

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 3

FEBRUARY 9, 1970, TO FEBRUARY 19, 1970  
(PAGES 2777 TO 4246)

than we are cleaning them up despite the expenditure of \$5.4 billion between 1957 and 1969 by federal, state and local governments.

The strategy for fighting pollution proposed in my bill offers, in my view, the best hope of effectively reversing the trend toward increasing contamination of our Nation's waters. It promises to be more comprehensive and far more effective than present programs. Yet it is a program that would not further upset the delicate condition of our economy with major new federal spending. And, unlike the Hickel Plan which press reports indicate you have under consideration as an alternative to present pollution control programs, my proposal would not add further to the already back-breaking burden on the property tax.

I therefore urge that you give serious consideration to endorsing in your State of the Union Message this year, or in any subsequent special message to Congress you may plan on environmental problems, the approach to water pollution control that I have proposed. I would welcome an opportunity to discuss my proposal with you in person.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
U.S. Senator.

#### POLLUTION BY GOVERNMENT

Hardly a week goes by that someone high in the Nixon Administration fails to pay his respects to the environment, which for political purposes is beginning to take on the combined attributes of flag and motherhood. The trouble with this admission of pure air and water into the pantheon of national symbols is that it becomes harder and harder for the public to tell whether the environment is being saved or only revered.

A case in point is the President's order to Federal agencies to move toward elimination of all polluting activity by the end of 1972. On the face of it, the directive is welcome. But if the public imagines that it heralds the end, or even a great reduction, of such activity by the very Government which is preaching a pure environment, the public is sadly misled.

The order is a clarification of President Johnson's on the same subject, and it proposes to spend more for the purpose. But the deadline for compliance with air and water pollution standards is farther off, by six months, than that set by the Johnson Administration, and requires not completion but only the beginnings of a corrective program.

More important is the question of how effective any such directive can be which expressly exempts all those agencies that can plead "national security." Chairman Russell E. Train of the new Council on Environmental Quality observed that the Department of Defense would be the largest single agency affected by the order, and certainly it has been by far the greatest violator.

No doubt something can be done to reduce pollution of various sorts in army camps and air bases. But does anyone seriously imagine that the Navy will rebuild its ships, that atomic installations will be redesigned, that chemical warfare plants will be dismantled—and all on a three-year budget of \$359 million? Will ammunition plants be shut down until anti-pollution improvements are made?

Presumably not, in the name of "national security." What would be left of the program is still worth doing—for the example it might set if for no other reason. But what is essentially the renewal of an established and highly limited policy hardly warrants the fanfare with which it was announced. How will the country know when something really big and significant is in the (polluted) air?

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a Special Subcommittee on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Transportation of the Commerce Committee is opening a series of hearings on problems confronting the transportation system on the Great Lakes. A number of these problems were recently reviewed at the 33d annual joint conference of the Dominion Marine Association and Lake Carriers Association last month. Mr. John J. Dwyer, executive vice president of the Aglebay Nortoh Co., gave a very perceptive address to the conference on "Improving Productivity of Industry in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Region." He pointed out how the shrinking Great Lakes fleet and discriminatory railroad rates to lake ports are frustrating the great potential for industrial development in the Great Lakes area.

I believe Mr. Dwyer's remarks deserve the attention of the Senate. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### IMPROVING PRODUCTIVITY IN THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE REGION

It is a pleasure to be here to meet with old friends of the U.S. and Canadian lake shipping industry. Talking shop as we have a chance to do in these pleasant surroundings has always led to helpful suggestions for solving our mutual problems and furthering the tremendous opportunities we both see ahead for the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence Seaway region.

Long before the older countries of Europe developed the idea of the common market, the U.S. and Canada had in effect developed a sort of North American common market and if you judge the success of such an arrangement by the growth rate in gross national product and in the standard of living of the populations on both sides of the border then you have to say the common working arrangements have been successful. In the future, they can be even more successful in realizing for the people of both our countries the bright promise of the resources, the capital, the energies we are enjoying.

We come together in this meeting in part at least to talk about how this long-standing and mutually beneficial partnership can be improved.

I would like to suggest that we give consideration today to the potential role lake transportation can play in the fight against inflation, one of the principal problems worrying the leaders of both our countries.

While naturally most of our attention is focussed on government actions in this area, too little attention, in my view, is being given to another way to break the cost-price spiral. It isn't the total answer of course. But it is an essential part of the answer, perhaps the most essential part of the answer in the long run.

There is an increasingly pressing need to increase the productivity of our use of labor, capital, and our resources.

