HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, March 11, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.—John 9: 4.

O God, from whom all great desires, all good counsels, and all genuine works proceed, grant unto us the peace which the world cannot give and cannot take away, that our hearts may be set to obey Thy commandments and to walk more worthily in Thy most wholesome ways. Open our eyes that we may see Thee, open our minds that we may know Thee, and open our hearts that we may receive Thee. Then may we make the great adventure of faith and discover the secret of peace in Thee who art the companion of our souls.

Endue with Thy wisdom those entrusted with the authority of government that there may be justice at home and peace among the nations of the world.

In the spirit of the Master of Men we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens eighteen years of age or older.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. GRAVEL as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; and Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, appointed Mr. LONG and Mr. STEVENS as members of the same Board of Visitors.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 85–874, appointed Mr. TUNNEY as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the National Cultural Center Board.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 207, 81st Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. RIBICOFF as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy; and Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, appointed Mr. HOLLINGS and Mr. HATFIELD as members of the same Board of Visitors.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 291) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 291

Resolved, That SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATION'S CREDIT UNIONS REACH ANOTHER MILESTONE

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 the credit unions of the United States, in general, and Federal credit unions, in particular, will have reached another milestone. For on that day, Mr. James W. Dodd, of Houston, Tex., will be sworn in as a member of the first National Credit Union Board. The swearing in of Mr. Dodd will complete the makeup of the seven-member board, which includes a representative from each Federal credit union region plus a chairman chosen at large.

The National Credit Union Board will work in cooperation with the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration to oversee the regulation and supervision of Federal credit unions. The Board was authorized under H.R. 2, legislation that I was pleased to have introduced, along with a bipartisan group of members of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The other members of the committee who cosponsored the legislation are Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. WIDNALL, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. COWGER.

The Board will complement the outstanding staff and officials of the National Credit Union Administration, headed by Gen. Herman Nickerson, Jr., who was selected by President Nixon to be the first Administrator of the new agency. Although General Nickerson has been with the agency only a few months, he has quickly shown his dedication to the credit union movement and has been an effective Administrator. General Nickerson's deputy assistant is Mr. Deane Gannon, who had been with the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions from its inception. Mr. Gannon has distinguished himself in credit union fields and is admired by the whole credit union movement. In short, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions was a stepchild in the Federal bureaucracy. Now, however, the credit unions have their own independent agency and their own Board. The members of that Board and the date of their oaths of office are as follows, including the person administering the oath of office:

Name	Address	Date	Administering official
Mr. DuBois McGee	San Francisco region (at El Centro, Calif.)	Feb. 24	Judge George R. Kirk (Superior Court judge).
Mr. Marion F. Gregory, Vice Chairman	Chicago region (at Miami, Fla.)	Feb. 25	Judge F. B. Dowling (Dade County judge).
Mr. John J. Hutchinson	Boston region (at Hartford, Conn.)	Feb. 26	Judge M. J. Blumenfeld (U.S. district judge).
Mr. Joseph F. Hinchey	Harrisburg region (in Senator Scott's Senate Office)	Mar. 1	Senator Hugh Scott (R., Pa.).
Mr. Richard H. Grant, Chairman	Nation at large (at Concord, N.H.)	Mar. 2	Judge Hugh Bownes (U.S. district judge).
Mrs. Lorena Matthews	Atlanta region (at Oak Ridge, Tenn.)	Mar. 8	Judge Frank Wilson (Federal judge).
Mr. James W. Dodd	Austin region (at Houston, Tex.)	Mar. 9	Mr. B. B. Lankford (regional director NCUA).

The creation of the National Credit Union Administration as an independent agency is indeed a fitting reward for the more than 24,000 credit unions with 24 million members in this country, which are made up roughly on a 50–50 basis of State and Federal charters. The National Credit Union Administration is run entirely from fees received by Federal credits unions and receives no Government funds. It is therefore very fitting that dedicated members of the credit union movement should serve on the National Credit Union Board. It was for this reason that I insisted that the law provide that one of the qualifications for membership on the Board is that a Board member must be a person of "tested credit union experience." We wanted people who would work to improve credit unions so that they could provide even better service to their members. I feel that President Nixon's selections for the first Board quite clearly fulfill the requirements for membership and that they will work together to build a better credit union system.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to a new, independent agency, credit unions, on October 1 of last year, were granted Federal share insurance, a piece of legislation which I was also pleased to sponsor in the House. Since the enactment of that legislation, which requires mandatory share insurance for Federal credit unions and voluntary share insurance for State-chartered credit unions, 6,700 Federal credit unions and 58 State-chartered credit unions have been insured. As of February 22, more than $6.3 billion in share accounts has been insured under the program.

Share insurance was another reward for credit unions. Their losses have been minimal over the years and, in fact, they have compiled a far greater record for safeguarding members' funds than any other group of financial institutions. But since they were the only federally chartered financial institution without Federal insurance, it was felt they deserved equal treatment.

Every Member of this body can be proud of the work of credit unions and they can be especially proud of the support that they have given credit unions. In a few days, I plan to introduce legislation that would provide a national capital bank for credit unions to provide them with a discount and liquidity facility. It is my hope that that legislation will reach the floor during this session of Congress so that Members once again will have an opportunity to demonstrate their unqualified support for credit unions.

INTEREST RATES REMAIN HIGH IN LONG-TERM MONEY MARKETS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, many of us warned the House that it was endangering the long-term money markets by removing the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

In the past week, bond issues by corporations have continued to sell at extremely high interest rates. The market is crowded and when and if the Federal Government enters this market, we are going to see serious repercussions.

The Associated Press yesterday reported "rates close to 8 percent are common on corporate offerings in the past 3 weeks." The analysis goes on to say that the high interest rates are the result of "tremendous demand for long-term funds, for money that can be used for the next 20, 30, or 40 years rather than for a couple of years or less."

This is the same kind of money that the Federal Government would be seeking if it is allowed to enter the long-term market without regard to the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling. Yields on Government bonds today are in excess of 6 percent and it is likely that this rate will skyrocket if the Government reenters the long-term money markets.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the article by John Cunniff, of the Associated Press, which appeared in the Wednesday afternoon editions of the Washington Evening Star:

SOME CORPORATIONS ARE PAYING MORE, NOT LESS FOR FUNDS

(By John Cunniff)

NEW YORK.—While borrowing costs have dropped generally and sharply during the past weeks and months, some of the nation's biggest corporations and soundest governmental units are paying more rather than less for money.

The situation is unique in money markets today, although it could change almost overnight. But until it does, those seeking to raise money in bond markets are finding their costs considerably higher than anticipated.

In order to attract funds of investors, some of the highest rated borrowers have had to pay rates a full percentage point above those of a month ago. Rates close to 8 percent are common on corporate offerings in the past three weeks.

LONG-TERM DEMAND

The main factor that produces the situation is a temporary but tremendous demand for long-term funds, for money that can be used for the next 20, 30 or 40 years rather than for a couple of years or less.

The March "calendar" of issues to be sold totals $4 billion, for example, the highest ever for any month and double the figure for many months. It means that lenders have power over borrowers in the bond markets.

Just when borrowers will achieve parity with lenders is debatable, although many securities dealers feel it could be momentary. As rates rise, they reason, lenders will be attracted to the market. They note that some mutual funds have already jumped over from the stock market.

SOMEWHAT UNPREDICTABLE

Others feel the situation is rare and somewhat unpredictable.

As one bond dealer explained, it would be easy to foresee lower rates if the borrowing were for the usual reasons, to expand or improve plants and facilities, as in the past. But this money is rarely going to that use.

Instead, he said, corporate treasurers now are borrowing in the bond markets to pay off bank loans. They are seeking to substitute long-terms financing for short-term bank loans.

"They had gone into the banks to the extent they were able," he said. "When bond costs began dropping they decided to restructure their balance sheets, get rid of pressing debts and assure themselves of longer terms."

LINING UP IN ADVANCE

Many of these treasurers had been stung in the past year by tight money. The severe credit squeeze of last year proved a harrowing experience to many of them, one that they vowed would never be repeated. They are, therefore, now lining up money for years in advance.

Moreover, the modern treasurer is said to be a lot more sophisticated than those of just five to eight years ago. Many of them no longer feel that banks are their primary source of funds.

Instead, they have learned that by going into bond markets, they sometimes can borrow more cheaply but, as they are learning, not always. They are much more astute, but for the time being they have produced a market that works against their goals.

DEMAND MAY GROW

While higher rates inevitably attract investors if there is money available in the economy—and compared with last year, money is much more plentiful—there is some possibility that demand also will increase.

Recent surveys suggest that while borrowing for new plants and equipment is still relatively slight, the situation is changing.

The latest Commerce Department survey of capital spending plans shows projections of $83.1 billion for 1971, a rise of 4.3 percent or $2.4 billion over 1970. A similar survey in December projected an increase of only 1.4 percent.

While some bond men are still forecasting for April a new issue market only half the size of March, some observers are keeping their fingers crossed. If capital spending does indeed rise, they say, the pressures will remain.

Moreover, they add, the Federal Reserve has given no overt indication so far that it will accede to the administration's wishes for an even easier money policy, which would tend to reduce upward pressures on prices.

ISRAEL MUST HAVE DEFENSIBLE BORDERS

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the United States must seriously ponder which direction it is taking in the search for a real peace in the Middle East.

An Israel without defensible borders is an engraved invitation to disaster. This ought to be primary in any settlement. A permanent peace can be achieved now and not be bargained away with the Scarlett O'Hara dicta of "I'll worry about that tomorrow." On such resolution rests a graveyard for peace. Three times in the past 22 years the world has lost the opportunity for a stabilized Middle East. Each time Israel, the victim of aggression, was forced by world pressure to divest herself of all her bargaining power to risk again and again and again the fires of conflict. Will other Arab countries demand anything less than total withdrawal once Egypt has achieved this goal? Stripping Israel of its bargaining powers to obtain defensible borders is certainly not in the interest of the United States. I cannot subscribe to "peace at any price" when peace would, at best, be illusionary and the price too high for civilization to pay.

MAKING FLAG DAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Leo Clubs—young people organized and sponsored by the Lions International—have set themselves the mighty task of convincing their elders that Flag Day should be a national legal holiday. It is my privilege to spearhead a drive by a dedicated group of these young people in the 22d Congressional District of Pennsylvania who are engaged in ths nationwide patriotic effort.

I am introducing today, along with 67 cosponsors of both parties, representing 26 States and Puerto Rico, a bill which would recognize Flag Day as a legal holiday. The day would be celebrated on the second Monday of each June.

I predict that each Member of the House and Senate will begin to hear from the concerned and patriotic young people of the Nation requesting speedy action on this bill.

The youth I have talked to admit that a three-pronged—Federal, State, and local—nationwide drive is necessary and desirable in order to assure acceptance of the holiday. The introduction of this bill today is just a beginning; our colleagues in the State legislatures will soon feel the effect of interested groups of young and old working to achieve the holiday in their respective legislatures. As it stands today, Pennsylvania is the only State which celebrates Flag Day as a legal holiday. The goal is for all 50 States.

The crusade for a National Flag Day holiday was initiated by the Leo Clubs

of Pennsylvania 2 years ago. I bring to your attention now a resolution passed at the Third Annual Pennsylvania Leo Clubs Convention held in April 1969. You will note from reading the clauses of the document that the group has captured the very essence of patriotism. The resolution follows:

FLAG DAY RESOLUTION

(At the Third Annual Leo Club State Convention, Willow Grove, Pa., April 25-27, 1969)

Whereas the Flag of the United States of America is a symbol of national independence, of individual liberty, of idealism, and of patriotism. It is also the symbol of our nation's progress, and

Whereas our forefathers used many standards and emblems to reflect their desire for freedom, the one standard that has come to mean more than any other in our nation's proud history is "Old Glory." For nearly 200 years, it has come to mean the United States, and

Whereas the Stars and Stripes is truly a living symbol, beautiful in color and meaning. The seven red stripes denote our courage and readiness to sacrifice for the defense of our country. The six white stripes symbolize our purity and purpose. The field of blue suggests unlimited vision, loyalty and unity, and

Whereas in no other nation are the people so diverse, yet so thoroughly united in upholding a single standard of freedom and justice for all. This is the Flag of every loyal American citizen—whether he be white or black, rich or poor—and regardless of his religious or political beliefs, and

Whereas we the members of high school Leo Clubs throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are assembled here in our Third Annual Leo Club State Convention at Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, which is within fifteen miles of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, the site where during the Third Continental Congress on June 14, 1777, passed the following resolution: "Resolved, that the Flag of the United States be thirteen stripes alternate red and white, that the Union be thirteen stars white in a blue field representing a new constellation," now

Therefore be it resolved that we, the American youth representing our Leo Clubs and our sponsoring Lions Clubs in Pennsylvania, show our continued dedication and respect toward the American Flag by encouraging all Americans to observe more deeply our patriotic holidays, and

Be it further resolved that we distribute and circulate this Flag Day Resolution, seeking the cooperation of other Americans—young and old—and other organizations of all kinds; with the resolve to set our sights on the establishing of Flag Day, June 14, as a national legal holiday each year. Thus it is fitting that on this day the American youth can acclaim the initiation of a day set aside to honor the birth of our great Flag of the United States.

I also point out that the sentiments expressed in the above resolution are similar to those of the American Legion when that group supported a similar bill of mine during the 91st Congress. Resolution 442 of the 52d Annual National Convention of the Legion, September 1970, reads as follows:

RESOLUTION 442

(At the 52d Annual National Convention of the American Legion, Sept. 1, 2, and 3, 1970)

Committee: Americanism.

Subject: Observe Flag Day, June 14th, as legal holiday.

Whereas, June 14th is widely observed with patriotic services as Flag Day, the birthday of our National Emblem; and

Whereas, Congress has not adopted legislation to make this date a National Holiday to be observed in all states with ceremony; and

Whereas, Congress has now adopted legislation providing penalties for the desecration of our Flag; and

Whereas, The American Legion believes that Flag Day, June 14th, should be observed as a National Holiday; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Portland, Oregon, September 1, 2, 3, 1970, that The American Legion seek legislation to establish June 14 in each year as a national holiday.

I am proud that every area of our country is represented on the list of cosponsors of the bills introduced today. I am sure that other Members will desire to join the crusade started by our young people to make Flag Day a legal holiday so I plan to introduce additional bills as more Members indicate a desire to cosponsor. The list of Members cosponsoring the bills introduced today include:

HOUSE MEMBERS COSPONSORING A BILL TO MAKE FLAG DAY A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY

ARIZONA

John J. Rhodes, Republican.

CALIFORNIA

Craig Hosmer, Republican.
Harold T. Johnson, Democrat.
Charles H. Wilson, Democrat.

CONNECTICUT

Ella T. Grasso, Democrat.
Robert H. Steel, Republican.

FLORIDA

Claude Pepper, Democrat.
Robert L. F. Sikes, Democrat.
C. W. Young, Republican.

GEORGIA

G. Elliott Hagan, Democrat.

ILLINOIS

Edward J. Derwinski, Republican.

INDIANA

John T. Myers, Republican.

KANSAS

Joe Skubitz, Republican.
Larry Winn, Jr., Republican.

LOUISIANA

Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., Democrat.

MARYLAND

Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat.

MASSACHUSETTS

Silvio O. Conte, Republican.
Louise Day Hicks, Democrat.

MICHIGAN

Guy Vander Jagt, Republican.

MONTANA

Richard G. Shoup, Republican.

NEBRASKA

Charles Thone, Republican.

NEW JERSEY

Florence P. Dwyer, Republican.
John E. Hunt, Republican.
Henry Helstoski, Democrat.
Robert Roe, Democrat.

NEW MEXICO

Harold Runnels, Democrat.

NEW YORK

Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat.
Frank J. Brasco, Democrat.
Seymour Halpern, Republican.
James F. Hastings, Republican.
Carleton J. King, Republican.
Alexander Pirnie, Republican.
Lester L. Wolff, Democrat.

NORTH CAROLINA

Walter B. Jones, Democrat.
Alton Lennon, Democrat.
Wilmer Mizell, Republican.

OKLAHOMA

Page Belcher, Republican.
John N. Happy Camp, Republican.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edward G. Biester, Republican.
James A. Byrne, Democrat.
Frank M. Clark, Democrat.
Robert J. Corbett, Republican.
R. Lawrence Coughlin, Republican.
Joshua Eilberg, Democrat.
Edwin D. Eshleman, Republican.
Daniel J. Flood, Democrat.
James G. Fulton, Republican.
Joseph M. Gaydos, Democrat.
Albert W. Johnson, Republican.
William S. Moorhead, Democrat.
Robert N. C. Nix, Democrat.
John P. Saylor, Republican.
J. Irving Whalley, Republican.
Lawrence G. Williams, Republican.
Gus Yatron, Democrat.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Floyd Spence, Republican.

TENNESSEE

John J. Duncan, Republican.
Joe L. Evins, Democrat.
Richard H. Fulton, Democrat.
Dan Kuykendall, Republican.

TEXAS

J. J. Pickle, Democrat.
Robert Price, Republican.
Ray Roberts, Democrat.

WEST VIRGINIA

James Kee, Democrat.
Harley O. Staggers, Democrat.

WISCONSIN

William A. Steiger, Republican.

WYOMING

Teno Roncalio, Democrat.

PUERTO RICO

Jorge L. Córdova.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN—WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. ULLMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a welfare reform bill that is an alternative to the family assistance plan that has been presented by the administration and was before the Congress last year.

Members will recall that last year I opposed the family assistance plan, and as the months and the year have gone by, I think it is even more clearly evident that is the wrong road to take. It is not welfare reform.

I have incorporated many of the deliberations over on the other side during the year into my draft. I think it is a responsible alternative. The Members will be interested in it. I hope we will have parliamentary procedures whereby this can be allowed to be presented to the House in the event the committee does not approve it.

A WELFARE REFORM PROGRAM

To say that our welfare system is a mess and that it needs reform is to join a great vocal majority in this House and in the country. But although we all agree

that the present system is a scandal, agreement evaporates when we discuss the specifics of reform.

Last year, this House passed the administration's family assistance program on the assumption that it was a welfare reform program and that it would get us out of the mess that we are in. That same program has been resubmitted to the Committee on Ways and Means in this Congress—but it is no more a welfare reform program now than it was then.

What is the matter with the welfare program? A spiraling caseload, but the family assistance plan would increase the caseload, instead of decreasing it. A continuously greater burden on the taxpayer, but the family assistance program would increase the costs of welfare, not decrease it. But the greatest failure of the present system is that despite spiraling caseloads, despite spiraling costs it is not meeting the problems of poor families with children—it is as unpopular with the poor as with the taxpayer because it locks the poor into poverty. It is a system in which it is easy to get in and hard to get out—not only for one generation but for the next as well. It condemns the children of the poor to tread in the footsteps of their parents.

We need a welfare system that will help the helpless—but just as much we need a welfare system that will insure that those who can help themselves do, and that those who can be taught to help themselves are set on the right road, and most important of all, that the children are not locked into a system that they did not create and are given the comprehensive care that they deserve for their own sake and for the sake of our society, which cannot tolerate the transmission of poverty and dependence from one generation to the next.

The family assistance plan makes no fundamental reform in our welfare program—under that plan the AFDC program is perpetuated intact except that payment levels in a few States are raised. It does make one fundamental change by adding a new welfare program for the working poor—but that change is in the wrong direction because what we need is a reform of welfare—not an addition to it.

The weaknesses of the family assistance plan have been sufficiently documented. I want to describe for you today not what is wrong with that plan but what a real reform of the welfare system should provide. For that reason, I am today introducing the Rehabilitation, Employment Assistance and Child Act of 1971. My bill is presented as an alternative to the family assistance plan so that Members who share my conviction that we need welfare reform, but that the administration plan does not give it, will have a proposal to vote for, as well as one to vote against.

This bill is a concrete proposal to reform the welfare system in the way it must be reformed; it is a reform that has as its primary objective to limit the welfare rolls to those who cannot help themselves and to provide programs other than welfare for those who can.

There is one critical point of principle on which my proposal is built—welfare is not for those who can work. The basis of this bill is that all applicants for welfare should be screened to determine whether or not they are employable—if they are unemployable they should be eligible for welfare but the Federal Government should make no contribution to welfare payments for any employable persons. The employables should be a Federal responsibility—but not a welfare responsibility. The Federal Government should provide work, training, child care and any other service needed to put the employables into jobs—the State governments, with Federal financial assistance, should provide welfare grants only for those who cannot work.

Under present law—and under the family assistance bill—both the employable and the unemployable go on the welfare rolls. After the employable are on the rolls and have become accustomed to their welfare checks, we try to get them off welfare and into training or employment. When I tell you that the WIN program has put 25,000 people into employment since its inception, and in the same period the welfare rolls have increased by more than 100 times that many people, I think you will agree that it is a little like King Canute trying to stop the advance of the ocean.

My bill has a different approach. The welfare system should be only for the unemployable—and my bill provides that the Federal Government will assess every applicant for AFDC to see if she is employable—only if the Federal Government determines that she is unemployable will we pick up our portion of the State's AFDC program. The States will be free to disqualify from their AFDC programs anyone not certified as unemployable. The unemployables will remain on the welfare rolls—they will remain a State responsibility with the Federal Government contributing to the costs just as it does now.

Employable applicants, however, would never get into the welfare system. They would become a Federal responsibility and would either be placed directly in jobs or go into a fully federally financed program of rehabilitation, employment assistance, and child care.

Before I describe the program for employables, let me say just a word about the transition to this system and how the employability determinations would be made. It is obviously not practical to try to assess the entire welfare caseload at any fixed point of time. Instead, my bill provides that effective January 1, 1972, all new welfare applicants must be assessed for employability and there is a 4-year period during which the new eligibility criterion will be applied to existing caseload—first to unemployed fathers, then to out of school youth, then to mothers with only one child and then to all others. In view of the general turnover on the rolls, a 4-year program to convert to the new eligibility system is quite practical. At the end of that period, the Federal Government will have assumed full responsibility for the employable population—leaving the States' AFDC program with responsibility only for those persons who are not employable.

The employability determination is central to the new program—it defines a new boundary between the role of the States and the Federal Government but, even more important, it defines the new role of welfare: to help only those who cannot help themselves. Perhaps it is wrong to call this a new role of welfare because it is what I, and I think most of you, have always thought ought to be the role of welfare.

This screening function is made a Federal responsibility and it is vested in the Department of Labor. To emphasize its importance, the bill specifically provides that the Department of Labor may not delegate the function to any State agency—it is the Labor Department's responsibility and I want no opportunity for excuses or buckpassing if it is not properly carried out. But I recognize the limitations of the Department of Labor so I have put some restrictions on their discretion—they can make the decision that a person is employable, but before they can decide that he is unemployable because of physical or mental incapacity they must consult the State Vocational Rehabilitation agency. Only if that agency agrees that the applicant cannot be rehabilitated can he be classified as unemployable. It will be easy to be classified as employable—but hard to be classified as unemployable.

While a certificate of unemployability will generally be required for eligibility for welfare, this requirement is not applicable to children, to full-time students under the age of 21 or to those required in the home on a substantially full-time basis to look after another ill member of the family. It is applicable to mothers with only one child regardless of age because I think that that mother has the greatest chance of escaping from the welfare trap before she has more children. It is also applicable to mothers with no preschool age children. However, no mother will be considered employable if there are not suitable day care facilities available for her children.

In determining whether a person is employable, the Department of Labor will look just at their personal characteristics—not at the state of the labor market. If the applicant has the capacity to work or to be trained for work, he or she is employable and, under my program, they will work or be trained for work—they will not draw a welfare check. That is right for them, for their children, and for society. The self-respect that comes from earning one's way for those who can work must no longer be swallowed up by a debilitating welfare system.

What will happen to those classified as employable? It is no answer to disqualify them from welfare if we do not have a viable alternative. No good would come from a system which called people employable but left them without work or the opportunity to qualify for a job. There would be no point in a reform which took employables off the welfare rolls left them to their own devices, with neither work nor welfare. My bill contains all the necessary mechanisms to ensure that the employables get jobs—and probably the most important of these is the commitment to provide quality child care to those who are prevented from working because of lack of facili-

ties to look after their children. My bill provides for an entirely new system of providing child care in America. The lack of child care is the greatest barrier to the employment of women in this country—the lack of quality child care is the greatest obstacle to improving the opportunities of the children now growing up in poverty in our urban ghettos. Quality child care can liberate mothers from the indignities of the welfare system by freeing them to earn their own living—it can provide their children with the opportunities for learning health and nutrition of which they are too often deprived today.

Despite the critical importance of child care, the present system is just not providing it in meaningful quantities. In 1969, the Congress appropriated $25 million for child care under the WIN program but only $4 million was actually used to buy child care. There are many reasons for this inability to deliver ranging from administrative inefficiency through diffusion of responsibilities to the vagaries of local licensing laws. We need a new system and my bill provides for a Federal Child Care Corporation—a single organization with both the responsibility and the capability of meeting the Nation's child care needs. The Corporation will be self-sustaining and will provide child care services for all, but with a mandate to give priority to the poor. The bill provides for a 100-percent Federal subsidy for child care for the poor—and for a graduated contribution toward its cost for those with income above the poverty level.

Those classified as employable will get child care for their children—which is not only necessary to enable them to work but is a contribution to the welfare of their children. Providing child care is, if you like, a subsidy to the working poor, but it is the kind of subsidy that benefits them and their children—a subsidy far preferable to the welfare check that emphasizes dependence instead of independence.

With child care provided, many of the barriers to employment can be overcome, but certainly not all. All those classified as employable will be eligible for the program of rehabilitation, employment assistance, and child care which is provided in the bill. This program will be administered by the Department of Labor, but it will not just be another program added onto the multiplicity of programs that are already administered by that Department and others with the objective of promoting employability.

