EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

ENVIRONMENTAL SYMPOSIUM - APRIL 6, 1970

CLOQUET, MINNESOTA

The last time I was here was on the occasion of the dedication of this wonderful school. I've been from one end of this country to another telling people about the amazing, wonderful school system in Cloquet, particularly this Senior High School. And I want to express again my thanks for the reception you gave me.

I want to get right down to business because this is a busy day for you, and we're here on very important business. We're here on the business of your future. And that includes the overwhelming majority of this audience. I am talking to a group of young people to whom the year 2,000 is just around the corner. Now as far as I am personally concerned, I am looking forward to the year 2,000, but I can't bet on it, even though I've got a couple of bottles of Geritol stashed away, but at least 85% of this audience will be alive and in the prime of life at the year 2,000.

Now some scientists tell us that by the year 2,000, unless we change our ways, that will be the beginning of the end. And I must say candidly that other civilizations have disappeared. So don't think that ours is eternal, necessarily. So you have to be quite objective about it and realistic.

Now what has happened recently is a whole new awareness of what we call ecology, the delicate balance in nature which God Almighty, or Divine Providence, or nature put together for us. We have been interrupting this balance ever since man put his feet upon the earth. We often talk about Minnesota, the land of ten thousand lakes and the sky blue water. Now I ask you very frankly, how many lakes have sky blue water today? We've talked about our beautiful rivers and our virgin forests and we've had a hard battle even preserving some of these forests. Thank goodness since the days of Theodore Roosevelt and others -- early pioneers in conservation -- we have done a better job in reforestation. We've talked about great rolling prairies, our magnificent fields -- America the beautiful. And for years we let our land erode and corrode. Fortunately, during the days of the Depression we learned something about it and we've done something about soil conservation.

But the big problem today is not just the land or water or air, but it's the people. I want to talk to you about what I hope is not going to be just a passing fancy -- a fad. I read somewhere that success is a man who wished to succeed and worked; a failure is a man who wanted to succeed and just wished. Now I don't want to stand here this morning with you and wish that we had a better world. I want to work at it. And I want you to work at it. How many of you remember the fads of the Freedom Riders in Appalachia, the sit-ins, the Freedom March, and all the things that students were doing here about ten years ago in the early 60's for the Civil Rights movement? And now we find that the job is not done, and a lot of that's just forgotten. And here we are with this sudden new recognition of our ecological concerns which I hope will not cause us to forget, neglect or ignore the pursuit of other critical areas of human environment. Environment is not only the air we breathe, the water we drink, or the land that we touch, it is where we live, our neighborhoods, our cities. It is the environment of violence in this country, crime and lawlessness, the problems of unemployment and an unstable economy, the problems of race relations, which surely provide an environment in America and not too healthy a one at this moment, the problems of the arms race, and the increasing international tension under which our young American men and women live every day of their lives.

That's environment -- the environment of tension, the environment of noise and congestion if you live in the city. Harlem is a good example of such congestion. The population density in Harlem is so dense that if all the other four boroughs of New York City had the same density of population as Harlem, you could put all two hundred million Americans in the other four boroughs of New York. One block in Harlem has more people than many a county in Minnesota. In Brooklyn, 22,000 people can live in one housing complex. I grew up in a community that had 10,000 people in the whole town.

These, you see, are some of the concerns that I speak of when I talk about environment. We can do something about this. I don't think you inspire people to succeed by pointing out failures. I do think the only reason we should list our problems is to increase our awareness of them and to marshal the resources to do something about them. And we have the resources. We've made amazing progress in the last decade with all our problems. Don't give up and don't let anyone sell you a bill of goods that this country can't do what it wants to do. I'll tell you what it takes. It takes the same kind of attitude that made this country a great country and we can make it even greater. You have to pledge your lives, if need be your fortunes, and your sacred honor to this effort. That's the way things started in this country, not with a halfway pledge. There is no room for halfway efforts anymore. We have to get in there and pitch.

I'll bet most of you never heard the word "ecology" mentioned until the last two or three years. Now it's everywhere and what it means is a "balance in the forces of nature" -- the delicate balance. Just as balance is required in the forces among the nations of the world and needed in your own personality, so that you are not hung up one day and dragging around the next day and tearing yourself apart.

What are some of the facts we face as a nation ? Remember that everything I talk about has to be put in dimensions of the world, because the world's getting smaller every day. And nothing is ever lost. Energy is never lost, it is just transformed. While it may be used in electrical energy, or fire, or in decomposition, the force of energy is still here. It just exists in different forms. Things are related. What happens in India affects us and what happens to us affects India. And the degree of pollution is directly related to the number of people and their standard of living. We pollute, per person, in the United States, more than any other people in the world, because we have more. Now we could say "there are eight hundred and fifty million Chinese. Look what they're doing to the world." Or, "There are five hundred million people in India, look what they're doing to the world." They're not doing much. They don't have many beer cans. They don't have many milk cartons. They don't drive many automobiles. Each American today has energy available to him equivalent to five hundred slaves. And in the last fifty years, the amount of energy available to us by machines and electricity has increased 300%. And we're using it up. 6% of the world's population consuming 40% of the world's goods. And lots of it we waste.

Each year two hundred million tons of smoke and fumes are spewed out in the atmosphere in the United States. Every time I go to Wold-Chamberlain Airport and see those jets take off, I'm reminded of what they're doing to us. They cause a hundred and five tons of fumes per day in the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C. They can put an adaptor on those engines and take out 90% of the fumes, but it costs a little bit. I have talked to the Federal Aviation Administration for months. Write them a letter and say why aren't you doing something about it, because it's technically and engineeringly feasible.

The internal combustion engine -- that's your car -- causes 60% of all the air pollution. I was in Phoenix, Arizona, the other day. When I was there ten years ago, it was just beautiful. Now there's smog all over the place. I was in Mexico City three years ago and the air was reasonably clean. Today you can choke to death. You may recall that in London in the early 50's they had a number of deaths from air pollution, and the government of Britain ordered no more soft coal to be burned as well as restrictions on burning trash and they enforced the law. They reduced the air pollution by over 75%. Today London has purer and cleaner air than any city in the United States. For better than twenty-five years, not a fish was ever caught in the Thames River in London, destroyed by industrial pollutants. This year fish came back into the river.

The St. Louis River could be one of the most beautiful rivers in Minnesota. It's polluted and we've got to do something about it. We could make a great recreation area out of this and make it worthwhile for generations yet unborn.

There are many types of pollution -- smogs, oxidants, etc. Let me give you an example. Recent studies show that smog out in California is killing a hundred thousand acres of Ponderosa and Jeffrey pine trees in San Bernadino National Forest near Los Angeles every year, ruining a whole area of our natural environment. Air pollution is a serious threat to our health. Our waters are being polluted by sewage, chemicals, and thermal and radioisotope pollution. Fish kills because of chemical, sewage, and thermal wastes have become numerous. I want young Americans in this audience to go around this beautiful state and see what's happened to our lakes. See the algae, the weeds, and ask why, why, why? There are reasons for it. Ten years ago that wasn't the case. I live out by a little lake called Lake Waverly. Ten years ago, you could drink water out of that lake. Within the last three years, it's been so close to permanent pollution, that no one would dare touch it, and it has become a pile of weeds and green algae and this will increase unless we treat it year after year. And what we're treating it with may hurt it more than what was in it. Do you want to see every lake in Minnesota like this? Of course you don't. And you are going to have to see that something is done about it.

Now pollution from radioisotopes which is exactly what they're talking about in the Minnesota rivers today from nuclear power plants can kill off marine life. Now our oceans are in jeopardy. You wouldn't think this could happen to the oceans. I have traveled to every continent and I have seen what is happening to the ocean waters. You fly over the vast expanse of the Pacific and Atlantic and there's a belt of smog all the way across the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. They've become dumping grounds these oceans for garbage and scientists now estimate that in another fifty years the oceans will be totally polluted and washing their waste into the estuaries along our coastlines.

And what about our subsurface water? That's where our well water will come from. Industry is dumping toxic waste down deep wells by injection and we're now finding out that brine waste injected deep in the waters of Canada have already erupted in Michigan. In Texas, sweet wells have been poisoned and sewer lines have broken under high pressure of waste that's been injected into underground channels.

Pesticides, DDT, 245T, 24D -- these are pesticides and herbicides. We find that about 800 to a 1,000 people die each year from them and 80 to 90 thousand are seriously injured each year. In some instances farm workers have been killed instantly by just a few drops of deadly chemicals that are used to protect plant life, as they take human life.

What about the upper atmosphere? Everybody has said "Well, if we can just get a good windstorm, we can just blow it out." Well, the trouble is that it only goes up so far. For awhile people thought that if you could just get it up high enough, it would all go out into space. But the fact of the matter is, that we found it doesn't go into space. We have been collecting a belt of radioactive material about twelve miles up and that is one reason why we stopped the nuclear tests, because of the deadly strontium 90. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963 is one of the greatest pollution control devices or control agreements that we've had. No longer do nations test in the atmosphere, except the Chinese and the French. They are still testing and every time they test your life is shortened. Remember that you live in what we call the Northern Belt, and the Northern Belt has a movement of air that brings the strontium 90, the radioactive particles from any test in any part of the Northern Hemisphere right into Minnesota, Montana, and all across the United States of America. The only part of the globe that has any protection at all is in the deep South in what we call the Southern Zone. Two years ago we signed what we call the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to prevent other nations from starting to test and building their own weapons.

Now what's the answer to all this? We've been designing laws and regulations for a long time. The first major Federal Water Pollution Control Act was passed in 1899, the Rivers and Harbors Act. It was designed to clean up the refuse in New York harbor. Under that act, a number of court cases have been filed -- 400 cases as a matter of fact. They even filed a case citing this act down in Key Biscayne Bay. I don't know if that's because the President is down there occasionally, but they have a suit down there on thermal pollution, putting hot waters into the Bay which results in killing the fish. This act was upheld in 1966 in the court case Standard Oil vs. the United States, which prevents oil from being put into our waters. Now listen to what the penalty was, though -- $250.00. Do you think Standard Oil could afford it?

Then there was the Oil Pollution Control Act of 1924 which provided penalties of $2,500 or imprisonment up to a year for dumping oil into the navigable waters of the United States. Very ineffective laws.

In 1948 -- now we're getting up in this century -- the first important Federal Water Pollution Control Act was introduced and it provided for the development of sewage disposal plants which you have today and that take care of organic waste, but do not take care of chemical waste. And the greatest threat to life today is stated to be by microbiologists, not organic waste, but chemical industrial waste. We have not yet developed the kind of treatment facilities for chemical industrial, non-organic waste that really works. Dr. Rene Dubois, one of the world's leading microbiologists and Nobel Prize winner told me that the plants we are presently designing, while important, were technically engineered long before the so-called detergent that ladies like to use so much. And we are having problems because you want to get that shirt a little whiter. Because the simple fact of the matter is today that many of these detergents are polluting the streams, polluting our water supplies and cannot be handled by our modern sanitation systems.

A very distinguished Minnesotan was the first man to introduce legislation relating to water pollution control in 1956. And, of course, prophets go without honor in their own country. But let it be a matter of record that the first man who introduced major pollution control legislation and took a beating for it because of being considered a zealot and radical, was the congressman from this district, John Blatnik. He was the author of the major,

basic piece of legislation that offers any hope for water pollution control. It provided grants to help local communities build sewage disposal plants. Then, in 1961, the same congressman introduced another bill to propose a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, a separate Federal administration that would exercise strict control with strict standards, and, by the way, that administration was to affect not only interstate water, but intra -- intra -- within the state. 26,000 bodies of fresh water exist in the United States and of those only 4,000 are interstate.

And, by the way, young friends, why don't you ask your county commissioners here and your state legislators and your governor and other people why we're letting raw sewage run from homes along lakeshores in lakes. They have no right to do this. What would you think if somebody came up and decided to empty their toilet in your front yard? I'll tell you the police would be right on them. Every lake in this state is part of your front yard. When people start polluting the air, polluting the rivers, dumping their sewage into the lakes and rivers, spewing up their smoke and fumes into the atmosphere, what they're really doing is taking a great big garbage truck and just driving up to your house and dumping it. And if they did that, somebody would say, "Well, look at that person."

Well, we have been doing something about this. We've established a water laboratory in Duluth. There is also new legislation, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965. I mention these things quickly and I want you to look into them.

Let's talk a little more about air pollution. The first legislation in a major sense was introduced in 1965. And the automobile industry came down to Washington. I was there and they said "We cannot have this legislation forced upon us to compel us to put on pollution control devices." I was taken to a laboratory, while Vice President, where I was told how difficult it would be to develop such a device. They said, "You know what it's going to mean don't you, Mr. Humphrey? It's going to raise the price of a car from twenty-five to forty dollars." I've seen car prices go up and I don't hold that against anyone, but what a bad argument. The smoke from one of these big buses is equivalent to an individual smoking a hundred cartons of cigarettes if he were to breathe it in. Smoking is another problem. The odds are that if you persist in smoking you will have a better chance of getting cancer of the lung and emphysema by a factor of about a hundred to one.

Going back to the Clean Air Act of 1965. Now, we know, don't we, that we can put devices on automobiles to remove a large amount of pollution. We know something else, too, that we can develop a low combustion engine. And we can develop gasoline that is not leaded. Leaded gasoline is about as harmless as eating strychnine. I'm a pharmacist and I know that strychnine is not healthy for you. Because breathing in leaded gasoline is accumulative, like arsenic. It never leaves you. Just gets in your lungs and stays right there and starts gnawing at them like an acid. Now we found that out, but it was kept out of the public domain for a long time.

Well, you might say, "If everybody knows all this, why haven't we done something about it?" Mainly because we've let things happen before we did anything about the pollution. An example was just given to you. We told the automobile industry to develop these devices to control pollution as soon as it was practical and feasible. And they never found the time to do it. Now I happen to know after one solid year of controversy with the Federal Aviation Administration that we now have engines for jets that take out 90% of the smoke, the fumes, of all the carbon you see spewing out over this country. In Washington, D.C., the

average cost per household increase because of pollution from air traffic is $200.00 for cleaning and wear and tear because much of it is like an acid that eats right into you and the fabrics. Now, if I were to tell that some group of people in Washington that they had to increase their taxes by $20.00 per year in order to control air pollution, they'd say "Get rid of that big spender, that fellow who wants to tax us." You're being taxed every day. Every day that your life is being shortened, you are being taxed. Every day sickness is the greatest tax on a human being there is. The rise in the rate of emphysema and the rise in the rate of lung cancer in this country is more costly than any single item in the Federal budget, save the defense budget.

The State of Minnesota is now in a row with the Federal government and I want you to know, despite the fact that I've been with that Federal government for a long time, I think our state is right. The State is involved in a pollution controversy relating to the discharge of radioisotopes in Minnesota's state waters by nuclear power plants. And they're arguing with the Federal Atomic Energy Commission as to which standards ought to prevail. And because our state took the initiative, the entire structure of Federal standards today is being reviewed, because somebody cared, because somebody blew the whistle. I want to remind this young audience that the standards we have for atomic energy -- disposal of atomic energy waste -- were standards that were arrived at 20 years ago, and have little or no relevancy to modern needs and modern science. And, fortunately, because seventeen other states have now joined with us, we are on the way to doing something about it.

Now, it's easy to look for villains in this environmental thing. Everybody likes to point to the other guy. I noticed the other day that a group of young students at the University of Michigan got their hammers out, steel saws, and bats and beat up an old 1959 Ford. They said it was symbolic. I said "What does it symbolize?" They said "Well, the automobile, it's a polluter. We were just beating it up, killing it off." I said "No, the automobile is not a polluter." You know, I've got an old Ford parked in my garage. It hasn't polluted anything. Caused a little trouble with Mrs. Humphrey. She wants the garage space. A car becomes a pollutor when you get into it -- when the motor moves. It's man that pollutes. It isn't the product, it's we the people. And we can go around here and point to the paper company, the power company, the steel company, the soap company. We can point to all of them and they do -- all of us have some guilt. And I want to say here in the presence of industry, and industrial representatives that the time for talking about what we are going to do about pollution is over. The time to act is now. And we are going to have to act precisely on the basis of the information that we have and the research that we're doing, and to expand that research. And this is part of the Federal government to expand that research. So, I repeat to you, it's easy to find villains. It's harder to reach a rational, mature recognition of our shared guilt. The road back to environmental health is going to be a long one and an expensive one. Volunteers in the battle against pollution are welcome. We even need a few speechmakers. Short termers won't help. Are you willing to sign up for a long hitch? Are you willing to commit more than your enthusiasm? Are you willing to pay a little higher price on occasion? Are you willing to pay higher taxes? Are you willing to have Federal appropriations to put some inspectors on to see that these oil digging rigs off the coastlines don't spew oil into our waters? Are you willing to put up some funds for some great research laboratories? Are you willing to have something done about your tax structure to give incentives to industry? Are you willing to put penalties on the polluters? Because if you're willing to make this commitment, then let's change from the rhetoric and get down to reality.

I recommend that the President and the Congress establish by resolution and Executive Order the decade of the 1970's as the decade of people, environment and peace, because they're all tied in together. And for lack of a better phrase, call it the PEP decade. Now an entire decade dedicated to people and how they live in their environment -- an entire decade set aside to concentrate on the battle of physical pollution of the environment -- a decade born in the frustration of war, and dedicated to peace -- that provides meaning for our ultimate goal of building together in peace a better world for tomorrow.