In the U.S. as in Canada there have been vast increases in productivity since World War II. Everybody is aware of the great impact of the computer in improving productivity. Automation, often linked to the computer, has given us a vast boost in productivity. Unprecedented economies of scale, particularly in materials handling, have cut down unit costs. Miniaturization and printed

circuits in the electronics field and the reduction of paperwork in all fields have provided substantial benefits. One can scan the entire panorama of agriculture, the extractive industries and manufacturing and see major advances on every hand.

We think of ourselves as caught up in an age of tremendous technological advance and yet—and this is a sobering statistic—in the United States the average advance in productivity, despite all our new technology, has, since the war, been less than 3 per cent a year. We have been running faster and faster to stay barely ahead of the rapid increases in labor and material costs. And now we are falling behind. In the early 1960's wages and productivity increases almost kept pace. Last year the average wage increase was about 6 per cent and the current demands will average out at much more than that if they prevail.

While we are hopeful that the governments of both our countries will be successful in curbing inflation, labor and management cannot escape the fact that real wages and real standards of living cannot rise unless output per unit of input, which after all is what we mean by productivity, goes up too.

Putting aside for a moment the thought of what sort of trouble we would be in if there had been less improvement in productivity over the past 20 years, it is surely obvious that we must all redouble our efforts to improve productivity.

I suggest that the states and provinces bordering the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River have an opportunity to make breakthroughs in productivity not as readily available to other parts of our North American common market area.

I refer specifically to promoting much more intensive use of the Great Lakes water highways both for interlake service and for export and import service.

We have been studying recently a most interesting analysis of the potential of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region prepared for the Detroit Edison Company by Constantin A. Doxiadis. Doxiadis has done useful work for the United Nations, the International Bank for Reconstruction and many other similar public and private organizations around the world. His study is not limited to Detroit, but takes into account the growth potential of the Canadian provinces and all the U.S. states bordering the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

The study was published in 1966 based on 1963 and earlier data and the estimate of the future growth of Great Lakes transportation was quite optimistic.

The study assumed that capital would flow freely into modernizing Great Lakes shipping and that the modernization of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system would continue on a reasonable schedule after the opening of the Poe Lock at Sault St. Marie.

On that basis, the study said that the ports of the Urban Detroit Area, including Toledo, Detroit and other ports as well as a greatly expanded Port Huron industrial area, would be handling 225 to 300 million tons of freight a year in the year 2000 compared to 77 million tons per year in the 1958-63 period. The Doxiadis staff is bringing their estimates up-to-date and hopes to publish soon a new volume on transportation in the Great Lakes region. We can expect it to be far less optimistic about lake shipping. Modernization of the balance of the Seaway system is not in sight and new capital is not flowing into improving the productivity of Great Lakes shipping in anything like the required volume. Indeed, except for two ships being built for private use, no new investment is going into U.S. lake shipping at all. A pessimistic forecast on lake shipping inevitably means a pessimistic forecast for industrial growth in the region.

The reason for the adverse effect on the economy of a decline in lake shipping is clearly indicated in Professor John L. Hazard's study of the Problems and Potential of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Transportation System, submitted to the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission last month. He says bulk lakers and ocean-lake vessels lift 4 to 5 times the tonnage of the average bulk hauling trains and convey it at almost the same through speeds at line haul costs one-fourth to one-fifth of railroads.

A substantial decline in lake shipping therefore destroys one of the principal economic advantages of the lake region, very low cost transportation by water.

In recent papers I have given before the Toledo Chamber of Commerce and the Council of Lower Lake Erie Ports, I have pointed out that there is beginning to be a perceptible drift of industry away from the lake region. Economic growth is less than the national average for the states bordering the lakes on the U.S. side. I would except the area around Detroit from this decline in growth rates. And, although I do not have the figures, the strip of industry from Windsor to Hamilton, Ontario is probably growing at a very fast rate. But compared to Southeastern U.S., the states bordering on the Gulf of Mexico and California, the economic growth of the Great Lakes states can only be described as lagging seriously.

We should know why this is so and what can be done to reverse the trend, because such a trend makes no sense at all. Our region, as all of us here know, is richly endowed with raw materials, it is closest of all to the important markets of both our countries, it has a work-minded and highly skilled labor force, we have vast resources of capital and we have, on both sides of the border, management know-how capable of out-producing and out-competing other regions of the U.S. and also other countries.

