

UNITED STATES

*U.S. Congress.*



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 119—PART 16

JUNE 15, 1973 TO JUNE 22, 1973

(PAGES 19757 TO 21050)

sible to get away from the threat of an accident?

Therefore, while the power and light companies are able to use this new form of energy with safety, it cannot be used for other energy demands, except for ships and submarines—where there is no problem of an essential cooling system. Of course, the threat of an accident to those ships and submarines is always present in pollution of the seas.

The conversion will not take place over night. There will be a gradual merging of electric power and the internal combustion engine as is already appearing on the railroads here and there over the country.

There is the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (called BART) three-way electric-like subway—with high fences and additional guards on the dangerous third rail.

There is the 100-mile-an-hour Metroliner between New York City and Washington with overhead wires something like the old street-car systems.

Morgantown, West Virginia, has developed an electric mass public transportation system. There are similar ones planned in our country. All take electricity and transmit power by traction motors.

As oil product shortages worsen, the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe—a railroad with sound finances and a management alert to the evolutionary changes coming in our national existence—is already taking a long hard look in depth at working out the possible advantages of electrifying eventually all the way from Chicago to the Pacific coast.

The Burlington Northern is considering trading coal from their owned reserves to electric utilities in return for power to electrify its railway system.

An acute problem is intra-city transportation.

Our major cities are choking to death on vehicular traffic. We greatly need a rapid mass transportation system that will get people in metropolitan areas to their jobs in the morning and back home that evening with speed and comfort.

The Kiplinger Washington Letter of May 25 reports that the Department of Transportation will now beef up an attack on the problem of deliveries in the cities, promoting—

1. Consolidate deliveries, with several area firms using one truck.
2. Make deliveries at off-hours—not during the commuting times.
3. Force trucks to load and unload in empty lots and not in streets.
4. Put terminals on city fringes—near freeways for easy access.
5. Set aside some lanes of highways for trucks—sharing with buses.
6. Use commuter transit for freight—move small packages on buses.

A 56 passenger bus obviously saves more in energy, pollution and money than the equivalent of about 35 private automobiles now moving people in and out of our biggest cities in time-and-patience-wearing congested traffic.

The demonstrated workability of overhead trolley wires for trains can also do the job better, utilizing existing railroad rights-of-way extending into the centers of all our big cities. Surely technology is capable of working out ways of meeting this increasingly pressing problem.

Of course—in addition to technological solutions—there are human problems. Two generations of Americans regard the private car as the means of freedom to move on personal schedules. However, they will not long have that freedom with the steady increase of traffic funneled into our large cities by highways and the rapid depletion of present fuel resources.

Regardless of state differences in transportation problems, the situation boils down to the fact that the railroads are the neces-

sity in meeting rapidly diminishing fuel energy supplies and rapidly increasing demands that will come to a head before the turn of this century. It is clear that the railroads will once again become essential as they were in breaking through the trackless prairies in moving settlers with ease and comfort and moving their products to markets.

There must, however, be a complete overhaul—administratively and legislatively—of the arrogant federal bureaucracies with their proclivity for paper make-work and procrastination.

There are six bankrupt railroads, known as the northeast group. There are some nine financially strong railroads. The rest are tottering in between. Action must be taken to shore up the railroads.

Yet, the over-lapping government agencies regulating railroads slow implementation of positive planning and increase operating costs. These agencies include:

1. Interstate Commerce Commission.
2. Housing and Urban Development is involved in mass transit programs.
3. Department of Transportation.
4. Department of the Interior.

The application of the Santa Fe to buy the Western Pacific took six years for the Interstate Commerce Commission to decide. That cost the Santa Fe 2 million dollars, which it recovered in its profits on the Western Pacific stock when their petition was finally decided negatively.

It took the I.C.C. nine years to finally approve of the merger of the Burlington-Great Northern and Northern Pacific. Then the opinion was so confused that the Supreme Court had to interpret it.

These costly and time consuming over-lapping government agencies should be consolidated by the Congress if railroad managers and their union counterparts are to function efficiently in their responsibility to the public, the employees and the investors. The President has recommended legislation to the Congress to accomplish precisely this as an aid to the reorganization of the six bankrupt northeast railroads.

We must face the need for both national and private long range planning, for the sake of coming generations, for the effective allocation of our remaining fossil fuel energy.

There are pending proposals in the Congress attempting to deal with this problem. Unfortunately, they are bits-and-pieces approaches to nationalization of railroads, such as giving the Interstate Commerce Commission authority over railroad car service; another to designate a national network of rail lines; another to authorize the I.C.C. to direct that traffic not being properly handled by one railroad be routed over the lines of another; also one creating a federal rolling stock authority.