We do not need another new manpower program or a warmed-over version of the work incentive program—what we do need is a coordinated and effective system for getting people into jobs that pay wages. The basic concept of the REACH program is to give people who would previously have gone on welfare priority in all other Federal programs that increase employability and promote employment opportunity. There is no need to establish another vocational rehabilitation program—what we need to do is to get these people into it by giving them priority and to increase the size of the program by using the REACH appropriation to buy additional opportunities in it. That is the basic function of the REACH program—to place the employables in existing programs and to expand opportunities in those programs by supplementing the appropriation and, where necessary, by paying the non-Federal share in those programs that require matching.

That is the basic strategy of the program—but there is more. To stimulate on-the-job training, the bill provides for a tax credit of 20 percent of the first year's wages for employers but this credit is reduced if the trainee is not kept in employment for 2 full years. This credit is in addition to the out-of-pocket training costs incurred which can be reimbursed as a training cost under the bill. At the latest count, the Department of Labor had less than 1,000 WIN enrollees in on-the-job training and yet that is the training that leads most directly to jobs. The essence of my bill is to put people into jobs and that is what an on-the-job training program does. A tax incentive will give a strong impetus to the private sector and will enable us to make on-the-job training a major component of the program.

Even with tax credits, we know that the private job market cannot by itself do the job of absorbing all these people. Therefore, we provide that REACH eligibles shall be entitled to an appropriate number of the jobs financed through Federal grant-in-aid programs. In addition, the bill provides a program of public service employment, in which the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the costs of employing REACH eligibles in useful employment for State and local governments.

REACH will provide day care; it will provide job training; most important, it will provide jobs. This program is fundamentally different from the WIN program and the training program of the family assistance bill. Under those programs the employables are put on welfare, then they are placed in training or jobs and, if they refuse, they are cut off from welfare. That is going at things backwards, in my opinion. If people are employable, they do not belong on welfare in the first place. They should not be put on and then taken off—they should not go on and that is how it operates under my bill.

That is the essence of my bill—welfare is for those who cannot work. Let us have a different program for those who can—let us not demean them with a welfare check but let us help them to lift themselves up with a job. Let us have a Federal program which will give them all the assistance that they need to convert their employment potential into an actual job—and if the job does not exist then we will create the job through the public service employment program.

It is my belief that those who can work do not belong on welfare—I also believe that those who do work do not belong on welfare either. The big innovation of the family assistance program is to put the working poor on welfare—I reject that concept both because it undermines the concept of work and because the resources that would be squandered in handouts to those who work can be put to much better use. I do not reject welfare supplements to those who work because I reject work—but because I reject welfare as a way of life.

Those who work should not be forgotten—we must assist them to an adequate standard of living but not through the welfare system. My bill provides free child care for the working poor—a benefit that can be of much greater value to them and to the future of their children than a small supplement to their wages. It also provides a work expense allowance of $720 a year to compensate for the expense of going to work—this would be reduced by $1 for every $2 that the family income, including the work expense allowance, exceeded the poverty level. And finally, the working poor would be able to cash out their food-stamp bonus.

I have described my bill in general terms. Its purpose is to reverse the drift toward welfare and to reemphasize the need for self-help. That is a purpose that is shared by all of us—but it is not carried out in the family assistance plan. That plan puts more people on welfare and then makes ineffective efforts to get them off—it seems to me incontrovertible that the right approach is to limit welfare eligibility in the first place and to provide work and training programs for those who do not belong on welfare.

The welfare load has become a crushing burden on State and local government. In fiscal year 1972, the non-Federal share of the AFDC program will be over $3 billion. The fiscal crisis facing so many of our States and cities is not only due to the explosion in welfare but there is no question that they need relief from the fiscal burden that the present welfare program puts on them. I do not propose that we federalize welfare—a phrase that is attractive to many but that poses immense problems.

A Federal program cannot continue the diversity of payment levels that now characterizes the AFDC program—but a Federal welfare standard will not be appropriate in both Mississippi and New York. I do not propose to federalize welfare, but I do propose to federalize that part of the program which never should have been included in welfare—the program for putting employable people to work. Child care, work and training are appropriate Federal responsibilities, and if the Federal Government takes over the responsibility for the employable portion of the population, the States will be left with their traditional—and manageable—responsibility of caring for those who cannot assist themselves. Under the program contemplated in the bill, no new employables would go on the welfare rolls after January 1, 1972, and by 1976 the Federal Government would have taken over the entire responsibility for all employables who were on the rolls on the date of enactment.

In the first year of the program, the States would have a net saving in their welfare bill of about $500 million. I recognize that that may not be enough to alleviate the immediate crisis with which they are faced, so I propose a transitional program of revenue sharing with the States and localities limited to the period until they realize the full benefits from the welfare reform program. This special

revenue sharing would amount to $1.5 billion in the first year, phase down to $500 million in 1974.

I have introduced this bill so that this House, and the American people, may have a constructive alternative to the family assistance plan as they contemplate the need for welfare reform. Reform is needed; the Rehabilitation, Employment Assistance and Child Care Act of 1971 is reform of the right kind.

QUALITY HEALTH CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to make quality health care available to all Americans regardless of financial status.

We must acknowledge that the United States finds itself in a health-care problem of massive proportions. We must also recognize that national efforts to improve and expand medical facilities, to increase the number of medical personnel and to broaden consumer participation in medical policy have fallen short of achievements of other comparable nations and of our own capabilities and desires. Of course, the quality and quantity of health-care programs in the United States have increased tremendously in recent years, and more persons have access to quality medical care than ever before in our history, but a nation of our wealth and compassion must not rest content with a system that provides less than the optimum for our people.

I believe that the objective of providing a system of national health insurance has the support of my constituents in Connecticut, and also has broad national support. There is a national consensus that every citizen has a right to adequate health care even though he may not have the capacity to pay for the services, and that Congress should take steps to provide this care on a reasonably acceptable basis.

My bill, which would be known as the National Healthcare Act, proposes a comprehensive health-care program which does have such a reasonable foundation that it is within the financial, technological, and manpower capabilities of the United States to achieve. It provides for a practical system, building wherever possible upon the existing structure, private and governmental, so that program implementation may be achieved at the earliest practicable date.

The main objectives of my bill are:

First, to increase the supply, productivity and distribution of health manpower by strengthening Federal grant and loan programs for health manpower training and offering incentives for personnel to locate in areas critically short of medical services;

Second, to develop ambulatory health-care services, promote health maintenance, and reduce costly hospital use by providing greater access to effective and less expensive community ambulatory health-care services. The services would include preventive care, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation through expansion of Federal hospital grants and loan guarantees;

Third, to improve health-care planning and to distribute current and future health resources more equitably by reinforcing the role and authority of State and areawide comprehensive health planning agencies;

Fourth, to halt the escalation in health-care costs and improve the quality of health care;

Fifth, to establish national goals and priorities to improve health care; and

Sixth, to remove the financial barriers to quality health care by insuring the availability of comprehensive coverage to all persons. While coverage costs for most people will continue to be met by individuals and employers, public funds will be used for persons needing total or partial support in financing their health care. Individuals and employers would be encouraged to participate in the coverage through tax incentives.

The bill provides for the establishment of minimum standard health-care benefits to be set by Government in consultation with professionals, consumers, and health insurers. The minimum standards will become effective in 1973, and will expand to full coverage by 1979.

I think this bill offers a workable approach to providing health care to all Americans. It is a measure which I hope will have the broad support of my colleagues.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, glad that an impasse has finally been broken on the 10-percent social security increase retroactive to January 1, 1971.

By this action, Congress is fulfilling its promise to act promptly on this issue, insuring a bill on the President's desk in a matter of days.

This action also makes it possible for increased benefits and the retroactive payment to be paid in the July checks.

The needs of the senior citizens of America—those who have been compelled to suffer the worst stings of the inflationary impact are finally being recognized.

ILLUSORY DECLARATION

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the recent proclamation by the Japanese textile industry with respect to their exports to the United States has been variously described as a declaration, a counterproposal, or an agreement. In fact, of course, it is merely a one-sided, unworkable, and conditional statement of future intent by the Japanese industry which in no way constitutes a meeting of the minds between the governments of the two countries.

But whatever you call it, Mr. Speaker, this plan is now a dead issue. The whole scheme advanced by their industry is by its terms conditioned on similar actions by other nations that export textiles to the United States; but Taiwan, to name one, has already rejected any such course of action. It is now crystal clear that such a statement concocted by the Japanese textile industry was designed by them to sabotage any government-to-government agreement and again delay consideration of the trade bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are back where we started on January 22, 1971, when our distinguished Chairman MILLS and others of us introduced the Mills trade bill. This bill is designed to encourage government-to-government negotiations and is designed to promote fair and orderly textile trade between the United States and its trading partners.

The American textile worker is also a consumer. When out of work or his work curtailed, he cannot purchase goods moving in international trade nor can he pay taxes desperately needed for local, State, and Federal Government programs.

I urge my colleagues to dismiss the recent diversion by the Japanese textile industry and to proceed with expeditious consideration of the Mills bill.

A FAIR TRADE POLICY

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the March 7 issue of the New York Times carried a most significant article by Mr. Ely Callaway, president of Burlington Industries, the Nation's largest textile manufacturer.

In this article, Mr. Callaway, who is acutely aware of the impact of low-wage imports on our domestic textile and apparel industries, points up the increasing peril for many of our basic manufacturing industries stemming from trade practices of other countries, particularly Japan. He cites the manner in which cartels and other special government-business relationships, which are illegal in this country, are giving other countries an unfair advantage in world trade.

His is a timely warning that the time has come to reexamine and rework our trade policies in light of modern day practices. He has carefully documented many of the reasons why it is impossible for domestic industries to compete with foreign monopolies.

Mr. Callaway's compelling arguments underscore why it is essential for Congress to pass legislation now which will result in fair and reasonable regulation of textile and apparel imports.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House and in the other body this outstanding and most timely article by Mr. Ely Callaway, a man who is dedicated to preserving those principles that made this country great and a man who is completely devoted to all the people who are a part of Burlington Industries:

U.S. TRADE POLICY

(By Ely Callaway)

One of the hard facts of business, no less than of life, is the fact of change. This is surely true of the vast and diversified textile business, which last year turned out some $21-billion worth of products to the ultimate benefit of the American consumer.

Certainly, the United States textile business qualifies as one of the dynamic industries. It is a huge manufacturing, marketing and distribution complex involving more than 600 competitive companies and 6,000 plants. Together with its major customers (the United States apparel industry) and its major suppliers (the fiber producers) it constitutes the largest aggregate manufacturing employer in the country—accounting for nearly 2.5 million jobs.

In its products and its attitudes, the American textile industry has been changing to reflect the changes in the social and psychological attitudes with the nation. In the process, it has been making its products among the best bargains available anywhere. Textile mill products are still being sold to our customers at wholesale prices that are far closer to the base period wholesale price index of 1957–59 than practically any other manufactured items produced in the United States.

This is being accomplished despite the fact that cotton textile imports into the United States have been limited by quota agreement with some 30 other nations for the last eight years. This experience contradicts the free traders' claims that quotas inevitably harm the consumer by causing prices to go sky high. It belies their fears that any move that gives even a reasonable degree of protection to American industry will surely bring on wrath and retaliation by foreign competitors.

Inasmuch as Japan is no longer an underdeveloped nation, I will cite Japan in illustrating why the United States textile industry is convinced that a fundamental change in our international trade policy is needed.

As everyone knows, Japan starts with one great advantage in the matter of wages and other costs. Indeed, the hourly wages and fringe benefits in American textile plants are some five times higher than the equivalent paid to textile workers in Japan. But in considering international trade policy, other factors, I believe, are far more important. For example:

Under the Japanese setup of close political-economic cooperation, they have developed various ways and means of prohibiting the import of disruptive quantities of any type of products from the United States and elsewhere. In other words, Japan protects its own industries against excessive imports.

The Japanese Government makes it almost impossible for an American company to own more than 50 per cent of any company in Japan, even under a joint venture arrangement. Japanese companies need no special approval from any United States Government or state agency in order to own 100 per cent of a company in America. All they need is the money and stockholder approval.

Japan produces excellent textile products and exports them to the United States market at low prices—often at little or no profit. Under their extremely complex international trading rules, this is apparently satisfactory to the Japanese—in view of the over-all Japanese goal.

Prices for Japanese textiles in the United States market are generally lower than prices for comparable textiles sold and consumed by their own people in Japan. In view of recent rulings by the United States Tariff Commission concerning the dumping of Japanese television sets and radios in the American market, it seems that we in textiles are not alone.

The practices described above are the result of a unique system of cooperation and inter-relatedness that exists among the Japanese Government and their industries, their trading companies and their financial institutions. They are all working together in reasonable harmony with understanding and with great effectiveness toward one common goal—i.e., to make "Japan, Inc.," the number one economic power in the world.

The workers in the textile industry in Japan share this ambition. They are intelligent, skilled, diligent, loyal and industrious. They are generally working hard to achieve the same goal that their company managements and their Government are trying to achieve. They all want Japan to be the world's strongest economic power. (In the United States is management and labor generally working together as a team and with such dedication toward any one goal as are the Japanese?)

Anyone who has tried to compete with this truly remarkable system understands that nothing like this exists in the United States, and probably never will. As a final example, the Japanese system encourages monopolies among large industrial and other business organizations in Japan. United States antitrust laws prohibit monopolies. And yet we are expected to be able to compete against foreign monopolies. Where is the logic in that?

As one who has personally been in direct competition with the Japanese in a major way for 12 years, I can say that they are extraordinarily able businessmen. With this in mind I state my personal point of view, which is:

The United States industrial community as a whole is fast losing its position as front runner in the international trade race in spite of the fact that we were almost at the finish line and were practically the only ones in the race 25 years ago.

American industries' investments abroad —no matter how successful financially—do not contribute importantly to the high level of employment we must maintain within the United States if we are to absorb the bulk of our own output from farm and industry.

Only a major change in United States trade policy will enable American industry as a whole to stay ahead in this contest—a contest that really is a race for economic survival and is therefore vital to every American's personal and national well-being.

The Japanese have already taken large segments of the United States market—not only for textiles and apparel, but for shipbuilding, specialty and other steels, cameras, television sets, radios, calculators, electronic devices of many types, and other products generally classified as "high technology."

These high technology areas are the very ones in which American ingenuity allowed us to prosper and dominate until recent years. I forecast that the Japanese will fully capitalize on the advantages in their system as they move to capture major portions of the United States markets for automobiles, aircraft and other equally high technology products.

Fortunately, Congress appears to be far ahead of some of our other branches of government and ahead of many leading American businessmen in recognizing the need for change. Hardly anyone thinks there is a realistic chance that the United States will adopt the Japanese system I have attemped to describe. That's why we in the textile industry feel that the Trade Bill recently introduced in Congress by the Ways and Means Committee chairman, Wilbur Mills, does provide for the needed changes in our trade policy.

That bill would allow Japanese textiles and apparel (and like items from all other currenty exporting nations) to continue to enter our market in huge quantities—and to continue to share in any growth in our markets here.

This principle is fair and reasonable to all concerned. But the bill does, by quantitative limitation, prevent imports—from any source—from gaining further excessive domination of United States markets in the future. It will provide a reasonable degree of protection against excessive domination of any United States market by any foreign nation that might have developed a system giving that nation most of the advantages over the United States in the international trade race.

ROASTING MARSHMALLOWS

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to read this morning about the political blasts directed by Senator DOLE at Senator MUSKIE and former Attorney General Ramsey Clark. Senator DOLE, who used to be a lawyer and is now chairman of the Republican National Committee, shot his mud over a lot of people in one speech. I am certain that presidential candidates can take care of themselves in the face of cheap shots like Senator DOLE's, but the jury is at least theoretically still out on the Berrigan case. As a lawyer, I would like to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the Republican National Committee could respect the fundamental proposition that in a free democratic society, even those indicted by the present administration, are entitled to counsel of their choice and that a lawyer worthy of the title responds to such requests. Senator DOLE's flippant criticism of Ramsey Clark because of his willingness to provide legal counsel to certain defendants in a criminal case shows utter insensitivity to the fundamental tenets of the Constitution and of American democracy. It would be nice if the Republican national chairman could find something else to sharpen his ax on besides our system of justice.

THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's outstanding organizations is celebrating its 52d anniversary on Monday, March 15, 1971. I am speaking of the American Legion, which was founded in Paris, France, at the historic caucus of delegates from the First American Expeditionary Force on March 15, 1919. They dedicated their organization to God and country, and the American Legion has honored this dedication ever since that day.

In its brief history the American Legion has served admirably as the champion of the veterans of our wars, and has served just as admirably the best interests of the Nation as a whole. It pioneered in obtaining deserved rehabilitation assistance for those who suffered physical disabilities in military service. It led the fight for deserved assistance to widows, orphans, and dependents of those who

gave their lives in military service. It obtained increased educational and training opportunities for veterans with its sponsorship of the GI bill of rights and the Korean GI bill. And, of course, the American Legion played a prominent role in the creation of the Veterans' Administration in 1930. The American Legion last year spent $10 million alone for its child welfare program, and its youth training program is one of the Nation's largest, including junior baseball, sponsorship of Boy Scout troops, Boys State, and Boys National Government.

These are wonderful examples of the actions taken by the American Legion to meet the challenge of its heritage—a heritage we must all cherish and which we must carry into the future by vigorous and selfless service at the community, State, and national level.

The largest veterans organization in the United States with about 3 million Legionnaires, the American Legion has enjoyed a consistent record of dedication to, and pursuit of, the American ideal. Its continuing goal has been to keep America always American. It is, therefore, fitting to take this opportunity to congratulate the American Legion on its impressive record of achievement, dedication, and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, no greater compliment can be paid, I think, than to state that the American Legion has lived up to the high standards it set for itself 52 years ago. I join with the Legion's many friends all over the world in offering my sincerest congratulations on the anniversary of its founding and on the outstanding record it has established.

THE AMERICAN SST—FACT, NOT FANTASY

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, as this historic debate continues on the American SST, I believe that each Member of Congress and each American citizen should be presented the facts which surround this program. It is for this purpose that I address the House today.

THE ATTACK ON THE SST

As you know, there have been charges that the SST will blot out the sun, melt the polar ice caps, cause skin cancer, and disturb animal life. The hearings have shown these charges to be unwarranted. To the contrary, the development of two prototypes—which is all that we are discussing on the House floor today—will allow the Department of Transportation to conduct the necessary research to determine whether any environmental harm may possibly occur and to develop means of eliminating any such damage. The scientists testifying stated there were no facts to establish any of the charges that have been made but they would continue a full-scale research program on all of the environmental aspects.

Mr. Speaker, some of the hysteria which has surrounded this debate reminds me of a similar outcry which occurred in this great Nation's past. I think Members will find it interesting to note that Martin Van Buren, when Governor of New York, stated in a letter to President Andrew Jackson in 1829:

> As you well know, Mr. President, railroad carriages are pulled at the enormous speed of 15 miles per hour by engines which in addition to endangering life and limb of passengers, roar and snort their way through the countryside, setting fire to the crops, scaring the livestock, and frightening women and children. The Almighty never intended that people should travel at such breakneck speed.

Congress and the administration, labor, and industry, have worked long, hard hours to keep the SST program going, with the congressional delegation from the State of Washington being in the forefront of the struggle. For my part, I have worked with all the interested parties in summoning support for continuation of the program. As the Northwest's representative on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House and as a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, I have also introduced legislation to prohibit flight over the United States at supersonic speeds in order to reassure those who are concerned about possible noise pollution. Senator MAGNUSON has introduced this legislation on the Senate side.

THE SST IS NOT A FANTASY

The supersonic transport is neither a fantasy nor a thing of the distant future. It is an aircraft which is here now. Two different supersonic transports have already been built: The TU–144, which is Russia's bid for the world's commercial airline market; and the Anglo-French Concorde, two prototypes of which have already flown at speeds of mach 2. These test flights have built a solid technical basis for production. My information indicates that this summer the major airlines and manufacturers will begin to work out details concerning fares, daily utilization, and design features for passenger appeal. The Russians have already announced flights from Moscow to India and Moscow to points east in Russia for October 1971. Advertisements for the TU-144 are already running in American trade journals.

PRODUCTIVITY

There is no question that the SST will be the most productive aircraft ever built. The most recent information presented by the hearings before the Appropriation Committee this month indicates the U.S. SST will be: first, three times as productive as the Concorde and the jumbo trijet; second, almost twice as productive as the 747; third, four times as productive as the 707; and fourth, 16 times as productive as the DC–6. New productivity levels will provide the basis for the airlines to accommodate the normal travel growth requirements coincident with attractive service, maintain a reasonable financial return in spite of cost escalation, provide the traveling public with reasonable fares, and maintain reasonable worldwide civil air transport fleet sizes. The operation of a single aircraft, which will do more work per unit of cost, will result in a more solid financial base for the airline industry as a whole. It will take fewer planes to meet the air travel demands which will reduce the amount of air congestion, air pollution, and the resulting side effects.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

In response to environmental skepticism about the program, I think it is most significant that the Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, William D. Ruckelshaus, have both assured Congress that should sonic boom, radiation, water vapor or other dangers be caused by the SST, they will use all means available to stop further development of that aircraft.

We cannot, of course, answer every scientific speculation on what effect large-scale operations by supersonic aircraft will have on the environment in the far-distant future. But we can say that most scientific information to date indicates no reason to halt or delay work on the U.S. SST prototype program. A report of the MIT-sponsored study of critical environmental problems, for example, indicated that the additional carbon dioxide from SST operations will cause no problem, that predicted ozone changes would be insignificant, and that the role of quantities of particulates in altering the heat budget is very small. Because of the foreign-built SST it will be necessary to carefully monitor these factors from now on. The American SST prototype program will allow us to do this.

NOISE PROBLEM

With respect to noise, the SST will be quieter over the community than the typical jet and will, in fact, have a noise level within the limits of the FAA 108 equivalent decibel rule for subsonic jets. The approach noise of the SST will be lower than the present 707 and DC–8 jets. Sonic boom will not be a problem because the proposed Federal air regulation which will be in effect within the next 90 days specifically prohibits flights over the United States at speeds that would create a boom on the ground. Flights over land, I might add, are not considered necessary in order for SST operations to be profitable. And as I mentioned previously, in order to provide maximum assurances that the SST will not cause noise pollution in our environment, I have introduced a bill to prohibit supersonic flight over the United States.

The boom effects that have broken windows or been unpleasant in other aspects have resulted from fighters breaking the sound barrier at low altitudes with a resulting increase in pressure of 40 to 60 pounds per square inch. The SST would not do this. At climb rates it only increases the pressure 4 pounds per square inch and only 2 pounds at cruise rates.

EMPLOYMENT

The effects of the SST program on the employment of Americans is considerable. Presently there are 13,000 people working on the prototype program. During the production phase, the SST program would provide a direct labor force of 50,000 jobs. Through the multiplier factor, the impact more reasonably can

be expected to involve 150,000 jobs in the next 15 years. The combined and cumulative income of the direct and supplemental labor force involved in more than 6,000 companies and plants may well exceed $33 billion by 1990. It is essential that we reverse the sharp downtrend in commercial transport aircraft development and manufacturing employment begun in mid-1968.

Without increased employment stability, the Nation's economic decline will not be halted. The health of the aerospace industry is closely tied to the development of new aircraft.

BALANCE OF TRADE

Mr. Speaker, if the United States fails to build an SST, an adverse effect will be felt in our balance of trade. If, for instance, we suffer a trade imbalance from 200 Concordes imported—worth $7 billion—and lose sales abroad by not building an American SST—a $10.1 billion loss—we are on the short end of this trade balance to the tune of $17.1 billion. If a more airline-economical Concorde II appears, this unfavorable trade impact would grow to $22.1 billion. If a productive family of civil aircraft surrounding the SST continues to be developed abroad, this impact will easily grow to $27.1 billion.

U.S. AIRLINES POSITION

The airline industry has given full support to the SST program. It is the industry's feeling that carriers which do not acquire new technologically advanced aircraft at a time in which its competitors have done so, will suffer a loss of passengers and a serious decline in their share of the market. The airlines strongly prefer to operate American-built supersonic planes for several reasons; first, no other country can produce such reliable and economical aircraft as the United States; second, American manufacturers can support the airline industry through spare parts and engineering service better than can European or other manufacturers; and third, investments by the industry would be pumped into the American economy, stimulating employment and economic growth.

The airline industry is convinced that whether or not an American SST is built, there will be supersonic transports operating on the world's air routes and that the Concorde and the TU–144 will be produced and sold to the airlines of the world. If U.S. carriers fail to protect themselves by buying aircraft with performance, safety, efficiency and service comparable to that equipment used by its competitors, those airlines would be relegated to offering second-class service.

It can hardly be doubted that international competition on the air routes of the world is severe. The foreign carriers which the American industry competes with are financially backed, and in most cases owned, by their governments.

STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, this program is now two-thirds complete. We are nearing our goal of providing two flying prototypes which will verify the technical, economic, and environmental viability of the aircraft. We are now 10 years along the road to completion. The U.S. Government has invested more than $860 million out of a total investment to date of over $1 billion. Private industry has presently invested more than $223 million out of its commitment of $403 million. As Secretary Volpe has stated:

> We have gone too far, invested too much, and are too near our goal to let this all go down the drain with no tangible results.

This is a program which is on schedule, within cost and facing no insurmountable technical problems.

The loss to the Federal Treasury if this program is abruptly canceled would be over $1 billion for nothing instead of $1.3 billion invested in two flying prototypes.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, we are at the crossroads in the history of civil aviation. We can vote to keep pace with the future, to support American technology and know-how, and to sustain the faith that most of us have in the American ability for progress. Or we can vote the American civil aviation industry into permanent secondary status. I urge my colleagues to lend their overwhelming support for the continuation of the SST program.

