UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 13

MAY 25, 1970, TO JUNE 3, 1970

(PAGES 16851 TO 18274)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1970

many voters in the heavily Scandinavian state probably didn't know he was a Swede.

Through the church records, the Swedish Tourist Traffic Association located two sets of relatives on my father's side I never knew I had. I met them in 1965 when the Swedish government selected me as the American journalist to announce plans for Sweden's homecoming year, aimed at getting Swedish Americans to visit the homeland.

It was a sentimental journey indeed when I went to Rada, near Sunne, to be feted by my newly discovered cousin, Kark David Eriksson, and his daughter's family.

I gave a bright new Kennedy half dollar to Hans Backman, my cousin's 6 year old grandson. It was worth the entire trip to see the excited boy, a towheaded Swede if there ever was one, study the coin for a long time and then hear him exclaim to himself in Swedish: "God, what a fine coin!"

I like to think that my young kinsman still cherishes it.

RESULTS OF THE CAMBODIAN SANCTUARY OPERATION

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the results of the Cambodian sanctuary operation as of 8 a.m. June 3, 1970, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY

Total operations	Number	24-hour change
Individual weapons	15,259	+60
Crew-served weapons	2,114	+8
Bunkers/structures destroyed	8,293	+100
Machinegun rounds	3,267,952	+200
Rifle rounds	6,910,376	+40
Total small arms ammunition (machinegun and rifle rounds)	10,178,328	+240
Grenades	34,803	+35
Mines	3,960	+35
Satchel charge	500	(2)
Miscellaneous explosives (pounds)	72,000	(2)
Anti-aircraft rounds	132,694	(1) −1,027
Mortar rounds	48,198	+2,678
Large rocket rounds	1,585	+70
Smaller rocket rounds	26,179	+744
Recoilless rifle rounds	22,166	+611
Rice (pounds)	11,080,000	+142,000
Man months	243,760	+3,124
Vehicles	359	+1
Boats	40	(2)
Generators	36	(2)
Radios	186	+1
Medical supplies (pounds)	39,600	(2)
Enemy KIA	9,139	+133
POW's (includes detainees)	1,913	+13

[1] Field adjustment.
[2] Unchanged.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY HEARINGS IN DULUTH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on Friday, May 22, the Special Subcommittee on Great Lakes—St. Lawrence Transportation of the Committee on Commerce, presided over by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), held hearings on S. 3137 in Duluth, Minn. The bill was introduced by 15 Senators from both parties from all the States in the upper Midwest.

A number of editorials were published by leading newspapers in my State commenting on the hearings and on the bill. On May 14, the Minneapolis Star pointed out that the Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., Mr. David Oberlin, had noted that the seaway had already repaid $36 million to the U.S. Treasury and that no other inland waterway in the country has even paid its operation and maintenance costs, let alone returning something to the Treasury. If the seaway is a failure, Mr. Oberlin said, "We should have more failures."

The Minneapolis Tribune on May 15, 1970, pointed out that the penalty which was imposed on the seaway—requiring it to pay for the cost of its construction, including interest, and for maintenance and operations—was the price for getting the seaway bill. As the Tribune observed:

> There is no doubt that the Seaway's self-sustaining requirement is discriminatory. Tolls are imposed on no other portion of the nation's 25,000-mile system of navigable waters, despite a large and continuing Federal outlay for construction and maintenance of this system.

Some Senators opposing S. 3137 have recommended that tolls be increased and have argued that such increases would not necessarily reduce traffic on the Seaway. But a number of witnesses in Duluth pointed out that shipments of commodities such as grain are quite sensitive to toll levels. Even as little a cost differential as one-eighth cent a bushel would dictate the route by which grain would be shipped, observed one of the witnesses. As the Duluth News-Tribune said in its May 22 editorial:

> A substantial increase in tolls clearly could diminish those economic advantages. In turn, traffic would diminish and the Seaway Corporation would be in a position to repay the government even less than it can pay now.

The St. Paul Pioneer Press in an editorial of May 25 also observed that:

> Enemies of the Seaway want . . . tolls to be sharply increased to continue meeting the construction debts, but this would only drive present shipping off the Great Lakes, diverting the traffic to railroads and East Coast seaports.

It is quite understandable that representatives of east coast interests and railroad interests would like to see the discrimination which was written into the seaway legislation in 1954 continued. But I think the interest of the Nation requires us to take a new look at the unfair treatment which the Great Lakes region has been suffering from.

I think that the record will show that the Nation has benefited from the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and I believe it is time to remove this unfair burden from the seaway. We are prepared to continue to pay operating and maintenance costs out of toll revenues, but it seems to me to be unconscionable to expect the seaway, alone among waterways in the United States, to pay not only these operating and maintenance costs but construction and interest costs as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, May 14, 1970]

DROP SEAWAY DEBT

Because the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway didn't produce all the economic benefits its most enthusiastic pre-construction boosters had predicted, it has been rated by many as a failure.

