

U.S. Congress.
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 12

APRIL 27, 1972 TO MAY 3, 1972

(PAGES 14557 TO 15776)

**MINING AND MINERALS POLICY ACT
OF 1970**

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, for many years I have been seeking the development of a policy which would insure a continuing and expanded supply from domestic deposits of those minerals and metals essential to our economy and security. The great State of Nevada has a bountiful supply of many minerals and metals and it has been my continuing desire to bring about their full development through policies which would encourage industry to do so.

We have just received the first report of Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton in response to the requirements for an annual status report and analysis of our minerals posture called for under the Mining and Minerals Policy Act. I had the honor of being a co-sponsor of the law which was enacted in 1970 and for once placed the responsibility for most of our mineral activities in the hands of a single Cabinet member.

I have had the opportunity of reviewing this report and find that it confirms the concerns that I and a number of other Senators have pointed up over the past decade. The report shows a rising reliance on foreign sources for a number of minerals. It indicates that this reliance might possibly reach the staggering total of \$64 billion by the year 2000 unless we are able to increase our own production of those minerals located within our borders, and improve our reuse of minerals and metals, or bring about a redesign in our requirements so that scarce minerals will be properly conserved.

This report also indicates that we need to improve the economic climate within the United States to assure those interested in mineral investment that we seriously intend to develop our own resources under policies of encouragement rather than discouragement.

I shall not go into the details of this report but commend it to the consideration of all Senators. It brings to our attention in a clear-cut manner the minerals situation in which we find ourselves. This report is a factual one, delineating the problem areas to meeting our future demands and the need for reasonable policies to encourage our private enterprise system to expand the funds here at home to bring about maximum output and maximum use of our available mineral resources. I know that those of us concerned with the welfare of our mineral industries and the security of the country are looking forward to giving full consideration to any suggestions which will lower our reliance on foreign supply and maintain a strong and economically sound natural resources base in the United States. I urge constraint on the part of our administrators in any activities which may result in impeding expansion of our minerals production. I am hopeful that all of us will take to heart the need to maintain a sound mineral base in the United States if we are to enjoy a continuing and progressive high standard of living.

**HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING
ACT OF 1972**

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased with the passage of S. 2219, the Veterans' Administration Health Manpower Training Act of 1972. I feel that this legislation is another step toward addressing two very important concerns of the Nation. First, it addresses the Nation's health manpower shortage. Very often, this shortage is measured by ratios of doctors to hospital beds, or dentists to population. Although these facts and figures help us size up the immensity of the problem, it is even more distressing if we analyze the shortage in terms of patients who cannot obtain medical treatment and rural physicians who must treat more patients than they can adequately care for.

In order to alleviate this health manpower shortage, we must utilize all of our national resources. Perhaps one of the most promising hopes for increasing our Nation's ability to train an adequate number of health professionals is the utilization of the resources and experience of the Veterans' Administration. The VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery has made a substantial contribution in the field of health education. For over 25 years, hospitals of the Veterans' Administration have been offering hospital-based educational experience in collaboration with most of the Nation's medical schools. Veterans' Administration hospitals are currently affiliated with 81 medical schools, 51 dental schools, 287 nursing schools, 274 universities, and 84 community and junior colleges. During the current fiscal year, more than 50,000 students will participate in more than 60 categories of training in VA institutions. Because of the size, diversity, experience, and quality of its medical facilities and training programs, the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery is uniquely qualified to undertake additional and expanded programs in order to provide an adequate supply of health care manpower to meet our national needs.

Second, S. 2219 addresses our Nation's concern for improving the quality of medical care that is available to our deserving veterans. As has been amply demonstrated, an improvement in medical care invariably accompanies medical education programs.

I am particularly pleased that the major provisions of two bills which I introduced in this Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 128 and S. 2304, have been incorporated into S. 2219.

Senate Joint Resolution 128, the Veterans' Administration Medical School Assistance and Health Service Personnel Education and Training Act, provided VA grants to public nonprofit institutions to assist them in the establishment of new medical schools. VA assistance to these institutions would include the leasing of unused VA hospital and other health facilities, remodeling and expansion of facilities when necessary to make them suitable for such educational purposes, and the reimbursement of faculty salaries during the first

years of operation. S. 2219 has expanded this provision. For example, it includes schools of other health professions, such as dentistry and optometry, allied health schools, and area health education centers.