We have four levels on which we can go to work. The local level, the state level, the national level and the international level. At the local level, it requires citizens' participation, rewards and awards. At the state level, new state laws, strict and effective state enforcement. I suggest that we call upon every legislature, particularly our own, to put at the top of its agenda for the legislative session of 1971 the improvement of the physical environment and the laws necessary to do it. If our state laws are not up to date, let's find out what we can do to make them up to date and let's find out what we can do to make them effective.

At the national level, we should call upon the Congress to establish strict standards for all forms of pollution, standards that would prevent economic blackmail where a major employer could cast aside the public's interests and put a gun to the community's head by threatening to close a plant and put thousands of people out of work if that plant is made to conform to even minimum pollution abatement measures for air and water. This is an anti-social attitude and has no place in modern industry. No business has the right to say that to a community. They may have good economic reasons to want to talk to a community, but no one should ever threaten a community, particularly when we're dealing with life itself. With Federal legislation, companies such as this who apparently have as their prime interest their annual profit statement, would find no haven of pollution privilege by being able to move to another state where pollution requirements are governed by state laws, rather than Federal law. I must say with equal candor that it's also the duty of public officials in the community to work with industry to try to prevent that unhappy situation.

Congress should review every law that we have on the books. Every law should be reviewed to bring them up to date and to make sure that penalties for polluters are strong enough and that the incentives to industry to take corrective measures are good enough.

At the international level, working through the United Nations, we should negotiate treaties and ratify these agreements to protect the environment, to establish enforceable standards for clean air and clean water and strict rules should be set up to prevent contamination of international rivers and oceans. And we need a U.N. Board of Environmental Control.

Now, up here at home. I want you to start right here in Colquet. I propose a community coalition for clean environment, a mobilization of public and private efforts of all age groups in all segments. To coordinate all of the essential efforts in such a program, I would suggest that the state through the Governor's office or the legislature, establish a citizen's advisory board on environment, in which there is industry, lay public, labor, young people and interested citizens. An advisory board on environment, conservation and recreation. And what state has more to offer than we do? The state board would work with similar boards at a local level.

I want to propose a special honors program for communities where the State of Minnesota, after examining their work in the field of recreation, conservation, and pollution control, would present an"E"award for excellence in environment. I'd like to recommend that the State of Minnesota and indeed, the nation, start to give E awards -- E awards -- excellence in environmental contral, and"E"award of a perfectly blue background, like the blue of the heavens and the blue waters of Minnesota with a white E that shows purity and cleanliness. It could be done and then we'll find out which towns and states are doing something.

I propose another thing that regular reports should be issued out of the Governor's office as to the beautification of environment and protection of our state, including how we're cleaning up automobile graveyards, what we're doing about our parks, beautification of local communities, and what we're doing about our neighborhoods. I don't want this society, after ten thousand years, when they dig around to be labeled in conversation as "Apparently everybody just lived in their car," or "We seem to find beer cans all over the place."

Well, we can do something about that. Let's clean these things up. And I have another suggestion. Each community should have its own environmental control officer. Now, if you go to Europe, you find in every part of a European community or country, a Conservation Office. They have local Conservation Officers out around the country-side. They have local park officers to help keep parks up. Sometimes they're voluntary; sometimes they're paid. And we've got to call on every youth organization in the state to make improvements in the physical environment their number one task -- starting with our 4H clubs, our Future Farmers, our Boys' Clubs, our Girl and Boy Scouts, Guides and so on.

I would suggest that we propose that radio, television and newspapers start including with each weather report, air pollution count for their particular community. I'd like to know, not only what kind of weather we're going to have, but what I'm going to be breathing during the day -- how much carbon dioxide, monoxide -- how much sulfurous gas I am going to be breathing, and I want to tell this audienceright now, that if in the large cities of America there was an air pollution report each day that you went out, you'd do something about it. I might even suggest that the Department of Conservation in this state, together with the Water Quality Laboratory in Duluth, could provide a weekly published report on water pollution in our lakes, streams and rivers.

Well, that's about what I wanted to tell you. So I ask this question: Can we as a nation entertain the painful possibility that our proud effort to conquer nature and to tame the frontier may very well have been destructive and can we reverse our course?

I think the structure of our Federal government needs to be reorganized to establish a whole new Department on Environmental Control. We take for granted the air that we breathe; we take for granted there is an unlimited supply of water and there isn't. As a matter of fact, one of the shortest resources in the world today is clean water and we take for granted that there is lots of land and living space.

I want you now to take for granted that God Almighty had a plan for this earth and it was called "ecology," the balance between man and his environment. And man has altered that environment, and in some places has altered it to his detriment. We have a high standard of living and if we don't watch out, we're going to have a higher standard of dying. This is what this conference is all about.

Adlai Stevenson, in his last address before the United Nations, summed it up for us, and listen to this. That is why I've covered the international, as well as the local, aspects. These are the words of this wonderful, beautiful man:

> "We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, our world, dependent on its vulnerable resources of air and soil, all committed to our safety, to its security and peace, preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work (and I will add, the love) that we give our fragile craft."

He reminded us that we will be preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and the love we give this fragile craft. And to my young friends who have shown so much concern these recent years to a world that would be free of violence, and to the many young people who say today that what the world needs is love rather than hate, and to the young people who say that what we need is to be more concerned and considerate of each other, rather than unconcerned or antagonistic, the best way I know how to do it is to take care of the air you breathe, the water you drink, the land upon which you live, and the community in which you will spend the days of your life.

REMARKS

BY

001700

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

ENVIRONMENTAL SYMPOSIUM

CLOQUET SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

CLOQUET, MINNESOTA

APRIL 6, 1970

In an earlier time, the world was wide, and man could afford to be profligate. He had unmeasurable oceans, unchartered seas, impenetrable forests, trackless desserts -- and more arable land than he could hope to till.

But over the centuries, man multiplied, and the once limitless earth shrunk to finite limits. The last hundred years have seen man -- with his dramatically increased numbers and mobility -- pre-empt almost all the habitable areas on our earth.

The precious balance between man and his natural environment - a balance that evolved through endless ages - has fallen victim to wanton application of technological progress.

Uncrowded primitive man with his simple technology could live at peace with his environment. But the wonders of science and technology -- which gave man the knowledge and the tools to change and adapt his environment -- have done violence to this once peaceful relationship.

The basic elements that comprise our environment -- air, water, and the earth that grows our food -- have been endangered by man's casual neglect of his natural heritage.

Man, with his erect posture and dominant intelligence, has endangered all other species until today, in the most remote corners of the earth, little plant or animal life exists save on man's sufference.

Yes! Today, highly structured and stable organizations of physical elements that have maintained and sustained life on our planet are in jeopardy.

and We know why! We know about the tons of solid waste we dump along our highways each year, the mountains of trash we toss in incenerators and alleys.

L We know our automobile exhausts poison the air -- and we know that the people who make the automobiles, and the people who produce the materials for the people who make the automobiles, poison our air.

We know that we are filling our great waterways with ~~fetid~~ pollutants and that fish are dying in our marvelous fresh water lakes, and that the once unchartered seas are becoming great garbage pits.

Many of us have come lately to this awareness. Only a few years ago the ~~great~~ leaders in the pollution battle -- ~~such men as Senator Muskie and Senator Jackson and Congressman Blatnik and Congressman Udall~~ -- were regarded - if they were regarded at all - as zealots - perhaps even as crackpots - as they warned of the damage we were willfully doing our natural heritage.

Some people in private + public life
~~Such fine legislators as the late Congressman Clem~~
~~Miller~~ fought lonely uphill battles to save our precious forest and
natural seashore areas from the increasing depredations
of the developers.

Today, with the fickle perversity of the April weather,
public opinion has swung high and wide to encompass
and surround the serious environmentalists and -- I
am afraid - to become this years fad.

Do not misunderstand: the new awareness and
concern for our environment is a good and constructive
development. But there are two aspects of this "green
Revolution" that cause me grave concern:

I worry

1. That it may indeed be a fad -- that, like civil rts freedom marches, sit-ins, freedom rides in Applachia and other causes of the sixties that today seem to be out of vogue -- this sudden and exhuberant concern for environmental problems may pass from popularity before the tough hard job is really begun, and

I worry,

2. That our sudden recognition of ecological concerns may cause us to forget, ignore or neglect to pursue the other critical areas of the human environment -- the continuing decay of our cities, the increase in crime and violence, the problems of unemployment and the unstable economy, racial polarity, the arms race -- and so forth.

It is unfortunate that the popular American culture so quickly devours and so abruptly forgets the passions of yesterday. Whether we are talking about hula hoops or Head Start, rat control or gun control, too often we are recalling a transitory National enthusiasm!

And I am concerned that we not enter this environmental battle with so shallow a commitment!

For this business of getting ourselves back into fragile balance with the natural world is going to require a long-range sustained effort by each one of us -- and a very personal effort.

-- It will be necessary new to support Federal legislation.

-- It will be necessary to lobby for tough new state laws and regulations.

-- It will be necessary to seek new land fill areas for municipal dumps.

-- It will be necessary to watch our personal trash -- the empty cigarette package tossed out of the car window, the tube of sun tan lotion on the beach, the paper plates and other refuse from a pleasant rural picnic. — Yes, all this — but we are going to have to go a lot farther, if we are to make any real headway in what is basically a battle against our own greed.

No pious preachments will win this battle. But a bit of self denial can do a great deal.

Americans --- only six percent of the worlds population -- consume 40 percent of the worlds produce.!

In physical energy alone -- the energy that softly and indirectly lights our pleasant dwelling places, that powers our vehicles of personal and mass transit, that heats and cools and purifies our air, that provides our television images and our recorded and transcribed music, that instantly heats our pre-packaged and frozen foods, that runs the hundreds of home hair dryers and electric razors and toasters and blendors and the multitude of other large and small appliances we have become so dependent on -- this energy (according to a Fortune magazine calculation) is equal to the muscular energy that would be generated if every American man, woman, and child had 500 "slaves" at his immediate disposal.

See this!

A similar calculation by Buckminster Fuller only three decades ago shows that such energy expenditure increased over 300 percent in this short time span.

I think we must consider Americans over-indulgent.

But self-indulgence becomes a habit, especially in the wake of affluence. Reversing this trend is going to require some hard choices.

Are we willing to sacrifice speed -- or will we accept the horrendous sound of supersonic transports?

Are we willing to have a less-than-perfect white wash -- or will we continue to pollute our underground reservoirs with the poisonous residues of our washday miracle products?

Are we willing to return beverage bottles for refilling -- or will we continue to pile up mountains of non-returnable-- and non-disintegratable - bottles and cans in our coast-to coast dumps?

Are we willing to pay higher local taxes -- or will we continue to allow raw sewage to pour into rivers and bays for want of adequate sewage treatment facilities?

Are we willing to assign enough Federal inspectors to check the off-shore oil rigs or ~~increase our Federal taxes -- or~~ will we continue to allow oil slicks - from Santa Barbara to Tampa to Louisiana - to pollute our beaches and kill marine life ~~because we don't have enough Federal inspectors to check the off-shore oil rigs?~~

Industry is well-known and easily attacked as a prime polluter! But who is really at fault -- the producer -- or the consumer without whom there would be no product? Are we willing to pay higher prices (for some of the cost of getting rid of industrial pollutants must be passed on to the consumer) ~~or will we continue to comparison shop and save pennies -- at the expense of environmental quality?~~

It is easy to find villains -- the oil companies and the power plants, the makers of pesticides and the producers of defoliants. It is harder to reach a rational and mature recognition of our shared guilt -- and our mutual responsibility for action.

The road back to environmental health is going to be a long one -- and an expensive one. Volunteers in the battle against pollution are welcome. But short-termers won't help. Are you willing to sign up for a long hitch? Are you willing to commit more than your enthusiasm, more than your rhetorical recognition of where we are? - and what must we do?

Can we, as a nation, entertain the painful possibility that our proud effort to "conquor nature" and to "tame the frontier" has been destructive; can we reverse our course?

Can we accept a technological moratorium and a considered halt to our expansionist commercial tendencies while we look again at our world and what we are doing to it?

This is what it is going to take, ~~my friends~~ and maybe much more.

Adlai Stevenson, in his last address at the United Nations, said it beautifully:

Adlai Stevenson, in his last address at the United Nations - said it so well.

"We travel together, passengers on a little spaceship, dependent on its vulnerable resources of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and, I will say, the love we give our fragile craft."

#

REMARKS

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

CLOQUET HIGH SCHOOL

APRIL 6, 1970

IF YOU ARE READY AND WILLING TO MAKE THIS COMMITMENT.. ...THEN LET'S CHANGE FROM RHETORIC TO REALITY.....LET US CONCENTRATE ON SOME POSITIVE AND IMMEDIATE STEPS THAT CAN BE TAKEN.....STEPS THAT WILL NOT ONLY HAVE A VISIBLE IMPACT ON MANY OF OUR ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS, BUT WILL MOST CERTAINLY WIDEN THE SCOPE OF ACTIVE COMMUNITY AWARENESS TO THIS VERY CRITICAL SITUATION NOW CONFRONTING OUR SOCIETY.

I RECOMMEND THAT THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS ESTABLISH THE 1970s AS THE DECADE OF PEOPLE, ENVIRONMENT AND PEACE - THE "PEP" DECADE, AN ENTIRE DECADE DEDICATED TO PEOPLE.....RECOGNIZING DIGNITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S HUMAN RIGHTS.....AN ENTIRE DECADE SET ASIDE TO CONCENTRATE ON THE BATTLE THAT MUST BE FOUGHT AGAINST POLLUTION.....AND A DECADE BORN IN THE FRUSTRATIONS OF WAR AND DEDICATED TO A PEACE THAT PROVIDES MEANING FOR OUR ULTIMATE GOAL OF BUILDING TOGETHER IN PEACE A BETTER WORLD FOR TOMORROW.

upon which to concentrate our attention.

THESE ARE A FEW OF THE THINGS. WE SHOULD HAVE FOUR LEVELS -- WHAT CAN YOU DO AT THE LOCAL LEVEL; WHAT CAN YOU DO AT THE STATE LEVEL; WHAT CAN YOU DO AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL; AND THEN, OF COURSE, THE FINAL -- WHAT CAN YOU DO AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL. AT THE LOCAL LEVEL IT REQUIRES CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, REWARDS AND AWARDS; AT THE STATE LEVEL IT REQUIRES NEW STATE LAW, STRICT AND effective STATE ENFORCEMENT.

(1) WE SHOULD CALL UPON EVERY LEGISLATURE TO PUT AT THE TOP OF ITS AGENDA FOR THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION STARTING 1971 THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.

(2) AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL WE MUST CALL UPON THE CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH STRICT STANDARDS ON ALL FORMS OF POLLUTION..... STANDARDS THAT WOULD PREVENT THE FAMILIAR ECONOMIC BLACKMAIL WE HAVE BEEN EXPOSED TO HERE IN MINNESOTA, WHERE A MAJOR EMPLOYER CASTS ASIDE THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND PUTS A GUN TO THE COMMUNITY'S HEAD BY THREATENING TO CLOSE HIS PLANT AND PUT

THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE OUT OF WORK IF MADE TO CONFORM TO EVEN THE MINIMUM POLLUTION ABATEMENT MEASURES FOR AIR AND WATER,

WITH FEDERAL LEGISLATION, COMPANIES SUCH AS THIS, WHOSE ~~ONLY~~ prime INTEREST ~~IS~~ sometimes THEIR ANNUAL PROFIT, WOULD ~~BE PROHIBITED FROM~~ find no haven of Pollution privilege by moving to ~~MOVING TO~~ ANOTHER STATE WHERE POLLUTION REQUIREMENTS if governed only by state laws might be less demanding. ~~WITHOUT THE NECESSARY ACTION BY THE CONGRESS MIGHT OTHERWISE NOT EXIST.~~

(3) ~~AT THE SAME TIME,~~ THE CONGRESS SHOULD REVIEW EVERY LAW REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENT THAT IS NOW ON THE BOOKS.

THESE LAWS SHOULD BE UPDATED.....MAKE SURE THE PENALTIES FOR POLLUTERS ARE STRONG ENOUGH.....AND EQUALLY IMPORTANT, MAKE SURE THE INCENTIVES TO TAKE CORRECTIVE MEASURES TO STOP POLLUTION ARE REALISTIC IN TERMS OF TODAY'S LONG RANGE CORPORATE PLANNING.

(4) International

AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL, WORKING THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS, WE SHOULD NEGOTIATE AND RATIFY TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT, TO ESTABLISH ENFORCEABLE

STANDARDS FOR CLEAN AIR; STANDARDS FOR CLEAN WATER; AND STRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS TO PREVENT CONTAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL RIVERS AND THE OCEANS.

A UNITED NATIONS BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED TO SUPERVISE AND MONITOR ALL ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EFFORTS.

(5) at the community level —

I PROPOSE A COMMUNITY COALITION FOR A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT -- A MOBILIZATION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE EFFORTS OF ALL AGE GROUPS AND ALL SEGMENTS OF THE SOCIETY.

WE NOW HAVE AN URBAN COALITION IN OUR MAJOR CITIES, BUT THE COMMUNITY COALITION FOR A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT WOULD BE MUCH BROADER AND COULD GO INTO EVERY PART OF THE STATE AND BEYOND THE STATE, TO THE NATION.