I don't pretend to know all the answers to this problem, but one of the most glaring difficulties is the fact that both railroad and lake transportation are in trouble. Too little investment is going into either U.S. railroads or U.S. lake transportation to keep up with the present growth of the region, much less help stimulate a faster growth rate.

From the Illinois Central in the West to the Penn Central in the East has come testimony complaining that the revenues and earnings of the carriers are not sufficient to pay for new and more productive equipment in the volume necessary. Even the past three rate increases will not provide the earnings required for the very heavy new investment urgently needed.

The causes of the decline of the U.S. lake fleet are different, but the results no less alarming. The "for hire" segment of lake transportation has been under severe pressure. There are serious threats to its ability to perform efficiently, and perhaps even to survive on a significant scale. The fleet has been steadily shrinking as more and more vessels reach the end of their economic life and are scrapped and retired rather than replaced. The number of ship operators has declined. Obsolescence is a growing problem, and, except for private use, no new vessel has been built in 10 years. Adverse regulatory actions have resulted in a progressive narrowing of the traffic base. It is becoming increasingly difficult to serve smaller shippers and receivers economically. And costs are rising ominously.

What is the significance of a decline in transport efficiency? Nationwide, transportation accounts for 10 cents of every dollar of gross national product. For the low-valued products like coal and ore, transport costs can be double and triple that amount. Since the Great Lakes economy is made up of heavy industry and heavy industry in turn depends on the cheap movement of millions

of tons of raw materials and semi-finished products, inefficiencies and inadequacies in transportation can be an all-pervasive and highly significant factor in slowing down a region's growth rate.

The inability of the business leadership of the region to develop a program to reverse the present deterioration of low cost water and rail service and the failure of the various agencies charged with responsibility for the health of the transport agencies to act in a coordinated fashion have been disappointing.

The approach has been fragmented, uncoordinated and short term. The railroads, the coal companies, the auto manufacturers, the electric utilities, the producers of ore and limestone, the ports and the steamship lines have not yet learned to work together to make the most out of the advantages the region has, and the most significant difference between our region and other regions is the broad low cost water highway of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system itself. More intensive use of this water highway could produce a major increase in productivity for the region.

One of the most notable failures of economic policy in the region is the failure to make a breakthrough in improving the coordination of rail and water service. Potential savings in transportation costs of 10 to 30 per cent can be achieved by joining the best efficiencies of rail and water. The recent study by the Bureau of Mines of the potential market for U.S. coal in Canada put the problem more politely than I have ever seen it put before. "Modern self-unloaders are in use and larger ones are planned. New coal cars and locomotives are in use in various parts of the country. Unit trains are no longer a novelty. What remains is to pull the techniques together, to bring the general level of practice up to the best."

Others have put it less politely. The railroads, because of their ability to manipulate the rates to the Great Lakes Ports, are in a position to stand on the oxygen hose of the lake shipping industry and thus have the power to smother most of it. They can triumph not because they are more efficient, but because they can decide the level of rates for the port and thus have the leverage to control whether or not the lake shipping industry lives or dies. Professor Hazard points out in his recent study: "What the railroads would do with rates after extinguishing much of the competitive carrier service has not been properly visualized." That is certainly a considerable understatement.

The Port of Toledo has been a leader in the fight to improve coordination of rail-water service at the lake ports and has experienced several years of frustration as a result. W. W. Knight, Chairman of its Board of Directors, has minced no words in assessing the situation. "The greatest concern since the opening of the Seaway is the apparent determination of the railroads to handicap Great Lakes ports by absolutely refusing to provide fair and equal rates from and to the lake ports' hinterlands. The railroads' action is not passive. Rather, it takes the form of aggressive rate cuts from Great Lakes hinterlands states to North Atlantic ports, accompanied by a bland refusal to accord proportional adjustments to the geographically closer lake ports."

The plain fact is that the failure of rail-water coordination is not only costing the region heavily today, but, in the future, if it is allowed to continue, it could be a major factor in the decline of the region as the U.S.-Canadian industrial heartland. What ever seriously hurts the U.S. side of the border will, in the end, adversely affect the Canadian side.

The problems of reviving Great Lakes transportation may sound overwhelming, but actually we have within our grasp a relatively simple remedy which will unlock tens of millions in new investment for more produc-

tive U.S. lake shipping. It is to end the active and calculated rate discrimination against Great Lakes ports by the railroad industry.

Until reasonable rules of inland access to traffic are developed and equitable rates are provided to the lake ports, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence shipping—and the economic advantage of low cost water transport to the region—will be severely handicapped.