S. 2304, the veterans allied health professions training assistance program, which I introduced, would have authorized a grant program to be administered by the Veterans' Administration for programs which were expanded or initiated to provide veterans with medical experience and training the additional education they needed to receive state certification and licensure. Over 30,000 men and women leave the armed services each year who possess valuable medical skills. However, they cannot join the civilian health manpower force because they lack formal certification. S. 2219 places special emphasis on programs to recruit and train veterans with medical military occupation specialties and to employ them in the Veterans' Administration.

I feel that such farsighted proposals as these can effectively utilize the vast resources of the Veterans' Administration in our Nation's effort to train an adequate number of qualified health personnel to meet the demands which are being placed on our system of delivery of medical care.

**OPPOSITION TO ABANDONMENT OF
RURAL RAILROADS**

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the abandonment of rural railroad branch lines is another growing force adding to the strength of several factors already choking off the vitality of rural America.

This abandonment of short railroad lines in rural America is just the beginning of a disastrous process that could eventually disrupt the rural economy, kill many communities and cause chaos in the national transportation complex.

In my home State of Minnesota it would cost nearly \$80 million just to provide necessary highways to serve those communities threatened with the loss of their railroads. For those towns, there are no good alternatives to rail service. Many of the Minnesota communities that face loss of rail service lack unrestricted access to good, all-weather highways. To provide improved highways to those Minnesota communities would cost \$79.7 million in additional State and county highway construction money.

Besides the tremendous cost to taxpayers, there also would be extremely high added costs to business which would have to convert their terminals and receiving facilities to accommodate the increased reliance on motor carriers.

We cannot allow these abandonments to go on and on, speeding the death of our rural communities. Instead, we need to develop a balanced approach to meet the Nation's growing transportation needs. To keep the railroads in service and to improve that service to small communities which desperately need rail service may require an entirely new approach. In my judgment, we should stop

the abandonments now and start investigations directed at finding some way to keep rail service in communities which need it.

Earlier this year, I sponsored, along with my colleague, Senator HUMPHREY, Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, which would declare a moratorium on abandonments until needed studies and investigations could be carried out. I urge other Senators to study the necessity of passing this measure. Further abandonments are a severe threat to rural businesses and to farmers. In my judgment they should not be allowed to continue.

Practically every night on radio and television, the public hears Wally Shirra, the former astronaut, saying that we all need the railroads. I agree. But I think we should start trying to keep our railroads. We do not need the space shuttle or other extravagant space projects. For now, we should scrap those expenditures and keep our railroads.

Mr. President, Monday I testified at an Interstate Commerce Commission hearing at Redwood Falls, Minn., in opposition to abandonment of a Chicago & Northwestern Railway, a branch line between the villages of Sanborn and Wanda, Minn. I ask unanimous consent that my testimony be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE

Mr. Examiner, thank you. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission to discuss the subject of railroad branch line abandonment—a subject of great importance to rural America.

Walter Shirra, the astronaut, now appears on television to tell us how vital our railroads are. I think we should believe him.

How ironic it is that now Shirra's former employer, NASA, is asking the Congress for \$5 billion for a space shuttle to take a few astronauts around the earth . . . while our government silently permits these rail lines to be cut.

I think that's truly an astronomical irony. A few men will be able to orbit the earth, but farmers in Wanda or Sanborn can't get their crops to market. If that happens we've come a long way . . . backwards.

I ask the Interstate Commerce Commission to help reverse these tragically mistaken choices, and keep essential rail service in rural America.

I, therefore, strongly oppose the proposed abandonment of the rail line from Sanborn to Wanda and I urge you and the Commission to consider what this abandonment will mean to the people of these communities.

To these people, and the people of rural America, the issues raised here are of highest priority. For rural America understands the devastating impact of railroad abandonments.

Many rural communities, like the Village of Wanda, are threatened with the loss of their rail service. In many instances, these communities developed as collection and shipping points for farm commodities. Their residents are shippers, those performing services to shippers, or farmers bringing commodities to town for shipment.