(6) TO COORDINATE ALL OF THE ESSENTIAL EFFORTS IN SUCH A PROGRAM, I SUGGEST THAT THE STATE ESTABLISH A CITIZENS' ADVISORY BOARD ON ENVIRONMENT, CONSERVATION AND RECREATION. THIS STATE BOARD WOULD WORK WITH SIMILAR BOARDS ORGANIZED IN EACH COMMUNITY THROUGHOUT MINNESOTA TO ESTABLISH LOCAL STANDARDS OF CONFORMANCE, AS WELL AS PROVIDING GUIDANCE, INFORMATION AND DIRECTION TO ITS LOCAL CITIZENS AND INDUSTRY. THIS IS WHAT WE REALLY MEAN BY "CITIZEN PARTICIPATION" IN THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL LIFE OF THE COUNTRY. LET'S TAKE POLITICS TO THE PEOPLE -- WHEN I SAY POLITICS, I MEAN THE WHOLE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC POLICY AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION TO THE PEOPLE.

(7) I PROPOSE A SPECIAL HONORS PROGRAM FOR OUR COMMUNITIES WHERE THE STATE OF MINNESOTA WOULD PRESENT AN "E" AWARD FOR "EXCELLENCE IN ENVIRONMENT".

(8) LIKEWISE, THERE SHOULD BE A REGULAR REPORT ISSUED OUT OF THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE AS TO RESULTS IN BEAUTIFICATION AND

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION OF OUR STATE.....THE RESULTS OF WHAT LOCAL COMMUNITIES ARE DOING IN THEIR PARKS, AROUND CITY HALL AND IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS.....INCLUDING HOW WE ARE CLEANING UP THE AUTOMOBILE GRAVEYARDS, HOW WE'RE CLEANING UP ALONG ROADSIDES.

(9) EACH COMMUNITY SHOULD HAVE AT LEAST ONE APPOINTED OFFICER, VOLUNTARY OR PAID, THAT WOULD SERVE LIKE A LOCAL CONSERVATIONIST OR ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER.

IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES THERE ARE LOCAL FORESTERS AND LOCAL CONSERVATIONISTS THAT HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A PARTICULAR AREA, WE CAN DO THE SAME THING HERE IN OUR RESPECTIVE CITIES. THIS MAN CAN BE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE LOCAL CITIZENS' BOARD ON ENVIRONMENT, CONSERVATION AND RECREATION.

10 WE SHOULD CALL ON EVERY YOUTH ORGANIZATION IN THE STATE TO MAKE IMPROVEMENTS OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT THEIR NUMBER ONE TASK. BOY SCOUTS, BOYS'CLUBS, FUTURE FARMERS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS GIRL GUIDES, CUBS, BLUEBIRDS, ETC.

001720

air Pollution Report

(11) I PROPOSE THAT THE RADIO, TELEVISION AND NEWSPAPERS START INCLUDING WITH EACH WEATHER REPORT A DAILY AIR POLLUTION COUNT FOR THEIR PARTICULAR COMMUNITY.

THE INFORMATION CAN BE READILY MADE AVAILABLE FROM THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OR THE CITY AND COUNTY POLLUTION ABATEMENT BOARDS. THESE AIR POLLUTION REPORTS WOULD PROVIDE AN ACCUMULATIVE COUNT OF THE TOTAL OF MICROGRAMS OF SOLID MATTER IN THE AIR YOU BREATHE IN THE PRECEDING 24 HOURS. ALL OF THIS WOULD BE REPORTED IN RELATION TO THE 75 MICROGRAMS WHICH IS THE ESTABLISHED LEGAL MAXIMUM ANNUAL AVERAGE. DO THIS ONE LITTLE THING AND YOU'D SOON SEE AN OTHERWISE APATHETIC CITIZENRY BECOME ACTIVELY CONCERNED WHEN THEY FIND -- AS THEY DO IN THE TWIN CITIES RIGHT NOW -- THAT THESE DAILY COUNTS OFTEN RUN MORE THAN 20% ABOVE THIS LEGAL LIMIT OF 75.

(12) THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION IN THIS STATE -- TOGETHER WITH THE WATER QUALITY LAB IN DULUTH -- SHOULD

PROVIDE A WEEKLY PUBLISHED REPORT OF WATER POLLUTION IN THE LAKES, STREAMS AND RIVERS OF THIS STATE.

NOW I REALIZE THAT THIS IS QUITE A FORMIDABLE TASK AT FIRST THOUGHT. HOWEVER, I AM CONFIDENT THAT SUCH AN ANALYSIS REPORTING SYSTEM COULD BE ESTABLISHED BY USING EXISTING FACILITIES WITHIN OUR COMMUNITIES AND COUNTIES. NOW A WATER POLLUTION REPORT, SUCH AS THIS, WILL BE OF NO VALUE IF THOSE MAKING THE SAMPLE ANALYSIS DRAG THEIR FEET, HIDE THE FACTS, OR ALLOW THEMSELVES TO BE INTIMIDATED BY SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS -- BE THEY POLITICAL OR INDUSTRIAL. JUST IMAGINE HOW QUICKLY A REPORT SUCH AS THIS WOULD POINT OUT AREAS NEEDING IMMEDIATE CONCENTRATION ON SUCH CORRECTIVE MEASURES AS NEW SEWAGE TREATMENT CENTERS. THIS WOULD ALLOW US TO DISCOVER THE PROBLEM AND TAKE REMEDIAL STEPS BEFORE IT BECOMES TOO LATE.

#######

Blogget Speech

opening

IF YOU ARE READY AND WILLING TO MAKE THIS COMMITMENT....THEN LET'S CHANGE FROM RHETORIC TO REALITY....LET US CONCENTRATE ON SOME POSITIVE AND IMMEDIATE STEPS THAT CAN BE TAKEN....STEPS THAT WILL NOT ONLY HAVE A VISIBLE IMPACT ON MANY OF OUR ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS, BUT WILL MOST CERTAINLY WIDEN THE SCOPE OF ACTIVE COMMUNITY AWARENESS TO THIS VERY CRITICAL SITUATION NOW CONFRONTING OUR SOCIETY.

(11) I PROPOSE THAT THE RADIO, TELEVISION AND NEWSPAPERS START INCLUDING WITH EACH WEATHER REPORT A DAILY AIR POLLUTION COUNT FOR THEIR PARTICULAR COMMUNITY. THE INFORMATION CAN BE READILY MADE AVAILABLE FROM THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OR THE CITY AND COUNTY POLLUTION ABATEMENT BOARDS. THESE AIR POLLUTION REPORTS WOULD PROVIDE AN ACCUMULATIVE COUNT OF THE TOTAL OF MICROGRAMS OF SOLID MATTER IN THE AIR YOU BREATHE IN THE PRECEDING 24 HOURS. ALL OF THIS WOULD BE REPORTED IN RELATION TO THE 75 MICROGRAMS WHICH IS THE ESTABLISHED LEGAL MAXIMUM ANNUAL AVERAGE. DO THIS ONE LITTLE THING AND YOU'D SOON SEE AN OTHERWISE APATHETIC CITIZENRY BECOME ACTIVELY CONCERNED WHEN THEY FIND -- AS THEY DO IN THE TWIN CITIES RIGHT NOW -- THAT THESE DAILY COUNTS OFTEN RUN MORE THAN 20% ABOVE THIS LEGAL LIMIT OF 75.

(12) THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION IN THIS STATE -- TOGETHER WITH THE WATER QUALITY LAB IN DULUTH -- SHOULD PROVIDE A WEEKLY PUBLISHED REPORT OF WATER POLLUTION IN THE LAKES, STREAMS AND RIVERS OF THIS STATE. NOW I REALIZE THAT THIS IS QUITE A FORMIDABLE TASK AT FIRST THOUGHT. HOWEVER, I AM CONFIDENT THAT SUCH AN ANALYSIS REPORTING SYSTEM COULD BE ESTABLISHED BY USING EXISTING FACILITIES WITHIN OUR COMMUNITIES AND COUNTIES. NOW A WATER POLLUTION REPORT, SUCH AS

THIS, WILL BE OF NO VALUE IF THOSE MAKING THE SAMPLE ANALYSIS DRAG THEIR FEET, HIDE THE FACTS, OR ALLOW THEMSELVES TO BE INTIMIDATED BY SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS -- BE THEY POLITICAL OR INDUSTRIAL. JUST IMAGINE HOW QUICKLY A REPORT SUCH AS THIS WOULD POINT OUT AREAS NEEDING IMMEDIATE CONCENTRATION ON SUCH CORRECTIVE MEASURES AS NEW SEWAGE TREATMENT CENTERS. THIS WOULD ALLOW US TO DISCOVER THE PROBLEM AND TAKE REMEDIAL STEPS BEFORE IT BECOMES TOO LATE.

LIKEWISE, THERE SHOULD BE A REGULAR REPORT ISSUED OUT OF THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE AS TO RESULTS IN BEAUTIFICATION and Environment Protection OF OUR STATE.. ...THE RESULTS OF WHAT LOCAL COMMUNITIES ARE DOING IN THEIR PARKS, AROUND CITY HALL AND IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS.....INCLUDING HOW WE ARE CLEANING UP THE AUTOMOBILE GRAVEYARDS, HOW WE'RE CLEANING UP ALONG ROADSIDES.

I PROPOSE A SPECIAL HONORS PROGRAM FOR OUR COMMUNITIES WHERE THE STATE OF MINNESOTA WOULD PRESENT AN "E" AWARD FOR "EXCELLENCE IN ENVIRONMENT". TO COORDINATE ALL OF THE ESSENTIAL EFFORTS IN SUCH A PROGRAM, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE STATE ESTABLISH A CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD ON ENVIRONMENT, CONSERVATION AND RECREATION. THIS STATE BOARD WOULD WORK WITH SIMILAR BOARDS ORGANIZED IN EACH COMMUNITY THROUGHOUT MINNESOTA TO ESTABLISH LOCAL STANDARDS OF CONFORMANCE AS WELL AS PROVIDING GUIDANCE, INFORMATION AND DIRECTION TO ITS LOCAL CITIZENS AND INDUSTRY. THIS IS WHAT WE REALLY MEAN BY "CITIZEN PARTICIPATION" IN THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL LIFE OF THE COUNTRY. LET'S TAKE POLITICS TO THE PEOPLE -- WHEN I SAY POLITICS, I MEAN THE WHOLE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC POLICY AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION TO THE PEOPLE.

EACH COMMUNITY SHOULD HAVE AT LEAST ONE APPOINTED OFFICER, [redacted] VOLUNTARY OR PAID, THAT WOULD SERVE LIKE A LOCAL CONSERVATIONIST or OR [redacted] AN ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER. IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES THERE ARE LOCAL FORESTERS AND LOCAL CONSERVATIONISTS THAT HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A PARTICULAR AREA. WE CAN DO THE SAME THING HERE, IN OUR RESPECTIVE CITIES. THIS MAN CAN BE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE LOCAL CITIZENS' BOARD ON ENVIRONMENT, CONSERVATION AND RECREATION.

WE SHOULD CALL ON EVERY YOUTH ORGANIZATION IN THE STATE TO MAKE IMPROVEMENTS OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT THEIR NUMBER ONE TASK. BOY SCOUTS, BOYS' CLUBS, FUTURE FARMERS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS GIRL SCOUTS, CUBS, BLUEBIRDS, ETC. I propose a [redacted] COMMUNITY COALITION FOR A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT. THIS WOULD BE A MOBILIZATION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE EFFORTS OF ALL AGE GROUPS AND ALL SEGMENTS OF THE SOCIETY. WE NOW HAVE AN URBAN COALITION IN OUR MAJOR CITIES, BUT THE COMMUNITY COALITION FOR A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT WOULD BE MUCH BROADER AND COULD GO INTO EVERY PART OF THE STATE AND BEYOND THE STATE, TO THE NATION.

I recommend that [redacted] THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH THE 1970s AS THE DECADE OF PEOPLE, ENVIRONMENT AND PEACE - THE PEP DECADE. AN ENTIRE DECADE DEDICATED TO PEOPLE....RECOGNIZING DIGNITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S HUMAN RIGHTS.....AN ENTIRE DECADE SET ASIDE TO CONCENTRATE ON THE BATTLE THAT MUST BE FOUGHT AGAINST POLLUTION....AND A DECADE BORN IN THE FRUSTRATIONS OF WAR AND DEDICATED TO A PEACE THAT PROVIDES MEANING FOR OUR ULTIMATE GOAL OF BUILDING TOGETHER IN PEACE A BETTER WORLD FOR TOMORROW.

001725

WE SHOULD ~~ALSO TAKE THE LEAD IN~~ call upon THE UNITED NATIONS FOR WORLDWIDE TREATIES ON ENVIRONMENT CONTROL, SETTING UP ~~THE~~ UN BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL TO SUPERVISE AND MONITOR ALL ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EFFORTS.

THESE ARE A FEW OF THE THINGS. WE SHOULD HAVE FOUR LEVELS -- WHAT CAN YOU DO AT THE LOCAL LEVEL; WHAT CAN YOU DO AT THE STATE LEVEL; WHAT CAN YOU DO AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL; AND THEN, OF COURSE, THE FINAL -- WHAT CAN YOU DO AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL. AT THE LOCAL LEVEL IT REQUIRES CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, REWARDS AND AWARDS; AT THE STATE LEVEL IT REQUIRES EFFECTIVE STATE LAW, STRICT AND MEANINGFUL STATE ENFORCEMENT. WE SHOULD CALL UPON EVERY LEGISLATURE TO PUT AT THE TOP OF ITS AGENDA FOR THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION STARTING 1971 THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT. AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL WE MUST CALL UPON THE CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH STRICT STANDARDS ON ALL FORMS OF POLLUTION..... STANDARDS THAT WOULD PREVENT THE FAMILIAR ECONOMIC BLACKMAIL WE HAVE BEEN EXPOSED TO HERE IN MINNESOTA, WHERE A MAJOR EMPLOYER CASTS ASIDE THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND PUTS A GUN TO THE COMMUNITY'S HEAD BY THREATENING TO CLOSE HIS PLANT AND PUT THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE OUT OF WORK IF MADE TO CONFORM TO EVEN THE MINIMUM POLLUTION ABATEMENT MEASURES FOR AIR AND WATER. WITH FEDERAL LEGISLATION COMPANIES SUCH AS THIS, WHOSE ONLY INTEREST IS THEIR ANNUAL PROFIT, WOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM MOVING TO ANOTHER STATE WHERE POLLUTION REQUIREMENTS -- WITHOUT THE NECESSARY ACTION BY THE CONGRESS -- MIGHT OTHERWISE NOT EXIST. AT THE SAME TIME THE CONGRESS SHOULD

(continued)

REVIEW EVERY LAW REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENT THAT IS NOW ON THE BOOKS. THESE LAWS SHOULD BE UPDATED.....MAKE SURE THE PENALTIES FOR POLLUTERS ARE STRONG ENOUGH.....AND EQUALLY IMPORTANT, MAKE SURE THE INCENTIVES TO TAKE CORRECTIVE MEASURES TO STOP POLLUTION ARE REALISTIC IN TERMS OF TODAY'S LONG RANGE CORPORATE PLANNING.,

4. AT the international level, working through the United Nations, we should negotiate and ratify Treaties and Agreements to establish enforceable Standards for clean Air; Standards for clean Water; and strict rules + regulations to prevent contamination of International rivers and the Oceans.

to protect the environment;

A UN Board of Environmental Control should be established to supervise and monitor all international environmental control efforts.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CLOQUET SPEECH

file

001727

Just as we have a daily weather report, we should also have a daily pollution report - pollution of the air - and at least once a week from the Department of Conservation in the state, or from the Water Quality lab in Duluth, we should have a report on water pollution in our Minnesota lakes, or at least a sampling of those lakes. Likewise, there should be a regular report issued out of the Governor's office as to results in beautification of our state, the results of what local communities are doing and their parks, around City Hall and in the neighborhoods, including how we are cleaning up the automobile graveyards, how we're cleaning up along roadsides and there should be a special program of honors for the communities. I would propose that the State of Minnesota offer an 'E' Award for Excellence in Environment for the localities that live up to certain standards. There should be set up in this state a Citizen's Advisory Board on Environment, Conservation and Recreation. We should propose that each community have its own Environment, Conservation and Recreation Board and establish its own local standards to make its own local awards and give guidance and direction. This is what we really mean by 'citizen participation' in the political and social life of the country. Let's take politics to the people - when I say politics, I mean the whole concept of public policy and its implementation to the people.

Each community should have at least one appointed officer, either voluntary or paid, that would serve like a local conservationist or in this instance, an environmental officer. In the European countries there

are local foresters and local conservationists that have responsibility for a particular area. We can do the same thing here, in our respective cities. This man can be the chairman of a Citizens' Board on Environment, Conservation and Recreation. We should call on every youth organization in the state to make improvements of the physical environment their number one task. Boy Scouts, Boys' Clubs, Future Farmers, and other organizations such as Girl Scouts, Cubs, Bluebirds, etc. What we need is a community coalition for a clean environment. This would be a mobilization of public and private efforts of all age groups and all segments of the society. We now have what we cann an Urban Coalition in our major cities, but the community coalition for a clean environment would be much broader and could go into every part of the state and nation. We should call upon the President and the Congress to establish by either Executive Order or Congressional Resolution the 1970s as the decade of people, environment and peace - the PEP decade - or something similar such as decade of environmental control, or improvement of environment.