But, as Seaway Director David Oberlin told a group of Minnesota legislators in Washington recently, the seaway has in its 10 years of existence paid its operation and maintenance costs plus $36 million into the Treasury.

No other inland waterway in the country has even paid its operation and maintenance costs, let alone returning something to the Treasury, Oberlin noted. If the seaway is a failure, he added, "we should have more failures."

But it is true that the seaway has been running behind projections of volume and that it has not been able to keep up with payments on its debt, which, as a result, has risen from $125 million in 1960 to $157 million at present. That in turn has brought pressure for an increase in the tolls which, seaway backers fear, would make the seaway still more unattractive to users.

A special Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Transportation will hold hearings May 22 in Duluth on a bill introduced by Sen. Walter Mondale, D-Minn., to forgive the seaway debt. Canada also is considering a similar move.

Just removing the debt will not solve the seaway's problems; there would still be the need for a longer shipping season, for action against discriminatory rail freight rates, for a change in regulations requiring shipments of government cargoes to move totally or partially in American ships.

The same political and commercial interests that opposed the seaway in the first place can be expected to oppose any easing of its financial burden. The issue, as State Sen. Gordon Rosenmeier has pointed out, is not so much a moral one of paying off a debt as it is a deliberate political handicap to commerce. In all fairness, that handicap should be removed.

[From The Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, May 15, 1970]

DISCRIMINATORY TOLLS ON THE SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence Seaway is in trouble. Unlike other inland waterways, it must (by law) pay for itself—construction, interest, maintenance and operations. This penalty was imposed by Eastern ports, railroads and other anti-seaway interests as the price for getting the seaway built. But present tolls cannot do the job—in fact, the seaway is falling behind. An original debt of $123 million has risen to $157 million, and the seaway is nearly $20 million behind interest payment.

A moratorium on toll increases expires this year. Charles Baker, assistant U.S. secretary of transportation, told Congress in March the tolls must be increased or the seaway refinanced, but the administration has yet to propose any action. Sen. Mondale has a better alternative. He argues that higher tolls would be even more discriminatory against the Upper Midwest and would only discourage use of the seaway. Mondale is sponsoring a bill to cancel the seaway debt. A field hearing on the proposal, which is languishing in a Senate Commerce subcommittee, is scheduled May 22 in Duluth. Mondale's bill would not reduce toll charges—that requires agreement with Canada. But it represents a step away from increases. And it would allow a two-thirds reduction in tolls should Canada agree, which seems unlikely.

There's no doubt that the seaway's self-sustaining requirement is discriminatory. Tolls are imposed on no other portion of the nation's 25,000-mile system of navigable waters, despite a large and continuing federal outlay for construction and maintenance of this system. But some of the steam has been taken from Mondale's bill by the Nixon administration's attempt to impose user charges on all inland waterways.

This latter approach, which puts waterway users in roughly the same category as highway and air-transport users, makes sense. It would recapture a small portion of the federal investment in waterways projects, and it would help to even the differential created by seaway tolls.

But the administration's user-charge bill is no answer to the seaway problem. That bill is stalled in the House Ways and Means Committee, and even if it became law the seaway-financing issue would not be resolved. The Mondale bill, which offers a realistic and, we believe, fair way to help the seaway realize its potential, ought to be passed.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, May 25, 1970]

UNFAIR SEAWAY BURDENS

No other inland waterway system in the United States can equal the record of the St. Lawrence Seaway in payment of operating and maintenance costs. Not only has it met these expenses in full but it has in addition paid $36 million into the federal treasury to apply against original construction costs.

Despite this remarkable success, the Seaway is in financial trouble because it has from the beginning been the victim of an economic discrimination policy of unparalleled severity. It has been saddled with the wholly unjustified burden of repaying the entire original cost of its construction to the government plus interest. No other federal waterway project of this nature is subject to such a handicap and penalty.

The only fair way to resolve this problem is for Congress to lift the $156 million construction debt off the back of the Seaway and thus free it to serve the Upper Midwest economy the way other public waterways serve the rest of the country.

Efforts in this direction were strengthened by hearings conducted at Duluth last week by a special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. The sessions received testimony from numerous groups supporting a bill by Senator Walter Mondale of Minnesota and 14 other senators from both parties which would remove the debt obligations from the Seaway Development Corporation. This is the organization responsible for operating the American section of the Seaway.

Under the Mondale bill the Seaway would continue to pay all its operating and maintenance costs, but would be relieved of the impossible burden of paying back original construction costs plus interest, as required by present law.

Shipping tolls now being collected on Seaway traffic are sufficient to meet the ongoing expenses of the waterway. Enemies of the Seaway want these tolls to be sharply increased to continue meeting the construction debts, but this would only drive present shipping off the Great Lakes, diverting the traffic to railroads and East Coast seaports. These interests have fought the St. Lawrence development for many years and don't want it to succeed.