It is not surprising that they are vitally dependent on railroads. Railroads often provide the only mode of transporting bulky commodities—especially agricultural produce. Despite the importance of railroads to rural America, over 60,000 miles of railway lines have been abandoned since 1920.

And more abandonments are planned. For example, the Penn Central intends to abandon 9,000 of its 21,000 miles of track. Here in the Midwest, the Chicago and Northwestern has indicated an interest in abandoning some 33% of its lines.

These abandonments pose a substantial threat to the prosperity and stability of rural America.

Railroads are integrally related to the entire grain marketing system. Even the government's Commodity Credit Corporation refuses to accept responsibility for grain until it is delivered to a railhead. This means that if a grain elevator loses its rail service, it will not be competitive when buying and selling grain because it must absorb the additional transportation expense of getting the grain to the railroad. Ultimately, farmers' incomes are reduced because of increased freight costs or because they have to drive to a more distant elevator and waste more time by waiting to unload.

Farm prices, especially grain prices, have been severely depressed for the past year, and tragically there is little hope of improvement unless national farm policy changes. Freight costs of a few cents more per bushel can easily force grain prices into the loss category.

A rural community's loss of a railroad is more than a matter of dry statistics; it directly affects real people with real problems.

For example, there is Clements, Minnesota—a community that lost its railroads two years ago. The manager of a grain and feed company in Clements estimates that he had to spend \$6,120 more to haul grain to Savage by truck than it would have cost to haul the same load by rail to Minneapolis. Because he could not afford to pay farmers as much for grain as his competitors on railroad lines, he lost all profits from 50,000 to 100,000 bushels of grain business.

As a result, his total loss for 1971 was \$8,620. In a recent letter to me he presented vivid and graphic account of what the loss of a railroad means to rural community:

"Not being competitive," he wrote, "means that I make from one to five cents less than competitors. The biggest spread is when we are in harvest and the trucks are lined up at Savage for a mile waiting 10 to 15 hours to get unloaded. So if the railroads were all taken out of Minnesota, it would mean millions of dollars to build enough terminal facilities at Savage to handle the volume. It would also mean millions more to upgrade the roads. Here in Redwood County, I know it would take all the State and Federal funds allowed to the county for about seven years just to give each town an all weather road. This wouldn't leave anything to maintain the rest of the roads in the county. I feel that the loss of the railroad in Clements is forcing us towards the closing of our business."

The last year we had the railroad, about 1,000 carloads of grain, sugar beets and lumber were shipped in or out of Clements. Sugar beets alone meant an income to the gas station, restaurant, garage, hardware store, grocery stores and I guess it helped about every other business place in Clements. So it is real hard to estimate how many dollars the loss of our railroad took from the town. I know we have lost a lot and I feel that other rural towns have just as much to lose."

The railroad he was describing is gone. It died a quick death.

Even where the railroads remain, the service continues to deteriorate. Poorly maintained branch lines mean slow moving trains. Farmers tell me that they can pass a train while plowing their fields. In fact, one man told me that his wife can jog faster than the train moves.

There is the case of the deterioration of a branch line from Sleepy Eye to Redwood Falls—which is about 30 miles long. It requires a full day for a train to travel from Sleepy Eye to Redwood Falls. When the train

finally arrives there in the evening, the crew is picked up and taken by automobile back to Sleepy Eye for the night. They are then brought back to pick up the train in the morning. There is little doubt that this train moves slower than stagecoaches in the old west.

Along with poor maintenance of roadbeds and track, shortages of boxcars are a perennial problem plaguing shippers of farm commodities. Grain elevators never seem to be able to obtain enough cars when they need them. Eventually, lines are abandoned and after abandonment, the rails, ties and even the ballast under the track are completely removed. Thus, once railroads are gone, they cannot be replaced without tremendous cost. If they had been properly maintained over the years, many depressed communities would still be thriving today.

Ironically, the abandonment of rural rail service is occurring at a time of increasing demand and need for this service. The Department of Transportation has estimated that the nation's ton-miles of freight volume will increase at least 40% by 1980. At the same time, railroads want to abandon between 35 and 40 per cent of their branch lines. Many of the abandonments are planned for rural areas.