We should also take the lead in the United Nations for worldwide treaties on environment control, setting up the UN Board of Environmental Control to supervise and monitor all environmental control efforts. George Kennan spoke on this and it's in the recent edition of the Foreign Affairs Quarterly - let's get it.

These are a few of the things. We should have three levels - what can you do at the local level; what can you do at the state level; what can you do at the national level; and then, of course, the final - what can you do at the international level - so this would be four things. At the local level it requires citizen participation, rewards,

awards; at the state level it requires state law, effective state administration - all states without proper legislation or without the authority and resources to do the job. We should call upon every legislature to put at the top of its agenda for the legislative session starting 1971 the improvement of the physical environment and we should make very sure that the same is done in Congress to review every law and make sure that the penalties are strong enough and the incentives are likewise good enough - incentives to control pollution. We should also make very clear that our present concern about the physical environment does not become an escape for doing the things that need to be done about total environment. I speak of the housing of our people, the noise and congestion of our cities, of the countryside that needs to be beautified and cleaned up, of the education and health of our people; because the physical environment of water and air is only part of the environment in which man lives. He also lives in buildings; he lives in schools; his mind can be polluted as well as the air that he breathes. His health can be polluted by inadequate food and lack of proper medical attention, etc.

REMARKS OF HHH at Cloquet, Minnesota
Environmental Symposium, April 6, 1970

Transcript

001730

HHH: Sue, I can't properly thank you for your generous introduction. I've said that if a man is going to be introduced, he ought to be introduced by a friend, because truth never stands in the way of a good introduction when a friend talks about you. And Sue has overdone it. But I'm grateful. After you've been Vice President, and almost got elected President, Sue, you have no idea how good it feels to hear somebody brag on you like you did on me.

I also want to thank both Sue and Rick Hagen and others that have been so very active in making this program possible, and your own John Ricotta(?) who has put so much effort into this program as the Advisor. I was met at the airport by a wonderful delegation; I was recruited for the hockey team by Bill Kennedy. I was given a royal good Democratic welcome by Floyd Roody(?), and I was embraced, almost, by both Sueand Nancy Gibbons, so that I can tell you that it's been a wonderful morning.

The last time I was here it's been indicated was on the occasion of the dedication of this wonderful school. And, by the way, I have been your public relations officer ever since. I've been from one end of this country to another and telling people about the amazing, wonderful school system in Cloquet, and particularly this Senior High School, because I remember so well, I believe it was May 23rd, that I was here with you. And I want to express again my thanks for the reception you gave me. And I recall that I was introduced on that occasxion by Nancy Gibbons, and I want you to know, Nancy, you're the prettiest president I've every met in my life, president of the student

council, but it only proves that women can be presidents, and you never can tell what's going to happen around this country. Now Sue has said that my life was sort of like a scare. Well, Sue, I want you to know I've been runnin' scared ever since I got started. And today I'd be very - I'd be less than honest if I didn't tell you that I'm just ~~as~~ about as nervous as I've ever been for any speech. People always say to me "Do you ever get nervous? Do you ever get butterflies? Do you ever get feeling all jittery?" Yes, I do. I hope that I always will, because that makes you want to do better. It's sort of like asking an older fellow if he ever gets excited when he sees a pretty girl. ~~XX~~ Of course. THat's why I took my stand for mini skirts against those new midis that they've got out lately.

Now I want to get right down to business because this is a busy day for you, and we're here on very important business. We're here on the business of your future. And that includes the overwhelming majority of this audience. I am talking to a group of young people to whom the year 2000 is just around the corner. Now as far as I am myself personally concerned, I - I'm ~~XXX~~ looking to the year 2000, but I can't bet one it, even though I've got a couple of bottles of Geritol stashed away, and I take a few exercises and so forth, but at least 85% of ~~you~~ this audience will be alive and in the prime of life at the year 2000.

Now some scientists tell us that by the year 2000, unless we change our ways, that will be the beginning of the end. And I have to tell you quite candidly that other civilizations have disappexared. So don't think that ours is eternal, necessarily.

And I have to tell you as a student and as a teacher, and I of human life
am now a teacher, that all forms/have disappeared from this earth before. So you have to be quite objective about it, realistic. I'm not a negativist. I don't believe in just downgrading people and whining and worrying. But I do believe in being a realist, facing up to the challenges, facing up to the problems that we have, facing up to the difficulties, and seizing upon those difficulties and problems and making them challenges and opportunities. And that's what I'd like to do here today. And I say to the parents that are here, that we've got to do our job. These young people out here not permitted by law to exercise the ballot. I happen to be one that believes they ought to exercise it and have the right to vote at age 18 and I strongly support it. Because their lives are involved in these political decisions. But we don't have that yet. We don't have the franchise at age 18, or 19, the right to votes. So those that are age 21 and over, and particularly parents, we've got some hard thinking to do about the kind of a world we want to live in. Now what happened recently is a whole new awareness about what we call ecology, this delicate balance in nature, which God Almighty, or Divine Providence, or nature put together for us, and what we as human beings have been doing about it. And we've been interrupting this balance ever since man put foot on earth. We often talk about Minnesota, the land of ten thousand lakes and the sky blue water. Now I ask you very frankly, how many lakes have sky blue water today. We've talked about our beautiful rivers and our virgin forests and we've had a hard battle even preserving some of those forests.

Thank goodness and since the days of Theodore Roosevelt and others, early pioneers in conservation, we've done a better job in reforestation. We've talked about a great rolling prairies, our magnificent fields, America the beautiful. And for years we let our land erode and corrode. Thank goodness during thedays of the Depression we learned something about it and we've done something about soil conservation. But the big problem today is not just the land or the water or the air, but it's people. And I want to talk to you now about what I hope is not going to be just a passing fancy, a fad, because we Americans get, you know, we get with things, we get all heated up about it and then we drop them. Yesterdays news is no news. And we are always trying to find something new to grab a hold of, rather than finishing the job. I read someplace that a success is a man who wished to succeed and worked; A failure is a man who wanted to succeed and just wished. Now I don't want to stand here this morning and wish with you that we had a better world. I want to work at it. And I want you to work at it. How many of you remember the fads of the Freedom Riders in Appalachia, and the sit-ins and the Freedom March and all the things that we were doing here as students about ten years ago, in the early 60's for the Civil Rights movement? And now we find that the job is not done, but a lot of that's just forgotten. And then there are - this new sudden recognition of our ecological concerns may cause us to forget or even ignore or neglect the pursuit of the other critical areas of human environment, because environment is not just the air that we breathe, the water that we

drink or the land that we touch; it's where we live, our neighborhoods, our cities, the environment of violence in this country, and crime, and lawlessness, theproblems of ~~xxxxx~~ unemployment and an unstable economy, the problems of race relations which surely provide an environment in America, and not too healthy a one at this moment, and the problems of the arms race, the increasing international tension under which these young men and women live every day, every day of their lives. Every morning they hear the news, and every day they see/ the daily press, every day we get the news flash, and what is it? Well this morning ~~I/r/d/~~ the first thing on the Today show I heard was about four police officers being shot in cold blood - that was the first announcement. Then I heard about the Israelis ~~s/n/~~ and the Arabs; then I heard about - something about Cambodia and Laos and Vietnam; and then I heard they've got trouble in the Kremlin. And it's day after day after day after day, just nipping at us. That's environment, the environment of tension, the environment of noise if you live in the city, the environment of congestion. Let me give you an example. Harlem, New York. Everybody hears about Harlem;we don't do much about it, but we hear about it. The population density in Harlem is so big and so intense and dense that if all the - if the other four boroughs, that is the other four regions of New York City had the same density of population as Harlem, you could put all two hundred million Americans in the other four boroughs of New York. Now ladies and gentlemen, one block in Harlem has more people, has more people than many a county in Minnesota, one apartment house. When I was campaigning for the

Presidency, I went into Brooklyn and I talked out in front of an apartment house and there were 22,000 people, 22,000 people in one housing complex. Well, now, I grew up in a community that had 10,000 in the whole town. And I lived in a little place called Waverly and we've got 400 now. But imagine that.

Well, these, you see, these are some of the concerns that I speak of when I speak of environment. And I want my young friends out here to know that every one of these problems is with us, but I want you to know something else. I'm not here to give you a message of doom and gloom. We can do something aboutthis. I don't think you inspire people to succeed by pointing out failures. I think the only reason that we ought to list our problems is to be aware of them, and then to marshal the resources to do something about them. And we have the resources. We've made amazing progress in the last decade, with all of our problems. And don't give up. And don't let anybody sell you a bill of goods that this country can't do what it wants to do. But I'll tell you what it takes. It takes the same kind of attitude that made this country a great country and can make it ever greater. You have to pledge your lives and if need be, your fortuntes, and your sacred honor. That's the way it started out in this country, not a halfway pledge, not just sort of doing it. There's just no room for just halfway efforts anymore. We have to get in there and pitch. Now scientists tell us that unless we do, and I'm not sure about all of this - I just give you what they say -

and you can read it - and I want you to read in depth, young friends. It's exciting reading, by the way, this business on environment, on population, on ecology. I'll bet most of us never heard the word "ecology" until the last two or three years. Now it's everyplace, and what it just means "balance in the forces of nature", delicate balance, just like you need balance in the forces amongst the nations of the world, balance in your own personality, so that you're not hung up one day and dragging around the next day, and tearing yourself apart.

What are some of the facts that we face? as a nation, just our country - and remember that everything I talk about has to be put in dimensions of the world. Because after all, we're just a - the world's getting smaller every day. And every - there's nothing lost - there's no energy ever lost; it'sjust transformed. Remember that thereis no energy ever lost, that while you may use it in electrical energy, or a fire, or in decomposition that that force of energy is still here, but it may be in different forms. So what happens in India affects us and what happens to us affects India. And your degree of pollution is related directly to the number of people and your standard of living. We pollute, per person, in the United States, more than any other people in the world, because we have more. Now we can say - we can go around and say"well there are eight hundred and fifty million Chinese. Look what they're doing to the world." Or "There are five hundred million people in India, look what they're doing to the world." They're not doing much. They don't have ~~that~~ many beer cans. They don't have many milk cartons. They

don't drive many automobiles. No, as a matter of fact, Americans are the -- each American, each American today has energy available to him, each person, equivalent to five hundred slaves. THat's a figure to remember; each one of us has energy equivalent to five hundred slaves. And in the last fifty years, the amount of energy available to us, by machines and electricity has increased three hundred ~~xxxx~~ per cent. And we're just using it up. 6% of the world's population consuming 40% of the world's goods. And lots of it we waste. Each year two hundred million tons, two hundred million tons of smoke and fumes are spewed out in the United States in the atmosphere. Everytime I go to Wold Chamberlain Airport and see when those jets take off, I'm reminded of what they're doing to us. A hundred and five tons perday in ~~the~~ District of Columbia, Washington, D.C. Ffshhieuw, out comes the fumes, and by the way, not necessar~~ily~~y at all. They can put an adaptor on those engines and take out ninety percent of it. Costs a little bit. I've been on the back of the Federal ~~xxxx~~ Aviation Administration for months. If they were half as concerned about that as they are these air traffic controllers, we'd have both things worked out. Get on their back; ~~xx~~ write them a letter and say why ~~don't~~ aren't you do ing something about it. Because it's technically, engineeringly feasible.

Internal combustion engine - that's your car. 60% of all the air pollution. Listen, I was in Phoenix, Arizona, the other day - I was there ten years ago and it was just beautiful. Now it's a - it's smog all over the place. I went into Mexico City ten days ago. I was in Mexico City just three years ago, and the air was reasonably clean. I was there

001738

eight years ago and itwas as clean as could be. Today you choke to death. Mexico City is a health hazard. I was in Tokyo in October. It's become critical. And something can be done about it. Because you -may recall that in London back in the early 50's they had a number of deaths out of air pollution, and the London government,/government of Britain the ordered no more coal to be burned, ordered no more trash to be burned, and they enforced the law, and they reduced the air pollution by over 75%. And today London has purer and cleaner air than any city in the United States. For better than 25 years, young friends, not a fish was ever caught in the Thames River in London, destroyed by industrial pollutants. This year fish came back into the river.

St. Louis River could be on e of the most beautiful rivers in Minnesota; it's polluted. And we've got to do something about it. Now/ we're all responsible. Dont' go around/pointing the just finger at somebody. We could make a great recreation area out of this and make it worth while for young generations yet unborn. Well there are all kinds of pollution: smog, oxidants, - let me give you an example. Recent studies show that smog out in California is killing a hundred thousand acres of Ponderosa and Jeffrey pine trees in San Bernadino ~~and~~ National Forest near Los Angeles every year, ruining a whole area of our natural environment. Air pollution is a serious threat as we know to health. Our waters are being polluted by sewage and chemicals and thermal pollution. And now with radioisotopes/ from nuclear power plants. Fish kills because of chemical,sewage and thermal wastes have become numerous. I want young Americans in this

audience to go around this beautiful state and see what's happened to our lakes, see the green , the algae, the weeds, and ask why, why, why, why? And there are reasons for it. Mind you, mark your words, ten years ago that wasn't the case. I live out by a little lake called Lake Waverly. Ten years ago, you could drink water out of that lake, direct our of the lake. Within the last three years, it's been so close to permanent pollution, that no one would dare touch it, and it is a pile of weed and algae and green covered unless we treat it year after year and what we're treating it with maybe ~~pe/hurtings~~ hurts it more ~~XXXXX~~ than what was in it. Now why? Do you want every lake in Minnesota like this? Of course you don't. And you're going ~~to~~ to have to see that something's done about it.

Now pollution from radioisotopes which is exactly what they're talking about in the Minnesota rivers today from nuclear power plants can kill off all marine life. Now our oceans are in jeopardy. And you wouldn'-t think that the oceans could get in trouble. I have traveled to every continent; I've been in 52 of the countries of the world; I have traveled by plane ~~and~~/ since 1964 over one million miles; and I hve gone by ocean vessel; I've been in submarines; and I have seen what's happening to the ocean waters ~~-~~ and what's happening over the ocean - you can fly over that vast expanse of the Pacific and theAtlantic an d there's a belt of smog all the way across the Atlantic and all the way across the Pacific. Looking right down you see it. They've become dumping grounds, these oceans, for garbage and the scientists now estimate that in another fifty years the oceans will be totally polluted, totally polluted, and washing

their waste into the estuaries along our coastlines.

And what about our subsurface water, that's where you're going to get your well water, lots of water in ~~XXXXXXXX~~ America comes from wells. Industry is dumping toxic waste deep down in these wells by injection, andwe're now finding out that brine waste injected deep in the waters in Canada have already erupted in Michigan. In Texas, sweet wells, good clean water wells, ~~XXXX~~ have been poisoned and sewer lines have broken under high pressure of waste that's been injected into underground channels. So you see that we have some problems.

Pesticides, DDT, 245T, 24D, these are pesticides and herbicides. These pesticides - we find from about 800 to a thousand people/die each year from them, and 80 to 90 thousand are seriously injured each year. In some instances farm workers have been killed instantly by just a few drops of deadly chemicals that are used to so-called protect plant life, as they take human life.

Now what about the upper atmosphere? Everybody has said "Well, if we can just,"you know, you always say" well, if we can just get a good wind storm, we can just blow it out." You know, "Get it away from us," you know. Just blow it out. Well the trouble is that it only goes up so far. For a while people thought that if you could just get it up high enough it'd get all out into space and there was sure a lot of room out there. But the fact of the matter is, that we found that it doesns't go out into space, that there is a belt around this globe, and it just packs up, a belt about twelve miles up, and about

8 of those 12 miles are being filled right now, and we're filling it at a rate in ten years faster than the previous thousand. Pretty fast. We do things in a hurry now. Now we've been collecting a belt of radioactive material, and that's one of the reasons we stopped the nuclear tests. The deadly strontium 90. And that's one of the great pollution controls - pollution control devices or control agreements that we've had - the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963. No longer do nations test in the atmosphere, except the Chinese and the French. But they're testing. And every time they test, your life is shortened. And remember that you live in what we call the Northern Belt, and the Northern Belt has a movement of air that brings the Strontium 90, the radioactive particles from any test in any part of the Northern Hemisphere right smack bang into Minnesota, and into Montana, all across the United States of America. The only part of the globethat has any protection at all is in the deep South in what we call the Southern Zone.

Now what's the answer to a lot of this? WEll we know now that we've got to someproblems. WEll we've taken some steps. I said the treaty on Nuclear Test Ban. And just 2 years ago, we signed what we call a Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, to prevent other nations from starting to test and building their own weapons. But we've been designing laws and regulations for a long time and if you just give me now - I'm just going to be Professor Humphrey here for a while. Let me just tell you a little bit about the background here. The first major Federal Water Pollution Control Act was passed

in 1899, the Rivers and Harbors Act. It was designed to clean up the refuse in the New York harbor. And under that Act a number of court cases had been taken, 400 court cases as a matter of fact, were filed under this act up to the present time. They even filed an Act down in Key Biscayne Bay. I don't know if that's because the President's down there occasionally, but they got a - they have a suit down there on thermal pollution, putting hot waters into the waters of the Bay and killing off the fish life. Now this act was upheld in 1966 in the court case Standard Oil Versus the United States, which prevented oil from being pushed into these bays. Now listen what the pen alty was though - $250. Do you think Standard Oil could afford it? Now they raised that penalty to $2,500. Now that isn't a good tip for an annual conference for a big major company, much less a penalty.