ONE-THIRD CUT IN URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) and I visited with Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, to discuss the study presently being conducted by the Department on the feasibility of providing Federal assistance to help defray the operating costs of mass transit companies in urban areas. This study was mandated by the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970. The Secretary told us that he expects to have preliminary data on this subject in June with the report ready by October, as requested by the Congress.

During the course of the meeting we asked Secretary Volpe about the reports that came from the Senate last week that the President is cutting back Federal commitments for mass transit capital programs in fiscal year 1971 by $200 million from the $600 million authorized by Congress to $400 million. Secretary Volpe confirmed that this is true. While stating that this was part of the President's efforts to hold down Federal spending, he tried to suggest that the President's action really did not make much difference to mass transit interests because the Urban Mass Transportation Administration would not have more than $400 million worth of applications ready for commitment this year.

The Secretary's confirmation of a one-third cut in the Nation's mass transit program this year distressed me greatly, while his suggestion that no more than $400 million worth of commitments could be made any way puzzled me as I recalled that last year UMTA Administrator Carlos Villarreal had come before the House Appropriations Committee and testified that his Administration, as of April 1970, had applications pending which totaled more than $1 billion. Furthermore, Administrator Villarreal told the Senate Appropriations Committee that his office was in a position to obligate approximately $850 million for capital construction programs in fiscal year 1971.

Today I learned that UMTA now has applications pending which total $2.7 billion—and of course this makes it all the more difficult to understand how the Administration should not be in a position to make commitments in excess of $400 million. Some of the major applications now pending include:

First, $1.2 billion for the New York metropolitan area—this is the total of a number of grant applications;

Second, $544 million for Chicago;

Third, $373 million for Boston;

Fourth, $150 million for Philadelphia;

Fifth, $105 million for the Delaware Port Authority;

Sixth, $99 million for San Francisco;

Seventh, $58 million for New Jersey; and

Eighth, $13 million for Los Angeles.

It is true that some of these applications have been submitted in the last 6 months, but some, such as Chicago's, have been pending since mid-1969. And, it is important to note, that even in the cases of recently submitted applications, the projects have been planned for years and in most cases are long overdue in realization. Many cities are ready to go ahead with construction, but are being held back because of the lack of Government funds.

The Nation's mass transportation budget is small enough without further cutbacks by the President. Estimates prepared for UMTA place the mass transportation capital requirements for this decade at between $28 and $34 billion. For too long the Federal Government has ignored the needs of public transportation and as a result most all mass transit systems have been undermined by a vicious cycle of declining transit patronage and declining profits. During the past two decades this has resulted in a two-thirds reduction in transit patronage, and it has meant that most transit systems today are relying on equipment that is 30 years old.

The Federal Government has poured tremendous sums into highway construction—over $50 billion—but barely a billion dollars into mass transit construction.

We are far behind in meeting the transit needs of our cities, large and small. It is urgent that we get on with the construction and modernization programs that will deliver efficient and safe transportation for the men and women who need to get to work and back home again in a reasonable amount of time. We should be redoubling our efforts in this field, not reducing them. I hope that the President will reconsider his posi-

tion on this matter and permit his loyal and good Secretary of Transportation to press UMTA to move on and make commitments to the full $600 million authorized by Congress.

BEGINNING OF PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, now that a certain national party chairman has told us where the Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE began his presidential campaign, I wonder if that chairman would care to say where President Nixon began his presidential campaign in 1960.

"TODAY" LASTS 10,000 HOURS

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, while shaving and dressing this morning, I was giving indirect attention to NBC's "Today" program on television. If a recent survey is reasonably reliable, as many as 280 of my Housse colleagues may also have been watching—for the survey showed that 65 percent of us see at least a part of it each day.

My point in mentioning the "Today" show is that it marked a major milestone this morning, by logging its 10,000th hour on the air. This is network television's longest running weekday program—and its most influential one, according to a Wall Street Journal article earlier in the week.

At 2 hours a day, I wondered how long it would take to reach that 10,000th hour. The answer is 19 years. We Congressmen and other decisionmaking personnel in Government constitute only a sliver of "Today's" audience of 7 million.

Almost daily, this early morning program offers a timely interview from Washington. In this and other ways, it has come to serve as a catalyst in history. Not infrequently, statements made by guests of "Today" have caused a chain of events that has improved the condition of American life.

A report by the noted conservationist, Roger Caras, spurred the Maine Legislature into outlawing the cruel practice, followed by some hunters, of caging bears before shooting them down. In addition, "Today's" own "reporter at large," Paul Cunningham, has been a mover and shaker in his own right, with notable series on mental retardation, mine safety and the threat once posed by airport developers to the Florida Everglades.

The program, by its impartial and thorough coverage of developments in the United States and abroad, has crystallized opinion on many important issues. "Today" has become well known for its exclusive interviews with government leaders and others prominent in our national life. Its lengthy and growing list of "firsts" has included such television coups as the first live color television picture from inside Buckingham Palace which was transmitted by satellite during President Nixon's visit with the British royal family.

"Today" has examined in depth many controversial and complex problems, among them birth control, abortions, pollution. It devoted a full week's study—five 2-hour programs—to man and his environment. The ideas and opinions presented on "Today" have ranged over the entire political and social spectra. Through its flexible format, "Today" is able to cover a wide variety of subjects—national and foreign news, weather, science, education, fine arts, music, literature, theater, fashions, sports, and travel. No other program on television has presented so many aspects of our world in such an illuminating and entertaining way.

For these reasons, I believe, we should honor the "Today" show as an example of the very finest in television programming, a program which clearly deserves the high critical and audience acclaim it continually receives.

NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to help preserve sections of the Au Sable and Manistee Rivers in the State of Michigan. This legislation designates these rivers as potential additions to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Under this act certain of the Nation's rivers are selected for preservation in their free-flowing condition so as to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill vital national conservation purposes.

These rivers and their tributaries possess outstanding scenic and recreational values which must be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.

Those of us who have had an opportunity to travel or live in northern Michigan know not only of the beauty of these streams but also the value these wild rivers give the area. I believe the deep feeling we have for these rivers can best be explained or described by Henry Stephen, a pioneer whose memories were recalled in "The Old Au Sable" by Hazen Miller:

> I have no great desire to catch a lot of trout now, being satisfied if I get a few to eat and being out fishing, enjoying wildlife and the peacefulness of it all. When the time comes for me . . . I would like to have a resting place on the bank of the beautiful beloved Au Sable.

It would be a disaster to see these streams destroyed by commercial pollutants. This, however, may be the case. The forested land along the rivers will be cleared and in its place will appear concrete structures. Leases have already been let and large parcels have been sold off for private development. If this continues these streams will lose their natural attractiveness and scenic beauty for which they are known. Action to protect this area is absolutely essential.

The State of Michigan has responded to the call for action. Last fall Michigan enacted its own wild rivers protection law, carefully written to coordinate well with the features of the national law. The bill I introduce today does not conflict with State plans. The study it orders will be a cooperative one, involving State, local, and citizen interests as well as the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the U.S. Forest Service, which administers large national forests near these two rivers. The bill I am introducing has the support of Michigan's Department of Natural Resources.

We in this Chamber have the authority, the methods by which, and the standards according to which, additional components may be added to this National Rivers System. I firmly believe that the Manistee and Au Sable Rivers should be included and as a result preserved for the enjoyment of generations.

REINSTATEMENT OF 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged to note in this morning's newsstories that Chairman Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve Board has urged the reinstatement of the 7-percent investment tax credit which was repealed by the Tax Reform Act of 1969. I share his view that more must be done to spur economic activity throughout the country.

Along these lines, I further feel that we should also be making additional affirmative efforts to help the small business community of our country. For the small businessman, dollars to finance expansion must either come from after-tax profits, which have been squeezed, or from borrowing, which has been either too expensive or not available at all. In an effort to help meet this problem, I want to remind my colleagues that earlier this year I introduced legislation calling for a so-called plowback allowance which would permit a business to deduct 20 percent of its taxable earnings, up to $40,000, when such funds are reinvested in the business. I am gratified that to date, some 34 Members have joined in sponsoring this bill, H.R. 3489.

Small businesses are the backbone of our economy. There is not a city or town across the country that is not vitally affected by their prosperity or decline. I am satisfied that they need this investment capability in order to help do their part to bring about the administration's goal of full employment, and I again urge that all of the legislative suggestions introduced to help stimulate our economy have the careful scrutiny of this Congress.

INCREASED SUPPORT PRICE ON MILK

(Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I reaffirm the sentiments I expressed to Secretary Hardin as early as February 1, when I urged him to increase the support price on milk to 90 percent of parity—the highest permitted by law.

I emphasize it is reasonable and fully warranted to raise parity to 90 percent. The consumer price index stood at 135 for the first 9 months of 1970, using 1957–59 as base years. Yet, the price index of fluid milk sold in the grocery store was 126.6. Not only did the price of milk rise far less than did the average increase of all goods and services, but it was also substantially below that of foods in general.

Even though milk prices have remained low in comparison to other goods, the dairyman's expenses have not. Farm wage rates in 1970 were nearly 7 percent above 1969; farm machinery and equipment costs were 6 percent higher last year than the one preceding; State and local taxes on farm real estate were up 11 percent in 1969 over 1968; in 1970, interest cost on real estate debt rose 7 percent, while interest cost on nonreal estate debt rose 18 percent; and the milk feed price ratio in January 1971 reached its lowest level since January 1968.

The situation would be different if the dairyman were in a better position than his urban counterpart. According to the latest available statistics, however, the average farmer has only 77 percent of the disposable income of nonfarmers. In addition, this fact does not take into consideration the farmer's longer working hours and greater investment.

Mr. Speaker, dairymen have lower incomes, lower prices for their products, and equally as great, if not a greater rise in expenses than the average American. While dairy farmers remember and appreciate Secretary Hardin's action last year when he increased parity to 85 percent, they are justified in hoping he will increase parity to 90 percent in 1971.

MR. ARENDS' SPEECH ON NATIONAL SECURITY

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) was awarded the most coveted honor bestowed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Congressional Award.

Mr. ARENDS is highly deserving.

The VFW should be highly commended for their choice.

Every American can be proud of the record of Mr. ARENDS. Every American and every citizen of the free world should be grateful for his selfless, sustained service to our Nation, to the concept of freedom and to the Congress.

Commander in Chief H. R. Rainwater, of my home State of California, one of the greatest commanders in chief in the long and distinguished history of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, made the following introduction of Mr. ARENDS in the presentation of the Congressional Award:

Tonight we are gathered in our nation's capital to pay homage to one of America's most respected leaders. We honor a man who has unselfishly dedicated his life to our country from the moment he was first elected to Congress during the dark days of the Great Depression nearly two score years ago.

We honor a man whose personal integrity has always been above reproach—a man who has been ever willing to listen to the plea for help and to lend a helping hand—a man who sincerely believes that being a member of Congress is being able to do things for his fellow man.

We honor a man who has been a confidant of America's great Presidents from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Richard Nixon. A man whose counsel has always been relied on for its depth of wisdom based on fact and logic—a man who is considered to be one of the most popular and well-liked members of Congress.

The gentleman we honor tonight, Les Arends, from the great state of Illinois—"the land of Abe Lincoln"—is a great American in the finest sense of that phrase. He believes in service to the nation, in our country's veterans—each and every one—and in a strong America. These are just some of the multitude of reasons that Congressman Arends is considered one of the most able and persuasive leaders of our time.

As Republican Party Whip, Les Arends is charged with making sure his party has all its votes on the floor when necessary. He was first picked by his colleagues for the honor of "Whip" in 1943, and has served in that position longer than anyone in history, on either the Democratic or Republican side of the aisle.

In this crucial position he plays a key role in the determination of party policy and strategy on various measures coming before the House of Representatives.

Friendship for the man we honor is not confined to one side of the political aisle, however, for he has just as many warm boosters on the Democratic side.

Today, only three men in the entire House of Representatives outrank him in years of service. Congressman Arends is the ranking Republican member of the important House Ethics Committee and the member with the most service on the House Armed Services Committee. As a Navy veteran, he is a stanch supporter of the men and women in our armed forces. And he realizes full well that our nation must remain strong if we are to remain a free people.

It has been said of Les Arends that he is as much a part of the House of Representatives as the statue of Freedom atop the Capitol dome. Tonight, with friendship, humility and heartfelt appreciation from all of us, it is my privilege to present the Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award to Congressman Leslie Arends for his outstanding service to our Nation.

Every American should read the acceptance speech of Mr. ARENDS. He has served longer than any other person on the Committee on Armed Services. He is more knowledgeable than any Member, perhaps any person, in matters of the security of our Nation.

The full text of the speech of the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS of Illinois follows:

It is a real privilege for me to be here with you this evening.

First of all, I should like to offer my personal congratulations, not only to the winners, but to all the fine young men and women who participated in the V.F.W. National Essay Contest. I hope you will pardon my boast when I take the liberty to point out that the essay winner of the State of Illinois, Miss Bailey, is a young lady from my Congressional District.

I am proud, very proud, to have been selected by your great and splendid organization to be the recipient of this coveted Congressional Award.

When I consider the contribution which you Veterans of Foreign Wars have made to the preservation and promulgation of our American ideals, and when I reflect on the outstanding contribution made by those who have previously received this recognition, I feel very humble, very humble indeed. I would that I could be as worthy.

In my many years of service in the Congress no honor has come to me that is more meaningful than the honor you bestow this evening.

When I first came to Congress I was assigned to the House Military Affairs Committee and, of course, have served on the Armed Services Committee since it was first established in 1948, with the unification of the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committee. I have the distinction, if indeed it is a distinction, considering that I am not the Chairman, to have served longer on the Armed Services Committee than any member of it.

When I learned that I was to be the recipient of this award, I called our Committee Chairman, the Honorable F. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana, to tell him the good news. Perhaps, I was subtly reminding him of my seniority. Perhaps I wanted to impress him with the fact that although in the minority we Republicans do, upon occasion, receive some recognition.

He congratulated me and said, "Now, Les, in accepting an award as important as this from an organization as important as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, you cannot make the standard politician's bullfight speech." For those of you who are not familiar with it, that is a speech which, like a bullfight, lasts approximately one-half hour and contains only a moment of truth.

I told him my remarks this evening would be substantially less than a half hour, that what I had to say would be the truth, and that I did not intend to make even a nonpartisan Republican speech.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have always been proud of the non-partisan manner in which our Committee has dealt with all matters pertaining to our national defense. When our Committee held its first organization meeting in this new Congress, Congressman Hébert—who succeeded the late Mendel Rivers as Chairman—emphasized in his opening statement that this was one policy he wanted to see continued. I am sure it will be.

As a member of my political party's leadership in the House of Representatives, I have always been proud of the non-partisanship with which the House, as a whole, has approached national security problems.

We used to have a fine old tradition in this country known as a bipartisan foreign policy. You may recall that as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the 80th Congress, the late Senator Arthur Vandenburg of Michigan, furnished the leadership for a bipartisan foreign policy during the Truman Administration. And this was during the period of the none too popular Korean "police action" as it was then characterized.

It is quite true that we who serve in the Congress, particularly in the United States Senate, have a responsibility in connection with the conduct of foreign relations and in the prosecution of a war. But under our Con-

stitution the President of the United States has *primary* responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations, and he is Commander-in-chief of all our armed forces. It is imperative that we give him our maximum possible support, and particularly during a period of international stresses and strains and conflict.

That does not mean we should "rubber stamp" whatever our President or any President proposes or undertakes. Bipartisanship does not mean that our voices of disagreement be silent. But let them be voices of restraint, not voices of opposition for opposition's sake.

At no time should partisan considerations enter into our decisions with respect to foreign policy or with respect to our national defense posture. One implements and supplements the other. Both pertain to our national security and to the preservation of freedom and to the maintenance of peace.

While our Constitution vests in the President primary responsibility for the formulation of foreign policy and designates him Commander-in-Chief of our armed forces, the Constitution vests in the Congress the primary responsibility for determining the size and the nature of our armed forces. It goes without saying that our national security—our safety as a free people—requires that there be maximum cooperation between the Congress and the President, whoever is our President and whatever the political complexion of the Congress.

In his recent "State of the World Report" President Nixon said: "It is essential that the United States maintain a military force sufficient to protect our interests and meet our commitments. Were we to do less, there would be no chance of creating a stable world structure."

The measure of sufficiency is not the number of dollars we annually spend on our defense establishment. The size and nature of our national defense is necessarily dictated by the nature of the world in which we live, by the threat and the potential threat we face. Our objective is to deter war, not to make war. We do not seek to impose our will on any people anywhere.

Had the conquest of territory and the subjugation of people been our objective we could readily have achieved it at the end of World War II, when we had in being the mightiest military and naval force in all the world and we were the sole possessors of the atom bomb.

Instead, we initiated the Marshall Plan to assist countries left prostrate from the ravages of war. This in itself belies the oft-repeated propaganda charge of United States imperialism.

The size and nature of our national defense is also dictated by our treaty commitments and by what our allies contribute to our mutual security. In my judgment we have been over-committed. Our interests should shape our commitments, not the other way around. We cannot police the world, and we do not seek to maintain a huge defense establishment for any such purpose.

There is no question but that our national defense budget for the current fiscal year is a very substantial sum—$71.8 billion—$76 billion if we include military assistance. Without question military spending places a heavy tax burden on all of our citizens. But I am confident the vast majority of the American taxpayers are willing to bear this burden as long as it is necessary for our country's security and provided we get a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar expended.

In the Congress, and particularly in the Senate, which incidentally is 750 feet and often one million light-years from the House of Representatives, voices are raised almost daily calling for more and more reductions in our defense budget. Over and over again we hear the quotation from President Eisenhower's Farewell Address when he said we must guard against any unwarranted influence by a military-industrial complex.

They seek to leave the impression that a great amount of this defense spending is due to the insidious influence of the military-industrial complex, whatever that is. They ignore that in the same address Eisenhower warned against other pressure groups. They conveniently ignore that in the same Farewell speech the late President Eisenhower said: "A vital element in keeping the peace is our Military Establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction".

Those who trumpet so loudly about the size of our defense budget, using the myth of a military-industrial complex as a scapegoat, invariably call for a reordering of our priorities that there may be an increase in spending on social programs. There is no denying that there is an increased need for some of our social problems—in the area of education, housing, health, environment and all such. I have and shall continue to support the President's programs to meet these human needs. But it does not follow that the way to meet these needs is to proceed to disarm unilaterally.

Insofar as the argument with respect to budget priorities is concerned, what program is entitled to a higher priority than our national security? In my judgment this hue and cry about reordering priorities is nothing more than a smoke screen to justify increased spending on programs that are thought to be politically popular.

There has already been a reordering of priorities. For fiscal years 1969, 1970 and 1971 there has been an average annual decrease of around $2 billion in military spending. And during this same period spending on nonmilitary programs—Federal, state and local—there has been an average annual increase of $23 billion.

For the first time in 20 years, the Federal Government will have spent in this fiscal year more to meet human needs than spent on our national defense. In our 1972 budget defense spending will amount to 34 percent of the total spending, and the outlays for human resources programs will amount to 42 percent of total spending in the next fiscal year.

In the 1972 budget it is proposed that we spend $76 billion for our military and military assistance programs. That is a tremendous sum. Understandably, the average citizen registers "shock" when he hears the figure—$76 billion. That is why our social planners persist in emphasizing the dollar amount.

But what the average citizen does not know is that it is less than outlayed for social programs, that it is less on a percentage basis than in any year since 1950, and that is less than we actually should spend if we are to continue to have a national defense second to none.

Bear in mind that not only has there been a decrease in the number of dollars spent for defense, there has been a decrease in what these dollars will buy. Like everything else, a ship, an airplane, a tank and every one of our costly weapons systems costs more today than they did two or three years ago.

And, as is always true in an inflationary period, personnel costs have greatly increased. The average citizen does not realize that over one-half of our total defense budget represents personnel costs.

And these costs will become substantially higher if we proceed, as proposed, to phase out the draft and establish an all-volunteer force. Right now this is being considered by our Armed Services Committee.

I am not an alarmist. And I do not think there is any reason to be alarmed as to our present security. But I must frankly say that I am concerned, deeply concerned, as we look to the future.

While Soviet Russia continues to increase its defense spending, we have been in the process of substantially reducing ours. While Russia continues to build up her Navy, we have been allowing ours to stagnate. That Soviet Russia has had a number of naval ships in the Mediterranean, in the Indian Ocean, and in the Caribbean is not without significance. Their navy is impressive, not only in numbers but in quality.

Most ominous, as we look to the future, is the Soviet drive for technological superiority. It is estimated that they are spending 40 to 50 percent more on military research and development than we are—a difference of around $3 billion a year.

In nuclear power the Soviets are not only developing large warheads, much larger than any in our arsenal, but have been increasing the number and accuracy of their intercontinental missile delivery system at an awesome rate. They have built up their strategic forces to the point where they have achieved nuclear parity and have continued costly missile development in a determination to achieve superiority.

We simply cannot let Soviet Russia control the seas. We simply cannot let the Russians move into a position of strategic superiority. Our strategic offense forces are not only the principal deterrent to global war, they are the principal deterrent to the kind of nuclear blackmail that a superior Soviet Russia could carry out—nuclear blackmail which would endanger freedom in our own country and destroy it in other parts of the world.

The security situation that confronts us today is decidedly different from what faced us before World War I and World War II. We will no longer have the time, as we did then, to delay an adversary long enough to produce the weapons and to train the men. All our defense planning must look not only to the realities of the present but to the grave potentials of the future.

You who have defended our country in foreign wars, as individuals and as an organization, have always recognized that the realities of national defense require some thing more than the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot. It requires men of all seasons. And we now seem to be in the winter of discontent insofar as our national defense is concerned.

Our objective is not to make war but to deter it. Our objective is to keep the peace. To achieve this objective we must at all times have a national defense second to none—a defense that is well-balanced—one that is sufficiently strong and sufficiently flexible to meet any threat to our security, whenever and wherever it may arise.

I urge you who have fought in past wars, to fight for a level of preparedness that will prevent wars. I urge you to heed the admonition of your comrades who lie in Flanders fields around the globe: "To you from failing hands we throw the torch; Be it yours to hold it high."

The safety of our country, and our cherished right to be free, is at stake. What we do today will determine our tomorrow.

HELP FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would free older workers from the burden of paying social security payroll taxes. This bill would provide a full exemption—

through a credit or refund—from the social security employees' tax for individuals 65 years of age and over. An equivalent exemption would be provided for senior citizens who are self-employed.

I firmly believe the enactment of such legislation to be greatly needed in order to correct a grave inequity in our Nation's social security program toward those individuals who continue to work—either full or part time—after they reach retirement age. For too long now, our social security laws have hit these senior citizens from two directions. The retirement test reduces their social security benefits according to their earnings at the very time they are required to contribute to the social security system from these same earnings. This is a particularly tragic situation for those many persons continuing to work past age 65 and paying into the social security system who are prevented from drawing any social security benefits because of the retirement test.

Under the bill which I am introducing today, individuals who continue to work past age 65 would still have the social security tax withheld from their wages by their employer, but they would be entitled to obtain a credit for this amount from their income taxes. Those who do not owe any income tax would be entitled to claim a refund. The employer's share of the social security tax would continue to be paid on their behalf, however, and their post-65 wages in covered employment would continue to be credited for benefit computation purposes. This latter provision would be of particular benefit to those individuals whose benefits may be increased by including earnings in years after they attain age 65.

In addition to the obvious return which we owe to those who have contributed for so long to the social security system, it seems to me that the inflation which bears particularly hard on our Nation's elderly citizens living on limited and often fixed incomes and which has resulted in such great degree from irresponsible government spending imposes an equal moral obligation on us to remove these inequities.

I am greatly encouraged by the fact that the ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable JOHN BYRNES, and others have already introduced identical measures. It is certainly my profound hope that this committee, currently in executive session on social security amendments, will take some action toward correcting this inequity.

HIRSHHORN ART SURVEY: STRIKING AND SURPRISING

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, as one long interested in the collection of contemporary art gathered by Joseph H. Hirshhorn, I was happy to note that the Committee on House Administration report on the activities of the Smithsonian had this to say:

> The Subcommittee recognizes the generosity of Mr. Hirshhorn and the enormous value of his gift, and acknowledges that his gift would greatly enhance the Nation's collection of art.
>
> The only specific recommendation the subcommittee made was that the sculpture garden contained in the original plan not be built on the Mall. I note that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON), has introduced legislation to give this recommendation the force of law so that this matter will receive further study and discussion. But there was no doubt in the subsommittee's mind on the central issue of the immense value to the Nation of this collection.

I am intimately familiar with this collection. When I was a member of the California State Legislature I worked very hard to obtain it for Los Angeles. In this instance, Los Angeles' loss is Washington's gain, and I am happy that by the end of 1972 this great collection will be installed in a free museum open to the millions of Americans who visit Washington each year. I think my colleagues will be interested in an excellent article describing the collection which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on February 23, and I include this article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The writer, Ben Forgey, says of the collection:

> Looking at the Joseph H. Hirshhorn collection of paintings and sculpture is the aesthetic equivalent of getting bowled over by a bulldozer.

And

> There is so much, and so much that is absolutely first rate, that you come away almost mesmerized by a brief encounter with the art.

The Nation has every cause to be grateful to Mr. Hirshhorn for his fine act of generosity in giving these works of art to the Nation.

The article follows:

A HIRSHHORN ART SURVEY: STRIKING AND SURPRISING

(By Benjamin Forgey)

NEW YORK.—Looking at the Joseph H. Hirshhorn collection of painting and sculpture is the aesthetic equivalent of getting bowled over by a bulldozer.

You forget all the things you've heard about gaps in the collection, about the collector's buckshot-buying habits, about storerooms jammed with second-rate works by first-rate artists, and worse.

There is so much, and so much that is absolutely first rate, that you come away almost mesmerized by a brief encounter with the art.