But that is precisely where overall freight volume is increasing. Corn and soybean production have increased tremendously in the last few years. And most of the increase has to be shipped away from home.

In Redwood County, for example, there is no soybean processing plant. However, soybeans are an important cash crop in that county. Almost 3½ million bushels were produced last year. And for 1972, a 9% increase in soybean planting is expected. While there is storage for some seven millions bushels, that storage space is also used for corn and flax. Eventually, most of the volume of all these commodities must be moved out of the county.

Corn production has increased even more dramatically. This has been due to the response of corn to heavy applications of commercial fertilizer. Fertilizer use is increasing about 12,000 tons a year in Redwood County and by over 17,000 tons a year in neighboring Renville County. This bulk fertilizer is needed at certain times of the year—mainly in the spring when road restrictions are on and substandard railroad beds cause a transportation crisis.

For these areas, there are no alternatives to railroads. The soybean volume which has to be hauled out of Redwood County every year amounts to 3,760 50-ton box cars—or 9,400 20-ton semi-trailer trucks.

But there are too many trucks on the road already. Anyone who has driven across the Northern part of Minnesota on Highway No. 2 can verify this fact. That highway often has grain trucks bumper to bumper hauling grain from the Red River Valley, North Dakota and Montana to Duluth.

Increased reliance on motor carriers is not the answer for these farmers or for other residents of rural America. A recent study indicates that if the railroads have their way 304 Minnesota communities will lose railroad service by 1980, 98 of these communities now have roads which are restricted to less than 9 ton carrying capacity.

Thus, it would cost highway departments of the State of Minnesota and the counties \$79.7 million in additional highway construction money to provide unrestricted access to these 98 communities. We know that many of our rural communities will be left to die because of the prohibitive cost of providing adequate transportation facilities to replace abandoned railroads.

The abandonment proceeding we are concerned with today illustrates why motor carriers are not a feasible alternative. The case of upgrading the road between Wanda and Sanborn to 9-ton capacity would be \$130,000.

It is also reasonable to assume that if abandonments occur at the rate the railroads are requesting them, highway improvements could never be made fast enough to keep pace. We would have an extremely costly situation and utter chaos for several years. Wholesale abandonments of railroad lines throughout our nation would destroy any hope of developing a viable national transportation system.

We must face the fact that there are no reasonable alternatives to keeping the railroads in rural America. However, the railroads insist that the unprofitability of branch lines justifies abandonment. But before a community is condemned to death by cutting off its railroad, we should examine how the branch lines have been treated by the railroads which own them.

The typical abandonment petition describes a sodded roadbed, an outmoded track unable to handle modern tonnages, and a fifty or sixty year old line which has never been renovated.

Who is responsible for the condition of these lines: this responsibility certainly does not rest on the shippers—the country elevators, the farmers or the rural businessmen.

I think it is clear that the railroad companies created those conditions. These companies abandoned service to the branch lines long ago. Now they want to make it official by abandoning the lines themselves—thereby isolating rural America in the process.

The abandonment of rural rail service is a sad replay of the deterioration of railroad passenger service a few years ago. Railroads which want to leave an area simply make the service so poor that shippers cannot provide enough business to make the line profitable. Rail business on the branch line inevitably decreases because of the inadequate service, and finally, the line is abandoned.

Unfortunately, neither the Department of Transportation or the Interstate Commerce Commission has made any effort to solve this problem. On the contrary, their proposals are designed to facilitate branch line abandonments.

For example, the Interstate Commerce Commission recently proposed a new standard on abandonments. Under this standard, a line can be eliminated if it has not been used by 34 cars per mile per year. This standard is most unfair, because it does not take into account the fact that many shippers are unable to obtain the number of cars that they order.

When the railroads opened the frontier, they were heavily subsidized with grants of land and other assistance from government agencies. Since that time, the railroads have continued to draw profits from the original grants—while refusing to invest money in maintaining roadbeds and tracks.

Today several of the railroads are owned by large conglomerates. It is clear that at least some of these conglomerates regard their railroad only as a tax loss; they ignore the fact that their tax loss is a transportation company vital to the lives of many Americans.