Then there was the Oil Control - Pollution -- Oil Pollution Control Act of 1924. And it provided penalties of $2,500 or imprisonment up to a year for dumping oil into the navigable waters of the United States. Very ineffective laws.

And in 1948, now we're getting up to this century - the first important Federal Water Pollution Control Act was introduced, and it provided for the development of sewage disposal plants. Now I must tell this young audience something that youmay not know. The sewage disposal plants which you have today and that you read about take care of organic waste, do not take care of chemical waste. And the greatest threat to life today is found out to be by the microbiologist, not organic waste, but chemical industrial waste. And we do not have yet -- we have not yet developed the

kind of treatment facilities for chemical industrial, non-organic waste that really works. Now I met about a month ago with Dr. Rene Dubau(?), who is the world's leading microbiologist at Rockefeller University in New York City. He is a Nobel Prize winner; he is considered to be the world's foremost expert. And he told me that the plants that we're presently designing, while they're important and while we must have them and we can't just neglect putting them in, that those plants were actually engineered, as far as their technology is concerned long before the so-called detergent that you ladies like to use came into being. They're for organic waste. And we're having problems today when you want to get that shirt a little whiter, you know, you look at those ads, "How come your shirt - John says my shirts are gray," and "Fred says my shirts - his shirts are whiter than John's." And then we get out two new cans of stuff that we start pouring around in those washing machines and I want to warn you, important as they are, you may very well have to make a determination sometime along the line of whether you think it's more important to have a whiter shirt than the fellow next door, or whether we all settle for something just a little bit less. Because the simple fact of the matter is today that many of these detergents are polluting the streams, polluting the water supply, and cannot be handled by the modern sanitation system. That's a fact that these young people are going to face and let me tell you that no one would have talked to you like this five years ago. But it's in the last five to ten years that this has happened. And I predict to these young men and women in this audience and

I'm interested in them. After all I'm - those of us that get over 50 years of age are living on borrowed time anyway. Good deal - I want to borrow about another forty years of it, but - the fact of the matter is this world belongs to the young. I think that we simply have to face up to ourselves - what we're doing to their environment. Now a very distinguished Minnesotan was the first man to introduce major legislation relating to water pollution control and that was in 1956. And of course prophets go without honor in their own country. But let it just be a matter of record, that the first man who introduced major pollution control legislation and took a beating for it because theywere looked upon as zealots and lunatics and radicals. There wasn't much support. I remember full well - was the congressman from this district, John Blatnik. He was the author of the major, basic piece of legislation that offers any hope for water pollution control. It provided grants to help local communities build sewage disposal plants. Then in 1961 the same Congressman introduced another bill to propose a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, a separate Federal administration that would exercise strict control with strict standards, and by the way that Administration was to affect not only interstate water but intra - intra - within the state, 26,000 bodies of fresh water in the United States. And of those only 4,000 are interstate. So if you're going to control water pollution you've got to control them right in the state.

And by the way, young friends, why don't you ask your county commissioners here, and why don't you ask your state

legislators and why don't you ask your Governor and why don't you ask everybody else why it is we're letting raw sewage run from homes along lakeshores in lakes. They have no right to do this. This water belongs to everybody. What would you think if somebody came up and decided to empty their toilet in your front yard? I'll tell you that right away the local police would be on them. WEll let me tell you every lake in this state is part of your front yard. These lakes are not owned by anybody but you. The air that you breathe is owned by you. And when people start polluting the air, polluting the rivers, dumping their sewage into the lakes, into the rivers, spewing up their smokes and fumes into the atmosphere, what they're really doing is taking a great big garbage truck and just driving it right up in your house and dumping it. And if they did that, somebody would say, "Well look at that person." Particularly if you were young andyou did that. They'd say "There's those young militant radicals again." Well let me tell you there are a lot of old fuddle-duddle radicals too that are going around here.

Well we've been doing a good deal now in these - we've established a water lab up in Duluth; we've got a new Federal Water Pollution Control Act of '65; (I'm just going to mention these things quickly because I want you to look into them - and I'm going to sent you some material on them.)

But now let's talk a little bit about air pollution - a little bit about air pollution. We never even got at it until 1965. And the automobile industry came down to Washington - if you talk about lobbying, Iwas there, and they said "We cannot have this forced legislation

upon us, to compel us to put on pollution control devices. I was taken out - I remember when I was Vice President, they invited me out to a laboratory to tell me how difficult it was to develop a device. And theysaid "You know what it'ɣɣll do, don't you, Mr. Humphrey,ɣ" if you forcedus - they looked me right there with their blood-shot/eyes and my pretty little blue ones - they looked right at ɣɣ/us, and I remember going through that laboratory, and they said "You know what it's goingto mean don't ɣɣɣɣɣɣ you, Mr. Humphrey, it's going to raise the price of a car from twenty-five to forty dollars." Heh, they didn't let ɣɣɣɣ that bother them at all recently. I've seen car prices go up and I don't hold it against anybody, but what a lousey argument. Letme tell this young audience, you stand behind one of these major big buses, and breathe in one big belch of that smoke ɣɣɣ that comes out of there and that's equivalent to a hundred cartons of cigarettes. And you ought not to be smoking cigarettes either, if you got any sense. Did you look at the television last night to see what's going on? Incontrovertable evidence - incontrovertable evidence. Now I've got kids - I know - they smoke. It doesn't do me much good. But when I hear people say that all you've got to do is make people aware of the danger and they'll do something about it, I say "Oh yah! The odds are that if you persist in smoking you will have a better chance of getting cancer of the lung and emphysema by a factor of about a hundred to one. Now you know that. /Now I don't think it's going to stop you right ɣɣ off the bat because after you've been told that by the best doctors in the world and they got ads on the TV now that just really shake you up. Last night they

even took lungs out to show people what was happening. Of course Iwant you to know I've been guilty of all these sins. I dont want you young folks to think that I'm a paragon of virtue. As a matter of fact I smoked like a smokestack until I saw one of those ads one time and got to feeling a little lousey. And I'll tell you, I know it is going to extend my life ten years. Some people are not happy about that, butI - Well, you know, my wife would have said there, my son would have said"there goes Dad on his weekly sermon, you know." I haven't saved a soul yet on that one, so I guess I better shut up.

Well, the Clean Air Act of 1965. Now we now know, don't we, that we can put devices on automobiles to remove a large amount of the pollution. We know something else too, that we can develop a low combustion engine. And we can develop gasoline that is not leaded. Leaded gasoline just as well go on out and eat strychnine. And I'm a pharmacist. Strychnine's not healthy for you. But we've been going around for years saying that if you just had leaded gasoline - takes the knock out of the engine and knocks you out - that - they didn't get the other sentence on there. Because you breathe that and there is - it's accumulative, like arsenic. Never leaves you. Just gets in your lungs and stays right there, and starts gnawing at them just like an acid. Now we found that out now, kept it out of the public domain for a long time.

"Well,
Well you might say, if everybody knows all this, why haven't we done something more about it?" Well mainly because we've let

things happen before we did anything about the pollution. An example that I've just given you. We told the automobile industry to develop these devices to control pollution as practical and as soon as practical and feasible. And they never found the time to do ~~so~~ it. Now I happen to know that after one solid year of controversy with the FAA, as I was telling you, the Federal Aviation Administration, that we now have engines for jets that take out 90% of the smoke, of the fumes, of all the carbon that you see spewing out over this country. In the city of Washington, D.C., the average increase in cost per household, because of pollution from air traffic, is $200 per year, for cleaning, for the wear and tear on drapes, on clothing, on furniture, and much of it is just like an acid, that eats right into you and the fabrics. Now if I were to tell that same group of people at Washington that they have to increase their taxes by $20 a year in order to control air pollution, they'd say get rid of that big spender, that tax - that fellow that wants to tax us. You're being taxed every day, every day that your life is shortened you're being taxed. Every day-sickness is the greatest tax on a human being there is, sickness, and the rise in the rate of emphysema and the rise in the rate of lung cancer in this country is more costly than any single item in the Federal budget,save the defense budget. Takes the - on working hours. Just put it down, per hour, the number of hours lost.

Well, now the state of Minnesota, has got a big row on with the Federal Government right now, and I want you toknow that despite the fact that I've been with that Federal Govern-

ment ~~right/now~~ for a long time, I think our state is right. The state is involved in a pollution controversy relating to the discharge of radioisotopes in Minnesota's state waters by nuclear power plants. And they're arguing with the Federal AEC, Atomic Energy Commission, as to which standards ought to prevail. And because our state took the initiative, because our pollution control agency in this state took the initiative, the entire structure of Federal standards today is being reviewed because somebody cared, because somebody blew the whistle. And Iwant to remind this young audience that the standards that we have ~~had~~ imposed for atomic energy, disposal of atomic energy waste were standards that were arrived at 20 years ago, and have little or no relevancy to modern needs and modern atomic science. And fortunately, because seventeen ~~of/the~~ other states ~~did/not~~ have now join/with ed us, we're on theway to doing something about it. Now it's easy ~~for~~ to look for a lot of villains in thisatomic, in this environment thing. Everybody likes to point to the other guy. I noticed the other day a group of young students up at the University of Michigan got their hamxmers out and they got sledge hammers, and they got steel saws, and they got bats and they went out there and they beat up on an old 1959 _Ford. Yes they did. They had it out there on the University campus, just knocked the living fenders off from it. And I was out at?the college and I said "What's that all about?" They said "Well it's symbolic." I said "What's it symbolize?" They said "Well, the automobile; it's a polluter. We were just beating it up, killing it off." I said "No, the automobile is not a polluter." You know, I've got anold Ford parked in my garage. It hasn't polluted anything. Caused a little trouble with Mrs. Humphrey.

She wants the garage space. But other than that, I've been going through those troubles a long time. I've managed now tohandle those. Dont' you tell her I said that. But - a car becomes a polluter when you get in it. A car becomes a polluter when you turn the crank, put the starter on, when the motor moves. That's when the - it's man that pollutes. And I told the students that if they felt they just had to beat up on somebody they might look around for the fellow that drove the car, not that I was advocating it, but I mean if it was a compulsion that you had to get at. No, ladies and gentlemen, it isn't the product, as such, so much. It's we,the people. And we can go around here and point to the paper company, the power company, the steel company, the soap company, we can point to all of them, and they do - all of us have some guilt. And I want to say here in the presence of industry, and industrial representatives, that the time of talking about what we're going to do about pollution is over. The time to act is now. And we're going to have to act precisely on the basis of the information that we have and the research that we're doing, and to expand that research. And this is part of the obligation of the Federal Government to expand that research. So I repeat to you, it's easy to find villains. It's harder to reach a rational, mature recognition of our shared guilt. The road back to environmental health is going to be a long one, and an expensive one. Volunteers in the battle against pollution are welcome. We even need a few speechmakers. But we need somebody else too. Short termers

won't help. Are you willing to sign up for the long hitch? Are you willing to commit more than your enthusiasm? Are you willing to pay a little higher price on occasion? Are you willing to pay higher taxes? Are you willing to have Federal appropriations to put some inspectors to see that these oil digging rigs off the coast lines don't spew oil into the bays? Are you willing to put up some funds for some great research laboratories? Are you willing to have something done about your tax structure to give incentive to industry? Are you willing to put on penalties on the polluters? Are you willing to commit more than your enthusiam and more than your rhetorical recognition of where we should go? And if you are, here's where we come now to pay-dirt. If you are, I want to talk to you about it. Because if you're willing to make this commitment, then let's change from the rhetoric and get down to reality.

I recommend, for example, and I want you to give consideration of these recommendations, - I recommend that the President and the Congress, -to show our awareness, to show our concern, to show that we mean business, at this SCARE Conference, -I recommend that the President and the Congress establish by resolution and executive order the decade of the 1970's as the decade of people, environment, and peace, because they're all tied in together. And for lack of a better phrase just call it the PEP decade, because if we don't do it, there won't be much pep left after that decade. Now an entire decade dedicated to people and how they lived in their environment, an entire decade set aside to concentrate on the battle of

physical pollution, the physical pollution of the environment, and a decade born in the frustrations of war and dedicated to peace, that provides meaning for our ultimate goal of building together in peace a better world for tomorrow.

Now we have four levels, on which you and I can go to work, and to concentrate our attention. We have the local level right here in Cloquet, the state level here in Minnesota, the national level, here in the United States, and of course, the international level. Now what can we do? Well at the local level it requires, first of all, citizen participation, rewards and awards. At the state level it requires new state law, strict and effective state enforcement. And here is what I would suggest - that we should call upon every legislature, and particularly our own, to put at the top of its agenda, for the legislative session of 1971 the improvement of the physical environment and the laws necessary to do it. Start right out there. Let's have some specifics. Let's find out what our state laws are. Let's find out whether they're up to date. They're not. Let's find out what we can do to make them up to date, and let's find out what we can do to make them effective.

At the national level, we should call upon the Congress to establish strict standards on all forms of pollution, standards that would prevent the familiar economic blackmail that we have been exposed to even here in Minnesota, where a major employer casts aside the public interests, and puts a gun to the community's head by threatening to close his plant and put thousands of people out of work, if that plant is made to conform

to even minimum pollution abatement measures for air and water. That, by the way, is a definitely anti-social attitude and has no place in modern industry. And if the shoe fits, let them put it on. No business has a right to say that to a community. They may have good economic reasons to want to talk to the community, but no one should ever threaten a community, particularly when we're dealing with life itself.

Now there's one answer to it, Federal Legislation. No place to escape then. Federal legislation, - with Federal legislation, companies such as this, who apparently - whose prime interest seems to be their annual profit statement, would find no haven of pollution privilege by being able to move to another state where pollution requirements are governed by state laws rather than Federal law. And we can't afford to have people hop skipping and jumping around in the name of industry from Minnesota to Wisconsin, or from Minnesota to North Dakota, or from North Dakota to South Dakota, trying to find a place where they can poison you, or where they can pollute the atmosphere. But I must say, with equal candor, it's the duty of public officials in the community to work with industry to try to prevent that unhappy situation.

Now thirdly, the Congress should review every law that we have on the books. We've got one starting at 1899. It's as old as just that. We should review every law and bring them up to date, and make sure that the penalties for the polluters are strong enouth, and equally important, that the in-

centives to industry to take corrective measures are good enough.

At the international level,(and by the way,this is terribly important- because at the international level we have western Europe that's a tremendous industrial enterprise,)working through the United Nations, we should negotiate treaties and ratify these agreements to protect the environment, to establish enforceable standards for clean air, and clean water and strict rules and regulations to prevent contamination of the international rivers and oceans. Let me tell the young friends here I was in Yugoslavia this summer. The Danube River is a moving sewer. There's no beautiful blue Danube; there is a cesspool. The Rhine River is the most polluted river in the world. Every major river in the world has become - the Nile River - you just go - Euphrates -- you take any major river today and they are a health hazard. And all of these waters converge, and we are affected by them just as much as you are affected by the water that you drink out of your tap here in your home city. We've got to get international agreements. Maybe this is the way we can start. Maybe we can start with agreements to save lives, rather than arguing about wars. And we need a United Nations Board of Environmental Control.

Now, up here at home. I want you to start right here in Cloquet. I propose a community coalition for clean environment, a mobilization of public and private efforts of all age groups in all segments, just like we have in our big cities, the urban coalition; to coordinate all of the essential efforts in ~~XXXXX~~ such a program, I would suggest that the state, through the Governor's office or the Legislature, establish a citizens advisory

board on environment, in which there is industry, lay public, labor, young people, interested citizens, an advisory board on environment,conservation and recreation. And what state has more to offer in these areas than we. This state board would work with the similar boards at a local level. Now this is what I mean by citizen participation. This is what I mean by taking/politics to the people, and I mean the whole concept of public policy. And then I want to propose a special honors program for communities where the State of Minnesota, after examining their work, in this field of recreation, conservation and pollution control, would present an E award for excellence in environment. Why you go down to Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth, these places and you get a big defense plant. And if they make good guns, good bomb sites, good tanks, do a good job, we give them a big flag, E Award, excellence in production of war material. I'd like to have the young people of this state recommend that the State of Minnesota and indeed, the nation, start to give E Awards, E Awards, excellence in environment control, an E Award of a perfectly blue background, like the blue of the heavens and the blue waters of Minnesota, and a white E that shows purity and cleanliness. It could be done. Then we'll find out which towns and states are doing something. And I propose anotherthing - that regular reports should be issued out of the Governor's office as to the beautification of environment andprotection of our state, including how we're cleaning up automobile graveyards,

what we're doing about our parks, beautification of local communities, and what we're doing about our neighborhoods. I don't want this society, ten thousand years as they dig around, you know, we're always digging around in Rome and Greece, and over in Lebanon, and we're trying to find out w-hat other civilizations looked like, and every once in a while we come up with a little piece of pottery and we say "Oh they must have been great pottery makers." And then a little while later we come up with some stone; they say/"Well, it must have been something from the Stone Age." I'm afraid somebody's going to look around in ten thousand years and say "These people just can kill themselves drinking beer" - find beer cans all over the place. Or"they all apparently - everybody just lived in their c ar." They'll be having people ten thousand years from now examining the remnants, the frames of automobiles, and they'll say "This is where they lived." "And what kind of a body do you think they had to get through all those little twists and turns that you have on the body frame."