Finally, there is another proposing that the federal government BUY from the railroads ownership of railroad rights-of-way. That would cause the taxpayers of Kansas to lose 11 million dollars a year in taxes. However, of critical importance—when the roadbeds of a railroad are owned by the federal government and the rolling equipment by a publicly owned corporation, you have disjointed their operation to such an extent that the only answer is a forced sale to the federal government consolidating the whole together.

It is clear that the responsibility for train operation officials rests on the condition of its roadbeds and equipment. That responsibility cannot be divided with one or more federal agencies with safety to either crews or passengers.

The effect of so many bills of this kind pending in the Congress obviously makes financing for all railroads difficult—especially the weak ones. It prevents them from recuperating, rather than helping them to meet America's need.

Nationalization of railroads is not a solution to railroad economics—shippers weary of annual box car shortages—investors hoping to be bailed out by our government—a public tired of the perennial railroad question—and those who sincerely believe in public ownership and operation of all utilities see in that solution a final end to the problem.

Nationalization will, however, simply present a new set of problems—bigger and more complex and, in the end, far more costly to the public.

It is a well established fact that no transportation system—no nationalized railroad anywhere in the world—moves large volumes of traffic at the lower cost per ton mile that the American railroads do.

Furthermore, the nationalization of railroads would increase enormously the centralization of power in the American presidency that has been the steady trend of the self-styled liberal crowd for 40 years that further increases government of a republic by a federal bureaucracy.

What is needed is reorganization of government regulatory agencies for railroads so that they can operate on sound business principles with good operating officials. With appropriate federal regulation, they could then provide, with safety and efficiency, the service which our fuel and ecological crises will demand of them.

I have only briefly touched the high spots that our public simply cannot ignore the symptoms of fossil fuel shortages ahead. America must streamline its future planning accordingly. Fortune describes it: "The energy 'joyride' is over."

#### GASOLINE TAX

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have heard numerous reports that the Nixon administration will in the near future seek to impose a gasoline tax on American consumers, ostensibly to curb demand for gasoline and to slow the overheated economy.

A recent editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune gives what I believe to be convincing reasons why such a tax on gasoline would be most undesirable. In particular, the fact that such a tax would be regressive in its impact should lead us to be very wary of any such proposal made in the name of gasoline economy and fiscal rationality. Certainly, we all wish to ease the gasoline shortage situation which exists this summer, and we all wish to see measures which will cool the economy without plunging us into a recession. The gas tax, however, is the wrong means to reach both of these highly desirable ends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Minneapolis Tribune editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

#### GAS-TAX INCREASE: THE WRONG ANSWER

Trial balloons wafted by the Nixon administration suggest that it will ask Congress for an increase in the federal gasoline tax. As an added inducement to accept this backdoor approach to the energy problem, administration sources cite the anti-inflation benefits such a tax increase would produce. For a number of reasons, we think the idea is a bad one.

First, it is an evasion of federal responsibility. A gasoline-tax increase would be federal action of sorts, but would slide

around the problem of regional scarcities by relying on higher costs to consumers to discourage consumption. But the price push on fuel is already gathering momentum. Oil companies agreed last year to accept oil-exporting countries' demands for increased prices. They did so again Friday night.

All forecasts point to an increasing percentage of American oil requirements being met by imports, and the upward trend in fuel prices is therefore clear. In other words, the disincentive of rising prices is already at work. Instead of accelerating that trend, the administration should in our view exert a stronger force in allocations around the country. So far, the White House has called only for voluntary allocations.

A second point against a gasoline-tax increase is that it would be regressive. The theory that the increase would inspire greater use of mass transit is sound—except that for millions mass transit is not a realistic option. In an automobile-developed society, the auto is an occupational necessity for many at all income levels. The proportionate burden of a gasoline-tax increase would be heaviest on those of lowest incomes.

That leads to our third objection: the fiscal bonus. The suggestion is made that such an increase would not only cool the overheated economy, but provide funds which, by legislative mandate, could be put into energy research and public transportation. If those are worthy national purposes—we think they are—then the funds should come by the more equitable route of an increase in income taxes. The related purpose of slowing the rate of increase in automotive energy consumption could better be fulfilled by excise taxes on new autos (being sold at record rates this year) in proportion to weight or horsepower.

Americans are accustomed to cheap, plentiful fuel produced domestically and distributed competitively. With domestic production inadequate, with world demand for oil now exceeding the discovery of new world reserves, fuel is neither plentiful nor cheap. But the Nixon administration seems reluctant to face a situation requiring allocation by means other than price. The latest evidence of that reluctance is its apparent hope for a "solution" by means of gasoline taxes.

#### JOHN HANSON

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, several years ago, Senator MATHIAS and I sponsored a reception marking the 250th anniversary of the birth of John Hanson, the first President elected in accordance with the provisions of the Articles of Confederation, our first post-Revolutionary War constitution.