If existing rural rail lines were maintained and serviced effectively, they would be a real enhancement to rural development. But faced with the chance of abandonment at any time, businesses shy away from many communities. A company has no guarantee that if it builds a new grain elevator or fertilizer plant on a railroad line in 1972, there will not be an abandonment petition a year from now—or that the railroad will not be abandoned a year and a half from now.

For these reasons, I oppose the proposed abandonment of the line from Sanborn to Wanda. I also oppose all further abandonments without additional study and investigation of our rural transportation problems and needs. That is why Senator Humphrey and I have introduced a Senate Joint Resolu-

tion declaring a moratorium on abandonments until further study and investigation can develop solutions to this tragic situation.

The Congress must consider alternatives for keeping branch lines open and viable where there is a genuine need for a railroad. A few decades ago, there were pessimists who said that electrification would be impractical in rural America. But the REA has proven to be our greatest rural development success story. I therefore think we should consider the possibility of patterning the operation of rural railroad branch lines after the Rural Electrification Program.

There are other alternatives. For example, the Federal government should also consider subsidizing the branch lines—insuring that any such subsidy be earmarked and used for only that purpose.

The Federal government now subsidizes other forms of transportation—such as air travel and mass transit for our urban areas.

Meeting the transportation needs of rural America is no less important than solving the transportation problems of our cities. If we can revitalize our rural areas with decent transportation systems and other programs, we can reserve the senseless flow of rural America to large, over-crowded cities.

What's at stake here, then, is more than the abandonment of one branch line in rural Minnesota. What's really at stake is the abandonment of an entire transportation system and the hopes and opportunities of those totally dependent on this system—and of rural Americans and communities like Wanda, Elmore, Herron Lake, and many others.

I urge the Commission to come to grips with the broader issue—and deny the pending abandonment.

GOV. WENDELL R. ANDERSON OF MINNESOTA
OPPOSES RAILROAD ABANDONMENTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Honorable Wendell R. Anderson, Governor of the State of Minnesota also testified in opposition to the abandonment of railroad branch lines. Governor Anderson focused on a clear parallel between what has happened to railroads due to the conglomerate takeovers and what has started to happen to agriculture due to vertical integration by corporate conglomerates.

In my judgment, Governor Anderson's testimony would be helpful to anyone interested in gaining an understanding of the problems which will be visited upon rural America by wholesale abandonment of railroad branch lines.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's statement be printed at this point in this RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY OF GOV. WENDELL R. ANDERSON

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission today to comment in opposition to the proposed abandonment of Chicago and Northwestern rail trackage between Sanborn and Wanda.

I appreciate the willingness of the Interstate Commerce Commission to honor my request for a public hearing on this proposed abandonment. I also appreciate the willingness of the I.C.C. to accommodate Senator Mondale's and my schedules by allowing us to appear at this time in the hearing, which is reserved for proponents of the proposed abandonment.

During the remainder of today you will be hearing an old story—that the declining revenues on this piece of track do not justify continued maintenance even of their pres-

ently deteriorated condition. You will certainly hear that profitability dictates no new investment in bringing the roadbed and track up to a more usable level.

And during tomorrow's session you will hear another old, familiar, and tragic story—another community left stranded by a broken promise. A new grain elevator; a cooperative effort of the local community in anticipation that rail service would continue; and then the news that the master plan for the railroad's future just doesn't include any plan for the future of the people of Wanda.

I am not here today to tell those two old stories over again. The representatives of the railroad and the community are prepared to testify before you.

But I am here to tell you that the effects of railroad abandonment in Minnesota are the business of the State of Minnesota.

We have not been adequately involved over the years. But we are determined to change that. The proposal to abandon a little over eight miles of track between Sanborn and Wanda is part of a plan to reduce, deliberately and methodically, the available railroad service throughout the outstate portions of Minnesota.

That is more than a question of eight miles of track that help Wanda survive as a community. It is more than a question of shipping in the products that make the land fruitful and shipping out the fruits of the labor of the people of this rural community in Minnesota.

The question that is really before us is what part a rail system can play in maintaining and improving the quality of life of half the people of Minnesota. And that makes it the business of Minnesota State Government.

That is the spirit in which I requested a public hearing on the abandonment of this segment of track.

That is the spirit in which my office joined in a delegation from Minnesota to oppose railroad abandonments.

