

UNITED STATES

U.S. Congress.



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 26

OCTOBER 9, 1973 TO OCTOBER 17, 1973

(PAGES 33229 TO 34550)

lem of foreign aid to developing countries. Eight years ago we stopped giving such aid to the Republic of China which is now celebrating the 62d anniversary of its founding by Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

I wonder how many of my colleagues know that the gross national product of Taiwan has increased 250 percent since American aid ended in 1965? I wonder how many know that less than one-third of the 14,000 square miles of Taiwan are arable and that the 15 million people who live on those 14,000 square miles represent the highest population density of any part of this world?

The Republic of China has been described as the "only one of the world's developing nations to have truly developed," and it is predicted that by 1975, per capita income in Taiwan will exceed \$500. This income level is generally viewed by economists as the takeoff point for a modern, industrial nation.

In a recent advertisement in the New York Times, the Republic of China explained its success in these words:

People come first. Our society was built by, and for the benefit of, our people . . . 15,350,000 individuals. Happily, we have avoided the pitfalls encountered by other developing nations. We placed agricultural modernization ahead of steel mills. Health ahead of "showcase projects." People ahead of machines. We didn't squander U.S. aid on unnecessary and nonproductive projects. We were, in truth, stingy with ourselves. The result has been a society and an economic system that not only works, but is working better every day. Our secret is this: A philosophy and an economic system that recognizes the rights and dignity of the individual. Confucius said it best: "The people come first."

Mr. President, I wish, when the United States embarked on foreign aid, we had shown as much wisdom in its disbursement as the Republic of China showed in its utilization.

The Republic of China is unstinting in expressing its appreciation for the help the United States gave that country in its darkest hour after the retreat from the Communist takeover of the mainland. I think it only proper on this occasion of their 62d birthday to let the leaders of the Republic of China know that America deeply appreciates the remarkable achievements attained in Taiwan. We appreciate the contribution the Republic of China has made to make this a better world through imagination, initiative, and enterprise against tremendous odds. Taiwan has shown us the impossible can still be achieved. This should be the greatest of all incentives to the struggling, developing countries of the world.

Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to join in bipartisan sponsorship of the resolution.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 50

At the request of Mr. JAVITS, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) were added as cosponsors of Senate Con-

current Resolution 50, establishing a World Food Conference.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 51

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, to express the appreciation of Congress to Vietnam Veterans on Veterans Day 1973.

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING JOHN C. STENNIS DAY

(Considered and agreed to.)

Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. EASTLAND), submitted a resolution (S. Res. 180) designating a JOHN C. STENNIS DAY.

(The text of the resolution is printed at a later point in the RECORD when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD and agreed to.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 173

At the request of Mr. McINTYRE, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. CLARK), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 173, directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to make such amendments as may be appropriate in order to reduce any unnecessary reporting burden on broker-dealers and help to assure the continued participation of small broker-dealers in the securities markets.

SENATE RESOLUTION 179

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 179, a resolution deploring the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East.

Once again the world is subjected to a saddening, frightening display of violence in the Middle East. Saddening because it points out the failure of 6 years of diplomacy. Frightening because it raises the always-present possibility that the situation may grow out of control.

While the resolution addresses itself equally to Israel and to her neighbors, urging both sides to stop fighting and to return to the positions they occupied prior to the outbreak of hostilities, it seems reasonably clear that Egypt and Syria must bear the weight of responsibility for this round of fighting.

I commend the President and Secretary of State Kissinger for their handling of the situation thus far. Reports in the press this morning that the United States, the U.S.S.R., and China are cooperating to prevent the spread of fighting are gratifying. What is needed now is a restoration of the status quo ante, and a resumption of the diplomatic efforts, however long and tedious, needed to bring lasting peace to the area.

At the request of Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD (for Mr. NELSON) the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 179, supra.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 617

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. CLARK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2491) to repeal the provisions of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 which provide for payments to farmers in the event of crop failures, with respect to crops planted in lieu of wheat or feed grains.

MIDWEST AND NORTHEAST RAIL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 618 AND 619

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am submitting with Senator HUMPHREY two amendments to S. 2188, the Midwest and Northeast Rail System Development Act.

These amendments are designed to address the critical inadequacy of America's rural transportation system and to prevent the continued decline in rail services to rural communities.

Because of increased domestic and world demand for American farm products, farmers have greatly increased production this year; and the administration has announced its intention to bring an additional 19 million acres under cultivation in 1974. This large-scale expansion of production generates major new demands on our already overburdened rural transportation system—demands for shipment of seed, fertilizer, and equipment, as well as the movement of commodities to market.