What is the real economic penalty to the region of a declining lake shipping industry? We can get a glimpse of the potential for greater efficiency in some of the proposals that have been made for improved water-rail coordination. The lake ports, for example, will give you chapter and verse on what a tremendous handicap it is to industries within range of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system to have to ship their products via east coast ports for export instead of directly via the Seaway. Rail rates are so designed that traffic has to make the long rail haul to the east coast and is burdened by that extra cost, instead of making the relatively short haul to the lake port and maximizing the economic contribution of cheap water transport. How much the manufacturers in Mid-America suffer from the special local transportation burdens they are forced to bear, no one knows. But it is certainly a heavy burden. The practice has chased all U.S. flag international shipping off the Seaway. American steamship lines can't afford to service the Seaway ports when they are subject to the disability of discriminatory rail rates to the ports.

The principle that needs establishing is that the transport resources of the region be used in the most efficient and effective way possible. As the situation is today, industry is foregoing multi-million dollar benefits in increased productivity which would certainly result from improved water-rail coordination.

We have pointed out that only the construction of vessels embodying the most advanced technologies can produce the operating efficiencies and economies which alone hold out a substantial promise of reversing these adverse trends. For example, the most efficient self-unloader today puts 3,000 to 5,000 tons of coal an hour on the shore. New equipment already designed could unload 10,000 to 15,000 tons hourly, drastically shortening vessel time in port, and greatly improving turn-around time and vessel productivity. Such a leap forward in basic efficiency, together with more automated engine rooms, better designed hulls, and many other refinements could, on a new Great Lakes self-unloader built today, make possible a piece of floating machinery at least twice as efficient as the most modern U.S. self-unloader now operating on the Lakes, with concomitant savings of great consequence to shippers and carriers alike. But it is clear that revenues and earnings now in prospect are not sufficient to justify the heavy investment of private-risk capital which is needed for such construction.

The problem of Great Lakes shipping has been studied to death. What is needed is action along relatively simple lines. There is, I believe, a growing realization among the major industries of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system that all is not well with the rail and lake services on which they depend. When these industries come to understand the implications of the decline in transport efficiency for future regional growth and development, lake shipping may get some crucial support.

On the key issue of improving productivity by joining the best efficiencies of rail and water, the U.S. lake carriers are engaged in expensive litigation before the ICC to establish the necessary legal framework for non-discriminatory treatment of the lake ports. We expect to win that case. In the meantime we are urging on the ICC specific ideas for savings in transportation costs

through improved coordination. For example, the railroads have so far refused to supply their most efficient unit train service to the lake ports. One of the Great Lakes shipping lines has offered to invest in a unit train for the transportation of coal from the mines to Ashtabula for transshipment beyond by lake vessel. The estimated overall saving in transport costs for the rail-lake service is between 21 and 30 per cent over the present all-rail. We are hopeful that the railroads, the ICC and the State authorities involved will help make their type of money savings improved coordination a pattern for the 1970's.

Our basic approach is that providing transportation in the most efficient manner possible is good for everybody, including the railroads. If, as seems to be the case, growth is slipping away to other parts of the continent, then the railroads are losers along with all the rest of us. It has recently been suggested that the ICC take the leadership in improving coordination of rail and lake service through a process of knocking heads together.

Unquestionably there is a tremendous growth potential for the established Great Lakes-St. Lawrence industrial heartland on both sides of the border. The industries in this region in both our countries are inter-related. Transport efficiency can stimulate or retard every aspect of the regional economy. Without the influence of a revived and expanding lake service it will be impossible to catch up with rising costs of labor and materials and reverse the economic slippage in regional growth.

With revived lake vessel industry, I have no doubt that the continental industrial heartland represented by the States and Provinces surrounding the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence will develop a surge of dynamism appropriate to its traditional leadership role.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, discussing the subject of human rights, I have maintained that the most basic and fundamental human right is the right to life. And it is almost axiomatic to state that the right to liberty, freedom, and happiness is a vital part of the right to life. In the American Declaration of Independence our Founding Fathers declared that the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness was inalienable and the colonists went to war with England to secure it.

Today, February 16, is the 52d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is fitting that we in this body remember and pay tribute today to the Lithuanian people whose struggle for freedom has been warmly supported by Americans.

In 1795 Lithuania was annexed by Russia and was dominated by czarist regimes for over 100 years. During this time Russia embarked on a deliberate policy of attempting to obliterate the Lithuanian language and culture and replace it with Russian. The attempt failed. The Lithuanian people resisted Russian cultural genocide. Then in 1915, German occupation replaced Russian domination.