That is the spirit in which I supported, and still support, a moratorium on railroad abandonment, nationwide, until vital questions of public policy can be addressed and resolved.

That is the spirit in which I established last month a railroad abandonment study committee in the State of Minnesota.

In Minnesota in 1972, we are facing up to a series of problems that are related to this abandonment proposal and all others which can be shown to have significant effects on the communities that may be abandoned along with the trackage.

In February I directed the chairman of the state's interdepartmental transportation task force to take the lead in preparing a proposal for a department of transportation in Minnesota.

In my letter to the chairman, Minnesota highway commissioner Ray Lappegaard I pointed out that:

"Transportation decisions also affect the environment, economic growth and development, population trends and the general quality of Minnesota life, even down to the neighborhood level. I believe the state must adopt a comprehensive approach to transportation."

In justifying the need for such a department, I argued that "we can no longer afford isolated single-purpose efforts if we are to provide the best possible access for our citizens and businesses to air, rail, highway, and local mass transit facilities. We must cross existing departmental and regulatory barriers in the interest of providing efficient, economical modern transportation for the people of Minnesota."

In my judgment, the questions of railroad abandonments are part and parcel of this philosophy toward transportation. Within the State of Minnesota, we must con-

sider individual rail abandonments within the framework of a general transportation policy for the state.

We do not yet have a department of transportation, and we do not yet have a transportation policy for the state. That is a Minnesota state problem. We are working to solve it. I believe we will accomplish both a department and a transportation policy soon.

In the meantime, it is my judgment that we can afford to wait a while before the track is abandoned between Sanborn and Wanda, and before it is abandoned anywhere in Minnesota where there is a question of the effect of abandonment on the well-being of the community involved. The Chicago and Northwestern Railroad can also wait a while.

By law, the hearing in which we are engaged today is the only forum in which the decision to wait a while can be made. That is one reason that I am asking the Interstate Commerce Commission today not to allow the abandonment of the track between Sanborn and Wanda.

Closely related to the question of a State Transportation Policy is another problem which the State of Minnesota is facing up to this year.

My administration is deeply concerned with the economic problems of the people who live in outstate Minnesota.

We are faced with a severe economic situation in the Duluth community of northeastern Minnesota, and it has received a great deal of attention. But we are presently preparing legislation that will address the State's economic situation on a statewide level.

Figures from the 1970 census show that nearly 16 per cent of the families in Redwood County had incomes below the poverty level in 1969. In the surrounding counties, the percentages vary from 13 to 16 per cent. For Redwood County, that means 786 families whose income did not meet the standards defined by the Federal Government as minimal for economic well-being.

On a State-wide basis, the percentage of families with incomes below the poverty level is 8.2 per cent. There is not one county west of Mankato and south of Moorhead which does not exceed the State average of families living in poverty.

That is one indication of the economic problems of outstate Minnesota. It is primarily a farm economy, and substantially a grain economy. And it is an economy in trouble.

For a farm family earning its living by producing and shipping agricultural products, the difference in freight rates between rail transit and other forms of transportation can make the difference between poverty and economic well-being.

I do not believe we should take any action that could threaten to add one family from Redwood County to the poverty statistics of the State. That is another reason that I am asking the Interstate Commerce Commission today not to allow the abandonment of the track between Sanborn and Wanda.

This year in Minnesota we are facing up to a third problem that bears a relationship to the question of railroad abandonment—the development of corporate farming in the State.

The 1971 legislature passed a law requiring the registration of corporate farms so that we can watch what is happening to our farming communities in the State. We hope to strengthen that law in our next legislature.

I can think of no better argument for State laws in the corporate farming area than the process we are talking about today.

For agriculture in Minnesota is just beginning the process that has led to the situation we now face in the railroad industry.

Over the years, small railroads dependent and involved with local communities and economies have become larger and larger railroads less and less concerned with the

economics and the people of local communities.

Finally they have become parts of huge conglomerate enterprises that are less and less concerned even with railroads.

The end result is that corporate executives and board members, sitting around tables in Dallas and New York and Chicago, make profitability decisions on a broader and broader basis. The people of Wanda are of no concern to them. But the decisions they make have major effects on the people of Wanda.