To understate a bit, the conditions for looking at the painting and much of the sculpture are not ideal. More than three quarters of the some 8,000 objects in the collection are stored in dark, little bins located on two floors of a warehouse on West 21st St.

In spite of the willing labors of two Hirshhorn assistants, who pull out paintaings you select more or less at random from the crowded bins, it is a terrible way to look at pictures. The lighting is poor, the space abominable and time fairly short.

Nevertheless, you can get a reasonable idea of what is in store for Washington audiences when the Hirshhorn Museum finally opens its doors sometime in the late fall of 1972. If it opens.

The whole project has been under an increasingly vociferous attack in recent months. Hirshhorn, the 72-year-old rags-to-riches immigrant who grew up in Brooklyn, who made his money mainly on stock speculation and who spent it mainly on art, has been personally vilified as unworthy of being "memoralized" on the Mall.

And several congressmen, irritated with the way the Johnson administration (which initiated the agreement with Hirshhorn) hurried the deal through an apparently unwary legislature four years ago, and belatedly bothered by the placement of the sunken sculpture garden across the grassy center strip of the Mall, are backing a bill to forbid construction of the sculpture garden.

The bill was introduced last month by Rep. Frank Thompson, D-N.J., who is chairman of a House subcommittee that last summer investigated operations of the Smithsonian Institution.

So it seemed a propitious time to visit the warehouse on 21st Street and ride the Penn Central to Hirshhorn's home in Greenwich, Conn., where many of the proudest pieces in the sculpture collection are laid out on the planed top and gentle slopes of a grass- and tree-covered hill.

CHECK OUT REPORTS

My principal interests in making the inspection were two. First, I wanted to see what Washington would lose, if indeed it were to come to that. And second, I wanted to check out reports that the painting collection is eccentric and full of art historical holes, therefore unworthy of its monumental home-to-be on the Mall.

The conclusion I reached on the second question after careful perusal of the long lists of paintings in the collection and after an intensive afternoon of viewing at the warehouse, is that those reports are eccentric and misinformed.

That conclusion is subject to the following reservation: It will take years before scholars and art lovers in general truly can take the measure of the Hirshhorn painting collection. No person, excepting the collector himself and his curator, Abram Lerner, has seen all the paintings in the collection, and the immense job of photographing and cataloguing the works has only just begun.

Be that as it may, roughly 75 percent of the roughly 500 paintings that I saw set off some kind of important personal reaction. They were either great paintings by recognized painters that I already had seen in magazine or catalogue reproduction; really good paintings that I had not seen before, but painted by important artists (this category is by far the largest one); and good paintings by artists previously unknown to me.

There are only a few additional categories: minor works by great artists, worthy of inclusion in any study collection because of the artist's acknowledged accomplishments; minor works by minor artists, still possessing their own charm and occasionally offering pleasant surprises in the form of qualities you did not expect; and uninteresting works by painters whose names I did not know or whose reputations appear to have no real foundation. Among the Hirshhorn paintings that I saw, this last category was decidedly the smallest.

The difficulty really arises when you try to organize your impressions of all this aesthetic wealth into some kind of communicable order, a job made even more complicated by the fact that the paintings are stuffed into the bins in a way that mixes up painters, styles and art-historical periods all over the place.

There were, of course, an odd dozen or so personal highlights, paintings so striking that you carry them around in your head for hours, like breathtaking after-images. The pinnacle of my inspection came when I

reached the recently acquired painting by Piet Mondrian, the 20th century Dutch master. It is a classic Mondrian of the Thirties, a resolutely simplified abstraction of black lines, a blue rectangle, and a yellow rectangle, all on a white ground, a painting that makes you realize what a superb painter Mondrian was, and how high he towers above many hard-edge abstractionists who followed him. It will be, incidentally, the first Mondrian in any Washington art museum.

But zipping back and forth between personal favorites hardly recommends itself as an ordering principle to a viewer who can only hope to sketch the riches of the Hirshhorn paintings. The painting collection as a whole forms an extraordinarily broad and deep survey of American art from the late 19th century to about 1965 (Lerner estimates the collection to be about 75 or 80 percent American).

Hirshhorn continues to buy present-day artists, but I omit the most present-day of these in this sketch because judgment in this area tends to be much less secure. In every case where I mention an artist by name, I saw at least one good example of the work.

To start with one of the acknowledged caches of the collection—its 51 oil paintings by Thomas Eakins, the pace-setting "scientific" realist of the 19th century. This is the most important group of Eakins paintings outside of Philadelphia, and from it I saw two delightful oil sketches and one excellent portrait.

Eakins is the only strictly 19th century painter held in depth, but the scattering of other artists represented tends to fill out the picture: 9 Bierstadt oils, of which I saw one, a typically meticulous western panorama; 4 oils by the genre painter Eastman Johnson, including an important self portrait; 6 Homer paintings, including one important oil and two good watercolors, and 12 paintings by Childe Hassam, who was the leader of a group of American Impressionists out at Old Lyme, Conn.

BEGAN IN 1908

In some ways modern American painting can be said to have begun in 1908 with the first exhibition of a mixed group of painters thereafter known as The Eight, several of whom can be legitmately placed in the "Ash Can School." The Hirshhorn collection contains an in-depth selection of paintings by members of The Eight, including 12 oils by Robert Henri, the oldest painter of the bunch and its acknowledged stylistic and theoretical master. Henri, however, was not the best painter of the group: perhaps John Sloan was. The Hirshhorn collection possesses 9 oil paintings by Sloan, including an excellent version of the famous "McSorley's Bar."

Most authorities agree, however, that modern American painting proper began with a loosely-knit "group" of artists who went to Europe in the first decade of this century and were influenced by the European painters who were revolutionizing the art at the time.

The Hirshhorn collection has a selection of paintings by almost every name you can think of in this group. It has, for example, 19 oils by Marsden Hartley, starting with an excellent Berlin abstraction of 1914–15, and ending with a painting completed in 1943, the year Hartley died. Another example: it owns 7 paintings by Arthur B. Dove—none of the important early abstractions, but a good selection from 1920 to 1940.

The collection does not have a particularly good representation of the American regionalists of the Thirties, but I did see one good, typical example of Thomas Hart Benton's work. The collection is well endowed with American paintings of the thirties, however, particularly those of social realist painters whose art and ideas dominated the scene during the decade of the depression. It has, for example, 18 paintings by William Gropper, 14 by Jack Levine (including the famous "Reception in Miami"), and a whopping 60 paintings by Philip Evergood.

Around 1940, with the influx of European artists into New York, the European modernist mainstream and the American grain began to mingle in such a way as to produce that fecund child, Postwar American Painting. Things, as we all know, haven't been the same since as the United States arrived as the dominant art and political power at about the same time.

The Hirshhorn collection has paintings from these years in plentiful numbers. It has 30 paintings by Arshile Gorky, a key figure in transmitting European expressionism and surrealism into the American idiom. It does not contain a large all-over drip painting by Jackson Pollock, but it does own one of the first, a good one, dated 1943.

FAIR REPRESENTATION

And it contains a fair representation of the "alternative tradition" in abstract expressionism, including nine big paintings by Clyfford Still. Most of these, incidentally, were purchased relatively recently, as Hirshhorn and Lerner continue to buy to fill in where the collection has been relatively weak.

In more recent developments, the collection has a good representation of the works of Robert Rauschenberg and Larry Rivers, two important figures in the reaction to abstract expressionism. In the field generally termed "post painterly abstraction" the collection owns a good selection of works by Frank Stella, Larry Poons and Kenneth Noland, to name three outstanding artists out of many in the collection. It also owns four magnificent (I saw them all) paintings by Morris Louis. Louis and Noland are the only Color Schoolers in the collection, and they appear to be the only "Washington" artists, as well.

The collection is not very deep in Pop Art (and how deep was Pop?), but the look is there, especially in a large panel by James Rosenquist and an outsized triptych by Roy Lichtenstein.

And so it goes. It is, for a personal collection, almost predictable and textbook-like, but it is so big and, paradoxically, so personal, that it is also rich in surprises: 19 paintings by Arthur B. Carles, an important influence on Gorky; 8 oils by Ralston Crawford, a precisionist painter who usually gets ignored behind the more famous Demuth and Sheeler; and more than 300 works by Louis Michel Eilshemius, the dreamy, eccentric New York painter whose work, it has been aptly said, was and is "the grand passion of Hirshhorn's collecting life."

That folks, is only the tip of the iceberg of the painting collection, a ready-made museum of modern American art if there ever was one. I haven't said anything yet about the sculpture, and can think of very little to add to the existing accolades. It is, as practically everybody has said, one of the greatest collections of modern sculpture in the world.

The sculpture collection does for the development of modern sculpture, in general, what the painting collection does in particular for modern American painting. One is reduced to an abbreviated and unordered listing of names, and perhaps, for the moment, that is enough: Daumier, Rodin, Bourdelle, Maillol, Giacometti, Moore, Manzu, Marini, Hepworth, Lipchitz, Calder, Caro, David Smith, Matisse, and—it seems almost vulgar to say this in such company, but here it is—et cetera.

There are some gaps, of course, notably the Futurists and the Constructivists, and there are some surprises. A stunning collection of Benin bronze pieces from Africa, for example, or an even more stunning collection of 2000-year-old stone heads from what is now Saudi Arabia.

The point worth stressing here, it seems, is the lovely setting for many of the bigger pieces, the truly enriching play between nature and art at the Hirshhorn estate in Greenwich. As one viewer ruefully commented, "It'll never look this good again," and that in itself is a comment on architect Gordon Bunshaft's controversial sculpture garon the Mall.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he will kindly advise us as to the legislative program for next week?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished acting minority leader yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the program for the House for the week beginning March 15 is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are no bills.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day. There are no bills.

Wednesday there will be consideration of House joint resolution—we still have to get a number—providing a continuing appropriation for the Department of Transportation, including the SST. On Wednesday we expect to have general debate. There will be no vote because of St. Patrick's Day when many Members will be missing.

Thursday we will continue the Department of Transportation appropriation bill and the SST, to be followed by consideration of House Joint Resolution 223, the constitutional amendment providing for 18-year-old voting in all elections.

Consideration of these measures is subject to rules being granted.

Any further program will be announced later, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished minority whip yielding. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader: Is it planned to have a meeting of the House on both Mondays and Tuesdays even though it is announced there is no business?

Mr. BOGGS. It is planned to have a meeting certainly on Monday. It is conceivable we may not have a meeting on Tuesday.

Mr. HALL. I presume this is necessary in order not to have a concurrent resolution in order to go over. I am not arguing the question of programing or leadership in this early stage when the committees are working, but is there not some way we can make announcements?

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman is asking whether we have to be here on Monday, the answer is "No"; and the same applies to Tuesday.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

WATER QUALITY CONTROL BILLS

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, control and abatement of pollution has become one of the principal priorities of our times. One of the most urgent and crucial environmental problems is that of the pollution of our Nation's water resources.

In his environmental message to the Congress on February 8, 1971, President Nixon announced his intention to submit new measures to strengthen water quality and pollution control programs. He declared:

> We have the technology now to deal with most forms of water pollution. We must make sure that it is used.

As ranking Republican on the Committee on Public Works, I am today introducing four administration-sponsored bills which contain the substance of the President's water pollution control proposals. Joining with me as cosponsors are minority leader GERALD R. FORD and 84 other Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, these are forceful and firm measures which will require adjustments on the part of industry and Government to comply. They are necessary, however, if we are to accomplish the task of preserving our water resources. We are at a critical point in the fight against pollution. Many of the laws now on the books are lengthy and cumbersome. Congress must give comprehensive, affirmative consideration to these bills. Failure on the part of Congress to respond to this challenge will result in alternatives that are totally unacceptable.

A section-by-section analysis of each of these important administration measures follows:

I. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 7 OF THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT RELATING TO STATE PROGRAM GRANTS

Subsection (a) would amend section 7 to increase authorizations for appropriations for purposes of State and interstate water pollution control programs from the present $10 million to $15 million in FY '72, $20 million in FY '73, $25 million in FY '74, and $30 million in FY '75. Not less than $10 million of those sums would be available for the basic State or interstate programs.

Subsection (b) would provide for allotments to the States of sums for purposes of basic State programs. This corresponds to the present section 7(c).

Subsection (c) would provide for the payment to the States of their allotment for purposes of their basic program. This corresponds to the present section 7(d). Clarification is provided in authorizing the use of such funds by a State through participation in an interstate agency.

Subsection (d) provides for the allotment and payment of sums to interstate agencies for purposes of basic interstate agency water pollution control programs. This corresponds to the present section 7(e).

Subsection (e) provides for the components of a basic State or interstate agency basic water pollution control program. These components correspond to those presently recited in section 7(f) of the Act, except that the criteria whereby States determine the priorities for waste treatment facilities projects must be criteria acceptable to the Administrator. The grant program would be changed from a mandatory to a discretionary authority.

Subsection (f) provides for the termination of grant support in the event the plan is inadequately executed or otherwise fails to meet the requirements of section 7. This subsection corresponds to the present section 7(g). It eliminates the public hearing and judicial review now provided in the event of grant termination, and would substitute therefore a conference with the Administrator.

Subsection (g) provides for the determination of the "Federal share" of the grant. This corresponds with the present subsection (h), (i) and (j).

Subsection (h) provides for grants to States and to interstate agencies to develop an improved water pollution control program consisting of five program components. This grant is in addition to the basic program grant.

Subsection (i) authorizes grant bonuses to States or interstate agencies for the achievement of the following program elements: (1) a mandatory permit system, (2) a sewage treatment facilities program, (3) a program of personnel training, (4) a personnel system, including a merit system for classification and competitive salaries, and (5) a planning capability.

Subsection (j) provides for the payment of bonus grants in the amount of 40% of the basic grant for each "improved program" element achieved. If all five elements are achieved a grant in an amount of 250% of the basic grant may be made.

Subsection (k) would authorize the Administrator to make grants, not in excess of 10% of the funds authorized by section 7, to States and interstate agencies for support of exceptional projects dealing with significant water pollution problems.

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 5 of the Act, relating to research and development, by extending authorizations for appropriations for those authorities through FY '72.

Section 3 of the bill would amend section 6 of the Act, relating to the development of technology in the areas of advanced waste treatment, combined sewers and industrial waste treatment, to provide authority to pursue the development of such technology within the Environmental Protection Agency as well as through grants and contracts.

Section 4 of the bill would amend section 23 of the Act to include American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands within the definition of "State" for all purposes of the Act. Those areas would be able to participate in all State programs and activities under the Act.

II. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 8 OF THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT RELATING TO GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TREATMENT WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPABILITIES FOR FUTURE WASTE TREATMENT NEEDS

Section 1 of the bill would amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Subsection 8(a) would authorize Federal grants for the construction of treatment works to prevent the discharge of inadequately treated wastes and for other purposes. Paragraph 8(a)(1) would retain the provisions of the present Act authorizing the Administrator to make grants for treatment works and related reports, plans and specifications. No change would be made in the existing definition of "treatment works" in section 23 of the Act and no change would be made in those eligible to receive grants, which would include States, municipalities, intermunicipal agencies and interstate agencies.

Grant limitations would be listed in paragraph 8(a)(2). There would be some modifications and additions to the grant limitations in the present Act. Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(A) would prohibit a grant unless it were approved by the State water pollution control agency and by the Administrator. Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(B) would prohibit a grant unless the grantee agreed to pay all costs not paid for by Federal and State funds.

Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(C) would permit a grant only if the grantee made provision for satisfactory operation and maintenance of the treatment works. Adequate provision would have to be made for an operating and managerial staff of well qualified personnel. A new provision in this subparagraph would require the grantee to have or develop the financial and other capability necessary to satisfy future waste treatment needs.

Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(D) would retain the provisions of the existing Act which prohibit a grant unless the project conforms with a section 7 State plan and is entitled to priority over other eligible projects. In addition, the project would have to be consistent with any planning requirements specified by the Administrator in regulations.

Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(E) would retain the provision of the present Act which specifies that the basic Federal grant share is 30 percent of the cost of the project.

Modifications would be made in the provisions of the present Act relating to the requirements for an increased Federal share and the requirements for matching payments by States. Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(F) would provide that the Federal share shall be increased to a maximum of 40 percent if the State agrees to "grant, loan or otherwise finance" 25 percent of the cost. (The required State share is 30 percent in the present Act). The words "to grant, loan or otherwise finance" would replace the words "to pay" in the present Act to make it clear that the State matching funds need not be an outright grant but may be in the form of a loan. This subparagraph would also provide that the Federal share shall be increased to 40 percent, regardless of whether there are State matching funds, if the grantee has a user charge system as well as other capability respect to projects on which construction for satisfying future waste treatment needs.

Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(G) would change the provisions of the present Act which provide that the Federal share shall be increased to 50 percent if the State agrees to pay 25 percent of the cost and if enforceable water quality standards have been established. The new provision would increase the Federal share to 55 percent if there are enforceable water quality standards and either the State agrees to grant, loan or otherwise finance 25 percent of the cost, or the grantee has a user charge system as well as other capability for satisfying future waste treatment needs.

Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(H) would add a new provision to prohibit grants unless the grantee provides assurance that it comply with regulations to assure the effective and efficient use of funds under the section.

Subparagraph 8(a)(2)(H) would add a new provision designed to make more effective and efficient use of construction grant monies and to avoid certain abusive practices and inequities associated with the treatment of industrial wastes in municipal waste treatment facilities. Grants would be prohibited for projects treating industrial wastes unless the industrial user were required by the grantee to pay back that portion of the project cost attributable to the treatment of industrial wastes. The Federal share of such recovered costs would be used by the grantee to operate and maintain its works and for meeting future waste treatment needs.

Paragraph 8(a)(3) identifies the factors which would be considered by the Administrator in approving a grant under subsection 8(a). Two factors specified in the present Act would be retained, specifically, an assessment of public benefits and the relation of project costs to the public interest. In addition, the Administrator would be required to assess the capability of the grantee to satisfy its own future waste treatment needs.

Paragraph 8(a)(4) would provide a new allocation formula to permit the optimum distribution of funds over the next three fiscal years in closer relationship to the construction needs of the respecting States. Four factors would be employed in distributing construction grant funds among the States. First, 45 percent of the amounts authorized to be obligated in each fiscal year would be allocated on the basis of relative State population; second, up to 20 percent would be allocated to States which agree to grant, loan or otherwise finance at least 25 percent of all project costs during a given fiscal year; third, up to 25 percent would be allocated to States which have approved projects for which grants have not been made or which have been made in a reduced amount because of lack of Federal funds; and fourth, the remainder would be distributed to meet the most serious water pollution control problems as determined by the Administrator. The new allocation formula would give the Administrator a degree of flexibility to direct construction grant funds to areas where funds are most critically needed and where they can be most effectively used. This paragraph would also provide for the reallotment of any sums which are not obligated by a State at the end of a fiscal year because of a lack of certified projects. [The Act now calls for a reallotment after 18 months.] These funds would be reallotted by the Administrator to meet the most serious water pollution control needs in accordance with the fourth factor mentioned above.

Paragraph 8(a)(5) would authorize Federal payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used to pre-finance the Federal share of qualified projects on which construction was initiated after June 30, 1966, but prior to July 1, 1971. Paragraph 8(a)(6) would extend this authorization with respect to projects on which construction is initiated after June 30, 1971, in order to continue to provide some encouragement to localities to initiate projects even though Federal funding is not then available. However, projects commenced after June 30, 1971, would not qualify for reimbursement unless, prior to the initiation of construction, the Administrator makes three findings. He would be required to find (1) that the State in which the project is located has given funding priority in the current fiscal year to projects in more advanced stages construction; (2) that the project is necessary to achieve compliance with water quality standards; and (3) that construction on the project will be initiated within a reasonable period of time. This approach would give the Administrator some control over the accumulation of reimbursables and thus minimize abusive practices.

Paragraph 8(a)(7) would direct the Administrator to make grant payments through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury. Such payments would be required to be used exclusively to meet the costs of construction.

Paragraph 8(a)(8) would retain the provisions from the present Act which direct the Administrator to make certain determinations with regard to the adequacy of wages of laborers working on projects funded under subsection 8(a).

Paragraph 8(a)(9) would define certain terms used in subsection 8(a). Subparagraph 8(a)(9)(A) would define "industrial wastes" as waste discharges (other than domestic sewage) from industries identified in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual and other wastes as determined by the Administrator. Subparagraph 8(a)(9)(B) would retain the same definition of "construction" as appears in the present Act which includes a range of activities from preliminary planning to the actual installation of the facility and alterations and improvements of the facility.

Subsection 8(b) would direct the Administrator to administer section 8 and related sections so as to encourage and assist grantees in developing adequate legal, institutional, managerial and financial capability for meeting forseeable future waste treatment needs to achieve compliance with applicable water quality standards. Future waste treatment needs would include the operation, maintenance, expansion and replacement of treatment works. This would be an important new provision to encourage local self-sufficiency and possibly to reduce the future levels of Federal funding needed for treatment works construction.

Subsection 8(c) would authorize the appropriation of $2 billion in each of fiscal years 1972, 1973, and 1974 for the purpose of making grants under this section. Sums appropriated would remain available until expended.

Section 2 of the bill would provide that the provisions of the bill take effect on July 1, 1971.

III. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 10 OF THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT AND ENFORCEMENT OF WATER QUALITY STANDARDS AND FOR OTHER RELATED PURPOSES

Subsection (a) defines the terms to be used in the section, particularly "water quality standards" and the components of such standards.

Subsection (b) states a Federal policy in favor of encouraging State and interstate action to abate pollution, and provides that the Administrator may not initiate an enforcement action if he determines that a State is taking appropriate abatement action.

Subsection (c) identifies the waters for which water quality standards would be required. These waters would include interstate waters, already subject to standards under the present Act, and, in addition, navigable waters; ground waters, tributaries of any such waters; the contiguous zone (with respect to pollution which threatens the territorial sea); and the high seas (with respect to discharges of matter transported from or originating within the United States.

Under a new requirement contained in subsection (d), the Administrator would be required, within six months after the enactment of the section and from time to time thereafter, to publish in the *Federal Register* regulations establishing specifications for water use designations, water quality criteria and effluent requirements for the purpose of advising the States in adopting or revising water quality standards. The regulations concerning water use designations will provide methods for assuring that legitimate factors are taken into account.

The regulations concerning water quality criteria would, on the basis of the latest scientific knowledge about the effects of identifiable pollutants on health, welfare and the environment, specify minimum and maximum water quality characteristics required to protect various legitimate and beneficial water uses. The regulations concerning effluent requirements would specify the minimum levels of treatment or control which would be generally applicable to various categories of industrial and municipal facilities and other pollution sources, and would specify procedures for determining additional treatment required to comply with water quality criteria or to prevent the degradation of high-quality waters. The Administrator would also be required to publish information concerning recommended pollution control techniques for complying with water quality criteria and effluent requirements.

Under subsection (e), States would have up to one year after the publication of regulations under subsection (d) to submit required new standards and revisions of old standards for all waters specified in subsection (c) which are within their jurisdiction. The Administrator would be required to advise the States as to which elements of existing standards require revision. If the State did not act within the one-year period, the Administrator would be authorized, after a public hearing, to publish regulations setting forth water quality standards for waters over which the State has jurisdiction. The Administrator would be required to promulgate such standards if, within 60 days after publication of the regulations, appropriate standards were not adopted by the State.

If the Administrator published regulations under subsection (d) twice in one year, publication of the later regulations would not extend the time for adopting water quality standards pursuant to the earlier regulations except with respect to elements thereof required to be revised by the later regulations.

Water quality standards established under the Water Quality Act of 1965 would continue to be effective, until superseded by new standards. The Administrator would be able to utilize the new enforcement authorities in subsection (f) to enforce standards established under existing law while new standards are being developed.

No provision is made at present for the Governor of a State to initiate revision of standards. The proposed subsection (e)(2)(D) would authorize the Governor of a State to submit revised standards at any time. If the Administrator determined that the revised standards met the requirements of subsection (d), such standards would become effective.

The authority of the Administrator to promulgate standards for waters in areas of exclusive Federal legislative jurisdiction, or where the States do not have jurisdiction, is unclear under existing laws. Subsection (e)(3) would provide the Administrator with clear authority to establish standards in such areas after public hearings.

Two administrative enforcement procedures were authorized by the existing provisions of section 10: the Administrator may convene an enforcement conference, or, in cases of violation of water quality standards, he may issue 180-day notices, followed by court action. Under the present proposal, these procedures would be replaced by a new administrative procedure based on the

violation of water quality standards (or of effluent requirements for hazardous substances established under subsection (1)). The Administrator would be required, upon a finding based on any information however obtained that any person is in violation of water quality standards or the requirements of subsection (1), to notify such person of the violation and the required remedial action, and simultaneously to provide notification to the water pollution control agencies of the States involved. If the required remedial action or appropriate State action were not taken within 30 days, the Administrator would be authorized to issue an order requiring compliance within a specified time, or bring a civil action for an injunction under subsection (f) (6). The recipient of an order directing compliance would be authorized to request a hearing within 15 days following receipt of the order. Following such hearing, the Administrator would be required to affirm, modify or revoke the order by written decision constituting his final order. In cases in which the recipient of the order did not make a timely request for a hearing, the original order would become the final order unless modified by the Administrator on his own initiative. Judicial review would be provided for all final orders after exhaustion of administrative remedies.

It is intended that an appeal or a request for a hearing would not operate as a stay of an order, except where a court determined a stay to be necessary as provided in the Administrative Procedure Act. The Administrator would be authorized to assess a civil penalty for violation of a final order of up to $25,000 per day of violation.