Well, we can dosomething about that. Let's clean these things up. And I have another suggestion that each community should have its own environmental control officer. Now if you go to Europe, you go to a community in Europe and you find in every part of a European community or country, a Conservation Officer. They have local Conservation Officers out around the countryside. They have local park officers to help keep parks up. Sometimes they're voluntary; sometimes they're paid. This is the way we're going to get it done here. And we've got to do something else, we've got to call on every youth organiza-

tion in the state to make improvements in the physical environment their number one task, starting with our 4H clubs, our Future Farmers, our Boys Clubs, our Girls and Boy Scouts, Guides and so on, all that we have. And then I would suggest that we propose that radio, television and newspapers start including with each weather report, air pollution count for their particular community. I'd like to know, not only what kind of weather we're going to have, but what I'm going to be breathing during the day, how much carbon dioxide, monoxide, how much sulfurous gas am I going to be breathing, and I want to tell this audience right now, that if in the large cities of America there was a air pollution report each day that you went out, you'd do something about it. You wouldn't take it for granted; you'd do something about it. And I might even suggest that the Department of Conservation in this state, together with the Water Quality Laboratory in Duluth, could provide a weekly published report on water pollution in our lakes, and streams and rivers. We always get a report on how the fishing is. I'm interested in whether there's going to be any fish. And I think that it's about time that we got up to date.

Well, that's about what I wanted to tell you. So I ask this question: Can we as a nation entertain the painful possibility that our proud effort to conquer nature and to tame the frontier may very well have been destructive and can we reverse our course? Now what I've outlined to you today is just some of the problems and some of the things that I think are going to be necessary. I personally think that the structure of our Federal Government needs to be reorganized to establish

a whole new department on environmental control, because we're talking about life and breath. We take for granted, we take for granted, dear friends, several things: we take for granted the air that we breathe; we take for granted that there is an unlimited supply of water, and there isn't, (As a matter of fact, one of the shortest resources in the world today is clean water.); we take for granted that there is lots of land and living space. I want you now to take forgranted that God Almighty had a plan for this earth and it was called an ecology, a balance between man and his environment. And man has altered that environment, and in some places, has altered it to his detriment. We have a high standard of living, and if we don't watch out, we're going to have a higher standard of dying.

This is what this conference is about. You're going to have experts talk to you; I'm not an expert. I'm a concerned citizen. I have spent a good deal of my time trying to get legislation on the book, but I've learned a long time ago that laws are no better than the willing nessof the people to abide by them. And what we need, is indeed, an awareness on the part of the people of what we're talking about, the seriousness of it, the seriousXness of it,ladies and gentlemen, We finally got the seriousness of German Measles, for children yet unborn; a pregnant mother that was doomed to have a deformed child. We finally got the seriousness, if you please, of Thalidomide, a drug that was taken during pregnancy that destroyed life. We finally got the seriousness of Strontium 90, getting in our milk, from nuclear tests,and causing cancer. We finally got

some seriousness about a few other things, such as we found out about polio, smallpox; we found out that people died from the plague of smallpox and something could be done about it, and today we require vaccination. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we better find out that smallpox is a small problem and so is German measles compared to what we're talking about here today. Adlai Stevenson, in his last address before the United Nations, summed it up for us, and listen to this. This is why I've covered the international as well as the local. These words of this wonderful, beautiful man:

> We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, our world, dependent on its vulnerable resources of air and soil, all committed to our safety, to its security and peace, preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work (and I will say,the love) that we give our fragile craft.

I have been Chairman of the Space Council of your government. I can say to the young men and women in this audience that the air that an astronaut breathes as he lands on the moon or as he travels in an Apollo space capsule is so much better than what you breath on earth that there is no comparison. The water that he drinks is pure; the food that he eats is balanced and nutritious. His chances of living are much better than yours, even though he travels in space, because man has put his technology and his science to making that space capsule clean, unpolluted, safe. And we stand and we marvel at it. And here we have a space capsule of our own, and that's where we live. We live on a little capsule called Earth, and it is spinning through the solar system, and each day by communication

we get a little closer together. Each day by industrialization we at each other a little more. And what Adlai Stevenson said was "We travel together, passengers on a little space ship," and then he reminded us that we will be "preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work" and the love "that we give our fragile craft." And to my young friends who have shown so much concern these recent years to a world that would be free of violence, and many young people who today say that what this world needs is love rather than hate, and many young people who say that what we need is to be more concerned and considerate of each other, rather than to be unconcerned and antagonistic, the best way that I know how to do it, is to take care of the air that you breathe, the water that you drink, the land on which you live, and the community where you will spend the days of your life. Thank you very much.

E N V I R O N M E N T A L M E M O R A N D U M

TO: HHH
FROM: Grant J. Merritt
DATE: April 2, 1970
RE: Cloquet and St. Louis River Pollution

Attached are three short but excellent statements on the pollution and problems of the St. Louis River. The St. Louis used to be one of the outstanding rivers of the entire Great Lakes. I am sure you have observed its beauty along Highway 23 at Fond du Lac. According to Dale Bryson, the top Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) official in Minnesota, the St. Louis River is now "one of the most polluted streams in the state". If and when this river is cleaned up, it has a vast recreational potential. The quality of its water is now so degraded, however, that safe swimming and fishing are now impossible.

Furthermore, even under the standards approved by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (PCA) and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA), recreational fishing will be impossible. Thus, when Northwest Paper Company, Conwed Corporation (formerly Wood Conversion) and the City of Cloquet install and operate the kind of secondary treatment facility which meets the standards now applicable, recreational fishing will <u>still</u> be impossible according to Dale Bryson. The reason is that these standards are not high enough to provide the oxygen necessary to support the most desirable sport fish. The minimum dissolved oxygen requirements for the St. Louis River between Cloquet and Fond du Lac of three (3) milligrams per litre is insufficient oxygen for popular fish such as coho salmon. The standard should be no less than six (6) milligrams per litre.

The St. Louis River has the potential for the finest coho salmon stream on Lake Superior. There is no excuse for standards which really do not clean up this river.

In addition to the water pollution problems of the St. Louis River, the air pollution caused by industry in Cloquet has fouled the air for miles around ever since I can remember as a child in Duluth during the early 1940's. The stench is as bad as ever and continues to permeate the air around Scanlon as you drive into Duluth on Highway 35 and 61 and continues to extend at least as far as Duluth when the wind is out of the west.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF POLLUTION AND DIVERSION
ON THE ST. LOUIS RIVER

FPC Project No. 2360
October 15, 1968

This report is in response to the attached memoranda dated November 24, 1967, from Under Secretary Black and July 8, 1968, from the Associate Solicitor, Reclamation and Power, both concerning FPC Project 2360 and pollution of the St. Louis River. Basic information for this report was gathered by various agencies and is used to determine recommendations. Reports from the participating agencies are attached as follows:

Exhibit A - Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife
Exhibit B - Federal Water Pollution Control Agency
Exhibit C and D - Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
Exhibit E - U. S. Geological Survey

Supporting information reports are as follows:

Exhibit F - Environmental Conditions of the Lower St. Louis River - Minnesota Department of Conservation, French River Station
Exhibit G - St. Louis River Fishing History - 1967 - Jerome A. Blazevic, Duluth, Minnesota
Exhibit H - Communication from Waino A. Hill, Cloquet, Minnesota
Exhibit I - Water Quality Criteria, Page 43-44 - Federal Water Pollution Control Administration

The St. Louis River forms the boundary line between Minnesota and Wisconsin from a point one-half mile northwest of Fond du Lac, Minnesota, to the mouth of the river at Duluth-Superior. Because of this, the St. Louis River is subject to interstate water quality standards.

I. BASIC INFORMATION

- Gross pollution exists from the City of Cloquet downstream to the mouth (Exhibits B, F, G).
- Discharges contain solids, dissolved organic material, and chemical wastes (Exhibit B).
- Extremely low dissolved oxygen concentrations occur during low flow periods (Exhibits B, F).
- Solid discharges accumulate in Thompson Lake and in Fond du Lac Lake (Exhibit B).
- Freshwater insects normally present in clean water have been replaced by pollution-tolerant species (Exhibit F).
- Extensive fish kills have occurred. (1954 chemical kill; 1956 and 1958 low oxygen concentrations). (Exhibits B,F,G.)

- A very limited use is made of the lower section of the river by lakerun rainbow and brown trout (Exhibit A,F).
- The St. Louis River has an extremely high potential for coho salmon if water conditions are improved. (Exhibit A,F.)
- The water emits a strong odor downstream from Cloquet to the mouth of the river at Duluth (Exhibit A, F, and field observations).
- Fish living in this lower section of the St. Louis River below Cloquet have this odor and taste in their bodies, making them inedible (Exhibit G and field contacts).
- The flow of the St. Louis River has fluctuations usually between 300 to 19,000 cfs with the average flow of 1,800 cfs (Exhibits E,F).
- Except for leakage, all of the St. Louis River is diverted around the scenic Jay Cooke State Park during the low flow months of summer (Exhibits C,F,H, and field observations).
- Additional flows through the park would improve the aesthetic qualities which would increase the quality of the visitor's experience (Exhibit C).
- Visits to Jay Cooke State Park have been increasing each year and are estimated to reach 695,000 visitor-days in 1980 (Exhibit D).
- A limited coldwater fishery might be restored in the section of the river through Jay Cooke State Park (Exhibits A,C,F).
- Bank erosion and siltation occur extensively along the river (Exhibits A,C).

II. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF INFORMATION

The St. Louis River receives a heavy pollutional load from the Conwed Corporation and the Northwest Paper Company, both in Cloquet, as well as several smaller firms there and downstream to the mouth of the river. Sewage receiving primary and little or no secondary treatment is dumped into the St. Louis River from Cloquet, Scanlon, Esko, Carlton, and other residential localities.

Discharges into the river contain solids from wood processing as well as dissolved organic material. During periods of low flow, the BOD of the discharges lower the dissolved oxygen concentrations to levels dangerous to aquatic life, especially fish. Extensive fish kills have resulted from the discharges in the Cloquet area. During 1956 and 1958, a combination of low flows and high BOD of effluents caused die-offs in Thompson Lake and the other in Fond du Lac. Solid wastes deposited in the reservoirs increase the rate of depletion of oxygen from the water due to their own oxygen demand.

Often, the discharges of effluent will cause discoloration of the water or layers of foam on the surface. This makes the river undesirable for swimming, boating, or any other water oriented form of recreation. There is also an unpleasant odor which is still detectable near the mouth of the river. This condition has imparted itself to the fish in the river so that from Cloquet to the mouth, fish are inedible due to the foul taste.

The change of conditions is evident from the change in the species complex of insects living in the river. Species such as mayflies, caddisflies and stone flies, normally present in clean water with high oxygen concentrations, are no longer present. Sludge worms and midge larvae which can survive low oxygen now predominate.

At the present time there is a very limited use made of the river by lakerun rainbow and brown trout. With proper cleanup of pollution and good oxygen concentrations, the St. Louis River could be the best on Lake Superior. With this cleanup, the coho salmon could also make extensive use of the river system, thus providing a valuable resource to Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The section of the river through Jay Cooke State Park is a valuable aesthetic resource. During much of the year there is little or no flow through the park. A constant flow from the Thompson Reservoir would increase the quality of the park visitor's experience. These visits are projected to reach 695,000 visitor-days by 1980. With a constant flow, a limited coldwater fishery might be restored to this section of the river.

With a minimum flow of 50-100 cfs through the Jay Cooke State Park area, the visitors to the park would enjoy their visits more and some would receive the benefits of fishing on an exceptionally beautiful part of the river. Another benefit would be the high DO concentration of the water due to the action of the rapids and falls in the park area. This would mean that the portion of the river below the rapids area would be saturated with oxygen, or close to it.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Currently planned pollution abatement measures be installed immediately. (Table 1, Exhibit B) and strictly enforced in order to reduce the discharge of polluted effluents to the river and its tributaries. Steps be instigated to upgrade the quality of the water environment by maintaining a DO level of at least 6 ppm for all sections of the river as soon as presently planned abatement measures are installed (Exhibits A,F,I).

2. A minimum flow of 100 cfs required when 1,000 cfs or better; drop to 10% of river discharge but maintain at minimum of 50 cfs at all times* be provided below the Thompson Reservoir for the preservation of the riffle and pool complex to accommodate upstream movement of migrating fish, and to increase the quality experience for visitors to Jay Cooke State Park (Exhibits A,C). Minimum flow of 100 cfs is equivalent to a reduction of about 2000 KWH's. The estimated capacity of the upstream hydroelectric plant (the only one affected) is rated at 66,600 KWH's according to a Mr. Rise of Federal Power Commission Chicago Regional Office.

*Investigation should be made by Minnesota Power and Light Company about possibilities of pumped storage during late night hours as a means of regulating flow.

3. Erosion control measures be adopted to prevent natural and man-made bank erosion along the St. Louis River and its tributaries to prevent heavy siltation of spawning areas (Exhibit A).

4. A fish passage facility be installed in the Fond du Lac Dam when it is determined by the Minnesota Department of Conservation and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife that improved water conditions and increased fish movements warrant the need for a fishway or other structure (Exhibit A).

5. State of Minnesota should develop water quality standards for the St. Louis River which were omitted from original submission to Secretary of Interior.

DIRECTOR
PROGRAM SUPPORT STAFF
U.S. DEPT OF ENVIRON

ST LOUIS RIVER FISHING HISTORY

1967

I am Jerome A. Blazevic, age 41, residing at 422-98th Avenue West, Duluth, Minnesota 55808, phone 626-2201; born in Gary, New Duluth and resided in this area during this entire time.
This narrative report is prepared to submit by mail to the Minnesota Conservation Department station at French River on Highway 61, Duluth, Minnesota to be used in any way they wish to help in their study of the St Louis River in Duluth, Minnesota and area.

I can first remember the St Louis River at the age of four years. This was a fishing trip with my brothers to the place we referred to as the "Trestle". This place is actually the Spirit Lake railroad trestle crossing Mud Lake at a wide spot in the St Louis River directly North of the DM&IR railroad bridge going to Oliver, Wisconsin. It has since been grade filled and has only a short trestle. We caught perch that hot summer day using worms with plain string for lines with an old nut for a sinker. They were good eating but we always knew that the city sewer came out into the river just a fourth of a mile up stream. The people always fished this trestle and it was a rare day that someone could not be seen walking and trolling from this place. This still holds true today. In the early spring when wall-eyed pike ran they were caught by the hundreds.

My next association with the river was at the old city dock at the foot of Commonwealth Avenue in New Duluth in 1932. This substantial dock could be driven on to and cars used to park on it. We caught the following species of fish here and in the immediate vicinity. Sargeant Creek empties nearby and this made it a natural fishing spot. In January and February we used to spear with sharpened welding rod spears which we made from scrap from the Western Steel Products factory nearby. We speared northern pike, perch, bullheads, and an eel like critter which could have been lawyers. In spring we caught northern pike and perch as soon as the ice left and then had a period when wall-eyed pike could be caught at will. Then suckers of several varieties came and then the wall-eyes returning from spawning would give us another run on these fish. Occasionally wall-eyes were caught intermittently but not regularly all year. We caught what we called pole bass all summer along with bullheads, crappies, sunfish, bluegills, perch and others.

the area were probably small mouth bass. I have seen these recently in the big springs areas in the winter.

The river has always been spoken of as polluted during my life time. Even in the 1930's and some people would not swim in it. There were many places on the river that the people swam in large numbers that I can remember. They were 1. The City docks which had several diving boards; this was an experienced swimmers area only. 2. Carlson's beach a block upstream from the dock which was for all bathers. 3. Fond du Lac at the city dock and beach at the Montauk steamer dock. 4. Oliver, Wisconsin. 5. Boat Club area in Spirit Lake. 6. Morgan Park. 7. Smithville. 8. Riverside and many other places all thru town along the river. The city of Superior, Wisconsin had the most elaborate set up at Billings Park. The city of Duluth maintained a paid life guard at Carlson's Beach each year until about 1945 when the war caused a complete breakdown of this type of service in the city. There were two signs at the beach. 1. "THIS AREA CLOSED TO SWIMMING" Duluth Health Department. 2. "SWIMMING HOURS ARE -- SWIM ONLY WHILE LIFEGUARD IS IN ATTENDANCE". Hundreds used to swim at all times weather permitting. I still swim daily in season at the foot of Commonwealth Avenue, but at times the sulphite smell gets strong if water levels have been low for a long time in the Cloquet, Jay Cooke Park sections of the river. We always shower immediately upon returning home. The children still swim and recently because the boy scouts built a dock which has given them a place to fish I have seen very good catches of a great variety of fish. Northerns are caught regularly and in good size. Wall-eyes are caught only after the spring run as far as the Fond du Lac power dam. They come from Lake Superior. I have caught bass, perch, northerns, wall-eyes and bullheads in recent years. Wall-eyes are almost uneatable after five days in the upper waters. Occasionally brown trout have been caught in Fond du Lac in spring and some brook trout are taken at mouths of all streams. I have observed brook trout in the St Louis river at mouths of streams in fall while trapping and in 1958 deer season observed several brook trout at stream mouths in Jay Cooke Park and they were in the fourteen inch sizes. They do come in some numbers to spawn in October in Red River also.