One of my constituent's, Peter Hanson, a 15-year-old Eagle Scout from Havre de Grace, Md., wrote a poem dedicated to John Hanson, and I ask unanimous consent that this poem be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

JOHN HANSON  
(By Peter Hanson)

There are times when I see the flag passing by  
That I think of John Hanson and I wonder why  
With your permission may I take the liberty now to say  
Why are so few words  
Of John Hanson passed our way?  
I am not a poet, and I probably never will  
be

But it certainly seems mighty peculiar to me  
That a Nation as big as ours and one that  
can go all the way to the moon  
Yet our Encyclopaedias can give John Hanson  
our first President so little room

In the Nation's Encyclopaedia there are only  
a few lines

We feel they have only showed us the cobwebs  
of his time

The Encyclopaedia tell us that—he was our  
first President and that is that—

And with pleasure to me, goes on to tell us  
where his bronze statue is at

In our Nation's Capitol building, almost under  
our great dome

In 1903 Maryland found a fitting place to  
bring home her own

In Statuary Hall, this Nation, gave him a  
place to stand

I know you have seen him—he is the one  
with a heavy walking stick in hand

Some visitors claim they have caught him  
smiling across on the man

Who so admirably and generously did so  
much to finish his plan

He is dear to our land, to our home, to our  
hearts with a fame that will never grow dim

I am afraid in the case of John Hanson, this  
Nation has done a tardy act of justice to him

He held the highest Federal office in our  
land in his day

And our books of this man has only a few  
lines to say

Shall only a few lines and a bronze statue,  
proclaim

His worth in Maryland's history to each future  
age

Maryland my Maryland has been slow to fan  
the flame

To see that historians put a few more words  
down on that page

This Nation has document proof today  
A man who under his administration, we  
can say

Gave us this Nation, our official Thanksgiving  
Day

And got the Post Office as we know it today,  
well on it's way

And yet our Encyclopaedia's of this man has  
so little to say

Remember a young boy lives with history  
books day by day

And I wouldn't want your bright name in  
history to be treated this way

I have been asked, What honors shall a generous  
people pay

Certainly not only a few lines and a bronze  
statue on display

You wise men in Washington will know better  
then I

Till then I'll pay tribute to him when I  
see the flag passing by

And wonder why a Nation has forgotten him  
and wonder why

To this Senate I say love, eat, drink, laugh,  
and sleep

And I say you have been good and wise beyond  
belief

And I hope we do as well in another generation  
when we will be sitting in your seat—

And we promise your bright name in history  
we will watch over and keep

#### NBC SPECIAL ON CHILDREN IN VIETNAM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, nothing so graphically reminds us of the massive human needs which have been created by a decade of war in Indochina, than the faces of maimed and orphaned children. Their plight reminds us as well of

the human debris left behind by the war, and of our national responsibility to help bring relief and rehabilitation to heal the wounds of war, particularly among the youngest victims of the battle, the children.

Tuesday evening, June 19, all America will have an opportunity to see some of the faces of these children in need, when the National Broadcasting Co. will telecast at 10 p.m. a special "NBC Report" entitled "The Sins of the Father". In a clear and unbiased fashion, this film documents the plight of orphans in South Vietnam, particularly the American-fathered child who has often been abandoned. NBC News deserves high praise for outstanding public service in broadcasting this important report, and I commend it to the attention of Senators and all Americans.

The NBC Report captures on film what has been documented time and time again before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, which I serve as chairman. The humanitarian needs of the youngest war victims are great, and their condition is deteriorating. But precious little is being done by our Government, or any other government, to help meet the needs of the children of Vietnam.

As early as 1965, witnesses before the subcommittee told of a growing need for child welfare programs, trained personnel and long range planning for disadvantaged children in South Vietnam. In 1967, at the urging of the subcommittee, a special AID social welfare task force was sent to South Vietnam to make program recommendations for children and orphans. But, as with so many other reports on humanitarian needs in Indochina, the task force recommendations were filed away and all but ignored. The problems of child welfare went unattended because governments, including our own, were too preoccupied with aiding the war, instead of assisting those affected by the war.

This appalling record of neglect which has now been so poignantly captured in the NBC report, prompted the Subcommittee on Refugees to dispatch in March a special study mission to assess child welfare needs, and to recommend a series of specific steps to meet these needs. These recommendations were examined in hearings last month, and because I felt they demanded the immediate concern and active intervention by the highest officials in our Government, I addressed letters to the President and to the Secretary of State detailing the study mission's report, subsequently, members of the study mission met with officials in AID and elsewhere.

But despite the urgency of the problem and the fact that the record of need is clear, and that there are agencies and people ready and willing to help, our Government seems paralyzed in indecision. Conferences are held at AID; vague letters of inquiry are mailed out to voluntary agencies; position papers are prepared—but nothing tangible is done. No new effort has been launched to expedite programs for orphans, especially those abandoned children fathered by Americans.

The reluctant conclusion, Mr. Presi-