milk production.

Mr. President, the wisdom of the Senate and House committees in including the \$6.7 million in this year's budget is justified not only because of the above-mentioned facts, but also in light of construction costs which are escalating at a rapid rate. If this money had not been included in this year's budget, a further delay in the start of construction would have meant additional costs as inflation pushes up the cost of labor and materials which are high enough as it is.

Although I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have testified before both the Senate and the House committees in the past urging them to include \$6.7 million in the budget for this project. I am pleased that the committee has placed a high priority on the Fleming Key project and I feel we here in the Senate must be level-headed in voting favorably on this measure. Certainly, we must decide how best we can spend a limited number of Federal dollars, however, I feel it is reasonable to invest the \$6.7 million now rather than to have the livestock industry of our country continue to spend \$1 billion a year to improve their herds. I feel it is also important that we budget, for the coming fiscal year, sufficient funds to allow the U.S. Department of Agriculture animal and plant health inspection service to make continued improvements on the Fleming Key Station.

America needs the Fleming Key Station to help increase the quality and quantity of its beef and to insure consumers of an adequate supply of high quality beef at a reasonable cost. The action that we take today on this measure will allow the cattle industry of our country to meet these needs. Therefore, I urge my colleagues here in the Senate to favorably consider this project and pass this measure without delay.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, we are in the midst of an unprecedented peacetime inflation. Even liberal economists, such as John Kenneth Galbraith, are now pointing to the urgent need, in his words, to establish "a fiscal policy that rules out for the indefinite future any expansion of the Federal budget."

Yet today, we are urged to approve an agricultural appropriation bill that exceeds last year's by 28 percent; and that exceeds the administration's 1975 budgetary request by more than \$260,000,000—more than a quarter of a billion dollars to fuel the inflation.

It may well be, Mr. President, that some of the programs covered by H.R. 15472 ought to have been expanded, but if so, I believe it was incumbent on the committee to cut back on others, to apply priorities to those areas in which it has special competence.

The time is long overdue for hard decisions. If we do not have the guts to