Under subsection (f) (6) the Administrator could enforce his final orders and recover fines upon petition to the appropriate U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Under subsection (f) (7), the Administrator would be authorized to commence a civil action in the appropriate U.S. district court for injunctive relief in any case of violation of water quality standards or of effluent requirements for hazardous substances established under subsection ( ). Under subsection (f) (8), the Court in any such proceeding would be authorized to assess a civil penalty of not more than $25,000 per day of violation. Subsection (f) (9) would authorize the imposition of criminal fines of up to $10,000, and imprisonment of up to six months, for making any false statement in any document or tampering with any monitoring device required by the section.

Although the enforcement conference would be eliminated by this proposal, its useful features would be retained in subsection (g), authorizing the Administrator to call fact-finding public hearings for the purpose of obtaining information necessary to carry out the Act, including the investigation of possible water quality standards violations. Notice of any hearing would be required to be published in the *Federal Register* and in a newspaper of general circulation in the area in which the hearing is to be held. The hearing would be conducted before a hearing panel, consisting of the Administrator's representative and representatives of the States involved. Any interested person would be permitted to make a statement of views.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the hearing panel would make findings concerning the existence of pollution, and would report such findings to the Administrator, including recommendations for remedial action. The Administrator would review the findings, and would take such action as he deemed appropriate, which are understood to include the issuance of an administrative order or the initiation of a civil action pursuant to subsection (f), or, the establishment of water quality standards under subsection (e) (2) (A). If, after a hearing under subsection (g), the Administrator determined that the public health or welfare required revision of water quality standards he would be authorized to request a State or States to adopt revised standards within 60 days. If the State did not adopt acceptable standards within such period, the Administrator would be authorized, after notice and hearing, to publish standards and to promulgate them after 30 days following publication. Subsection (g) (7) would make it clear that the Administrator could issue administrative orders to require compliance with water quality standards even while a hearing is being held under subsection (g).

Subsection (h) would provide the Administrator with broad authority to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses at hearings, and to order the production of records. However, Agency representatives would still be subject to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 1905 with regard to protection of trade secrets.

Subsection (i) would authorize the Administrator to require any discharger to perform effluent monitoring and to report the results to EPA. In exercising this authority the Administrator would be required to take into consideration the availability of the desired information from State or local monitoring programs. Further provisions of this subsection would authorize the Administrator's representatives to enter and inspect facilities from which discharge is made into sewers or waters specified in subsection (c), and to have access to monitoring or other records. Any information obtained under subsection (i) would be available to the public except information which is shown to the satisfaction of the Administrator to contain trade secrets.

Subsection (j) would provide emergency authority for the Administrator to commence an action in the appropriate U.S. district court for an injunction or other appropriate equitable relief whenever a pollution source presents or may present an imminent and substantial danger to the health or welfare of any person, or to water quality. It would also provide for the consolidation of suits.

Subsection (l) would require the Administrator within 60 days after enactment of the new section 10, to publish in the *Federal Register* a list of substances which in his opinion possess a high potential for causing substantial danger to the public health or the environment and which shall be subject to a prohibition or effluent requirement. Within six months after publication of the list, the Administrator would be required to publish proposed effluent requirements or prohibitions for such substances, and within ninety days after such publication, he would be required to promulgate such requirements and prohibitions in final form.

IV. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCING ACT OF 1971

Section 1. This section provides for the Act to be cited as the "Environmental Financing Act of 1971."

Section 2. Creation of Authority. This section establishes the Environmental Financing Authority as an instrumentality of the United States subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and authorizes the Authority to establish offices to conduct its business.

Section 3. Purpose. This section states that the purpose of the Act is to assure that inability to borrow necessary funds on reasonable terms does not prevent any State or local public body from carrying out a waste treatment works project eligible for financial assistance under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Section 4. Board of Directors. This section provides a five-member Board of Directors consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury or his designee as Chairman and four others appointed by the President from the officers or employees of the Authority or of any Federal agency. The Board would meet at the call of the Chairman and would determine the general policies of the Authority. The Chairman would appoint the officers of the Authority.

Section 5. Functions. This section authorizes the Authority to purchase obligations issued by State and local public bodies to finance the non-Federal share of the cost of a waste treatment construction project. No purchase could be made unless the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has certified that the seller is unable to obtain sufficient credit on reasonable terms, has approved the project as eligible under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and has agreed to guarantee principal and interest payments on the obligation. No purchase could be made of obligations issued to finance projects the permanent financing of which occurred prior to this Act. Interest rates on such purchases would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration (i) current market yields on obligations of comparable maturity issued by the Treasury or the Authority and (ii) market yields on municipal bonds. The Authority would charge fees to cover expenses and to accumulate reasonable reserves, and such fees would be included in project costs.

Section 6. Initial Capital. This section authorizes appropriations to the Secretary of the Treasury to advance up to $100 million for initial capital to the Authority. The interest rate on advances would be not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration current market yields on Treasury obligations. Interest payments could be deferred at the discretion of the Treasury.

Section 7. Obligations of the Authority. This section authorizes the Authority, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue its own obligations in the market. The Secretary of the Treasury could purchase such obligations, as authorized in appropriation acts. Purchases by the Secretary would be public debt transactions and would be at interest rates determined by him taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturities.

Section 8. Federal Payment to the Authority. This section directs the Secretary of the Treasury to make annual payments to the Authority in the amount by which the Authority's interest expense exceeds its interest income.

Section 9. General Powers. This section provides the Authority with general corporate powers.

Section 10. Tax Exemption. This section generally exempts the Authority and its income from all taxes except real and personal property taxes and taxes on the principal or interest on obligations issued by the Authority, which would be taxed to the same extent as obligations of private corporations.

Section 11. Obligations as Lawful Investments, Acceptance as Security. This section makes obligations issued by the Authority lawful investments, acceptable as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, and exempt from SEC requirements.

Section 12. Preparation of Obligations. This section authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare, hold, and deliver obligations for the Authority on a reimbursable basis.

Section 13. Annual Report. This section requires the Authority to transmit to the President and Congress an annual report of its operations and activities.

Section 14. Obligations Eligible for Purchase by National Banks. This section permits national banks to invest in or deal in obligations of the Authority.

Section 15. Government Corporation Con-

trol Act. This section subjects the Authority to the budget and audit provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act in the same manner as they are applied to a wholly-owned Government corporation.

Section 16. Permanent Appropriation for Federal Payment to Authority. This section provides a permanent indefinite appropriation to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to make interest payments to the Authority as required by section 8.

Section 17. Separability. This section makes the provisions and validity of the Act separable if any of the provisions are held invalid.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SPECIAL ORDER ON WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to announce I have taken a special order today to explain the welfare reform bill I have introduced.

ALTERNATIVE WELFARE REFORM PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today an alternative welfare reform proposal that I hope the Members will study. We have been considering the family assistance plan again in the Committee on Ways and Means for a number of weeks. It is becoming more obvious with every day that the program has many complications and is impossible to administer, and there are many unanswered questions. What we really need in welfare is a new direction rather than the hodgepodge on a hodgepodge which it is becoming obvious the family assistance plan is. The family assistance plan covers up the welfare mess with a sugar coating of Federal cash. It is the first leg up on a guaranteed national income.

FAP will not turn the welfare program around. It does not implement the work provisions on a meaningful basis. It mandates that the Federal Government assume 100 percent of the whole new welfare load of the country at State-determined standards which are totally indefensible from a national point of view. It institutes a new numbers game for all people in the poverty area that will add some 13 million new people to the Federal welfare caseload with no assurance whatsoever that the incentives are not in the direction of more welfare rather than less. It is an administrative monstrosity and, in my judgment, sets a disaster course for this Nation.

I have proposed in the bill I have introduced today, after a great deal of study, what I consider to be a real welfare reform proposal. It builds upon the foundation of the studies we have made during the past year and a half, both on this side and over in the other body. It is based upon some rather fundamental changes in thinking on the welfare program. It does turn the welfare program around. It includes the Federal assumption of much of the welfare costs, but it does not assume responsibility for the welfare quagmire that exists in this country today. It does separate the employable people from the unemployables. It does establish a meaningful and a major national child care program for all poverty employables over a 4-year period. It does provide for meaningful rehabilitation and employment programs with a meaningful administrative organization to carry it out. It does provide meaningful and defensible incentives for people to work. It does involve meaningful work training Federal allowances based on the percentage of average wage in the area rather than the mess of State programs that is the basis for the FAP program.

It does provide meaningful rehabilitation for marginal, employable people.

It does provide for meaningful scheduling of the reclassification of all welfare recipients between employable people and unemployable people.

It is a program that provides over a 4-year period for the Federal takeover of some 75 percent of the welfare caseload, but they are not turned over as welfare recipients, but as employable persons.

It does provide, in addition, emergency relief now for the States, and it is a new direction for the whole concept of welfare.

Let me just very quickly go into this matter—and may I also urge the Members to read the full text of my statement today to get the details of this concept. I do not want to deceive anyone into thinking that there is any magic formula on welfare reform, there just is not. There is no easy way out. There is no such thing as a good welfare program, but there is such a thing as turning our program around, heading it in the direction where we can assimilate ideas and ingenuity and administrative capabilities that exist in the American people. We are sinking deeper and deeper into the morass of welfare, and FAP, let us face it, does not take us out of that morass.

Now, the first problem of welfare is that without an adequate day-care program you cannot have meaningful welfare reform. It is just not possible because most welfare recipients are burdened—and we are talking about the AFDC program—are burdened with children. Until we get adequate child care for those children you simply are not going to get those people off of the welfare rolls. So we would establish a national child-care corporation that would contract with localities, with public agencies and nonprofit organizations in the localities to set up meaningful child-care facilities. That includes not only supervision and training programs for children, but also at least one square meal a day and, particularly in the ghetto areas of the country, two square meals a day.

Then, second, I would separate, with proper administrative organization, the employable people from the unemployable people. The unemployable people are not the problem of welfare. The employable people on welfare are a problem. And the administrative organization would be a new Federal rehabilitation and employment office organization in every community in the country. Here Federal officials properly schooled in utilizing the experience we have had under the WIN program would classify welfare applicants on an orderly schedule as employable or unemployable. When they are classified "employable" they would no longer be eligible for Federal welfare assistance, and then would become the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Now we are here federalizing welfare on an orderly schedule, again, so that at the end of the 4-year period the Federal Government would have assumed full responsibility for 75 percent of the caseload. But we are not calling them welfare people—we are reclassifying them employable, and we are making employable people a Federal responsibility in a whole wide range of programs we already have in being, we would coordinate in this program to send people, if they need some basic adjustments, to vocational rehabilitation, which would be greatly upgraded and made a 100-percent Federal expense charge with respect to these people.

Or we would send them to the manpower programs, or we would put them in on-the-job training slots, or put them into new public service employment programs that have been recommended by the administration. When they became a Federal charge, we would not accept the hodgepodge of Federal welfare payments. We would establish a training reimbursement based on a formula keyed to 40 percent of the average wage in the area.

So this reimbursement is not based upon the whims of the individual State legislators around the country and the complexities of Federal payments for welfare, but would be based on a meaningful average wage factor in a given area. That would eliminate a great deal of the problems we have in our State-by-State diversity.

But then in addition to this now, we would have meaningful job incentives—incentives for people to go to work. For example, the case of a woman with four children on welfare and possibly getting $3,500 a year. How can we induce her now to go to work possibly at a minimum wage of $2,200 when she has her family to support? So the first thing we would do would be to give her quality day care for her children including one or two meals a day—and that is tremendously important to the welfare mother.

The second thing we would do would be to allow her to cash out her food stamps. This to most welfare mothers would be terribly important. In other words, the benefit she would get from the present food stamps would be converted to cash if she requested it and she would get a food allowance in cash every month for it. Remember, she is a responsible, employed person.

Third, then we would give a work ex-

pense allowance to this mother with four children of $60 per month and we would not only give it to her but we would give it to the whole gamut of the working poor voluntarily enrolled in this program as an incentive to work and as a vehicle whereby we can justify the difference between the welfare payment and a minimum wage job.

It is a meaningful and easy-to-administer concept that would make up the difference between welfare payments to a large extent and what an individual can make on a minimum wage job.

The cost of this program on a 4-year basis would be about $5 billion including this great new child care corporation which not only is the answer to welfare but which really is fundamental to any answer to the ghetto problems of our Nation today. This would be phased in over a 4-year period.

You see the way the Federal Government would reclassify and take over these people would be: First, the new applicants, all new applicants would be screened. The criteria for mothers would be that we would only exclude mothers with two or more children, one of them being under 6 years of age, in the original screening.

Then, second, we would go to the existing welfare rolls, and we would take first the unemployed fathers, naturally.

Second, we would take the single children dependents who are on welfare over 16 years of age.

Third, we would consider the mothers and take the mothers with one child.

Fourth, we would take mothers with more than one child with none of them under 3 years of age.

Finally, at the end of the line—and this would be scheduled over a 4-year period—we would take all mothers who were classified "able to work."

Naturally, there will be a backlog of people, probably 25 or 30 percent of the heads of household on the existing rolls, who are nonemployable for physical reasons or for many other reasons.

In implementing this program we would save initially, because we are not making the family assistance payments, some $1.5 billion the first year, and we would convert that to emergency relief payments to the States, so that we would get immediately emergency assistance to the States that so desperately need it.

Then, as we phase this program in, we would phase out the emergency relief over the 4-year period. The emergency assistance to States would be distributed first to the States according to population and then distributed within the States according to the record of costs for caseloads in welfare within the State.

So this program would turn welfare around. It would provide a meaningful vehicle for reclassifying people, employable or nonemployable, with the backup of a major child-care program that is essential for any such a classification.

It would provide, then, for the employable people be taken care of on a job assistance program, and reimbursement for job assistance under the Federal Government set according to its relation to the average wage in an area.

It would provide substantial supplements. In addition to a child care program, which is so terribly important, it would include a cash out of the food stamps, a monthly payment for that, which would vary according to family size.

Then, finally, a monthly expense allowance to the working poor.

In summary, it avoids not all but most of the complexities that we are finding in the present FAP program. Almost every way we turn under the FAP program it is so complex, so poorly thought out administratively, that we have almost impossible problems to solve.

This proposal, in turning the whole program around, would avoid those complexities, and I commend it to the Members of the Congress. I hope it is possible to get it approved in a committee. If not, I hope it will be possible to present it as an alternative to the Congress when this matter comes to the floor of the House.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. I want to commend the gentleman for his thoughtful presentation of this plan, one that I am sure all Members will wish to read in the RECORD.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman.

THE NOISE CONTROL ACT OF 1971

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, 60 years ago, Robert Koch, the famed bacteriologist and Nobel laureate, predicted:

> The day will come when man will have to fight merciless noise as the worst enemy of his health.

While this prediction has not yet proven itself to be true, if we do not act swiftly the day will soon come when deafness will be as common as the common cold.

Noise is a negative fringe benefit of the manmade environment of our industrial and high density urban society. To the extent to which this environment is becoming increasingly manmade, noise is not likely to go away, but only to become more pervasive.

I am, therefore, today introducing the Noise Control Act of 1971. Under this bill, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency will have broad powers to distribute grants to States to provide programs of noise control, research into causes, and effects of noise, and the enforcement of noise standards, rules, and regulations. The Administrator also has authority to distribute grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, organizations, or indiviudals to engage in research, the training of personnel, and demonstration projects.

This legislation is the most comprehensive noise abatement bill ever proposed to the Congress. It would establish specific standards in the areas of aircraft, motor vehicle and occupational noise. In each of these areas, the Administrator is given the authority to set standards and amend rules and regulations, but he is also required to enforce specified minimum standards. Among the aircraft standards is a time restriction for aircraft takeoffs over populated areas. My bill also prohibits the operation of civil aircraft at supersonic speeds over land areas of the United States.

Motor vehicles weighing under 6,000 pounds are prohibited from operating at noise levels in excess of 86 dBA at a speed of 35 miles per hour or less, and in excess of 90 dBA at a speed of more than 35 miles per hour. These limits are presently in effect in California and are considered to be adequate to protect the mental and physical health of her citizens. The Administrator shall specify a date on which these Federal standards shall go into effect.

The Walsh-Healey Act presently requires those businesses which receive more than $10,000 of Federal assistance to maintain a sound level of not more than 90 dBA for an 8-hour day. Under my bill, the noise level must be below 85 dBA, a figure suggested by President Johnson shortly before he left office. It is estimated that 60 percent of the workers in this country are subjected to noise which exceeds an acceptable level. The World Health Organization states that industrial noise alone costs the United States more than $4 billion annually in accidents, absenteeism, inefficiency, and compensation claims. The new noise levels I propose would tremendously alter these statistics, I believe, for a 90 dBA sound level is nearly half again as loud as an 85 dBA sound level. My purpose is to preserve the hearing of these workers, not to impair or destroy an essential industrial effort.

Noise is not just a nuisance, it is a health hazard. The word itself is derived from the same Latin root as "nausea." The dangerous and hazardous effects of intense noise on human health are seriously underestimated. There appears to be a close relationship between bodily fatigue and noise exposure. Psychological and social stresses also result from intense noise. Some scientists even believe that if city noise continues to rise at its present rate of 1 decibel a year, everyone will be stone deaf by the year 2000.

We will never be able to eliminate each sound that is objectionable to each individual. Human desires are too variable. But noise is not the inescapable price of progress. The know-how already exists to control its level. It is the will which has to date been lacking. Americans often seem to react to noise as if nature were compelling us to accept it, or even savor it. We are tacitly accepting an increasingly deteriorating situation.

We must now decide what importance noise control and noise abatement have relative to the other values of our urban civilization. In protecting our health, absolute proof comes late. To wait for it is to invite disaster or to court disaster unnecessarily.

We reached the critical stage with our polluted air and water because of belated action. Unless we act now, we will

soon reach the critical stage as far as our hearing is concerned, a stage from which we cannot retreat.

I do not claim that this bill I introduce today will by itself solve our noise problem, but it is an important first step which must be taken. It is my hope this bill will act as a catalyst for far-reaching and effective actions by our local, State, and Federal Governments.

CAPITOL POLICE

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, for 11 days now we have heard that the Capitol was able to be bombed because of the laxity of the Capitol Police Force. Chief James Powell implies that it is the fault of the students on the force. He is quoted again and again as saying that 25 percent of the Capitol force are appointees, many of whom are students. When I called the police office in the Capitol, I was told that 115 of the 622-man force are students. This is 18.5 percent, less than one-fifth of the entire force.

Police Chief Powell says he has sympathy for the students. He says it is "very difficult to properly do their schoolwork and give us 8 solid hours of work," and that some find the work boring. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the Capitol Police Force needs the mental and physical integrity which the students provide. Physically, they are much more capable of protecting the Capitol than many of our present policemen. In addition, police forces across the country are now actively recruiting men and women with college educations. We should feel proud to have these students on our force. This does not mean that we should allow them to study on the job or cater to them in any way. But let us be honest. The students have done nothing less than what has been required of them by Chief Powell. If this is nothing, it is because the chief has never required nothing.

It is time for Chief Powell to stop using the students as scapegoats. I personally know of the many lawyers, doctors, and other professional men who have served on the Capitol Police Force and done a commendable job.

I do not mean to place the blame for laxity on the large majority of the force who are not students. I do mean to place the blame on the top officials. This is where the failure is. This is where the investigations should begin.

GATEWAY NATIONAL SEASHORE—A FORTHCOMING REALITY

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met with Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton. His remarks at our meeting, in addition to my own prior conversations with him, give considerable impetus to a project for which I have been pressing for more than 2 years—creation of the Gateway National Seashore within the New York Harbor region—and which is embodied in my bill, H.R. 1121.

Secretary Morton, in our meeting today, stated that the Gateway project has a "high priority." He added:

I am very much for the project.

This is crucial, because the administration should, and must, give it full support. This support, in fact, is consonant with the President's own state of the Union message, delivered on January 22, 1971, when he said:

And not only to meet today's needs but to anticipate those of tomorrow I will put forward the most extensive program ever proposed by a President of the United States to expand the nation's parks, recreation areas, and open spaces in a way that truly brings parks to the people where the people are. For only if we leave a legacy of parks will the next generation have parks to enjoy.

Surely, nothing could be more in line with the President's own words than creation of a recreation complex in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. Gateway, which would include Jamaica Bay, Breezy Point, Sandy Hook, and additional areas, is within a 2-hour drive for 15 million people. It would eventually be able to accommodate 500,000 people a day.

Of course, it is essential that national parks be created in our yet-remaining natural areas. But surely Gateway is far more immediately and directly relevant, and beneficial, to these millions of city dwellers in New York City and its environs who cannot afford to travel hundreds of miles to a park. Gateway truly "brings parks to the people where the people are"—to quote the President.

There are, in fact, in the New York metropolitan region more than 19 million people, in 31 counties, in three States—New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. By the year 2000, there will be 30 million people in the region: 11 million more people competing for access to the region's ocean beaches, which stretch from Montauk Point, N.Y., to Point Pleasant, N.J.

These ocean beaches provide the largest source of summer recreation at present, and their use will continue to rise. Not only regional residents, but vacationers from farther inland use them. The proposed Gateway National Seashore would be a major step toward preserving open ocean front and making it available for public use.

The genesis for Federal legislative action aimed at bringing Gateway to reality arose 2 years ago, when I began to work in conjunction with the Regional Plan Association on plans for a national seashore in New York Harbor. Our interest in turn stimulated the Department of the Interior, then headed by Walter B. Hickel, to become involved. On May 13, 1969, then-Secretary Hickel announced the administration proposal for what he termed the Gateway National Recreation area.

Subsequently, two bills were introduced to create Gateway. My bill—H.R. 12436 in the 91st Congress—was introduced on June 25, 1969, following weeks of delay by the Department of the Interior, which was preparing the first draft of the legislation, at my request.

Unfortunately, despite Secretary Hickel's initial espousal of Gateway, little action ensued on the part of the administration. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee's request for an administration report on my bill languished unanswered.

In the interim, however, considerable interest had been building concerning Gateway, particularly due to the work of the Regional Plan Association and of the Citizen's Committee for the Gateway. Numerous news stories and editorials furthered our cause.

Thus, when I introduced my bill to create the Gateway National Seashore on the first day of the 92d Congress as H.R. 1121, prospects for action appeared brighter. Public sentiment clearly favors its creation. Congressional sentiment reflects this same attitude. Since the introduction of my bill, my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABO) has introduced a similar bill, in which several other Members joined. And I will be reintroducing my bill for myself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CAREY of New York, and Mr. KOCH.

Today, in the other body, the Senators from New York—Senators JAVITS and BUCKLEY—and from New Jersey—Senators WILLIAMS and CASE—have introduced a similar bill. This action particularly reflects the efforts of the senior senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, who has also long been interested in the creation of Gateway, and with whom I have been working to further our shared goal.

My conversations with Secretary Morton have considerably encouraged me that unified administration support will be forthcoming. However, some recent developments, such as the proposed turning over Fort Hancock, on Sandy Hook, to the State of New Jersey by the General Services Administration, do give good cause for concern. This action was taken despite the fact that—

The Department of the Interior pointed out that Fort Hancock is in the proposed Gateway Recreation Area and requested that . . .(GSA) withhold disposal action pending enactment by the Congress of Gateway legislation—

According to a letter to me from Harold S. Trimmer, Jr., assistant administrator, General Services Administration. Apparently, it is the Office of Management and Budget—an arm of the White House—which does not share either Secretary Morton's enthusiasm, or the President's stated commitment to parks for the people.

Hopefully, the public's demand for the creation of Gateway, reflected in the legislation now sponsored by some 28 Members of the House and Senate, and matched by the President's own state of the Union message language, will soon make the Gateway National Seashore a reality.

At this point, I should like to include several releases, new articles, and editorials concerning Gateway:

[News release of the Regional Plan Association, Inc., of May 13, 1969]

STATEMENT OF JOHN P. KEITH, PRESIDENT, REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION REGARDING PROPOSAL BY SECRETARY HICKEL FOR NEW GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Secretary of Interior Hickel's proposal for a national recreation area at the entrance to New York Harbor is a great triumph for Nation, Region and City. It does credit to the members of Congress who stimulated it, first William Fitts Ryan, Congressman from Manhattan, and Senators Jacob K. Javits and Charles E. Goodell. It represents a major achievement for Mayor John V. Lindsay.

The Gateway National Recreation Area proposal means greatly improved and accessible recreation opportunities for the millions of people living in the core of this crowded Region. It means the preservation for future generations of the incomparable beaches of Sandy Hook and Breezy Point.

It is the culmination of the effort for public acquisition of Breezy Point, for "a park where the people are", and the beginning of a new era of federal involvement in urban recreation.

In this monumental step forward we should recall the efforts of a host of civic and neighborhood organizations that saved these beaches for the public led by the Citizens Committee for Children, Citizens Union, Community Service Society and Parks Association of New York.

We urge the Congress and Administration to move with speed in making the proposal a reality.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1970]

GATEWAY STILL JUST AN IDEA

(By Douglas Robinson)

Almost a year after Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel announced the immediate start of planning on the Gateway National Recreation Area at the entrance to New York Harbor, the project remains little more than a sand castle.

The project, which Mr. Hickel spoke of while standing among the clam shells and driftwood on a littered city beach, was designed to give slum dwellers a place to play in the sea and sun.

It envisioned extensive park and recreation facilities in Jamaica Bay and Breezy Point in Queens, Swinburne and Hoffman Islands at the entrance to New York Harbor, Great Kills Park on Staten Island, and Sandy Hook, N.J.

Today, the bistate Federal project is plagued with problems both bureaucratic and otherwise.

The Mayor, during the election campaign last fall, signed new five-year permits for several thousand people who live on city-owned land in Broad Channel and who dump raw sewage into the center of Jamaica Bay, a move that would cut the 9,500-acre ecological treasure almost in half.

New York City intends to build a sports stadium in Great Kills Park in Staten Island and the City Planning Commission has suggested that a shore parkway run through the park, a roadway that would include and interchange within park borders.

