

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

*U.S. Congress.*

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 19

JULY 13, 1973 TO JULY 19, 1973

(PAGES 23745 TO 25050)

ton-miles of freight service in 1972, an increase of 5.2 per cent over the previous year. And grain car loadings—including those for both domestic and export shipments—averaged 32,660 per week for the first 10 weeks of this year, an increase of nearly 44 per cent over the corresponding period in 1972. This was accomplished despite the fact that there were 40,000 fewer freight cars in service last year than in 1969, when the previous all-time rail traffic record was set.

Since 1960, when virtually all rail grain shipment was in boxcars, railroads have been adding an average of about 11,000 covered hopper cars to their fleets annually. They and private shippers now operate 190,000 of these large hopper cars, and another 5,000 were on order as of last March 1.

It is generally true that, as a group, railroads still rank well down the list in terms of management, operational and labor efficiency. But gains also are being made in this area. A special AAR task force already is well along in a design study for a greatly expanded computerized freight car information program, while improvements are still being made in the basic system now in use. And various individual railroads are continuing to develop new and highly sophisticated computer programs within their own systems.

These stubborn facts remain, however: (a) railroads still do not have sufficient rolling stock to handle loading volume requirements, and existing fleets are not being utilized with maximum efficiency; (b) thousands of miles of rural area rail trackage are no longer in use, and more abandonments are in the offing, and (c) as much as half of the roadbed mileage still in service is inadequate and unsafe for today's 100-ton hopper car loadings.

Without a sustained, multi-billion dollar infusion of funds for new rolling stock and for needed improvement of roadbeds and other physical facilities, U.S. railroads will be extremely hard pressed to meet mounting demands for movement of grain and other basic commodities in the immediate future, let alone handle their subsequent burden of an overall national freight load which, according to DOT predictions, will double by 1985.

As was repeatedly emphasized at the two grain movement seminars, this situation also mandates immediate attention to the other modes of transportation, i.e. rural and farm-to-market roads and inland waterways.

Although over-the-road shipment of heavy bulk farm commodities for distances of more than 50 miles has, in the past, been considered prohibitively expensive, many rail-isolated farmers and suppliers are now left with no alternative. In Illinois alone, because of the lack of railroad lines and/or cars, truck hauling of grain increased by nearly 19-million bushels in 1972.

This extended truck-hauling trend will continue to accelerate. And, even within the prescribed 50-mile radius, the movement of grain to elevators and the equally important transporting of fertilizer, feed grain and heavy equipment to farmers is being choked off or made much more expensive by horse-and-buggy secondary roads and dilapidated, unsafe bridges.

It was this fact which prompted Rep. William H. Harsha (R-Ohio) to comment, during recent floor debate on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, that actual and proposed abandonment of thousands of miles of rail trackage is putting "an inordinate burden on our already over-burdened highway system and leaves highways—many of them inadequate—as the sole source and method of moving goods and services in and out of many of our rural communities." Harsha went ahead to point out that this is a significant factor in steadily rising feed prices.

Overdue improvements and expansion of the nation's waterways system have been almost equally slow in coming. Commercially

navigable inland channels were extended by a scant 290 miles, or only slightly more than 1 per cent, in the 1960-70 decade, and stop-and-go funding of Army Corps of Engineers programs has stalled dozens of needed lock and dam and navigation projects.

A case in point is the old Lock & Dam 26 on the Mississippi River at Alton, Ill. The 41-million tons design capacity of these locks was reached and passed five years ago, and barge tow delays of as much as 18 hours are not uncommon.

There is no practical alternative route for these barges and, in addition to the present delay-loss to shippers and consumers of millions of dollars a year, there exists the possibility of structural failure which would immediately deprive all cities on the upper Mississippi and Illinois rivers of through-barge transportation.

Testifying before Congressional appropriations committees in mid-May, James B. Meanor Jr., manager of the Metropolitan St. Louis Chamber of Commerce transportation department, warned that "with the railroad car shortage becoming even more serious, loss of barge service to and from the upper midwest area would result in extremely serious conditions for its people and industry."