At the same time rural transportation needs are rapidly growing; however, thousands of miles of railroad track serving farm communities are threatened with abandonment. Since 1970, the number of abandonment cases brought before the Interstate Commerce Commission has nearly tripled from a rate of about 100 per year in the 1960's to a rate of from 250-300 per year at the present time. In virtually every case that has been decided since 1970, the ICC has granted the railroad's request for a discontinuance of service, resulting in the loss of 7,800 miles of track to rural America.

Incredibly, the Federal agencies and departments, charged with responsibility for decisions that have a profound impact on America's rail transportation system, do not know precisely how rail abandonments have affected rural communities; and they do not know what the impact of future abandonments may be on the Nation's transportation system. In its report on S. 2188, the Senate Commerce Committee revealed:

Time and again, the Committee has found disturbing the large gaps in basic information about straight-forward questions—gaps shared alike by private and public organizations. For example, despite the decades of experience with economic regulation of the railroads by federal and state agencies, and the huge R&D budgets provided to the D.O.T., including both the Office of the Sec-

retary and the Federal Rail Administration, nobody could answer the simple question, "What has happened in the past to shippers, communities, workers and other affected parties when railroads have been permitted to abandon lines?" And what might happen in the future.

In many cases among communities now threatened with abandonment, alternative means of transportation do not exist, are more expensive and less efficient for shippers, or involve public costs which greatly exceed any private gain that might accrue to a railroad as a result of a discontinuance. In the State of Minnesota, for example, it would cost an estimated \$80 million just to provide highways to serve those communities threatened with loss of their railroads. These towns have no alternative to rail service. And aside from the tremendous costs to taxpayers for the construction of new roads to replace rail lines, there would also be extremely high added costs to businesses, which would have to convert their terminals and receiving facilities to accommodate increased reliance on motor carriers.

Our country is facing a fuel shortage, necessitating ever-increasing imports of oil at great cost to our balance of payments and the value of the dollar. Expanded agricultural exports are viewed by economists as the principal hope for offsetting the disastrous trade deficit caused by oil imports. Yet we are at the same time continuing a policy of abandoning essential rural train service, trains which can move each ton of freight from one-fourth to one-seventh the amount of fuel consumed by trucks. Rural communities obviously need good modern roads; nevertheless, available evidence casts serious doubt upon the advisability of Federal policies which consciously result in decreased rail service and inordinate dependence upon highways . . . highways that too often do not exist or are hopelessly inadequate.

Before we proceed full speed ahead on a course which could result in immense costs to our Nation, we ought to examine the impact of continued rural rail abandonments and find out how best to provide an adequate rural transportation system.

The amendments which Senator HUMPHREY and I offer today are designed to obtain within 1 year the information we need to make a sensible judgment; and they would allow time for congressional action to promote the continuation and improvement of vital rural rail services.

One amendment would create a Rural Rail Transportation Planning Commission. The Commission would conduct a study of the overall transportation needs and capabilities in rural America. In addition the Commission would carry out an in-depth economic and operational study of rail lines, identified by the Governors of the States as presently threatened or likely to be endangered by abandonment. This study would include a calculation of current and projected demand for rail services, a review of available alternative modes of transportation, and an evaluation of the economic, environmental and social costs involved in the substitution of such alternatives, as well as an examination of the revenues

and costs of rail service on identified lines. Finally, the Commission would be charged with responsibility for an analysis of the costs and benefits of various methods to continue rail service where a valid need for such service exists and for the submission of its recommendations on those methods which would best enable us to achieve an efficient and fully adequate rural rail transportation system.

In carrying out the Rural Rail Transportation Study, the Commission would cooperate with the Rail Emergency Planning Office, created under S. 2188, in the exchange of information, including data, analyses and findings with particular bearing upon methods to meet the rural rail needs of States included in the Rail Emergency Region.

But while these studies are being conducted to measure the consequences of abandonments and to develop methods to continue service, it would be senseless to proceed with the abandonment of many thousands more miles of track.

The second amendment, which Senator HUMPHREY and I today propose, would establish a 2-year moratorium on the abandonment of rural freight service to provide time for completion of the study and subsequent legislative action. This moratorium would not apply in a case where a railroad is in reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and where the Court requests the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve an abandonment. However, where no immediate financial threat exists and where States or local communities express opposition to a proposed abandonment, the ICC would be precluded from making a final decision until the study and congressional action can be completed.

The moratorium would simply insure that we have all the facts about the consequences of abandonment before we implement decisions which could seriously jeopardize the economic, environmental, and social interests of rural communities and the Nation as a whole.