The Army Corps of Engineers is considering digging a boat channel across Sandy Hook that might affect the lateral flow of sand needed to nourish the beaches and could allow the polluted water of Sandy Hook Bay to flow into the ocean with the resulting damage to the shore.

The Consolidated Edison Company is seeking to build nuclear power plants on man-made islands off Coney Island and in the Lower Bay, a plan the Interior Department feels is aimed at Swinburne and Hoffman Islands.

In addition to these large scale problems, there are several smaller ones, such as protests by the Breezy Point Cooperative that a man-made sand beach in front of many of its structures belongs to it and not the city, and a tentative city plan for a landfill project all along the south shore of Staten Island.

Since the Secretary's enthusiastic announcement last May 13, an elaborate four-color report has been printed, at a cost of $10,000 in donated funds, and a legislative package is now being prepared for Congress. The Interior Department hopes to introduce the legislation late this spring.

Once legislation is submitted, however, extensive public hearings will have to be held before any over-all Congressional action can be taken. This means that any funds for Gateway probably would not be authorized before early 1971.

"We are not dismayed," said Edward S. Peetz, chief of the division of urban planning of the Interior Department's Office of National, Capital and Urban Park Affairs. "However, instead of our problems diminishing, they seem to be growing."

MANY PROBLEMS INVOLVED

Among the troubles besetting the Gateway projects are the following:

The Defense Department refuses to release Fort Tilden, an integral part of the Breezy Point section of the recreation area, because it says the Nike missile battery, a training building and an officer's club are an "operational requirement."

The Department of Agriculture is planning construction of a 30-acre animal quarantine station on the parade ground at Fort Tilden and so far has resisted suggestions for an alternate site.

Mayor Lindsay, who stood beside Mr. Hickel on that windswept beach last May and enthusiastically endorsed the project, is said not to have replied to a letter from the Interior Department sent last Nov. 26 that asks for assurances on city-owned land and possibly litigation procedures.

Mr. Peetz, the chief planner for the recreation area, said in a recent interview at the Interior Department that the city's plans for Great Kills Park might cause that unit to be lost from the planned Federal project.

"We could live with a sports stadium," he said, "but if they put through a road with an interchange right in the middle, "we might as well give it up."

The Army's refusal to give up Fort Tilden also strikes a heavy blow at plans for Breezy Point. The fort, which stretches almost all the way across the Breezy Point peninsula, is largely unused.

There is a Nike battery at the east end of the fort and the missile's radar control center at the west end of the fort.

In addition to the Nike site, the Army uses a two-story brick building as a reserve training center. During the summer, however, the officer's club is heavily used by military men and their families from throughout the metropolitan area. They are especially drawn by the private beach.

In the matter of Mr. Lindsay not answering the letter from the Interior Department, a spokesman for the Mayor said that "no one has any record of the letter." An official at the Federal agency said another letter was being prepared.

Although planners at the Interior Department are opposed to Con Edison's quest for power plants in the harbor, Mr. Underhill is more sanguine about the controversial subject.

"If adequate safety standards could be determined," he said, "I could see, perhaps, a revolving restaurant atop a nuclear plant on Hoffman-Swinburne Islands."

Present plans call for the two small islands just beyond the Narrows to be joined by a landfill project over a 10-year period. The Gateway project envisions promenades, outdoor cafes and family picnic areas on the joined island. Visitors would get there by ferry.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 6, 1971]

SAVING SANDY HOOK

What the General Services Administration gives away, the Interior Department, in a proper situation, ought to receive. It would not only demonstrate that the agencies are not working at cross-purposes, but also, in the case of Sandy Hook, provide an unaccustomed boon from the federal government for New Jersey.

The GSA has labeled 1,033 acres of Sandy Hook as surplus land and therefore subject to disposal. This, even though the Interior Department has plans for including the Hook in a federal project for New York Harbor called the Gateway National Park.

The Interior Department possesses authority to receive surplus property and hold it for development for park and recreational purposes. Exercise of this authority with regard to Sandy Hook is now being urged upon the department by Sen. Case, mindful that the GSA has set a deadline of Thursday for a decision by New Jersey as to whether it wants to acquire title to the land, 745 acres of which it already leases from the federal government as a state park.

New Jersey, however, doesn't have the kind of money needed to develop and maintain the area, and has not even been able to fund the kind of engineering program needed to halt the serious erosion of the state-leased beaches.

Accordingly, it would seem sensible for Sandy Hook, for which recreation is the only appropriate use, to remain under federal aegis and developed under the National Park System, as legislation introduced by Sen. Case provides. Any other course would place an intolerable financial burden on the state, which for too long has been giving a lot more to Washington than it ever gets back.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Feb. 9, 1971]

TOTTERING GATEWAY

The Nixon administration's decision to get rid of the 1,033 acres of federal land called Fort Hancock on Sandy Hook is an appalling caricature of the New Federalism. The Regional Plan Association and Richard J. Sullivan, New Jersey Commissioner of Environmental Protection, are to be thanked for exposing and protesting this coldblooded plan to disembowel the Gateway national park concept that the Department of the Interior only two years ago was hailing as the No. 1 park priority for the federal government. They're right. This is carrying federalism too far.

Fifteen million people live within a two-hour drive of the Gateway complex which would consist of Sandy Hook on the New Jersey side of the lower bay plus four all but unused ocean beaches on the New York side. More than half a million people a day, more than 50 million a year, would come there to swim, fish, go boating, sprawl loaf, or just sit there watching the waves march in. Because all of the land is owned by governments, the cost of development would be no more than $20 million—over the 10 years leading up to Gateway's completion, 40 cents a day per user.

The decision to dispose of Fort Hancock comes from the Bureau of Budget and Management in an administration whose President was saying in his State of the Union message Jan. 22:

"And not only to meet today's need but to anticipate those of tomorrow, I will put forward the most extensive program ever proposed by a President of the United States to expand the nation's parks, recreation areas, and open spaces in a way that truly brings parks to the people where the people are. For only if we have a legacy of parks will the next generation have parks to enjoy."

In accordance with the procedures govern-

ing disposition of federal property declared surplus, the General Services Administration has asked the State of New Jersey whether it wants Fort Hancock, and Gov. Cahill has said, somewhat reluctantly, yes. But New Jersey is in no better fiancial condition to undertake the development needed than New York City has been to develop a beach park at Breezy Point. The Governor has observed correctly that if Gateway is not developed as a national recreation area it is not likely to be developed at all. And John P. Keith, president of the Regional Plan Association, has explained why:

If the Gateway proposal is cast away, many aspects of the plan will be lost even if New Jersey and New York City eventually prepare their holdings for limited use.

For example, there probably would be no ferry trips to the parks, the beaches would not be managed as a unit to balance their use and offer varied types of recreation, and nature education promised under the Department of Interior plan would be lost. Overcrowded existing beaches will become more crowded still.

Gateway was a cherished ambition of Walter J. Hickel, who Mr. Nixon relieved of office as Secretary of the Interior last November. If that thorny populist had not talked himself out of a job we could rely on him to see that the abandonment of Gateway was reconsidered. As matters stand, the appeal for revocation of the budget bureau decision should be carried to the President and his new Interior Secretary, Rogers C. B. Morton, at once by the two states' congressional delegations. And they should be implored to see that legislation to create and fund the Gateway project is enacted during this session. The next generation whose need for parks Mr. Nixon expounded Jan. 22 is coming, ready or not. By the year 2000 there will be 30 million people in the region, 11 million more people competing for access to the ocean beaches.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1971]

SAVE THE GATEWAY

Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton has done something, but not quite enough, to quiet the growing uneasiness over prospects for the Gateway National Park. According to Mr. Morton, the disposal of Federal surplus land at Sandy Hook to the state of New Jersey need not prejudice its ultimate use as a key segment of the seashore project. But, if it is still the Government's intention to establish the park, why did the Department of the Interior needlessly release its hold on the tract in the first place, thus signaling the General Services Administration to get rid of it?

Governor Cahill has indicated that New Jersey will acquire the land but, with the state in no financial position to restore and maintain the area, he would much prefer to have it remain in Federal hands. So would the Regional Planning Association, which conceived of the Gateway National Park. So it might seem from his recent State of the Union speech, would President Nixon, who promised to expand the nation's open spaces "in a way that truly brings parks to the people where the people are."

No proposal could possibly fit that ideal better than the Gateway, whose benefits would be a maximum of two hours away for some fifteen million people—7 per cent of the country's entire population. It has been estimated that, when developed, this stretch of seashore from Sandy Hook to Jamaica Bay would allow a half-million people a day to enjoy its swimming, fishing, boating and cultural facilities.

Here was the first opportunity for Mr. Morton to prove that, whatever the Administration's differences with his predecessor, he is just as committed as Mr. Hickel to what Mayor Lindsay aptly describes as "the most important urban recreational breakthrough" of our time. The Secretary's assertion of "enthusiastic" interest is all to the good, but after two years of favorable consideration, the project should be further along than informal commendation. It is time that legislation was sent to Congress and machinery created to establish this magnificent seashore park for the people of metropolitan New York.

[From the Newark, (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 18, 1971]

GATEWAY'S FUTURE

The Regional Plan Association, a private organization that has been promoting development of the tristate metropolitan area for 42 years, offers some compelling reasons why the proposed Gateway National Recreation Area at the mouth of New York Harbor should not be abandoned by the federal government.

At the moment, the government's approach to Gateway can best be described as ambivalent. It's made so by Washington's announcement that Sandy Hook, an integral part of the project, is surplus, i.e., disposable, land and President Nixon's assurance that he will propose the "most extensive program" in the nation's history to expand parks and other recreational areas "in a way that truly brings parks to the people where the people are."

Surely, Gateway should be where the people are. As RPA emphasizes, 7 per cent of the nation's population lives within a two-hour drive, a demographic phenomenon unduplicated anywhere in the country, and Gateway would be able eventually to accommodate 500,000 a day. Moreover, Gateway can be acquired just for the asking. The acreage not already owned by the federal government is owned by lower echelons of government.

Accordingly, if the government's performance is to be equal to presidential promises, there would appear to be no good reason why Sandy Hook and the adjacent areas in New York should not be developed by the federal government and even less reason why it should pursue a contradictory course as it has in the matter of Sandy Hook. In so doing it denies 7 per cent of the nation's population a forthright statement of intention.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 27, 1971]

JAMAICA BAY HALF SAVED

"Jamaica Bay and Kennedy Airport," a study commissioned by the Port Authority a little over a year ago, offers two major conclusions. One is excellent and to the point. The other is extremely dubious, not to say beyond the scope of the assignment undertaken by the Jamaica Bay Environmental Study Group of the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering.

The Study Group perceived that a choice had inevitably to be made between two incompatible uses of Jamaica Bay. It was ideal for habitation, recreation and conservation or for commerce, industry and waste disposal—but not for both sets of uses. Commendably it opted for the former combination, concluding that the choice had to be made on the basis of which uses promised to confer more benefits on more people, especially benefits that could not otherwise be provided.

Applying this criterion, the Study Group found what the Port Authority and the Federal Aviation Administration have long refused to concede: that what the air traffic of this city requires at the moment is not more acreage but better technology. What would be gained by extending runways into the bay, to the bay's certain destruction, can be achieved at least for the immediate future by modernizing the airport's control system, rearranging runway patterns, consolidating flight schedules, limiting the accommodation of private planes, increasing the use of jumbo jets and STOL planes—in short by resorts to ingenuity rather than concrete.

Having ruled out the need for commercial exploitation of the bay, the report proceeds to demonstrate the crying need for park space in this area of New York and the spectacularly unique character of this wetland in the heart of the metropolis: "probably no other area quite like it within a city of this size anywhere." If the Study Group had stopped there it would have performed an invaluable service. But it went on with an ill-conceived intrusion into the question of what the park should be like and who should manage it.

In general, the report recommends a city park on the shores of Jamaica Bay, wholly divorced from the proposed Gateway National Seashore project and designed primarily for the recreation of the area's immediate neighbors. Unquestionably those neighbors need recreational facilities, and they have been included in Gateway plans all along.

Unfortunately, the report takes little notice of that fact and appears to read into the Gateway project a conflict between mass recreation and wildlife preservation that does not necessarily exist. The confusion leads the Study Group into a certain ambivalence which allows it to speak of the wild life refuge and bird sanctuary in the middle of the bay as "an ecological treasure" and at the same time to suggest that the project now is primarily something for "upper-class people" to enjoy. This gratuitous slur is all the more absurd because the refuge has been a major attraction for large numbers of children brought out on school excursions from the inner city itself.

Adequate support of the whole Jamaica Bay project—both the "ecological treasure" and the proposed recreational parks and beaches on the periphery—requires Federal funds. There is no other way, in view of the city's financial condition. So does a comprehensively planned seashore park for the entire metropolitan region.

The warning in the report that potential areas of recreation might be "locked up" in a Federal park displays misunderstanding of the National Park concept as well as of the city's needs. The Study Group and its parent academies have had the judgment and courage to save Jamaica Bay from commercial vandalism. But they have not had the vision to see it as part of an experiment to bring the Federal park system to urban America.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 27, 1971]

PARTNER FOR GATEWAY

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE GATEWAY,
New York, February 19, 1971

TO THE EDITOR:

Statements quoted from the recently released report of the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering on Jamaica Bay raise questions about the inclusion of the bay in the proposed Gateway National Recreation Area.

Those citizens and elected officials of New York and New Jersey who are working to bring the Gateway proposal into being are first and foremost concerned with developing recreation facilities within easy reach of the vast numbers of inner city residents who now have few alternatives for summer recreation.

We are therefore entirely in sympathy with the National Academies' strongly worded recommendations for beach development in the northern and northwestern portions of Jamaica Bay. These proposals are entirely in keeping with our understanding of the Gateway proposal.

We do not believe, as the report implies, that Federal participation in the operation of the Gateway facilities means that future

plans for Jamaica Bay would be unresponsive to the perceived needs of the city. We view the Gateway as a proposal for partnership. The genius of that proposal as originally framed was that it, for the first time, indicated a willingness on the part of the Federal Government to bear development and operating expenses of this kind.

Without that commitment (which necessarily implies some involvement by the Federal authorities) all concerned have grave doubts about the capacity of the city or the states of New York and New Jersey to provide the recreation and educational services which all parties, including the National Academies, agree are so vitally needed.

ARCHIBALD S. ALEXANDER,
Chairman (New Jersey)
ALEXANDER ALDRICH,
Chairman (New York)

[From the New York Times Magazine, Feb. 7, 1971]

THE "BLACK MAYONNAISE" AT THE BOTTOM OF JAMAICA BAY

(By Michael Harwood)

Early in December, a spell of cold weather froze the surface of the two ponds in the Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge. The closing ice pushed out most of the ducks and geese that had collected there since August, and the birds either moved into the salt water of the bay or flew south, hunting for ponds still open. Despite the exodus, when the ice melted late in the month, many green-winged teal remained, dipping—yellow rumps up—for food along the edges of the ponds. Coots waddled on the shore and pecked in the grass. In the lee of tall brown reeds, hundreds of canvasback ducks rested, bills tucked into their back feathers. A squadron of five snowy egrets played a graceful avian leapfrog, each bird trying to precede the others as they chased minnows in the shallows. Overhead, black ducks and mallards, baldpates and scaup, ruddy ducks and bufflehead hurried to food and safe havens, their wings ringing against the wind.

It was a weekday, and the wind was cold, blowing briskly out of the northwest; the only other people on the path around the West Pond were a couple out for a walk, seeing the birds as part of the land and waterscape, without binoculars. They passed me twice, heading the other way, and each time we nodded and smiled at each other—a friendliness engendered by space.

The space is considerable. The refuge lies in the middle of 13,000 acres of bay—an area nearly as big as Manhattan Island. Nine thousand of these acres are "parkland"—mostly water and marshy islands—which accounts for about a fourth of the city's park acreage. The impression of space is enhanced by the sweep of marsh and the flatness of the terrain. From Cross Bay Boulevard, which bisects the refuge, one can look across the bay to the Rockaways and to Floyd Bennett Field on the moors of Barren Island; above the western shore and the low skyline of Brooklyn rises the Empire State Building; to the north and east spread the Borough of Queens, Kennedy International Airport, and a corner of Nassau County.

The sense of space is heightened by contrasts. One has usually fled to the refuge from an apartment in the city. And most visitors are aware that much of this particular space may soon be lost; there has been considerable debate recently about how the bay should be developed to meet the needs of the New York City region. One plan would have new Kennedy runways built far out into the bay. Another would have storm gates constructed at the mouth of the bay, to protect against flooding. Still another would concentrate on the area's potential as a park. Most participants in the debate would agree on one point: the bay will not be simply left alone. It is too late for that.

The margins of Jamaica Bay are, by nature, marshland. But creeks that once fed and sheltered fiddler crabs, mussels and young fish have been dredged, widened, straightened, lined with marinas, filled with power yachts. The water in the creeks is foul with spilled fuel and human waste, and the banks are strewn with rotting dories and piles of rubble. Scattered around the bay are clusters of dirty-pink, gray, green cottages, each a bit out of plumb, with one foot on stilts in the marshy ground or the water and one foot on dry land. On higher ground stand herds of two-family homes and monotomous brick apartment buildings. Huge silver and white cylinders crowd together in fuel-tank farms at the water's edge, or raise their heads behind the ranks of dry, rustling reeds.

Here and there, construction equipment crawls, roaring. The arms of derricks and pile drivers swing slowly, the piles are driven, bulkheads are built out in the water, sand is pumped from the bottom of the bay for fill, soil and "sanitary landfill" are dumped by trucks and shoved by bulldozers. As it has for years, the bay diminishes into it, from the mouths of 1,600 pipes, pours sewage; by themselves, four city sewage-treatment plants and two Nassau County plants dump more than a quarter million gallons of partially treated waste every day, and on one day out of three, bad weather forces storm water and raw sewage into the bay from seven storm-overflow sewers.

Until very recently jet fuel and oil were flushed into the water from Kennedy, creating slicks that occasionally became serious fire hazards; State Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz brought suit to stop this practice. Over the years, the airport and other enterprises have pumped acres of sand from the bay bottom as fill, and oil sludge and sewage have settled into the deep bottom trenches thus created. A few years ago a runway was extended across a navigable channel and into city parkland. One consequence of this construction, according to some observers, was the changing of tidal currents at that end of the bay and the virtual elimination of tidal flushing of the deep bottom trench near the extended runway. In any event, the bottom there is now difficult to find; the sludge and waste lie queasily, a liquid quicksand—"black mayonnaise" is the description given by one marine biologist.

Everywhere on the margins, even where man has not built and does not set his foot, there is trash—trash blown, trash washed up and trash dumped. The marshes bloom with flotsam and newspapers. The meadows above the marsh collect abandoned cars, tires, beer cans, white plastic bottles, broken glass, piles of lumber peeling paint and sprouting rusty spikes—right to the edges of the homes and shopping centers and gas stations.

At the railings of North Channel Bridge, over which Cross Bay Boulevard runs to the mainland, stood a dozen fishermen, fishing for herring. They wore quilted parkas with hoods, heavy overcoats and Navy watch caps, and held their fishing rods with gloved hands. They had brought buckets in which they would carry home their catches.

Salt marshes like Jamaica Bay are remarkable for their capacity to withstand continued and persistent insults in the form of sewage. In a report on the bay last summer, two authorities on salt marshes, John M. Teal of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and William Niering of Connecticut College, remarked on the "extent to which the marsh removes pollutants, particularly plant nutrients, from the water and converts them into food for marine animals through the growth of Spartina grass. "It is likely," they said, "that, in the Jamaica Bay system, Spartina acts as an efficient mechanism for converting some of the load of human sewage from waste product into usable material. In other words, the marsh functions as a free tertiary treatment plant." Furthermore, the trench near Kennedy and various basins elsewhere along the shore of the bay seem to act as settling plants for sewage, thus protecting the rest of the waterway.

The tide sweeps in and out, carrying food from the ocean, stirring and scrubbing the bay. And the center of the bay—despite dredging and filling and pollution there, too—still contains thousands of acres of relatively undisturbed marsh and mudflats and shallow water. In the marshy islands, which bear such names as Black Wall Marsh, Yellow Bar Hassock, Little Egg Marsh, Stony Creek Marsh, Ruffle Bar and Pumpkin Patch Marsh, inlets and twisting creeks abound.

"A couple of my friends make a living out of the bay," volunteered the driver of a sanitation truck in Far Rockaway—"digging worms, catching killies and grass shrimp. Don't let anyone try to tell you the bay is dead." (That the bay is ecologically dead has been an argument apparently used widely by the promoters of an expanded airport.) Weakfish and mullet and flounder spawn in the bay, and the small young of fish that spawn elsewhere—shad, menhaden, winter flounder and possibly bluefish—come to feed and grow in the sheltered food-rich waters. Other fish caught in the bay include stripped bass, tomcod, hake and eels. Blue crabs that once swarmed on the bottom virtually vanished several years ago, but now they seem to be making a comeback; lobsters can be found there, too.

Near Kennedy airport, to be sure, the bottom is utterly sterile in spots. And though striped bass and flounder can still be caught in that area, they have been found to taste strongly of fuel. Mussels, clams, oysters and bay scallops grow in the bay (among dozens of other species of shellfish); as late as 1905, the harvest of shellfish yielded $5,000,000 a year, but pollution has now made eating them hazardous. Clams are still dug, both legally and illegally. The legal diggers ship them to beds on eastern Long Isand; transplanted, the shellfish eventually clean themselves.

But shellfish present a special problem. They consume what the tides present, and then they are eaten whole. The flesh of finfish, on the other hand, is muscle, protected by skin. Those parts of the fish that collect bacteria are not eaten. So finfish caught in the bay are safe to eat, although people of nervous palates may blanch at the thought of eating fish from water officially declared—as Jamaica Bay has been for years—unsafe for swimming.

No one knows how many people fish there, but on almost any day of the year, given bearable weather, there are fishermen on the North Channel Bridge, and on weekends they may number in the hundreds; small boys arrive with only handlines, cadge bait from strangers, and add to the veritable veil of lines dangling from the bridge. There are other likely spots from which the landlubber can cast a hook, and of the thousands of boats moored in marinas along the bay share, many are used for fishing. Undoubtedly much, if not most, of the catch is eaten. One woman I know has fished the bay for 30 years; she eats what she catches, and if she catches more than she can eat, she gives the surplus away. She remembers one streak of particularly marvelous fishing when, in the space of a few days, she provided about a hundred families in her Brooklyn neighborhood with fish dinners. Lady Bountiful, indeed. But she would insist that the bay is the real bountiful lady.

In the middle of this patch of productive marshland lies the Jamaica Bay refuge. Like so much of the bay now, it is in a number of respects the handiwork of man. In 1938, the city's freewheeling Parks Commissioner, Robert Moses, began maneuvering to take control of the central marshes of Jamaica Bay. The city had long contemplated turning

the bay into a huge port. Now it was considering the marshes as a dump. But Moses won, and the area was turned over to the Parks Department.

The Commissioner had in mind the development of the bay as a huge marine playland, including six beaches, ball fields, a golf course, and a wildlife refuge. The marshes, of course, were already a natural refuge, but the wildlife there was dispersed and not particularly accessible. In 1950, the Long Island Rail Road made a decision that ultimately led to both concentration of birds and visibility. The railroad had been running trains out to the Rockaways, and now elected to end that service. The Transit Authority agreed to take over the line, and proposed to replace the railroad trestle along Broad Channel Island with a viaduct built from sand dredged out of the bay. Fine, said Moses; if the Transit Authority wants to build a viaduct across parkland, then it can also build the Parks Department a couple of freshwater ponds for wildlife. So dikes were built to impound water for a long, narrow pond of about 100 acres on the east side of Cross Bay Boulevard and a second pond of about 40 acres west of the road.

New York is geographically an ideal place to create a refuge for birds, since it lies on the Atlantic flyway. Millions of birds pass over the region in spring and fall, many of them searching for some place, amid all the cement below, where they can feed and rest. Furthermore, a refuge that combines freshwater ponds and salt-water marsh is especially attractive to waterfowl and shore birds, because it offers a wide variety of food and cover. So—potentially, at least—the Jamaica Bay refuge was now a natural.

The diking for the ponds was finished in 1953. The Parks Department looked around for someone to run its new sanctuary. It had never had reason to develop a staff of trained wildlife managers, and it simply appointed a competent "parkie," who at the time was employed in its soil-testing laboratory, working on experimental turfs for golf courses. Herbert Johnson was born in Tarrytown in 1910, the son of a Swedish gardener who worked on the John D. Rockefeller estate in Tarrytown for a while, then moved his family out to Long Island. There, as a small boy, Herb Johnson began learning horticulture. After high school, he worked for his father, entered the Parks Department, left it to go to war, then went back to school, and was graduated from the Long Island Agricultural and Technological Institute in Farmingdale. He rejoined the Parks Department and was assigned to experimental work. He had no interest at all in birds and knew virtually nothing about them except that they might eat insects harmful to plants.

When he took over the refuge, the ponds held salt water, turning brackish with rain. Much of their freshening and fruition would have to wait on nature. On the low dunes and the stretches of sandy upland above the ponds little more grew than bayberry, poverty grass—a coarse variety that thrives in sand—and a few poplars and birches. Johnson conscientiously read up on suitable plant foods, and he began to plant shrubs and trees and grasses that would provide cover and sustenance: beach grass, wild cherry, wild roses (*Rosa rugosa* and *Rosa multiflora*), Russian olive, autumn olive, chokeberries, beach plum, willow oaks, Japanese black pine, American holly. Vast stands of tall reeds—Phragmites—spread along the borders of the ponds, and aquatic plants seeded themselves and multiplied on the bottom.