"In this connection, grain exports, much of which move south by barge, are extremely important to improving our balance of trade deficit," he added.

Meanor urged quick release of funds for replacement of Lock & Dam 26, explaining that, even if construction were to start immediately the new facility would not be fully operational for another seven or eight years.

Sen. R. Vance Hartke, chairman of Senate's Surface Transportation Subcommittee, sums up the total picture in this manner: "The situation, simply put, is that our needs for fast, safe and efficient ways to move people and goods are far in excess of the capacity of available systems."

"Our rail system is in disrepair. The waterways are nowhere near their full potential as useful carriers. And, despite tremendous strides made in recent years, many of our road and streets are still either unsafe or inadequate for the traffic volumes they are required to handle."

A number of other influential Congressional leaders are now speaking out on this problem and the enigma of more and more bypassed and isolated "ghost towns" in the hinterlands contrasting sharply with people-packed, transportation-jammed urban areas.

"Our population distribution today is badly unbalanced, with 80 per cent of all Americans living on 5 per cent of the nation's land area," explains Rep. John A. Blatnik (D-Minn.), chairman of the House Public Works Committee. "Half of all our people live on the perimeter of the mainland within 50 miles of the Atlantic, Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico or the Great Lakes"

"We can and we must reverse this flow, and in so doing we can do much to reduce the population pressures that are at the root of today's urban congestion," he stated, adding: "One way to get people back to countryside America is through the development of adequate highways that will encourage industry to locate in rural and small town areas."

"In our concern over the undeniable transportation crisis of our cities," Blatnik concluded, "we cannot afford to overlook or minimize the vital transportation needs of rural America."

Rep. Don Clausen (R-Calif.) echoed the same logic when he said that "if there is ever going to be a change in the quality of life in America, it's going to be brought about as a result of creating either new economic growth centers or revitalizing and diversifying some of the more sparsely populated areas in the U.S."

"If we are going to reverse or slow this

out-migration from our rural sections, and if we're going to stop the stacking of people on top of one another in the big cities, then we must stop giving total consideration to allocating funds where the population is without giving some consideration to where the population can be," Clausen pointed out.

The grain shipment impasse is, obviously just one important symptom of a number of interlocking problems from which the only key is a carefully conceived, adequately financed and quickly implemented national transportation plan.

## THE UNITED STATES AS AN ARMS MERCHANT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two editorials which recently appeared in the New York Times and the New York Post concerning the U.S. sale of conventional weapons to nations in the Middle East and Latin America.

The New York Times editorial, entitled "Phantom Security," persuasively rebuts administration justifications for our arms sales policy. The administration argues, for example, that if the United States does not sell jets to the Saudis or the Chileans, someone else will. But the Times replies: "The same arguments could be made by a debt-ridden dope pusher in Harlem."

Phantom jets and napalm cannot be equated with farm machinery and wheat, competing with others to place lethal weapons into the hands of nations which often can't afford them and which may use them to add to the world's burden of strife and misery is not a wise or honorable way to balance the books of a nation that claims to be leading the world to a generation of peace.

An editorial in the New York Post makes the additional point that while the Nixon-Brezhnev summit focused on negotiating a limit on offensive nuclear weapons, world peace could be strengthened "by reducing the bigger business in smaller armaments."

Mr. President, my amendment to the Foreign Military Sales and Assistance Act would direct the President to convene an international conference on conventional arms to eliminate the kind of situation which these editorials describe. I hope that the President acts promptly and signs this bill into law so that the United States will eventually cease from being a merchant of death.

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

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

[From the New York Times, July 7, 1973]

### PHANTOM SECURITY

The sharply reduced foreign military aid bill as passed by the Senate recently represents a timely attempt to exercise some restraint over a new Administration drive to boost sales of sophisticated military equipment to nations in the Middle East, Latin America and perhaps elsewhere.

In recent weeks Washington has announced its willingness to sell F-4 Phantom fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia as part of a billion-dollar deal to modernize that country's defenses; has entered negotiations to sell \$500-million worth of arms and services to the tiny Persian Gulf state of Kuwait, including F-8 Crusader jet fighters;

and has authorized the sale of F-5E International fighters to Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela and Chile, ending a five-year ban on the transfer of sophisticated arms to Latin America. In addition, Iran has committed itself to purchase about \$2.5 billion in American military hardware and services, including Phantoms.