I am hopeful that these two crucial amendments will be adopted as part of S. 2188 when that measure reaches the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT No. 618

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
CURTAILMENT OR ABANDONMENT OF RURAL RAIL SERVICE OR LINES

SEC. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, no carrier subject to part I of such Act shall, within the two-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, limit in a significant way freight service to, or abandon all or any portion of a line of a railroad in, any rural area, except in any case where such discontinuance, significant limitation, or abandonment is not opposed, in hearings held by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect thereto, by any State or local government having jurisdiction over an area receiving such service.

(b) If a railroad is in reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 205) and the Court requests the Commission to approve an abandonment, the Commission

may consider the abandonment request under the authority of the Interstate Commerce Act, without regard to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

AMENDMENT No. 619

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
RURAL RAIL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION

SEC. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established and independent commission to be known as the Rural Rail Transportation Commission (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the President on the following basis:

(1) one, the Chairman, to be selected from a list of not less than three qualified individuals recommended by the Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate;

(2) one, to be selected from a list of not less than three qualified individuals recommended by the Association of American Railroads or its successor, who shall be representative of railway management;

(3) one, to be selected from a list of not less than three qualified individuals recommended by the parent body of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations or its successor, who shall be representative of railway labor;

(4) one, to be selected from lists of qualified individuals recommended by organizations representative of significant rural rail shipping interests, including small shippers, consumer organizations, environmental organizations and community organizations; and

(5) one, to be selected from a list of not less than three individuals recommended by the Governors of the States and local community officials, who shall be representative of State and local interests.

(b) DUTIES.—The Commission shall:

(1) conduct a comprehensive analysis of present and future rail freight transportation needs in rural areas throughout the United States, taking into account increased demand for transportation resulting from expanded production of agricultural and forest products and the national goal of promoting the growth and development of rural America, and in carrying out such analysis, shall consider factors such as—

(A) the nature and volume of traffic now being moved and likely to be moved in the future in rural America by all the various modes of transportation;

(B) existing and projected rural transportation capabilities to handle such traffic, including all modes of transportation;

(C) the extent to which alternative modes of transportation are available to move traffic that is now carried by rail lines identified pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

(D) the relative economic, social and environmental costs including energy utilization involved in the substitution of alternative modes of transportation to move traffic that is now carried by rail lines identified pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection and in increasing reliance upon alternative modes of transportation to meet projected rural transportation needs;

(2) prepare an information survey and an economic and operational study of all rural freight lines or portions thereof identified by the Governors of the several States as currently threatened or likely to be threatened by abandonment, taking into account—

(A) current and projected demand for rail service along such lines including demand which may not be reflected in current traffic density because of a shortage of rail cars or the poor condition of track and roadbed;

(B) traffic density over identified lines, plant equipment and facilities, and pertinent costs and revenues of such lines;

(C) the extent to which alternative modes of transportation could move traffic that is carried by identified lines;

(D) the relative economic social and environmental costs involved in the use of alternative modes of transportation including energy utilization; and

(E) the economic impact, competitive and otherwise upon local shippers, railroad companies, and rural communities involved in the abandonment of identified lines; and

(3) analyze and make recommendations regarding methods to continue to improve rail freight service to rural communities particularly in cases where such service may otherwise be discontinued and where there is a valid need for such service in order to maintain economic growth and development of affected communities or to prevent adverse economic, social or environmental impacts resulting from the substitution of alternative modes of transportation, and such analysis shall include but not be limited to methods such as—

(A) the provision of low interest loans or loan guarantees to enable local non-profit organization composed of shippers and residents and agencies of State and local governments to continue rail service on abandoned lines or lines to be abandoned;

(B) the provision of low interest loans, loan guarantees, grants or other methods as may be appropriate to improve the availability of railroad rolling stock;

(C) operating assistance to enable rail companies or non-profit private or public organizations to maintain service along rail lines threatened with abandonment;

(D) assistance for the rehabilitation of track and roadbed, or the acquisition or modernization of facilities and equipment required to continue and improve service; and in analyzing such methods the Commission shall consider the relative economic, social and environmental costs and benefits thereof and utilize such findings in making recommendations concerning the methods which would best assist in satisfying the public need for an efficient and fully adequate rural freight transportation system.

(c) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Commission shall be compensated at the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay of level III of the Executive Schedule for each day he is engaged on the work of the Commission, and shall be entitled to travel expenses, including a per diem allowance in accordance with section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) RULES.—The Commission shall adopt rules of procedure to govern its proceedings. Vacancies on the Commission shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to continue with the Commission's activities, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

(e) HEARINGS.—The Commission, or any members thereof as authorized by the Commission, may conduct hearings anywhere in the United States or otherwise secure data and expressions of opinion pertinent to its study. In connection therewith the Commission is authorized to pay witnesses travel, lodging, and subsistence expenses.