I fear that development in agriculture because we can see so clearly what its parallel has been in rail transportation. In agriculture, we are moving as a State to protect the people of communities like Wanda from conglomerate decision-making in agriculture.

Unfortunately, we have not moved as a State to protect our people against conglomerate decision-making in rail transportation.

But I do not believe it is too late to start. And that is another reason that I am here today to ask the Interstate Commerce Commission not to allow the abandonment of the track between Sanborn and Wanda.

Let me be as clear as I can be about one thing.

I recognize the fact that railroad companies have a responsibility to operate at a profit. As a matter of fact, I believe that if we are to make policy decisions about transportation that require certain services, we must be prepared to protect the providers as well as the consumers of those services.

That question is part of the national debate over rail transportation that is now going on in Congress. And I recognize the responsibility of government not to make unfair demands upon regulated industries.

But with the movement toward conglomerate industries, we are faced with virtual monopoly decision-making about transportation. The people of Wanda have nowhere else to go for dependable rail service. To the extent that such service is needed, it must be someone's responsibility to see that it is available. It is clear that the railroad industry does not see that it has any responsibility.

If the number of negative decisions on abandonment is any indication, it is also clear that the interstate commerce commission does not see the people of communities like Wanda as its responsibility, either.

But as governor of Minnesota, I know that they are my responsibility.

That is the reason I am here today to oppose the abandonment of the trackage between Sanborn and Wanda.

I am not asking for a permanent decision.

I am not claiming that profitability should go unconsidered in making decisions about rail service.

But I am asking that abandonment be discontinued wherever there is an indication of adverse economic impact on the community, until we can develop a state department of transportation and a state transportation policy.

I am asking that we do not burden an economically distressed area with higher freight rates that may add more families to the poverty statistics, until we are able as a state to take steps to improve Minnesota's outstate economy.

I am asking that we use the instruments of government to protect people in the communities of Minnesota from decision-making that is far removed from them even though it affects the immediate worlds in which they live.

Thank you.

MARIHUANA LAWS IN NEED OF REFORM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, substantial public usage of marihuana—an estimated 24 million Americans have tried mari-

huana in some form and many use it regularly—coupled with the fact that research to date has uncovered relatively few known harmful effects to the individual or the society, lead me to conclude that existing criminal penalties are clearly ineffective as a deterrent.

Thousands of otherwise law-abiding citizens are being branded as criminals by an arbitrary and unequal application of the law. We see increasing reports of sons and daughters being sent to jail for the mistake of getting caught. And we suffer the anguish of seeing our youth and Vietnam veterans treated as criminals, their personal lives and job opportunities marred by a prison record or dishonorable discharge, their alienation from the society in which they live made more severe.

At the same time, heated rhetoric and misallocated resources in enforcing laws that bear no demonstrable relation to the harm done—if any—have impeded our efforts at controlling more significant hard-drug use.

On the basis of the evidence and sound conclusions of the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, following on the heels of similar conclusions reached by the National Institute of Mental Health, we must begin to deal honestly with the marihuana issue by decriminalizing our laws relating to personal possession and use. This course would have the effect of distinguishing marihuana from drugs known to be dangerous. It would constitute an acceptable middle ground between a policy of encouragement through outright legalization and the present unsuccessful policy of elimination through stiff sanctions. We only succeed in undermining respect for the law by continuing to hold to anachronistic sanctions arbitrarily enforced which result in serious psychological, social, and economic consequences for the society and the individual far more damaging than any direct consequence of using marihuana.

Mr. President, in connection with the current debate on the efficacy of Federal and State laws pertaining to marihuana, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a series of editorials from leading newspapers across the Nation commenting on the need for a change in attitude and approach toward this problem.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an updated compilation of "Criminal Penalties Under the Current Marihuana Laws," current as of January 1, 1972, which was put together at my suggestion by a nonprofit, private group here in Washington called the National Organization for the Reform of Marihuana Laws—NORML.

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

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 27, 1972]

SANITY ON MARIJUANA

We welcome the proposal by the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse to abolish criminal penalties for the private use and possession of pot. The conservatively oriented commission's findings are based on the most thorough study ever conducted of marijuana use and its physiological, psychological and sociological effects. A careful read-