Credit limits and a specific ceiling on arms transfers to Latin America in the Senate bill could inhibit Administration plans for new sales in the Southern Hemisphere. Although credit curbs would not affect sales to oil-rich Middle East nations that can afford to pay cash, the bill does provide for Congressional review of sales exceeding \$25 million.

Administration spokesmen have asserted that all of these new arms sales serve United States security interests. This may be demonstrable in some cases but it is certainly doubtful in many others. In any event, the scope of the new drive to expand arms exports and some of the explanations offered to justify them suggest motivations that have nothing to do with American security.

It is argued, for example, that arms sales which rose to a record \$3.4 billion last year and are expected to reach \$4.6 billion next year, will help the United States balance of payments. Furthermore, it is pointed out that if the United States doesn't sell jets to the Saudis or the Chileans somebody else will. The same arguments could be made by a debt-ridden dope pusher in Harlem.

Phantom jets and napalm cannot be equated with farm machinery and wheat. Competing with others to place lethal weapons into the hands of nations which often can't afford them and which may use them to add to the world's burden of strife and misery is not a wise or honorable way to balance the books of a nation that claims to be leading the world to a generation of peace.

Administration officials also argue that the sale of weapons will help the United States gain influence in purchasing countries and that Washington will be able to control their use. Has nothing been learned from the Soviet experience in Egypt or from their country's own miscalculations in South and Southeast Asia?

Even where a strong case for American security interests can be made, there needs to be careful analysis of the wider implications of any arms transfer to any country. Will arms aid lead to direct United States military involvement, as is the case today in Cambodia? Is there any real assurance that jets sold to the Saudis, for example, will be directed solely against forces hostile to the United States in the Persian Gulf area?

Finally, since the United States is already the world's leading arms exporter, the impact of stepped-up American arms sales on the worldwide arms race merits special consideration. The respected Stockholm International Peace Research Institute recently noted: "Although the greatest single threat to Man's survival is, undoubtedly, the nuclear arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union, the conventional arms races now taking place elsewhere are also extremely dangerous. A future conflict in one of these areas could escalate into a general nuclear war—possibly the most likely way in which such a war would come about." In the interest of its own security, can the United States afford to continue feeding so indiscriminately the imbalance of terror around the world?

[From the New York Post, June 22, 1973]

#### WORLD ARMS BUSINESS

If the U.S. and the Soviet Union can meet the deadline they agreed on yesterday—to negotiate a permanent limit on offensive nuclear weapons next year—the accomplishment will be both admirable and memorable; the initial agreement alone is most reassuring. In the meantime, they could contribute

a great deal by reducing the bigger business in smaller armaments.

There are, indeed, some distressing ironies in the current spectacle. As the world welcomes and ponders the Camp David agreement, there is every likelihood that the global traffic in "conventional" arms, now somewhere above \$216 billion a year, will reach \$350 billion by the end of the decade.

And, as Sen. Mondale (D-Minn.) is now warning: "... the greatest danger to world peace may well lie not so much in the sudden outbreak of nuclear warfare ... but in the step-by-step escalation of a local war fought with conventional weapons."

To limit such dangers, Mondale is now proposing legislation that would oblige President Nixon to seek a meeting of the world's principal arms suppliers—the U.S. has the unpleasant distinction of originating half the trade—with a view toward serious negotiations on reducing, instead of expanding, sales. Such talks could perhaps restrict the savage competition. The proposal invites study now by the White House.

#### CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY AND MARIHUANA USERS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations upon which I serve has just completed hearings on proposals to create an independent Consumer Protection Agency.

A colloquy between a Consumers Union witness and myself during the hearings on March 28, 1973, concerned whether that interests of marihuana users should be represented by a CPA. This led to a letter from Consumers Union, dated May 8, 1973 in an attempt "to clarify" its position followed by a "clarifying" letter from me to the subcommittee.