In recent years in late spring I have taken movies of Carp spawning in shallow bays where they were so thick that their backs were out of the water and their antics foamed the surface. We never saw or heard of carp in past years. As a

boy I remember an enormous sturgeon and everyone used to come home with a string of northerns or perch taken with worms and feathered spoons or the Lake Superior shiner minnow which used to run and spawn in large numbers. I can remember people seining over fifty dozen of these shiners in one scoop in home made seins. They placed them in live boxes and used them all summer or sold them for 10 and 15 cents a dozen. These shiners would keep all summer if kept in these boxes and not crowded. It is impossible today. Only a few shiners are taken now. We did not have the smelt years ago either. Some years they have been taken in large numbers in the upper St Louis and other years they were few. I can remember one year they all died. The river and upper streams right up to the dam were full of dead smelt. This same year the wall-eyes died by the thousands and so did the suckers which followed them. They barely made it to the spawning area below the Fond du Lac dam and ran out of enough oxygenated water. The river condition that year was bad for these reasons. 1. Low rain in previous fall; 2. Very heavy sulphited water laid for extended periods in upper river; 3. An early freeze up without the usual fall storms which tore the weeds and dead vegetation up and piled it either on the shores or drifted it out. All weeds laid rotting all winter; 4. Heavy snow cover early and absolutely no spring run-off of any consequence; 5. Unusually low water in spring. This caused the heaviest fish kill I have ever seen and I have pictures and the local conservation people were escorted to all kill areas to study this situation. I believe there still is almost every kind of fish today as there were in past years with the exception of the sturgeon, white fish, trout and probably others which were forced to absolutely change their normal habits of spawning in the St Louis River because of the power dams without fishways and the industrial and civic wastes. All fish presently taken are almost uneatable because of a strong swampy taste. I do freeze spring wall-eyes and we serve them with proper seasoning and enjoy them. The trout remain delicious, with the exception of browns and rainbows taken in Jay Cooke Park sections of the river which get very fishy tasting are so strong making it impossible to mask the flavor to make them palatable.

In 1956 the Conservation Committee of State Legislators met at the old Holland Hotel in Duluth and I can remember meetings before this, but State Legislators seemed to do this because the study was required in each biannium. I remember many things being brought up each time with substantial proofs of water and

and pollution, but each time absolutely nothing was done. Even when the water quality laws were proven being broken. Legislators were told at that time to quit holding meetings for the sake of filling brief cases if they did not intend to serve the people and take positive action which was in laws at the time. They seemed to only defend industrial interests efforts and these were certainly amply represented. They dragged their feet and each time these men met with me they told how hard they were trying, but legislative action and judicial actions on record denied this consistently. I believe that none of them really cared and the proof is with us today.

I remember trapping muskrats in the swamps below and adjacent to the Steel Plant during the depression in the 1930's but since the industrial recovery in early 1940's these swamps are empty of animals except vagrant ones. Their houses are still there to be seen but coated as is the shore and all drift wood with the tars and oils from the coke ovens of American Steel and Wire Co. I have seen ducks which could not fly because of the heavy film of oils and tars which they pick up drifting on Spirit Lake in the St Louis River. We have many game and trapping animals yet, but none in this specific area.

There used to be three boat liveries in New Duluth and many, many private row boats and this held true all along the river. In season all were busy catching fish, recreating or gathering fire wood drifted in bays. From the historical point of view I have gathered this information which should be of value. In the years specifically 1899 thru 1914 two people cited these facts: "We caught sturgeon, catfish, wall-eye pike, muskullunge, northern pike, white fish, suckers, pickerel and these were very plentiful in 1913-1914 before the Fond du Lac dam and Cloquet paper mills. Fish were caught with set lines, spearing, trolling and scoop nets." "There was one day in particular that was a record, when there were 62 barrels of white fish caught and salted and packed in barrels for individual family use in Fond du Lac near Sam Eiberg's beach." This is located just above the present mouth of Mission Creek.

In the early years another old timer mentioned tending set lines on the old draw bridge above the present Oliver bridge. He said they caught fish of every type as they migrated to spawn or resided in the river.

CONCLUSION: We know now what we have. We know what it must have been like. Now it is our responsibility to try to repair, replace and reproduce adequate standards and methods to regain our heritage for future generations. My first step would be to study with accurate modern methods just exactly what we have. Then reverse and even possibly improve on mother nature to insure results for the generations to follow. I firmly believe that the Minnesota Power Company's series of dams has done more to stop the normal migration of fish to their spawning grounds and the scouring effect of run-offs of heavy water which are so necessary to clean spawning beds and rocks for our Lake Superior fish. Let's look at the whole river and its origin of swamp drainage to our latest threats in the taconite industry for all the answers and then start a movement using the Government as a standard setter, but get industry and the public to voluntarily live up to these standards and contribute to even higher standards.

SUBMITTED BY: JOHN HALE - 525-4080, 10029 North Shore Drive, Duluth, Minn. 55804

RESUME OF WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS OF THE ST. LOUIS RIVER

The St. Louis River has its source in Seven Beaver Lake on the boundary between Lake and St. Louis Counties. The river flows a distance of 160 miles from its source to Lake Superior with a fall of about 1,065 feet. The drainage area of the St. Louis River watershed is 3,634 square miles, with a total population of 117,400 people. The population is concentrated mainly in the northwestern and southern parts of the watershed.

The St. Louis River receives a heavy pollutional load from the two paper mills in Cloquet; the Conwed Corporation and the Northwest Paper Company. Also, the city of Cloquet discharges a primary effluent to the river. The waste discharges have caused gross pollution of the St. Louis River from Cloquet to Lake Superior resulting in extremely low dissolved oxygen levels during low flow periods. Extensive fish kills have resulted. The discharges contain solids as well as dissolved organic material. Over the years solids deposits have accumulated behind the dams operated by the Minnesota Power and Light Company. The Northwest Paper Company has installed equipment to remove most of their waste solids, however, no equipment has been installed at any plant for the removal of dissolved organics.

The surface waters of the St. Louis River between Cloquet and the mouth are used extensively for hydroelectric power. In this reach there are five hydroelectric dams; at Knife Falls, Cloquet, Scanlon, Thompson, and Fond du Lac.

The St. Louis River project of the Minnesota Power and Light Company consists of hydroelectric developments at Knife Falls, Scanlon, Thompson, and Fond du Lac. While not being a direct contributor to the pollution of the St. Louis River, the project has intensified the pollution problems. Twenty-three percent of the St. Louis River drainage basin is controlled

by headwaters reservoirs operated and owned by the Minnesota Power and Light Company. Releases from the reservoirs are based on flow requirements for power generation. This has resulted in a wide fluctuation of river flows which during periods of low flow intensifies the harmful effects of the inadequately treated wastes from the Cloquet area. Also, the oxygen demanding solids deposits that have built up behind the power dams between Cloquet and Fond du Lac aggravate the problem. The major areas of solids deposition are in Thompson Lake and in Fond du Lac Lake.

Several studies of the water quality of the St. Louis River and its tributaries have been made. The most comprehensive study was that performed by Quirk, Lawler, and Matusky Engineers, Environmental Science and Engineering Consultants from New York. The firm was retained in 1965 by the Northwest Paper Company and Conwed Corporation to perform a system analyses of the St. Louis River to determine the river's assimilative capacity. The study was later expanded to include recommendations for the establishment of river standards. Briefly, the study concluded that the natural pollution of the St. Louis River from swamp drainage upstream of Cloquet was sufficient to completely deplete the dissolved oxygen resources of the River below Cloquet. They recommended that the river standards established be cognizant of the effect of natural pollution.

In June 1967 the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency submitted water quality standards for all interstate streams in Minnesota to the Secretary of the Interior as required by the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965. The St. Louis River is an interstate stream with the State of Wisconsin. For the purpose of setting standards, the river was broken into three reaches; from the outlet of Seven Beaver Lake to Cloquet, from Cloquet to Fond du Lac,

and from Fond du Lac to Clough Island (the mouth of the river). As initially proposed, the reach of the river from Cloquet to Fond du Lac was classified for general industrial purposes only with a minimum requirement of only a trace of dissolved oxygen.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration reviewed the Minnesota standards and found unacceptable the standards for the St. Louis River from Cloquet to Fond du Lac. After further negotiations with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, acceptable standards for the St. Louis River were agreed upon. Table 1 attached is a summary of the Minnesota water quality standards for the St. Louis River. The standards will be submitted to Secretary Udall in the near future for approval. The major change in the revised standards is that the reach from Cloquet to Fond du Lac has now been classified for the propagation and maintenance of fish commonly inhabiting the water under natural conditions and for other recreation not involving whole body contact. Also included as a part of the standards package is a plan of implementation. In this plan the Northwest Paper Company and Conwed Corporation will be required to provide secondary treatment of their waste discharge amounting to a removal of 80% of the BOD. The city of Cloquet must also provide secondary treatment. With this level of treatment the dissolved oxygen criteria of 3 mg/l can be met at the designed flow. This, however, does not take into consideration the effect of the solids deposits. Therefore, for an interim period, the minimum dissolved oxygen may go below the minimum level. However, it is felt that the effects of the deposits will dissipate and in short order the minimum requirement will be met.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency is proposing to conduct a comprehensive study of the St. Louis River basin. The purpose of this study would

be to develop a comprehensive water quality control and pollution abatement plan for the river basin. Specific items that will be studied are the effect of natural pollution on the quality of the St. Louis River; the effect of manmade pollution including sludge banks and the treatment required; a flow regime that will be consistent with all needs of the basin, including maintenance of water quality standards, power generation and flow through Jay Cooke State Park; and alternatives to waste treatment if these are applicable. The Agency is proposing to apply for a grant from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to assist them in paying for the administrative expenses of such a study. It is expected that an application for a grant will be submitted by the Agency in the near future. At the present time the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration does not have sufficient information to be able to recommend a water release regiment to improve water quality. The proposed basin study will provide this information.

A basin plan as developed from the comprehensive study should provide the information necessary to restore the water quality of the St. Louis River so that it will be satisfactory for all legitimate uses.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED WATER QUALITY STANDARDS
ST. LOUIS RIVER
BY
MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

Reach of River	Seven Beaver Lake Outlet to Cloquet	Cloquet to Fond du Lac	Fond du Lac to Clough Island
River Miles in Reach	125 (est.)	15 (est.)	20 (est.)
Water Use Classification	Propagation and maintenance of sport or commercial fish, whole body contact recreation, general industrial purposes (except food processing)	Propagation and maintenance of fish commonly inhabiting the water under natural conditions, boating, and other forms of aquatic recreation not involving whole body contact, general industrial purposes (except food processing)	Propagation and maintenance of fish commonly inhabiting the water under natural conditions, boating, and other forms of aquatic recreation not involving whole body contact, general industrial purposes (except food processing)
Water Quality Criteria			
Bacterial	Total Coliform - 1000 MPN/100 ml	Total Coliform - 5000 MPN/100 ml	Total Coliform - 5000 MPN/100 ml
Dissolved Oxygen	Min. - 6 mg/l April 1 thru May 31 Min. - 5 mg/l at other times	Min. - 5 mg/l April 1 thru May 31 Min. - 3 mg/l at other times	Min. - 5 mg/l April 1 thru May 31 Min. - 3 mg/l at other times
Temperature	86°F (max.)	86°F (max.)	86°F (max.)
pH	Min. 6.5 Max. 9.0	Min. 6.0 Max. 9.0	Min. 6.0 Max. 9.0

Environment

The young people of this nation are now facing a challenge which, in my estimation, if far greater than any faced by previous generations.

-- They have been born in an age where technological advancements have progressed so far that certain of its applications to sophisticated nuclear weaponry threaten the total survival of future generations. This is a grave responsibility, indeed, to pass on to the young people of today.

-- They are the inheritors of a nation in which settlement and industrial development have taken their toll in the use of our natural resources.

We were once a country that could boast of abundant resources.

--Our forests were plentiful

--Our great bodies of water were clean and unpolluted

--Our wildlife was not threatened with extinction because of exposure to chemical compounds.

--Our air was clean -- untainted by smog.

We must remember, however, that our industrial development made us a leading power in the world. It has given us a very high standard of living, but we have paid a price for our comfort in the dissipation of our natural resources. This is unfortunate, but we cannot turn back the clock. We must deal with the realities that exist today.

Our young people face serious responsibilities. They must deal in a very real sense with the question of man's survival on this planet. Their latitude has been considerably narrowed by technological breakthroughs which have occurred and the options that are open to them.

They too must leave a heritage for those who will follow in the future.

The achievement of peace in the world is certainly one top priority. Limitations must be placed upon the use of destructive weapons and war must be made obsolete as a means of settling disputes.

Preservation of our environment is another very important necessity. Given the predictions of several emminent scientists, we have only another thirty years to survive on this planet, if means are not implemented to stop pollution now.

Will the year 2000 be an end or a beginning. Only this young, new generation can determine that fully by their efforts in the cause of preservation of mankind. And that is really what we are talking about when we discuss the preservation of environment.

My generation has tried to solve many of these problems. In many instances, ~~they~~ we have laid the groundwork for the future.

--The 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was an important step in trying to establish peace and in protecting the environment from the harmful effects of nuclear bomb testing.

--The 1970 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty another vital step to control the use of nuclear weapons.

Past generations have expressed concern for pollution and it is interesting to note that the first major Federal water pollution Act, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 is still being used to limit pollution of our navigable waters. 400 suits per year are being filed under this Act by the Justice Department at the present time. The recent action of the Justice Department in filing suit involving thermal pollution in Biscayne Bay ~~recently filed by the Administration~~ used this Act as one of its counts. The legislation was originally designed to clean up refuse in New York Harbor, but was extended to cover a great segment of our navigable waters.

The Act states, "it shall not be lawful to throw, discharge, or deposit, or cause, suffer or procure to be thrown, discharged or deposited either from any ship barge, or other floating craft of any kind, or from the shore, wharf, manufacturing establishment, or mill of any kind, any refuse matter of any kind or description whatever other than that flowing from streets and sewers and passing therefrom in a liquid state, into any navigable water of the United States, or into any tributary of any navigable water of the United States, or into any tributary of any navigable water from which the same

shall float or be washed into such navigable water..."

Of course, there is a humorous aspect in the application of this Act in that it deals with the modern problem of thermal pollution, but does not treat sewage. Fortunately, some of the more recent laws we have developed have brought many of our sewage problems under some measure of control.

This Act was interpreted in 1966 in a case involving the United States vs. Standard Oil. Chief Justice Douglas ruled that the 1899 Act included as refuse "all foreign substances and pollutants apart from those "flowing from streets and sewers..." Hence this Act was used in a case dealing with oil pollution.

Also, it is a commentary on the fact that sufficient legislation has not been enacted to deal with modern pollution problems, such as thermal, chemical and radiological pollution.

In 1894 the Act was expanded to provide penalties for those who polluted from $250.00 to $2,500.00 or thirty days in jail.

In 1904 studies were conducted by Jordan, Russell, Zeit and Frost on the longevity of typhoid, cholera and dysentry bacteria in regard to stream purification. It was found that streams would purify themselves to a degree,

In 1912 Congress extended the functions of the Public Health Service to include the "investigation of the diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation and sewage and the pollution either directly or indirectly of the navigable stream and

lakes of the United States."

In 1913 the Public Health Service set up the first field station for this purpose to make studies of pollution and self purification in Ohio.

The Oil Pollution Control Act of 1924 was another important piece of legislation. It provided penalties of up to $2,500.00 or imprisonment up to a year for dumping oil into the navigabble waters of the United States. This Act was emasculated somewhat in 1966 by a court ruling that "it was necessary to prove intent or conscious neglect before companies could be fined or prosecuted for oil pollution."

In the 1920's and 1930's there were findings made relating to biological wastes treatments. This type of bacterial treatment is widely used in sewage treatment plants today.

In 1931 Thorndike Seville, an American professor of Economics and Political Science made a comment on the subject of pollution which I still think has relevance today. He said, "The complexity of the problem of water pollution is indicated by the fact that with all the advance in the sciences related to industry and government, with the notable increase in stream pollution everywhere consequent upon industrial development and growth of urban populations, no country has yet worked out any scheme satisfactorily reconciling the conflicting interests of public water supply versus waste disposal; of industrial interests versus those of the sportsman; of public welfare as opposed to private or corporate gain; or,

in short, the true conservation of water resources by maximum judicious use for the greatest public benefit."

However, it was not until 1948 that a major bill was introduced to deal with water pollution. It was the work of Senators Alben Barkley and Robert Taft. The Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 represented a major breakthrough in terms of Federal recognition of the problem, although it provided little aid, control, or enforcement. The Act provided for project loans for development of sewage plants up to $250,000. at 2% interest to cover 1/3 of the total cost of a project. But appropriations were limited and were not available to help local communities. The Act also provided that the Public Health Service coordinate research, provide technical information, and when asked by affected states - provide limited enforcement over interstate waters. It also declared that pollution was best dealt with on the local level.

~~I am proud to say that~~ The next important bill came about because of the efforts of a fine Minnesotan, Congressman Blatnik and it became public law 660 on July 9, 1956. The important aspect of this bill was its provision to provide grants-in-aid to help local communities build sewage disposal plants. The bill contained appropriations in the amount of $100 million annually, based on estimates by health officials that outlays for construction of $500 million annually would be needed for the next ten years.