(f) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—The Commission may acquire directly from the head of any Federal executive department or agency or from the Congress, available information which the Commission deems useful in the discharge of its duties. All Federal executive departments and agencies and the Congress shall cooperate with the Commission and furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law and the Constitution of the United States.

(g) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—The Commission may enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and

other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties.

(h) DELEGATION AUTHORITY.—The Commission may delegate any of its functions to individual members of the Commission or to designated individuals on its staff and make such rules and regulations as are necessary for the conduct of its business, except as otherwise provided in this section.

(i) STAFF.—The Commission may, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to appointments in the competitive service but otherwise in accordance with General Schedule pay rates, appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission.

(j) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may obtain services in accordance with section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$250 a day for qualified experts.

(k) ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE.—Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting and accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, on a reimbursable basis, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services. The regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments apply to the collection of erroneous payments to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of that Administration for the administrative control of funds apply to appropriations of the Commission.

(l) REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit to the Congress within 60 days from the date the members take office pursuant to subsection (a) a summary report of its plans for carrying on its duties, within 270 days from such date a preliminary report of its findings and recommendations, and within 360 days from such date a final report of its findings and recommendations.

(m) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Commission shall consult and cooperate with appropriate State and local agencies, shippers, railroads, organizations representing railroad workers, and other appropriate organizations and groups. The Commission shall also cooperate in the exchange of information regarding its plans, findings and recommendations with the Rail Emergency Planning Office, established under section 4(a) of this Act.

(n) AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed \$2,000,000.

(o) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall cease to exist at the end of 30 days following the submission of its final report pursuant to subsection (l).

HOUSING ACT OF 1973— AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 620

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to submit, with my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), amendments to S. 2182, the Housing Act of 1973, to assist local housing authorities in providing greater security and safety to tenants.

These amendments require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to include security and safety factors in his estimate of the cost of constructing public housing units. Further, the amendments require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to take

into account the cost of design features that will contribute to the security and safety of tenants within their project and in areas directly adjacent to their project.

A recent book by Oscar Newman entitled, "Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design," documents the influence that architecture and landscaping can have on a public housing tenant's perception of himself and his environment. Mr. Newman's book forcefully argues that design features play a significant role in promoting or detracting from security in public housing projects.

Mr. President, the book "Defensible Space" was reviewed in the New York Times on November 5, 1972. I ask unanimous consent that this review be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ARCHITECTURE: A PRESCRIPTION FOR DISASTER

(By Ada Louise Huxtable)

When officials dynamited Pruitt-Igoe Houses in St. Louis this year, they finally blasted the subject of housing design into the public consciousness. It took the violent and necessary act of destruction of part of a public housing project that had become an obscenity of American life to make it clear that we have been doing something awfully wrong.

It wasn't the failure of a dream, although that was bad enough. One of the great American social reforms—safe and sanitary housing in exchange for slums—has obviously gone off the rails. The anguished "why?" that society is asking now has many complex answers. But one of the most basic and important is the physical fact of how American public housing has been planned and designed. Now comes a supremely significant study and book to tell us that we have, with the best intentions, literally built in failure by erecting buildings that are actually designed to exacerbate crime and violence and problems of human behavior, for the near-destruction of a segment of our society and whole sections of our cities.

The book is "Defensible Space," subtitled, "Crime Prevention Through Urban Design," by Oscar Newman, just published by Macmillan. It details the results of a three-year research program called the Project for the Security Design of Urban Residential Areas, directed by Professor Newman, who is also an architect and director of the Institute of Planning and Housing of New York University, where he is an associate professor.

The study deals primarily with the "effects of the physical layout of residential environments on the criminal vulnerability of its inhabitants." It relates the incidence of crime and vandalism to the specific factors that encourage it. In doing so, it indicts much current housing practice. More broadly, and most importantly, it deals with a most controversial subject—how environment affects behavior.

The study, significantly for these times, has been funded not by housing or design sources, but by the U.S. Department of Justice. The method has been statistical analysis and experimental design modification of existing projects to test hypotheses. Housing developments in every major city in the country have been examined, with heavy reliance on the inexhaustibly complete statistics of the New York Housing Authority. Professor Newman points out that New York builds and maintains better, keeps better files, and has a better housing record than any other city. But the findings were the same everywhere, and they are going to shake a lot of people up.