These letters and the colloquy crystallize some of the major issues which this body will face when debating a CPA bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my letter on the subject of July 11, 1973, which reprints the hearing colloquy, followed by Consumers Union's letter of May 8, 1973, which attempts "to clarify" statements made in the colloquy.

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

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,

Washington, D.C., July 11, 1973.

HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization,  
Research and International Organizations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have read the May 8, 1973, letter from Mr. Peter H. Schuck of Consumers Union clarifying his remarks to me, during the hearings on the Consumer Protection Agency bills, concerning legalizing marihuana.

His letter, I feel, might distort the import of that dialogue on marihuana, unless further clarification is made. Therefore, I request that this letter immediately follow Mr. Schuck's letter of May 8, 1973, in the hearing record.

My question about marihuana was one of a series designed to gain knowledge about how a CPA would determine what was a proper "interest of consumers"—a determination that is left to the sole, unchallengeable discretion of the CPA under S. 707 which Consumers Union strongly supports.

Thus, I asked Mr. Schuck about situations in which the interests of consumers might

conflict with the interest of environmentalists (e.g., in the Alaska pipeline controversy), with the interests of American workers (e.g., increasing the importation of less expensive foreign products), with the interests of the press (e.g., in demanding source identification), and so forth.

The purposes of Consumers Union, as stated in its charter, are to provide consumers with information and counsel on consumer goods and services, to give information and assistance on all matters relating to the expenditure of the family income, and to initiate and to cooperate with individual and group efforts seeking to create and maintain decent living standards.

The testimony and action of Consumers Union, therefore, are very instructive to the Subcommittee. Much of what the prestigious Consumers Union does now parallels what is proposed for the CPA under S. 707—it testifies before Congressional bodies, requests action by Federal agencies and intervenes in their proceedings and activities, seeks judicial review of the decisions of these agencies and gathers and disseminates information thought to be of interest to consumers.

We have been assured continually by supporters of S. 707 that we should not be alarmed by the sweeping advocacy and information powers proposed by it for a CPA which will determine what is an interest of consumers. The CPA, these supporters say, is to be a nonregulatory agency that will take a prudent course.

Seeing the parallel between the CPA proposed in S. 707 and the mandates imposed upon Consumers Union by its charter—and as part of my attempt to fathom how any single government unit is going to prudently determine what is in the interest of consumers—the following dialogue, taken from the unedited transcript, ensued between the Consumers Union witness and myself:

"Senator ALLEN. Your organization, Consumers Union, has not taken a position in advocacy of the users of marihuana?"

"Mr. SCHUCK. Well, the position that we have taken is that the mere possession of marihuana should not be regarded as criminal conduct. We have not in anyway advocated the use of marihuana. In fact, it is quite clear we have taken quite the opposite position. But we do not feel the mere possession of marihuana should bear criminal penalties.

"Senator ALLEN. I have an item from the Star, the Washington Star of November 28, 1972, 'Consumers Union Endorses Legalizing Marihuana.' That is a correct statement, is it not?"

"Mr. SCHUCK. There is some confusion between the terms 'legalization' and 'decriminalization.' Usually, the term that is used to describe the position that possession of marihuana should not carry criminal penalties is called 'decriminalization.' Consumers Union, in the book it published to which you refer did suggest that the production and marketing be retained under government control.

"So, it would be not be legalization in that sense at all. To the extent that the Washington Star calls it legalization if it had that in mind, that is not our position.

"Senator ALLEN. Would you feel, then, that the CPA ought to take over the advocacy of the interest of the users of marihuana in line with your recommendation?"

"Mr. SCHUCK. Which particular interests of the users do you mean?"

"Senator ALLEN. Well, who ever uses it, the users. A user is a user by any other name.

"Mr. SCHUCK. I think, if there are 20 million people in this country who are using marihuana, and the figures is somewhere in that neighborhood—

"Senator ALLEN. Their interests ought to be protected by the CPA?"

"Mr. SCHUCK. May I continue?"

"Senator ALLEN. Yes. Excuse me.

"Mr. SCHUCK. And if their conduct is