But with the growing European chaos that accompanied the end of the First World War came Lithuania's moment for independence. On February 16, 1918, an elected council proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles. A brief Russian occupation was followed by a period of full Lithuanian independence during which time Lithuania joined the League of Nations.

In the Second World War Lithuania was occupied by both Germany and Russia. During the war almost all Lithuanian Jews were executed by the Nazis. Though a puppet government declared Lithuania a constituent republic of the Soviet Union in 1940, total Soviet control did not come until the Soviet armies occupied Lithuania in 1944.

In spite of the fact that Lithuania has effectively been raped by the Soviet Union, and though its sovereignty has vanished, we in the United States have never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We still recognize an independent Lithuania and maintain diplomatic relations with the independent Lithuanian State which has a legation in Washington. As Secretary of State Rusk wrote in 1967 to the Lithuanian chargé d'affaires ad interim:

United States support of the Lithuanian people's just aspirations for freedom and independence is reflected clearly in our refusal to recognize the forcible incorporation of your country into the Soviet Union and in the warm sympathy manifested by the American people in the Lithuanian cause.

In continuing to look resolutely toward a free and independent existence, the Lithuanian people both here and abroad have established a firm foundation for the hope of free men everywhere that the goal of Lithuanian national self-determination will ultimately be realized.

I can but echo the Secretary's sentiments and reaffirm my belief in the basic principles of life, freedom, and dignity for all human beings.

#### FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the relatively short time since its establishment on February 15, 1965, the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service has improved the effectiveness and efficiency of traffic management support of the Nation's Armed Forces through the elimination of duplication. As the newest of the single manager transportation agencies in the Department of Defense, it has brought together functions and resources formerly lodged in a number of agencies.

U.S. Army Maj. Gen. Clarence J. Lang, formerly of Iowa City, Iowa, present commander of MTMTS, has had a varied and distinguished career in the logistics and transportation field. No stranger to Washington, General Lang first served in the Nation's Capital with the Transportation Division, J-4 in the office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Two years later, he served as special assistant to the Army's Chief of Transportation and in 1961 became deputy of the Military Traffic Management Agency. A Transportation Corps officer since 1950, he is acknowledged throughout the Military Establishment and industry as one of the country's foremost experts on transportation and traffic management matters. The Nation is indeed fortunate in having in its service Major General Lang.

The fifth anniversary marks a special milestone in the history of the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service. In this period of trial, the validity of the original concept for MTMTS has

been thoroughly tested and proved sound. The experience gained has opened up new vistas and new opportunities for improvements in military transportation service, as well as opportunities for the avoidance of unnecessary cost through skillful management.

It is particularly fitting that we salute the fine record of achievement established by MTMTS personnel during these past 5 years in meeting all Defense transportation requirements thrust upon them.

On February 15, 1965, the Honorable Stephen Ailes, then Secretary of the Army, marked the activation of the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service, by presenting the agency's charter to its first commander, Maj. Gen. John J. Lane.

The new organization was charged by the Department of Defense with providing "effective, responsive and economical support to the military department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the unified and specified commands and other DOD agencies in the areas of military traffic management, land transportation and common-user ocean terminals." Considerable history and a good deal of frenetic planning lay behind that imposing mission statement.

MTMTS was the product of a growing trend toward unification of those functions within the Department of Defense which could be shared in common by the several services. In the years immediately following World War II, a curtailment of wartime defense budgets lent urgent emphasis to intensified management of the resources of the military departments. The duplication and overlapping in the field of transportation were natural candidates for reform. The more idealistic—and simplistic—defense planners envisioned the assignment of the various types of transportation activities—air, sea, and land—to the military departments best qualified to handle them.

The rationale worked well with the assignment of the air transport mission to the Air Force, which gave the responsibility to the Military Air Transport Service, established in June 1948. The following year the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service assumed the sea-lift chores for DOD, taking over the world's largest fleet of cargo ships from the Army.

The task of delegating the responsibility for land transportation was not so easily accomplished. To begin with, there was the matter of semantics. "Land transportation" is a misnomer. The definition of the function does not parallel that of air or sea transportation, which are operationally oriented. The term "land transportation," as used by the planners, meant "transportation management within the continental United States," and it was not limited to the earthbound modes of transportation. Moreover the CONUS land transportation manager would not have his own assets, but would rely on commercial carriers for support.

Finally—and most important—the services strongly resisted any plan to divest them of responsibility for managing their own traffic. This resistance was predicated on the concept that traffic