Mondale pointed out at the Duluth hearings that if his proposal is approved and the Seaway Development Corporation's liabilities are restricted to operating and maintenance costs, the Seaway "still would be treated unfavorably with respect to all other waterways in the United States." Waterways throughout the rest of the nation have been built and operated entirely from general tax revenues. They have not been required even to pay for upkeep, to say nothing of capital debt charges.

Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana chaired the Duluth hearings. He and most other senators from Great Lakes states are backing the Mondale bill.

One of the witnesses, E. L. Slaughter, vice president of the International Longshoremen's Association, put his finger on one of the fundamentals of the situation. He said the present toll and debt charge system "is deliberately discriminatory and is maintained to give coastal seaports and inland transportation interests such as the railroads a competitive edge over Great Lakes shipping."

It was political influence from such interests which forced the original congressional approval of the anti-Seaway self financing program now in effect. It has always been unfair to the Midwest and still is. The situation should be cured by passage of the Mondale bill by the Senate and House.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News Tribune, May 22, 1970]

FAIR BREAK FOR SEAWAY

As a special Senate subcommittee conducts hearings in Duluth today on legislation affecting the St. Lawrence Seaway, it should become apparent that without a fair financial break, the Seaway may flounder.

The Senate Commerce Special Subcommittee on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Transportation will hear testimony relevant to a bill (introduced by Sen. Walter Mondale and 13 other senators from Great Lakes states) which would relieve the Seaway from repaying to the federal government the investment, plus interest, the government made in construction of the Seaway.

This investment was $124 million. Since the 2,342-mile waterway was opened, the Seaway Corp. has paid $33 million in interest to the federal government. Yet, the Seaway Corp. has fallen in arrears $12½ million in interest charges, and owing to other unexpected costs, now owes the government $155.9 million. If this pattern continues, by 2009, when the original debt is to be paid, the total debt will have increased to about $800 million.

Supposedly to give the Seaway Corp. an edge on repaying its debt, consideration has been given to increasing toll charges from 25 to 50 per cent. Such a plan might work, of course, if our seacoast was our only seacoast and if there were no other means of transportation to the heartland.

But the St. Lawrence Seaway has no such competitive advantage, and a substantial increase in tolls only would force a rerouting of much Seaway commerce into other coastal ports.

If the Seaway, in fact, were a transportation luxury, economic sense would dictate that it be closed as an avenue for commerce. But merely from the evidence that the annual cargo volume on the Seaway increased from 12 million tons to 48 million tons in 10 years, it may be concluded that this waterway provides definite economic advantages to many shippers.

A substantial increase in tolls clearly could diminish those economic advantages. In turn, traffic would diminish, and the Seaway Corp. would be in a position of being able to repay the government even less than it can pay now.

A sounder economic move, both for the Seaway and the government, would be to write off the debt, treating it instead of a permanent investment in a commercial waterway. Such an action wouldn't be an act of favoritism toward the Seaway interests. Rather, it would amount to giving the Seaway a concession granted other major waterways in the nation that have been built at government expense.

The government, for example, paid $56 million to develop the Gulf Intercoastal Waterway, and $50 million for maintenance and operation—$62 million to develop the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, and $11 million for maintenance and operation—$33 million to develop the Houston Ship Channel, and $37 million for maintenance and operation—$130 million to develop the Delaware River Channel, and $140 million for maintenance and operation.

Mondale's bill doesn't seek such gratuitous treatment from the government. It calls only for canceling the debt and interest for the Seaway construction. Maintenance and operation costs would continue to be borne by the Seaway Corp. and any revenues in excess of these costs would be returned each year to the U.S. Treasury.

In light of concessions made to other waterways, Mondale's requests are not unreasonable. More to the point, if it is return on investment that the government is interested in the government can best assure returns by lifting the construction cost debt and allowing the Seaway to grow, rather than strangling it with an uncustomary and unfair financial obligation.

RETIREMENT OF ROBERT J. MYERS, CHIEF ACTUARY, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of regret that I learned that Mr. Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, is no longer in Government service. Mr. Myers is an outstanding public servant. As a Government employee he was competent, honest, and loyal.

It is unfortunate that the higher authorities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did not take the necessary steps to keep Mr. Myers in that Department. Mr. Myers was intensely loyal to the Nixon administration. His departure from Government is a loss to the Nixon administration and to the Government. It is a loss for all those who want to make social security better and who want social security financing to be sound.

Mr. Robert J. Myers has the gratitude of all Senators and Representatives who dealt with social security matters. He has the gratitude of the committee which had jurisdiction over social security legislation. He has performed his job well. He is entitled to great credit and high esteem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Myers' letter of resignation dated April 14, 1970, together with a brief biographical sketch which partially shows his outstanding record.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1970.

Hon. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is with the utmost regret that I am constrained to submit my resignation as Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration.

I am deeply concerned about the welfare of the Nation, and I wish to serve the Nixon Administration and the Congress to the best of my ability. I believe that I can best serve these causes by remaining in my present position until the President signs the Social Security bill which will result from the