The Eisenhower administration officials protested the construction grants. The law strengthened the Federal government's responsibility to encourage states and localities to control their pollution. The Act required the Public Health Service to assist states in preparing comprehensive programs for the elimination and reduction of pollution of interstate waters. It authorized grants of $3 million annually in matching funds to state and interstate agencies in development of comprehensive water pollution control programs. It authorized $500 million for ten years for matching grants to help localities construct sewage disposal plants, with a limit of $50 million per year. Allocations were limited to 30% of project cost. 50% of the funds went to municipalities of 125,000 or less. This was a very important provision.

check provisions

It established a Water pollution Control Advisory Board and made provision for antipollution rules by authorizing the Surgeon General to call a conference of officials when he had reason to believe "pollution of interstate waters was occurring" and to recommend remedial action after the conference. If no action was taken by the offender, the offended state could request the Attorney General of the United States to bring suit against the offender.

In 1958 President Eisenhower asked Congress to discontinue the grants provision to a three year term on the grounds that the states should pay for their own construction costs,

based on a telephone tax rebate program which would give the states revenue. The Administration was not successful in its attempt to have the grant program revert to a state level.

In 1959 and 1960 expanded water pollution control legislation was sought and President Eisenhower vetoed it.

The grants-in-aid program to states was successful and it was popular. A strong case could be made that the grants had a profound effect on pollution control efforts. During the two years following passage of the bill, sewage construction works doubled. Thirty-five states achieved their highest all-time levels of construction. A third of the projects which were constructed in 1958 were those which had received Federal grants.

The chief argument against President Eisenhower's tax rebate was that there was no guarantee that funds would be used for pollution control activities.

During this period I supported the proposals for expanded water pollution legislation vigorously.

The controversy continued and subsequent bills increasing Federal aid were vetoed because of the Administration's position that "Because water pollution is a uniquely local blight, primary responsibility for solving the problem lies not with the Federal government, but rather must be exercised, as it has been, by State and local governments...By holding forth the promise of a large-scale program of long term

Federal support, it would tempt municipalities to delay essential water pollution abatement efforts while they waited for Federal funds."

In the 1960 Presidential campaign the Democratic ticket of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson charged that Eisenhower's veto of the pollution bill for increased grants-in-aid was a "national tragedy".

Kennedy declared, "The problem of water pollution is not a local problem...We must step up the fight against water pollution. We must stimulate construction of needed sewage and waste treatment plants and prevent further spread of water pollution. Our goal must be abundant clean water for all Americans, with full utilization of every drop of water in every river system in the nation."

In 1961 Congressman Blatnik introduced a bill which proposed a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, as a separate independent operating agency within the Department of Health, Education & Welfare.

It contained a significant innovation in the field of enforcement. Under ~~existing~~ prior legislation Federal enforcement operations applied only to interstate waters which flow across or form a part of boundaries between two or more states. Of the 26,000 bodies of water in the United States only an estimated 4,000 were interstate and did not include, as an example, a great part of the Great Lakes and their

tributaries or many other important bodies of water.

This situation was corrected in the Blatnik bill. Enforcement proceedings were toughened and an enforcement construction grant fund of $25 million was proposed to help financially pressed communities who had to construct treatment facilities for sewage because of enforcement proceedings.

The bill became law with provisions agreeing to most of the proposals, except for the proposal giving the Secretary the power to issue orders for abatement. The law provided that if pollution was not abated within the specified time, the Secretary could ask the Attorney General to bring suit to secure abatement in case of interstate pollution. In the case of intrastate pollution, the Secretary could only ask for such a suit provided he had the written consent of the state involved.

What followed was the legislation titled the Water Quality Act of 1965. It increased construction grants to $150 million, facilitated multicommunity and large construction programs. It contained significant and needed administrative administrative reorganization. Public Health Service Controls were substituted by direct action by the Secretary of HEW.

The major thrust of this legislation was its initiation of water quality standards. No clear standards of violation existed previously. And even today all aspects of pollution have not been implement in water quality standards.

The states were required to establish standards, adopt a

plan for implementation and enforcement of these standards. Senator Muskie with strong Johnson administration backing took the leadership in securing strong water quality standards. Later on, the administration of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration was transferred to the Department of the Interior as a result of an Executive Order.

Water quality standards have to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, as they are submitted by the States. All states have submitted standards, but some have not been fully approved to date.

During the past few weeks a bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act was reported out of Conference in the Congress and must be signed into law by the President.

It deals very strongly with the problem of oil pollution. It establishes a "clean up authority" for oil pollution. It contains strict features of liability to oil shippers and covers onshore and offshore installations. Penalties are set forth as $100.00 per gross ton in regard to oil spills or a maximum of $14 million. We have advanced a long way from the Oil Act of 1924 and penalties of $250.00 to $2,500.00.

It requires reasonable assurance from anyone requiring licensing to construct facilities within the states that their operation will not cause pollution of the waters of the state.

It calls for research on the environmental effects of pesticides. It deals with sewage from small boats. It also touches on thermal pollution of water.

Up to this point we have been concerned with legislation dealing with water pollution. If there had not been extensive concern with air pollution, one can understand why.

It was not until the development of the automobile, the airplane, and heavy industrial plant expansion that air pollution became a noticeable and dangerous problem. Industrial wastes alone did not attract much attention, although a problem certainly in urban areas. But combined with mass use of the automobile and the airplane, the situation is a severe one that we face today.

The problem of air pollution was tackled in a major sense in the Clean Air Act of 1965.

Title II of this bill deals with air pollution from motor vehicles and sets Federal standards for emmissions and requires that pollution devices be developed for automobiles "as soon as it is practical and feasible".

Another section of the Act deals with Federal assistance to the states in dealing with solid wastes -- garbage, refuse, etc.

The Clean Air Act was further amended in 1967 to strengthen it and broaden its provisions.

One striking provision is that it allows a State, political subdivision, intermunicipal or interstate agency to adopt standards and plans to implement an air quality program which will achieve a higher level of ambient air quality than that approved by the Secretary of HEW.

State Powers

This is a most interesting provision in light of one of the most important pollution controversies in the country today. This controversy involves the State of Minnesota.

Somehow Minnesota or Minnesotans seem always to be in the forefront of the battle to combat pollution, ~~and I say that with pride.~~

In the question of nuclear power plants being built within the State, the State contends that the standard set for the amount of radioisotopes which are to be discharged into State waters are not high enough to protect the health and welfare of the people of Minnesota. The standard is a Federal standard which is being challenged and the case will decide whether a state has the right clearly to set a higher standardsthan that set by the Federal government.

I feel that the State of Minnesota has every right to pursue this claim in protecting the health and welfare of herecitizens. This is a most important case and its outcome may affect many people throughout the nation. Seventeen states have filed briefs in support of Minnesota's case.

The Clean Air Act also states that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare shall after appropriate consultation issue to the states such criteria of air quality as in his judgement may be requisite for the protection of public health and welfare. The States are to set up

for approval by the Secretary means of implementation, maintenance and enforcement of air quality standards. Air quality regions have been established under the Act and enforcement provisions are included.

Now, I think it may be logical for all of you to raide the question, "If all this legislation exists, why do we still have a pollution problem?"

The answer to that question is quite complex and the solutions are even more complex.

That is why it is important for all of you to continue your interest in pollution. Because after all of the rhetoric and after all of the complaints, a great deal more action will be needed before pollution can be brought under control.

There are many areas in which legislation does not exist, or if it does exist it is not strong enough to do the job.

All existing pollution legislation stops at our feet for one thing -- the Water Quality Act and the Water Pollution Control Act and amendments are designed to protect our surface water -- our lakes, rivers and streams.

Other existing acts are directed at air pollution and conservation of wilderness areas.

There is still no legislation to protect our vast bodies of sub-surface water -- the underground reservoirs that are the water supply of the future.

Sub surface water

Industry is already taking advantage of this gap in the control laws by dumping toxic wastes down deep injection wells -- wastes that in a few years, or sooner will migrate underground and poison these valuable reservoirs.

Much of this waste -- injected under pressure into geological formations, once considered stable -- eventually finds its way to the surface and re-pollutes the surface waters and the atmosphere.

Brine wastes injected deep in the earth in Canada have already erupted in Michigan. In Texas, sweet wells have been poisoned and sewer lines have broken as high pressure waste injection found new underground channels.

Thermal pollution has not been dealt with adequately in a legislative sense on either a Federal or State level.

The dangers of thermal pollution upon marine ecology are many, including death from high temperatures, oxygen reduction in water to a toxic extent and harmful effects which relate to spawning and migratory habits of our marine life.

Pollution from radioisotopes is another area that needs careful examination. The dangers of cancer and lukemia to those who have been exposed to these isotopes, either in drinking water or by breathing them in still have to be carefully estimated. Not all cancer occurs immediately due to exposure. There is a latent period for the disease and the effects of radioisotopes must be measured over a long period of time. Their effects should also be measured by a particular study of the environment where they will be discharged.

Their effects on embryos and marine life have not been considered in light of the present Atomic Energy Commission Standards. The standards are based on studies which were made at Hiroshima over twenty years ago after the bomb explosion. There has been no legislation to require the AEC to perform specific environmental studies relating to the ecology where nuclear power plants are to be constructed. I think this should be corrected and such studies not left to power companies to perform or the states who may not have the resources to perform adequate studies.

Minnesota is the first state to challenge these standards and her efforts may change the whole legislative outlook on this subject.

Pesticides are another hazard. The ban on DDT is not sufficient because of the damage which has occurred in the buildup of chemicals in the cells of our wildlife. This damage may be irreparable.

Herbicides are yet another matter. A ban has been instituted on 2,4,5,T, effective January 1, 1970 by the Department of Agriculture. This herbicide has been found to cause birth malformations in rats and mice in a study conducted by the National Cancer Institute in October of 1969 and it was concluded that 2,4,5,T was probably dangerous to man. 2,4D is another. It is one of six best selling pesticides in the country and grosses $25 million annually. Even though it has been labeled potentially dangerous, no action on banning this substance has been announced.

Now let's examine the effects of pollution which we are facing right now. Air Pollution

Many people are dying each year because of pollution. It is shocking to realize that an estimated 20,000 people die annually as a result of air pollution.

According to the Food and Drug Administration 800 to 1,000 people die from pesticide poisoning each year and an additional 80,000 to 90,000 people are injured from these pesticides. In some instances farm workers have been killed by a few drops of pesticides which have penetrated their clothing.

But far worse will be the number of human deaths caused by these chemicals such as DDT or 2,4,5T after a lifetime of exposure.

Fish kills because of chemical, sewage, and thermal wastes have become serious & critical. Another valuable resource is being destroyed in an age where food supplies are vital because of expanded population growth.

The oceans have been used as garbage, pesticide and dumping grounds extensively, and according to many scientists, it will only be fifty years before they will be totally polluted if the situation is not corrected.

The upper atmosphere is being given close scrutiny. Scientists at one time believed that isotopes released from bomb tests and in particular the deadly Strontium 90 would penetrate the upper atmosphere and flow into outer space. This, turn out not to be true and we are collecting a belt of radioactive material that is circling the earth

Our clean water supply has been depleted. Today we have a demand for 411 billions of gallons of water per day and a dependable supply of 315 billions of gallons. In 1980 demand is estimated at 597 billions of gallons per day with a dependable supply of 515 billions of gallons. Obviously, there is not a very high reserve of clean, usable water.

Each year 200 million tons of smoke and fumes are spewed into the atmosphere and we have cited how many people are dying because of that.

We have 195 million tons of solid waste to deal with annually. Each year Americans junk 7 million cars, throw away 20 million tons of paper, 48 billion cans and 28 billion bottles.

Where have we failed. Why are we faced with this pollution crisis?

Technology, or the lack of development of it to be more precise, has hindered progress in this area. We must face the fact that safety devices were not developed simultaneously as we advanced industrial technolocially. There has always been a tendency in our development to pollute first and measure the effects later. That attitude must change. We cannot afford pollution any longer.

Internal combustion engines account for 60% of our air pollution.

The 1965 Air Pollution law required that devices for control be developed as soon as it was practicable and feasible.

Auto manufacturers are just now developing exhaust control devices for cars that will cut down air pollution. Their use will require a low compression auto engine which will use a low octane gasoline. Lead free gasoline has been developed but it has to be widely used.

Power and industrial plants must develop safety control devices to cut down stack emmissions which account for part of the remaining air pollution problem. Control devices for thermal, chemical and radiological wastes must be developed.

The jet airplane engine will also have to be tackled in cutting down pollution.

Pesticides are going to have to be researched carefully and taken off the market if they are proven dangerous to man and wildlife.

Solid waste disposal is an area which can be turned into one of conservation. Recycling of solid wastes is an important concept to be considered in the future. Recycling of paper and wood products would help save our great remaining forests. Recycling of autos and metal products would save our mineral resources. Aluminum, for example, is 100% salvageable.

Sewage treatment needs to be researched for methods of tertiary treatment which will remove the nitrates and sulphates which cause extensive algae growth and cut down the oxygen supply in our waters.

Open burning in dumps and other areas should be banned.

As you can see there are great improvements to be made.

Why hasn't this been accomplished with all the legislation enacted and in the works, aside from the lack of technology to do the job.?

Simply because the Federal and State governments cannot accomplish these goals alone. Industry and the public as a whole must fully cooperate in this effort. That is why I am delighted that there has become a national consciousness of environment.

We need a Department of the Environment, as an independent government agency, to combine all legislative aspects of the pollution problems. Under its jurisdiction would be brought the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, an Air Pollution Department would be created to administer air pollution programs, and a Solid Waste Department. We need a Secretary of the Environment to administer these programs. Research would then be coordinated, legislative efforts combined under the authority of one agency, and new aspects of international cooperation in the environment developed and implemented.

Population research could be included. Research into the critical areas of developing food supplies needed for an expanding population ~~could be included~~ as well.

This ~~Agency~~ Dept could look into the practicality of giving industry tax credits to develop safety devices and work closely with industrial and public programs designed to combat pollution.

But we might as well make up our minds to the fact that none of this will be effectively done unless there is a national effort by all citizens of the United States to stop pollution.

I have heard it said that the cost will be prohibitively expensive. But the threat to our health and survival cannot be underestimated or neglected.

The actual cost to control pollution has been estimated at $275 billion dollars over a thirty year period.

Significantly, this is the equivalent of the anticipated Department of Defense expenditure over the next four years. I think that pollution control must be one of our top priorities.

And we really do not have a choice. The amount of deaths because of pollution are rising each year and the damage to our wildlife and natural resources is becoming stagering.

~~I think~~ the cost of polluting is sometimes more expensive. A case in point is the Chevron Oil incident that occurred in Louisiana recently. An $800.00 collar was all that was needed to prevent that oil spill and Chevron is paying $2,000.00 per day to clean up the spill, It may take several months to clean it up and the bill is going to be very expensive.

I also don't need to mention the terrible effects of oil spills. You have seen the pictures of ~~wildlife that has been destroyed and~~ our helpless birds and fish the damage to our beaches.

~~I think~~ pollution control is good business. And ~~I think~~ the costs of prevention and control on a comparative basis would be cheaper in the long run and in some instances even profitable.

~~Now how can that be?~~ ~~I shall tell you how.~~

Industry must lead the way in developing new safety devices. But they also should realize that pollution control may involve the creation of new businesses. There may have to be a shift in our industrial emphasis, but that does not have to be a negative or expensive shift.

For example, recycling plants for automobiles and scrap metal could save natural resources and provide new jobs.

Recycling for paper and wood products would do the same thing. Salvage company operations could be expanded.

New techniques for salvaging solid wastes would inevitably be stimulated and developed and this would be a boon to pollution control.

Population growth will necessitate a greater reliance on mass transportion facilities. This can mean a revival of the railroads, the shipping industry and passenger travel on ships, as well as efficient mass transit systems. So there will undoubtedly be shifts in industrial emphasis and changes in industrial markets in the future. But this does not say that they will not be profitable.

So I do not subscribe to the theory that pollution control is impossibly expensive ~~in the long run~~. It can be economically profitable, and it is socially imperative.

I certainly think that a country that could develop technology sophisticated enough to land a man on the moon, is one that can certainly conquer pollution.

All of you have a big stake in this new enterprise. It

is your life, your breath and your future. And I know that you will be willing and able to accept the challenge that lies before you.

I am pleased with the number of seminars that are being held on the high school and college level on the environment in Minnesota and throughout the country. We need to be environmentally aware.

Now is the time to start -- now is the time to learn, so that your ideas and constructive solutions can be implemented in the future.

We can legislate every aspect of pollution but it will only be conquered by cooperative, dedicated effort on the part ~~of the people of the United States~~ each and every one of us and particularly ~~our~~ the young people. ~~who will be the leaders of the future.~~

The 70's have begun, ~~and~~ let's choose to extend our lease on this planet for a little longer than thirty years.

Let's make the next thirty years the beginning of a New Age -- the Age of Preservation, so that we can begin a new century of progress in the year 2,000. So that there will be a heritage for another and another generation of clean water, clean air, thriving wildlife and abundant food.

Let it be said that this generation and the next did not despoil and destroy the fabric of civilization ~~and~~ ; they did not leave ~~as the~~ footprints ~~of their passing~~ of a dead and lifeless planet. Let it be said that we met the challenge of the future with great ~~one for the heritage~~

Minnesota
Historical Society

www.mnhs.org