Birds began to accumulate. So did the birders—many of them (as now) coming by the IND Rockaway line to the Broad Channel stop and walking a mile from there. A path built around the West Pond brought the birders close to the birds; on the one side was salt water; on the other, the pond. The East Pond was left without a circumnavigating path, partly to provide the birds a wilder space; nonetheless, determined birders beat their way through the Phragmites. In 1961, after only eight years, the number of species recorded either passing through or nesting in the refuge climbed above 250.

The most exciting development was the nesting of glossy ibis. A prehistoric-looking marsh bird—dark, iridescent brown in color, long-legged, bony, with a long, down-curved bill—the ibis had been seen only a few times in New York State before the nineteen-forties. Then the number of sightings increased; it was apparent the species was spreading north, and during the mid-nineteen-fifties, ibis bred for the first time in New Jersey. In 1959, five of the birds arrived at Jamaica Bay in April and stayed all summer, but no nests were found. Then, in 1961, at least three pairs of glossy ibis bred successfully in the refuge, the first such record for the state.

Now, more than a hundred pairs of ibis bred each summer in Jamaica Bay, and other colonies have established themselves on Long Island. The total number of species recorded for the refuge has reached 310, including such rarities as the cinnamon teal, Townsend's warbler and white pelican—all Western birds—and bald eagles, wood ibis and a European red-wing thrush. The thrush sighting was particularly remarkable; it was the first record of the bird in North America. Birders flocked to Jamaica Bay to see it. A group of Texans—they do such things right in Texas—chartered a plane and hurried east to add the thrush to their personal lists of birds seen in the United States.

Sixty-five species are known to have bred at least once in the refuge. But the busy seasons there are spring and fall when migrating waterfowl, shore birds, swallows, warblers, sparrows and many others swarm through. Although winter brings birds from the north—owls, horned larks, and occasional flock of snow buntings and Lapland longspurs, perhaps crossbills and evening grosbeaks—winter does not, as a rule, provide much exciting birding in the refuge.

When the birds diminish, Herb Johnson becomes visibly depressed. For as the birds discovered the refuge and the plantings he was so carefully making, he discovered the birds and became hooked. He is now considered something of an authority by the rest of the birding fraternity. When he meets a visitor at the refuge entrance on a winter day and to the question, "Anything special around?" has to answer, "Not much," his look is that of a man whose friends have unaccountably deserted him.

None of the proposals for changing Jamaica Bay is without justification.

The New York area needs more airport space. The fourth jetport still waits upon a site. To provide a temporary solution to the crowding while the search for a site continues, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Port Authority and the airlines are promoting the expansion of Kennedy's runway facilities. No specific design has been settled on; but sample plans show two long runways stretching out into the bay, with one of them crossing the eastern half of the bay all the way to Cross Bay Boulevard; a third runway would be laid at right angles to the first two, well off the present shore of Kennedy.

The Army Corps of Engineers has its own ideas. Filling in the shoreline has made the bay smaller, which has increased the danger of flooding along the waterfront in bad storms. The Engineers' solution would be to build a set of gates across the Rockaway Inlet, which connects the bay to the ocean; the inlet could be partly closed off in particularly severe weather to keep out abnormally high tides.

Meanwhile, the Department of the Interior and the city have been discussing a plan for a Gateway National Recreation Area, to include Jamaica Bay, the western end of the Rockaway peninsula and Sandy Hook. Over the years, the city has been building the beaches on the bay that Robert Moses envisioned—dumping landfill and covering it with sand; with the help of Federal funds, it has committed itself to the installation of improved sewage-treatment facilities that would clean up the water.

Some of the people who live around the bay would like to have the Engineers protect them from flooding. But most are leery of Kennedy expansion. As it is, there are areas around the airport where the roar of jets is practically perpetual and sometimes unbearable; local residents are afraid, despite assurances to the contrary, that adding to Kennedy's capacity would also add to the noise. A number of them, particularly those in Broad Channel—who share the bay's central island with the refuge—are worried that extension of the runways would force them to move.

Environmentalists strenuously oppose both projects on the ground that such construction would seriously endanger the living things in the bay. They would encourage developing the bay—but only for recreation, for education and for the study and improvement of the salt-marsh ecosystem. One major objection to the storm gates and runways is unpredictability. Relatively little is known about the workings of salt marshes. The dredging and filling and pollution already threaten the bay, but to what degree, no one is certain. Is more of the same, or less, in the offing, and what will that do? A change in the average height of the water, for example, or shifts in the currents, could have serious consequences. The proposed construction projects could have a variety of effects, depending on how they were designed, whether only one or both were built, and what else happened to the bay.

The environmentalists also cite specific drawbacks to each plan, taken separately. The closing of storm gates, they say, could keep the tides from giving the bay a normal flushing at a time when such a cleansing would be most needed—with both fresh storm water and sewage streaming in. One hurricane "controlled" in this fashion, they suggest, would change the ecosystem so abruptly and severely that it would jeopardize the life of the salt marsh. And salt marshes are not expendable. In fact, because they are being destroyed at a rapid rate, each one that survives takes on increasing importance to the life of the birds and fish that depend upon marshland.

The new Kennedy runways, contend the critics, would at a minimum seriously damage the ecosystem wherever they were built, and might well have a much wider impact. Even if the runways were to cover a relatively small area themselves, they would overrun a good deal of marshland.

"While it is clear that the Jamaica Bay salt marshes are withstanding the present pollution levels," commented John Teal and William Niering, "we have no way of judging how close they are to being stressed to the point which would overtax their resilience. Any decrease in the marsh area in the system will push the remaining marsh further toward its breaking point."

The runways could also change drastically the flow of the tides in the eastern half of the bay. The critics foresee the possibility that the sewage that at present collects on the bottom near Kennedy, and so does not spread to the rest of the bay, would be diverted by the runways into areas as yet relatively free of pollution.

Kennedy expansion is chiefly at issue now. The Port Authority commissioned the Environmental Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering to conduct a study of the environmental effects of the proposed construction. The board appointed a panel to look into the matter, and the report of that panel has been awaited for months. Regard-

less of any recommendations the report makes, however, the airport's encroachment on the bay will remain a possibility, although for the time being, at least, key officials in the city and state governments have lined up on the side of the environmentalists.

On the day after the snowstorm that ushered in the new year, a few fishermen jigged for herring from North Channel Bridge. The refuge ponds were closing again. Flocks of sparrows and blackbirds and mourning doves few in the upland, but most of the waterfowl had left the refuge or moved into the bay. The activity of the gulls and the remaining ducks and geese had combined with the wind to keep open three small patches of water in the West Pond; gulls monopolized two of them, and the ducks, the other. Black ducks and herring gulls huddled in small groups on the white ice.

Soon, a calm and cold night would freeze the rest of the surface, and Herb Johnson and his two assistants would go out on the ice and chop a bathing hole for the birds. The year's cycle for the bay had reached ebb tide. The future that nature held in store was predictable; what man would do was not.

MONTANA LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTIONS

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MELCHER. The Montana House of Representatives has transmitted to me five resolutions enacted by the house dealing with matters of Federal concern, which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD following these remarks.

The resolutions deal with the following:

Restoration of Forest Service lands seriously disturbed by mining exploration operations;

Opposing construction of an air facility at East Glacier;

Dust abatement and wildlife enhancement at Canyon Ferry Reservoir;

Restoration of railway mail services; and

Reopening of the Holly Sugar Refinery at Hardin, Mont.

The resolutions follow:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 25

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the 42d Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Rogers Morton, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Clifford Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Mike Mansfield, and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from Montana; the Honorable Richard Shoup and the Honorable John Melcher, Representatives from Montana; and the Honorable Forrest H. Anderson, Governor of Montana, urging investigation into ways of restoring public lands disturbed by recent mining exploration in the Beartooth Mountains within the Custer and Gallatin National Forests

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

Whereas, the natural landscape of the Beartooth Mountains within Custer and Gallatin National Forest possesses unique scenic beauty,

Whereas, alpine ecosystems are fragile and do not readily heal themselves without treatment when abused,

Whereas, the scars left by mining exploration in the Beartooth Mountains will remain ugly scars unless reclamation is undertaken and the landscape restored to a natural condition,

Whereas, erosion has been accelerated by the recent mining exploration and is now, and will continue to result in pollution of the waters draining these landscapes,

Whereas, much of the recent mining activity in the Beartooth mainly south of the Benbow Mine, in the vicinity of Iron Mountain, and the Moaut Mine area has greatly disturbed the lands to date and little or no reclamation has taken place,

Whereas, major mining companies in this area have currently shown interest in cooperating with the United States Forest Service in obtaining water quality data and maintaining water quality in the streams of this area,

Whereas, local residents and all Montana outdoorsmen and conservationists are interested and concerned about proper reclamation in disturbed areas and not currently reclaimed and whether or not reclamation will commence in these places.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the mining companies active in exploration and mining operations are urged to work together with the United States Forest Service, the State Fish and Game Department, and the State Board of Health, and the State Lands and Investments to investigate ways of restoring the land disturbed by recent mining exploration of the Beartooth area,

Be it further resolved, that companies operating in these areas which are not to be further explored or developed be urged to start reclamation on an experimental, or if and where possible, on a final reclamation standard, and to develop reclamation techniques most suited for alpine mountain landscapes, and

Be it further resolved, that this action commence as soon as practicable, and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to Russell Chadwick, President of the Northwest Mining Association, Spokane, Washington, and that he be asked to forward copies of this resolution to those companies doing business in the Beartooth area, namely American Metals Climax Inc., Johns Manville, Cypress Mines Corporation, and the Anaconda Company, and any other company or companies currently doing business in the Beartooth Mountains,

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent by the Chief clerk of the House of Representatives to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, the Honorable Rogers Morton, Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Clifford Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from Montana, the Honorable Richard Shoup and the Honorable John Melcher, Representatives from Montana, and the Honorable Forrest H. Anderson, Governor of Montana.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 17

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana registering opposition to the proposed construction of an air facility near Glacier National Park which would be capable of accommodating the most modern type of aircraft

Whereas, the Senate and House of Representatives of the state of Montana in 1965 passed a joint resolution supporting the construction of an air facility capable of accommodating the most modern aircraft near East Glacier, and

Whereas, there has now been constructed an adequate air facility capable of accommodating the most modern aircraft near Glacier National Park Headquarters at West Glacier, and

Whereas, the construction of such a facility at East Glacier would result in an unnecessary duplication of facilities and expenditure of funds, and

Whereas, the construction of such a facility at East Glacier would be impractical and unnecessary due to the distance from any entrance to Glacier National Park and the headquarters and major tourist facilities of Glacier National Park.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the House of Representatives request the Federal Government to discontinue all efforts directed toward authorization and construction of an air facility near East Glacier, Montana.

Be it further resolved, that the House of Representatives believes that such a facility is not in the best interests of the people of the state of Montana, or the orderly development and utilization of Glacier National Park by tourists.

Be it further resolved, that the chief clerk of the House of Representatives is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to each member of the Montana Congressional Delegation, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to the Montana Aeronautical Commission.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 15

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to the United States Congress, in support of the proposed plan of the United States Bureau of Reclamation for dust abatement on the Canyon Ferry Unit, Helena-Great Falls Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program of the Missouri River Basin project, Montana

Whereas, the Canyon Ferry Unit, Helena-Great Falls Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Montana, was constructed at considerable expense to the United States in 1954, and

Whereas, in the normal practice of raising and lowering the water level in Canyon Ferry Reservoir for the purpose of flood control and hydro-electric power production some nine thousand (9,000) acres of beaches at the south end of the reservoir become exposed and subject to wind erosion, and

Whereas, the Bureau of Reclamation, in conjunction with the Montana Fish and Game Commission, has developed a plan to protect the most frequently exposed areas by a series of dikes, dredging of silt, and flooding, resulting in impoundments being created and developed for wildlife enhancement, and

Whereas, the proposed plan would:

(a) provide complete dust abatement for forty-six hundred (4,600) acres of beaches lying between elevation 3797 and 3780, which constitutes the limit of the most frequently exposed areas;

(b) maximize wildlife and recreation enhancement with a planned water supply and control facilities;

(c) greatly enhance the ecology, environment, and physical appearance of the area by providing wildlife nesting and breeding grounds;

(d) assist in controlling the air pollution of the area; and

(e) would serve as an excellent demonstration project for other areas experiencing similar dust problems.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the House of Representatives of the state of Montana urge the United States Congress to appropriate funds to carry out the plan of dust abatement proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation for Canyon Ferry Reservoir.

Be it further resolved, that the House of Representatives of the state of Montana urge the Montana congressional delegation to support any federal legislation proposed to accomplish this purpose.

Be it further resolved, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States

Senate, The Honorable Mike Mansfield and The Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from the state of Montana, and The Honorable John Melcher and The Honorable Richard Shoup, Congressmen from the state of Montana.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 23

A resolution of the House of Representatives requesting immediate passage of enabling legislation in the interests of national defense and for reestablishment of more efficient mail and rail services to all the people, by providing distribution enroute of all four classes of in-transit mail by highly qualified railway postal clerks, in refitted railway postal cars and highway post offices, in Montana and interstate in the United States of America

Whereas, it is a fact that mail services of all four classes of in-transit mail to the public under present postal policies and practices, is now too uncertain and inadequate, and institution of RAIL-PAX theories will further downgrade passenger train travel throughout the entire Northwest, and

Whereas, the United States Post Office Department on September 15, 1967, withdrew Railway Postal Office cars and instituted the detrimental practice of centralizing all four classes of in-transit mail to distribution in designated "Postal Sectional Centers", there being nine (9) in Montana; Miles City, Billings, Butte, Helena, Missoula, Kalispell, Great Falls, Havre and Wolf Point, and all four classes of mail from the immediate vicinity of these nine (9) centers must go first to one of these designated sectional centers for distribution, regardless of the fact that either all or part of that mail may be for destinations between the office of mailing and the sectional center, or in the opposite direction. This backhaul results in totally unjustifiable delay and added transportation costs, payable by the post office department to the carrier, and such backhauled mail amounts to tons daily throughout the United States, and

Whereas, the United States railroad system is the most dependable means of transportation and communication in times of peace or war, in any kind of weather, and the trains maintain their schedules on a very creditable basis, superior in certainty to any other type of transportation, and

Whereas, distribution of all transit mail enroute by highly trained postal transportation clerks in railway postal cars, operated in passenger trains in this area, was entirely eliminated by Postmaster General O'Brien on September 15, 1967, and that the nine (9) sectional centers now do all the mail distribution in this state, and these changes have downgraded mail services, along with airlift taxi service of part of first class mail, and these are inoperative in inclement weather, and in unheated trucks mounted on freight cars (piggybacks), operation, subjecting all perishable mail, liquids, eggs, baby chicks, medicines, fresh flowers, etc., regardless of special delivery or other special fees paid, to being destroyed enroute in these piggybacks operated in freight trains, and these perishables are inexcusably delayed and endangered, thus placing mail service on a par with freight car delivery, and

Whereas, reestablishment of regular daily Railway Postal Office mail service in passenger trains, wherein all four classes of mail in transit is distributed enroute, as done previously by highly trained postal transportation clerks, along with heated mail storage cars, will provide the railroads with ample funds to operate and maintain their equipment more profitably, and provide the public with the very best of mail and passenger train services throughout the country on a more efficient basis than at present.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the state of Montana send to The Honorable Mike Mansfield and The Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from the state of Montana, and The Honorable Richard Shoup and The Honorable John Melcher, Congressmen from the state of Montana, requesting that they use all honorable means within their power to bring about the enactment of necessary legislation with provisions of any needed supplemental appropriation, which will reinstate and maintain on a regular daily basis, fully adequate railway postal services on an interstate basis in the passenger trains of this state and throughout the northwest, equivalent to such mail services in effect previous to September 15, 1967.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 13

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana directing that the State Office of Planning and Economic Development meet with officials of the Holly Sugar Company to determine any common ground that may enable the reopening of the sugar refinery

Whereas, the Holly Sugar Company has announced that it would terminate the refining of sugar from sugar beets, and would close its plant in Hardin, Montana, and

Whereas, such termination is to take effect immediately, to the economic detriment of that community and this state, and

Whereas, no public notice prior to the announcement was given by the Holly Sugar Company to the growers supplying its sugar refinery there, that such closure was imminent, and to the community of Hardin, and

Whereas, there has been no public pronouncement of any interest on the part of Holly Sugar that such closure be temporary, and

Whereas, great hardships and economic deterioration will result in the community of Hardin and in the state, in that such refinery employed fifty-five (55) year-round employees and one hundred fifty (150) seasonal employees, representing an annual economic effect of over six million dollars ($6,000,000), and

Whereas, some thirteen thousand (13,000) acres of irrigated land are adversely affected, and the closure creates a hardship on farm operators who have heavy investments in machinery and equipment suitable only for beet raising, and

Whereas, much of the land involved is owned by members of the Crow Indian Tribe who will suffer loss of income by such closure, and in addition Crow Tribal members are employees of the refinery, and

Whereas, it appears that the freight rate structure applying to the transportation of beets and the refined product contributed to the decision to close, and prohibits the transportation of beets from the stricken area to other refineries, and

Whereas, the tax base of Big Horn County, and the state of Montana are adversely affected.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the House of Representatives earnestly solicit the management officers of Holly Sugar Company to rescind its decision to close the factory at Hardin in 1971.

Be it further resolved, that Holly Sugar Company be requested to study the possibility of putting into effect a phase-out program or a lease arrangement if such is necessary so that producers and workers affected, as well as the community and the state, can gradually adjust to such closure.

Be it further resolved, that the State Office of Planning and Economic Development call for and direct a conference, with all deliberate speed, of the corporate officers of Holly Sugar Company, responsible railroad and motor truck officials, and any other industrial representatives necessary, together with representatives of producers and other interested parties in the area, to determine any common ground that might enable the reopening of such sugar refinery.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be forthwith mailed by the Chief Clerk of the House, to the Holly Sugar Company, to the director of the State Office of Planning and Economic Development, to the mayor of the city of Hardin, Montana, to the Board of County Commissioners of Big Horn County, and to all members of the Congressional Delegation.

TO END A WAR IS SIMPLE, BUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RONCALIO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, when he presented his public summation of the foreign policy—or state of the world—report he recently sent Congress, President Nixon said, with reference to the war in Vietnam:

> It matters very much how we end this war. To end a war is simple. But to end it in a way that will not bring on another war is far from simple.

Throughout recorded history, most wars—the exception being those few that ended in stalemate and just faded away—have ended in victory for one side, and defeat for the other. They were entered into, and fought, on such a basis.

Obviously, things are not quite so simple these days.

One historic axiom, however, applies as clearly today as in earlier times. That is, that it is always far easier to begin a war—any war—than it is to end one; and this certainly applies to the war in Vietnam.

All of us pray for that war's early end, and probably none among us more devoutly so than Richard Nixon.

But there are divisions between us as to how to end this particularly unfortunate conflict. Only a few among us still hold out hope for some sort of military victory—that elusive will-of-the-wisp which, if we believe our own statements, never was a goal we pursued in Vietnam. At the other end of the spectrum, is a larger—but still minority—opinion group that sees ending the war, or at least our involvement in it, as a very simple thing to do, contrary to the President's view. They would have us cut our losses and simply walk out, leaving the Vietnamese to settle their own affairs.

In between these extremes, however, is that largest of all opinion groups composed of those Americans who—for a variety of reasons—agree with Mr. Nixon that "it matters" how we end this war. I doubt "it matters" so much with them, for the moment anyway, that ending it in the wrong way might bring on the possibility the President raised of yet another war. Instead, I think it matters with them because, being people of conscience, they believe we still owe the people of South Vietnam something more than abandonment to their fate. If we are to leave them—and we must, sooner or later—we still wish to leave them with

at least a fair chance of making it the rest of the way on their own.

And so it has been that, despite our bone-deep weariness with the war, a near-unanimous retrospective view that our original involvement in it was a mistake, and our anxiety to cut short its awful costs, most of us have given our support to that method for our gradual disengagement therefrom which the President has devised and calls "Vietnamization."

We have understood the strategic dilemma he has faced in applying that disengagement method—not to withdraw so precipitately as to cause an abrupt deterioration of the military, economic and political situation in South Vietnam of the sort that might destroy whatever chance its people had of standing on their own once we had left and, in light of our own concerns, not to withdraw in such a disorderly fashion as to invite, once our forces were thinned down, some sort of Asian "Dunkirk" for those that remained.

We recognized that all this would take time to arrange; and we have given the President the time he needed to arrange it, confident that he was moving, on an irreversible course, to end the war as best, and as fast, as he could.

At the same time, we—or most of us—have recognized that, at best, "Vietnamization" could only end our part in the shooting war; that, if carried out to the point of withdrawal of all U.S. forces, Vietnamese might thereafter still be fighting Vietnamese, a situation with which, as Mr. Nixon properly noted in his recent report, we could "take no satisfaction." Thus, we—or most of us—have similarly recognized that the "constant primary goal" of our overall policy for ending the war for all participants had to be our ambition to arrange a negotiated settlement of the political issues that produced the conflict in the first place; and we were pleased to have the President, in his report, restate that ambition in just those words.

I shall not, in the course of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, go deeper into the question of negotiations. The need to go on searching for a political settlement is of paramount importance. As the President notes, such a settlement is "the heart of the matter; it is what the fighting has been all about." But, though I am not sure we have yet done all we could to "kindle negotiations"—again borrowing a Presidential phrase—that is not what concerns me so much at the moment, nor what prompts these remarks.

Instead, I am concerned—and deeply concerned—over what may be a shift in emphasis by the White House in application of its policy of "Vietnamizing"—or "de-Americanizing," if you prefer—what remains of the conflict while the search for a negotiated settlement goes on.

Such a shift in emphasis may not have taken place—the picture is not clear—but there are some who think it has, as well as others who ask if it is not about to.

Let us now take a look at some of those suggestions:

First, I submit a column entitled "The New Pattern" as the same appeared in the February 23 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, under the by-line of the experienced and usually objective reporter, Joseph C. Harsch:

THE NEW PATTERN

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon has once again ruled out the use of nuclear weapons in the war in Indo-China. He has done it categorically. His words (Feb. 18) were:

"I am not going to place any limitation upon the use of air power except, of course, to rule out a rather ridiculous suggestion that is made from time to time—I think the latest by Hans Morgenthau—that our air power might include the use of tactical nuclear weapons. . . . I have said for a period of five years that is not an area where the use of nuclear weapons, in any form, is either needed or would be wise."

FRIENDLY REGIME

But anything else now goes, including presumably the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, if Mr. Nixon thinks that would help in protecting American forces in Vietnam.

Technically, his condition is "the safety of Americans" in Vietnam. He is prepared to allow his generals to do anything short of using ground troops outside South Vietnam, or nuclear weapons anywhere, to protect "the safety of Americans."

But is something else implied here? I think it is.

The American forces in Vietnam now are protected in part by themselves, and in part by the existence of a friendly political regime and a large army dependent on American aid. Not a single American in Vietnam of any kind would be safe if the regime in Saigon suddenly became unfriendly, or if the army of South Vietnam ceased to be the ally of the United States.

The original stated purpose of American intervention in Vietnam was to allow the people to choose their own form of government.

LONG-TERM PRESENCE

It was long presumed, indeed specified, that Washington would accept any political settlement in Vietnam which was worked out by the people themselves. It used to say that this included a possible coalition government. It was repeatedly stated that the Communist elements in Vietnam could be included in such a coalition government.

Has Mr. Nixon now ruled out any such political solution? Is he saying now that his purpose is to secure and protect a permanent non-Communist regime in Saigon?

It begins to sound like that.

The talk here is no longer of a total American withdrawal. It is rather of a long-term American military presence in support of the existing regime in Saigon.

This is probably now possible. Public opposition to the war has greatly diminished as American casualties have declined and as the draft calls have been cut down. The fighting is being done largely now by willing professionals, not by unwilling conscripts. It is politically possible at home for Mr. Nixon to think now in terms of a long-term American military presence, rather than in terms of total withdrawal. Besides, with unemployment still rising no one wants to add to it by releasing more men from military service.

BARGAINING COUNTER

All of this has broadened Mr. Nixon's range of options. A year ago he had to talk in terms of total American withdrawal. Conditions on his home front imposed that upon him. They no longer do. He could keep a force of a hundred thousand Americans in Vietnam indefinitely, if he chose.

Present indications are that he has so chosen: that he is thinking now of keeping a substantial American military presence in Vietnam so long as they may be necessary or desirable in bolstering and sustaining the regime in Saigon and the armed forces of that regime.

This, of course, rules out any negotiated settlement at the tables of diplomacy in Paris.

It also leaves unsolved the problem of the Americans held in Hanoi's prison camps.

Those luckless persons become Hanoi's last bargaining counter. They will be released, Hanoi says, when the last American leaves Vietnam. But is there anything Mr. Nixon can do to get them released so long as American troops remain in Vietnam? The prisoners will, I suspect, pay the price of a new policy of a permanent American presence in Vietnam.

The Harsch thesis is a disturbing one—at least to me. He suggests, as my colleagues can note, that the President is now thinking of "keeping a substantial American military presence in Vietnam so long as they may be necessary or desirable in bolstering and sustaining the regime in Saigon and the armed forces of that regime," and argues—with which argument I have some trouble since such a result would not necessarily follow—that this "rules out any negotiated settlement at the tables of diplomacy in Paris."

The column by Mr. Harsch appeared prior to the release of the President's foreign-policy report, of course. While its burden of thought concerned me at the time, I thought it best to await that report to see if Mr. Nixon might therein shed any greater light on what was, at best, an ambiguous situation.

I now have that report before me—and have read it, and re-read it, most carefully.

While I find it, in most respects, a valuable, very comprehensive, and well-reasoned document—including the section therein on Indochina—I have not been able to find any real clues, of the sort I was looking for, to help me better understand the President's ultimate intentions via Vietnamization.

Now, certainly, a certain amount of ambiguity on the President's part relative to all this is both understandable and supportable—especially at this particular moment when the results of the Laotian operation which, despite its obvious risks, may be sound military strategy, are still uncertain.

At the same time, however, Richard Nixon can hardly be unmindful of the political lesson learned at such great cost by his immediate predecessor through failing to keep the American people—not to mention the Congress—within his confidence, to the fullest extent possible.

Surely, I had no desire to embarrass the President—to force him, at an inopportune time, to tip his hand.

But, still, the questions came—and the doubt continued to grow in my own mind.

There was, for instance, this column by James Reston entitled "Backing Out of the Saloon," as carried in the February 21 edition of the New York Times:

BACKING OUT OF THE SALOON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The latest official explanation of the President's Indochina policy is

that "he is backing out of the saloon with both guns firing," but there is a catch to this.

He insists that the guys in the white hats keep control of the saloon before he leaves town. He wants a non-Communist bartender, and a non-Communist sheriff, and a secure non-Communist town before he rides away into the sunset of November, 1972. It is a logical personal and political strategy, but in Asia it is a military and geographical contradiction. Asia is not a frontier town, and the white hats are a small minority.

Washington is deeply divided about all this, increasingly frustrated and cynical, because the President is emphasizing one thing and doing another. He is emphasizing withdrawal of the American troops to keep the home front quiet and fighting in Laos to cripple the enemy and keep the Saigon front quiet, and the thing would probably work if the white hats were in the majority in that part of the world or if the President stayed around. It is his withdrawal and his faith in the minority in Saigon that is troubling and dividing Washington. In the short run the strategy will probably work, but in the long run geography and the majority will probably prevail, and meanwhile, what will justify the bloodshed?

It is not possible to understand the honest differences here over the President's policy unless a distinction is made between his dual aims of getting out and maintaining a non-Communist regime in Saigon. At some point he has to choose: He can stay in Indochina with his air power and probably prevail for a time against the patient weight of China's seven hundred million people, a quarter of the human race, or he can withdraw the American expeditionary force, but it is doubtful that he can do both.

Maybe he could do it long enough to hold the line through the Saigon election this autumn and the American Presidential election of 1972, but the future order of the world is not going to depend on the re-election of Richard Nixon or Generals Thieu and Ky. Either a non-Communist government in Saigon is vital to the interests of the United States or it isn't. If it is, we should stand and fight—not hold General Thieu's coat or count on the C.I.A.'s mercenary tribal warriors to fight in the hills or, if cutting the Ho Chi Minh Trail is cutting the enemy's "life line," as Mr. Nixon calls it, leave the battle to the South Vietnamese and abandon them if they are trapped.

This is not to say that the President has a clear intention of making his military strategy fit his re-election problems in 1972. But he is a deeply political man, and there is always a confusion between political interest and the larger realities of world politics. No doubt he hopes that the success in the present Laos campaign would really cut the Hanoi "life line," but the larger historical and geographical realities are against him.

There is something not only illogical but almost dishonorable in his present strategy. If, as the President implies, the invasion of Laos is critical and may even be decisive in the war and "vital" to our interests, then one would have thought we should fight for it. If, as he emphasizes, the main point of what he calls the Laos "incursion" is to "insure our withdrawal, to reduce our casualties and to shorten the war," then this can clearly be negotiated with Hanoi and the National Liberation Front.

Hanoi and the Vietcong are not going to refuse to agree to the departure of the American troops. If this is really the President's purpose, he can get the boys back home and end the casualties and shorten the war. He can negotiate this, he doesn't have to fight for it in Laos or anywhere else.

But this is clearly the puzzling point. He must have another purpose, and the guess here is that his purpose is really to maintain a non-Communist regime in Saigon. Indeed this has been central to the struggle from the very beginning. There is a good argument for it, but the thing should be stated plain and clear. Who will control Vietnam—the Communists or the non-Communists? This is what the battle is all about, and at least it ought to be made clear.

Mr. Nixon presented the Laos adventure this week as if it would settle everything. The North Vietnamese, he said "have to fight here or give up the struggle to conquer South Vietnam, Cambodia, and [give up] their influence extending through other parts of Asia." But why do they have to do so? They can withdraw and wait while Mr. Nixon brings the boys back home. They have been fighting the Chinese, the French, the Japanese and themselves for thousands of years. They can lose and retreat into the jungle and try again after Mr. Nixon has kept his promise to withdraw our men. After all, November, 1972, means nothing to them.

It is this contradiction of withdrawing American troops and leaving the battle to the South Vietnamese that is tearing up this capital. This is a political city, and everybody understands the President's dilemma. In fact, most people here understand his political strategy and agree that he can probably hold the line with air power through the next couple of years. But all this is a little more complicated than "backing out of the saloon." The hills are full of black hats in that part of the world, and they are still going to be around long after Mr. Nixon has retired to San Clemente.

I regret that Mr. Reston saw fit to use the words "almost dishonorable" in describing the President's strategy. Ambiguity—perhaps too much of it—marks that strategy and, perhaps, depending on your point of view, a certain amount of illogic. But of more importance is the Reston idea that Mr. Nixon assigns "dual aims" to his "Vietnamization" policy—the "aims of getting out and maintaining a non-Communist regime in Saigon," between which dual aims and at some point in time, Reston argues, the President must choose for, as he says, "it is doubtful he can do both."

I must say I share the same doubt. But, in any event, from the February 25 edition of the Times came a column by David Halberstam—a Pulitzer Price winner and contributing editor to Harper's magazine. That column was entitled "Laos and the Old Illusions," and read as follows:

LAOS AND THE OLD ILLUSIONS

(By David Halberstam)

So this time it is Laos.

On and on it goes: Who would have thought that instead of the light at the end of the tunnel we would have found a tunnel at the end of the tunnel. The rationalizations are familiar: shorten the war, bring the troops home quicker, protect American lives, improve the morale of the South Vietnamese Government, serve notice on Hanoi of the seriousness of our intent.

Yet one has a sense of microcosm about Laos; if it invokes all the old rationales it also reeks of all the old misconceptions and illusions.

The first is the belief that when we make a move the other side has no alternative, no counter-move. This is perhaps the most remarkable continuing illusion of the war. Its entire history going back to 1946 has been that the Vietnamese Communist forces possess the greater roots in society, the greater willingness to die for their ideas. (Thus the misconception of the Kennedy years when the idea of limited war was fashionable: you fight limited war, but the other side, small, underdeveloped, fights total war.)

The most neglected lesson of the war is that it is their country. Time is on their side. They can take all the time they want. (If the guerrilla is not defeated then he has won, once said the noted political scientist Henry A. Kissenger before he went from critic to second-stage architect of the war.) Whatever we do, they can match. We bomb the North; they send men down the trail. We send combat troops to the South; they send more men down the trail. We go after the Cambodian sanctuaries; they shift the war to Cambodia where once again they are stronger. So we move into Laos, South Vietnamese or American troops notwithstanding. Does anyone familiar with the painful history of the war really believe that they cannot move somewhere else where we are weak and they are strong?

The second illusion might be called the illusion of tangible structures. Trails, sanctuaries, main force units, depots, factories. Things to be seen, photographed, identified, and destroyed. This has always been a central problem. Do you see it as a war in which the tangible structures and the tangible force levels are the given? Or do you see it as a war in which these structures are the minor temporary reflection of the other side—the real factor being his ideas, his determination? Twenty-five years of war has proven that the latter view is the dominant one ("And how long do you Americans wish to fight?" Pham Van Dong asked four years ago in Hanoi. "One year? Two years? Twenty years? We will be glad to accommodate you." Yet the instinct on the part of Westerners particularly of Western military men, has always been to concentrate on structures and to overrate the results of temporary destruction of them.

There is a melancholy feeling to this. A feeling that we are back where we were a few years ago. The question is how and why we got here again. The earliest tipoff came during the silence of the 1968 campaign; had Nixon truly wanted to get out he would have surfaced with his thoughts then.

Then in early 1969 when there was still an official silence, when Mr. Kissinger went around Washington telling people that the greatest mistake of the Johnson Administration was Clifford and Harriman's attacks upon the Thieu-Ky Government. And then Nixon's own attack on Clifford. Quickly after that the most important speech of the Administration, Nixon's Nov. 3, 1969, speech when he said we would get out, but get out with honor and where he bought the assumptions and the rhetoric of the war; that a viable non-Communist South Vietnam is vital to American interest.

That policy has of course become clearer ever since: The welcoming of hawkish labor leaders to the White House, the honoring of Joseph Alsop, the purging of a dovish Republican Senator, the unleashing of the Vice President upon the war's critics. And Cambodia and Laos. Last week Don Oberdorfer, the Washington Post White House correspondent, wrote a particularly incisive explanation of what had happened, noting "the cardinal point is that the President seems truly to believe that a non-Communist South Vietnam is extremely important to the interests of the United States. He appears to believe this may be achievable and he is prepared to take important risks and incur large costs to further this cause." In other words the President appears to believe that the United States can win the war, or if you prefer, can avoid losing it. He means by "peace" what other people think of as "victory."

So that is why we are where we are, making the same foolish mistakes and taking the same foolish risks.

It is all so futile; for years now the only question left on Vietnam is how much damage we will do to ourselves as a society. Eighteen months ago a group of foreigners went by Mr. Kissinger's office and talked about Vietnam with him.

Midway through Kissinger's explanation

one of the foreigners said it sounded like they were repeating all the old mistakes. Kissinger, who is known and liked for his humor, stopped and answered, no. "We will make our own mistakes in our own way and they will be completely new mistakes." Very funny, very charming. Too bad he was wrong.

Halberstam is known as a longtime critic of the war, but he nevertheless raises a most pertinent question: Is a viable, non-Communist South Vietnam vital to American interest?

That is a question, Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to answer in the affirmative. Which is why, over a period of years, I have been saying that our involvement—"over-involvement," is a better word—in South Vietnam's affairs was a foreign-policy mistake of tragic proportions; an assessment it was not possible for me to alter merely because it had now become the lot of a President of my own political party to try, among other things, to correct that mistake.

Now, let me try to make one thing crystal clear at this point, Mr. Speaker, if I can.

I do not—for one moment—doubt Mr. Nixon's determination to disengage us from this conflict which has cost us so dearly.

In point of fact, by any standard, the speed and scale of our actual withdrawal from the conflict for Vietnam—as directed by the President—has been most impressive.

The President has thus far kept every promise he has made regarding withdrawal to the American people. As detailed in his foreign-policy report, when he assumed office, the authorized American troop strength in Vietnam was 549,500, and troop levels in Vietnam had been steadily rising during the previous 5 years as also—and so unhappily—had been the level of U.S. casualties.

By contrast, as of January 1 of this year, our authorized troop level in Vietnam was down to 344,000 and, by May 1 of this year, Mr. Nixon promises it will drop to a new ceiling of 284,000.

To continue, 2 years ago American combat deaths for the previous 12 months were 14,561, and averaged 278 weekly. For 1969, the comparable figures were 9,367 and 180, respectively. While for 1970, they were 4,183 and 80; and for the last 6 months of 1970, were 1,337 and 51; besides which, except for the past week, the decline has been constant.

In addition to all of which, as I saw for myself when I was in Vietnam last July, U.S. forces are almost entirely out of ground combat—large units, anyway, and middle-sized units, too, for that matter. In addition to which, again, although the fact does not seem to be generally known, draftees—who, wrongly to my mind, used to be carrying much of the burden of ground combat in what was essentially a political war in which the security of the United States was, at best, only peripherally involved—have now been almost totally relieved of ground combat duty, and risks, and are now largely assigned to logistical or support activities.

This reflects—and dramatically so—the manner in which South Vietnam's own forces have been taking over this war, which is still theirs, as it always essentially has been to win or lose; something that is also reflected—as reported by the President—in the fact that while, 2 years ago, the ratio of South Vietnamese forces to American forces in Vietnam was less than 2 to 1, today it is more than 3½ to 1. A fact still further reflected in the war's dollar cost to us which, 2 years ago, was approximately $22 billion per year but is now down to about half that, according to Mr. Nixon.

For all of which President Nixon deserves our congratulations, and our thanks, for he has certainly set us in the right direction, at last, in Vietnam: "Out."

Understanding the nature of the progress made in that direction helps us understand why, for instance, Secretary of State Rogers has been heard to exclaim, in response to the President's critics: "Do they not know we are getting out?"

As one who has supported the "Vietnamization" policy—not because I saw it as a perfect policy, nor anything like an answer, in and of itself, to the burden of responsibility we may wrongly have assumed for the South Vietnamese, but because it seemed the best course we could then adopt—I do not now wish to be numbered among the President's critics.

However, Mr. Speaker—as now confronted by the ambiguities surrounding the issue of where we go from here with "Vietnamization"—I can only answer Mr. Rogers' question this way: "Well—yes, and no."

For, at the risk of overburdening the RECORD, I believe it would be of value to ask my colleagues to consider two more newspaper articles of recent vintage that seem to round out the dilemma I face, for such interest as that may be to others.

The first such item is a column by Richard Wilson entitled "Confrontation on Vietnam Policy," as carried in Washington's Evening Star on March 2:

CONFRONTATION ON VIETNAM POLICY

Now there can be no doubt that the issue is joined between President Nixon and all those in both parties in the United States Senate on when and how to terminate American involvement in Indochina.

Anyone who reads with any care the 60,000-word statement on foreign policy submitted to Congress cannot escape the conclusion that the United States will be deeply involved militarily for many years to come if Nixon's policy prevails.

Nor could anyone escape the conclusion that the Democrats of the Senate, including all the presidential candidates, are resolved to bring American involvement totally to an end at some certain date far short of any likely termination under Nixon's policy.

The result is a confrontation equally as important as that on the battlefield. The Vietnam issue which was defused in the election of 1968 and 1970 now promises to become the paramount issue in 1972.

The President's policy statement contains two essential points. First, there is no expectation of a negotiated settlement, and even if there were one in Vietnam the war would still go on in Cambodia and Laos. Second, and this is a subjective conclusion, the President will be compelled to create at the best a Korea-like condition in a long-term commitment to sustain a non-Communist government in South Vietnam. At the worst, heavy U.S. air support will be required for long-continuing military operations of the army of South Vietnam.

And the question now before the country is whether or not the people of the United States will support the President in a policy falling far short of complete withdrawal from Indochina.

The President has thus finally had the fortitude to make explicit what had formerly been merely sound conjecture. There will be no early end to the war. He will not bug out. He will not abandon South Vietnam to the Communists for fear that if he does not he will be defeated for re-election in 1972.

All pious disclaimers to the contrary, that is what Nixon's critics wish him to do. But they were reasonably certain he would not do it before they demanded he do so, and now they are sure he will not.

In the White House there is total awareness of the issue. It is condensed into the oft repeated statement there that the people will judge in 1972 if Nixon's policy is supportable.

To this end, and preliminary to a similar report next year, the Nixon accomplishments have been listed and highlighted lower casualties, troop withdrawals, a sharp increase in the ratio of South Vietnamese to American fire fights but not any more a promise to end the war, and not any more the slightest reliance on a negotiated settlement.

If one were to chart the temperature of White House briefings over the last couple of years it would show high readings of hope and expectation in the earlier months slowly receding into the lower degrees prevailing today.

More and more the President's chief adviser, Dr. Henry Kissinger, sounds like his predecessor, Walt Whitman Rostow. More and more President Nixon faces the dilemma of President Johnson. But when all that is said, and the long-range nature of the contest in Asia is appreciated, still Nixon has wound down the war, as President Johnson would also undoubtedly have done had he not decided that he could not unite the country behind his policies.

Even with the war winding down, the country is not united, and there will come a time when Nixon, like Johnson, must consider whether or not he can hold the country to a steady course for another period of years to achieve a stable non-Communist or non-aligned South Vietnam.

It would seem now as unlikely that Nixon would decide he could not hold the country steady as it was unlikely Johnson ever would have come to such a conclusion.

But the recurrence of one phrase in Nixon's report to Congress must be noted. He has laid strong emphasis on the limits to American policy imposed by the extent of support for it by the American people.

That is the matter at issue right now, and once again. Since it weighs so heavily on Nixon's mind, it must be considered the controlling factor in whether or not he can carry out his policy.

That is why the result of the present confrontation in American domestic politics is as important, or more important, than the confrontation on the battlefield.

Mr. Wilson flatly states:

The United States will be deeply involved (in Vietnam) militarily for years to come if the Nixon policy prevails—

And that—

there will be no early end to the war.

This is a prospect that I, for one, do not believe a majority of the American people is—rightly or wrongly—willing to accept; and I have to say I have grave doubt of the President's ability to rally the American people behind such a policy. I say that because I think a majority

of them tend to believe—as I believe—that we have done about all we can for the South Vietnamese, and that it is beyond our power, as well as being far outside the scope of our strategic interests in Southeast Asia, to now attempt to guarantee, or insure, for them the success we hope they will eventually have.

My reasons for taking such a position are quite well summed up in the last insertion I wish to submit with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, which is the lead editorial for the March 3d edition of the Wall Street Journal, that addresses itself to the choice to be made as between what the writer describes as "Vietnamization's two-pronged purposes":

THE SUBTLE QUESTIONS

At this point, we think the questions to raise about the South Vietnamese strike into Laos are not the obvious military ones; indeed, we think it a mistake to judge the operation a failure too hastily. The questions of the moment, rather, are more subtle ones about an evolution, or clouding, or even escalation of the purposes of the Vietnamization policy.

The strategic justification of the Laos operation, it's important to remember, is to reduce the North Vietnamese offensive capability in South Vietnam next year, when American forces will be smaller and more vulnerable. One way to do this is to disrupt supply routes, the original tactical intention of the mission. The penetration was apparently stopped short of its planned depth when it became evident the North Vietnamese were choosing to fight. But if the enemy spends his men and material fighting for mountaintops in Laos, he will not have them to spend in South Vietnam next year. Thus the allied strategy can work even if the outcome of the Laotian fighting is in itself inconclusive.

The obvious risk is that the outcome will be worse than that. So far the South Vietnamese have taken a number of individual defeats without cracking, and no doubt the heavy fighting has been costly for the Communists. There are suggestions, though, that the enemy is massing for a huge battle, another great throw of the dice. By massing, he will be open to heavy punishment from U.S. airpower. But he can hope to humiliate the South Vietnamese army, and to unravel the Saigon government and the whole Vietnamization policy.

This very high risk in the Laotian strike, even if it is in fact offset by a comparably higher chance of success, seems to us to raise questions about the administration's fundamental purpose in Indochina. We have always understood Vietnamization as a two-pronged policy. The paramount purpose was to withdraw American forces, but a secondary purpose was to preserve at least a chance that a non-Communist government could be maintained in Saigon. Giving Saigon that chance was necessary to American honor and world credibility, but if South Vietnam did fall when the time came to stand alone, at least American troops would no longer be involved.

The questions start because on its face the Laotian operation looks more like an attempt to insure a non-Communist South Vietnam than an attempt to insure continued American withdrawals. Not that its success would not speed withdrawals, but one wonders whether risks of this magnitude are really critical to their continuation.

One wonders even more after a remarkable article by Peregrine Worsthorne of the London Sunday Telegraph, based on private interviews with President Nixon and his national security adviser, Henry Kissinger. In an entirely sympathetic and optimistic way, it describes how Vietnamization was once merely a face-saving formula to cover a North Vietnamese victory, but has now become a way to guarantee a non-Communist South Vietnam.

We hope as hard as we can that events vindicate the optimism Mr. Worsthorne describes. We have long been convinced that, after all that has been done so far, it will be far better for the United States both at home and abroad if a non-Communist Saigon remains to show for the sacrifice. And just because optimism has been wrong in the past is no guarantee it will always be wrong in the future; this administration's track record remains pretty good as its withdrawals testify.

But even if some sort of success is finally won in Vietnam, it will not begin to balance the costs we have paid in blood, in treasure and in the strain on the American social fabric. The purpose of ending these costs must remain the keystone of policy, and there is a danger it will be subtly downgraded if the administration starts to smell a larger success. If it looks as if Saigon's independence can in fact be guaranteed, there will be a temptation to run a few more risks, risks that may compromise the purpose of withdrawals.

If the Laotian operation does fail in any dramatic way all this may not matter, for then perhaps the administration will never have to choose between its two purposes. But we desperately hope it can keep and has kept a firm grip on the first purpose of withdrawal. The load of accumulated grief is such that doubt lingers, that we are haunted by the thought of future troubles when we will look back and say, we had a chance to get out with a modicum of honor but we did not take it.

I hope—with Mr. Nixon—for the success of the current Laotian operation. One can hardly do otherwise, under the circumstances. And I was pleased to have the President say, at last week's press conference, that its success will permit our current troop withdrawal program to go forward, at least at the present rate of about 12,500 men being brought home monthly, for sometime into the immediate future. We will apparently have to wait until April for more specific White House advice on this.

I was also pleased to hear the President, at that press conference, tell us that our goal is still one of "a total withdrawal of all American forces," even if he then shaded that by reminding us that we are for such total withdrawal "on a mutual basis," and stated again that "we will have to maintain at least a residual force in South Vietnam" so long as there are American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam.

But, having said all that, Mr. Speaker, what can I do—what can be done by those of my colleagues who feel as I do—to encourage the President to keep, in the words of the "Journal's" editorialist, a "firm grip on the first purpose of withdrawal?"

The right answer does not come easy. It never has, for there are no easier answers for us than for the President.

But one thing we ought to do, it seems to me, is to put our stamp of approval on Vietnamization—which we have never yet formally done—as being our Nation's present policy toward terminating our role in South Vietnam. We ought to do so if for no other reason than that the President should not, alone, continue to carry the burden for the success, or failure, of such a policy.

We also ought to do so—if we can find a consensus among us—in order to try to clarify for ourselves, and for the people of both the United States and South Vietnam, exactly what Vietnamization means, and what we expect to be able to accomplish thereunder if all attempts at a negotiated settlement of the war should fail.

No less is required of us, as a partner under our Constitution with the President in attempting to shape our Nation's long-range foreign policy.

We can—we must try to—succeed in living up to this responsibility despite the failure of past Congresses, when confronted with the dilemma of Vietnam, to do so.

Finally, we ought to begin anew that search for some consensus among us as to the right way to end this war because—as I suspect is the case, Richard Wilson's column to the contrary—if the President has not yet made up his mind about "where we go from here" with his disengagement policy, and if that question is being still debated at the White House level, Mr. Nixon needs, and may privately want, our advice.

There is presently pending before this and the other body any number of so-called end-the-war resolutions.

I do not question the sincerity of the proponents of any of them, but I do question—even as I suspect they do—whether any of those resolutions have any better chance in this Congress than their counterparts had in the last.

In an effort last year to bridge that gap between what was politically feasible and what was not, I offered two resolutions—House Concurrent Resolution 703, and a stripped-down version thereof, House Concurrent Resolution 756. The thrust of both of these proposals was in the direction of validating a total U.S. withdrawal, via Vietnamization, from former Indochina, in a sense-of-Congress form, and both included approval in that form of our withdrawal from participation in ground combat activities, except insofar as it might be necessary for our remaining troops to defend themselves, on or before May 1, 1971. This is a goal that, thanks to the President, now seems to be well in sight.

In any event, I have now up-dated my prior effort along these same lines and am, today, offering a new proposal.

In doing so, I have purposely switched from a concurrent resolution to a joint resolution—as some interested colleagues, last year, suggested ought to be the legislative approach in order to "wire in" President and Congress in any such attempt at confirming, or validating, our policy toward ending this conflict as now laid down by Mr. Nixon but, unfortunately so far, without formal adoption by the Congress.

As is stated in the new offering, any such policy ought to be a joint undertaking by both President and Congress. Surely, the President, alone, should not carry the burden of responsibility for the success or failure thereof; and I, for one, think it important for us to try to bolster the President's determination—if, in fact, it needs bolstering—relative to the irreversibility and totality, eventuality, of the Vietnamization policy. In any event, Mr. Speaker, the text of the joint

resolution I am now introducing reads as follows:

"Whereas, the people of the United States, at great cost and sacrifice to themselves, have over a period of years been providing direct military assistance to the people of South Vietnam in an attempt to preserve for them the opportunity to determine their own political future without outside interference, and

"Whereas, by so doing, we have fulfilled several times over whatever commitment we may have had to the people of South Vietnam, and

"Whereas, the time is fast approaching when the people of South Vietnam must be left to their own devices and determination, and

"Whereas, the President of the United States, in his foreign Policy Report as sent to the Congress on February 25, 1971, has defined our present policy towards ending the conflict in Vietnam as well as in adjoining areas of former Indochina as being one of seeking 'above all a rapid negotiated solution' thereof and, meanwhile, in the absence of such a settlement, of seeking 'through Vietnamization, to shift American responsibilities to the South Vietnamese,' and

"Whereas, the burden of responsibility for fashioning and carrying out a policy to bring peace to Indochina through negotiations or, failing that goal, to disengage our forces from the conflict therein, should not fall solely on the President of the United States, but rather should be a responsibility shared by both the President and the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress joins with the President in confirming, as the constant primary goal of our policy towards the conflict in Indochina, the search for a negotiated end to the war therein for all participants; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be supported and encouraged in all his efforts to achieve such a negotiated settlement of the political issues dividing the people and nations of Indochina, including the related issues involved in obtaining agreement for the release of all prisoners of war, journalists and other innocent civilian victims, as held by both sides in the conflict; but, irrespective of any such settlement, be it further

Resolved, That United States troop withdrawals from Indochina be continued, on an irreversible basis, until all United States armed forces are withdrawn from Indochina; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress in this regard, that United States servicemen in Indochina should be withdrawn from any and all participation in ground combat activities therein on or before June 1, 1971, except insofar as it may be necessary for such troops remaining therein after such date to defend themselves or their positions; and be it further

Resolved, That it is further the sense of Congress, in this regard, that all other United States servicemen in Indochina, including those specifically engaged in combat-support activities of whatever nature, should be withdrawn therefrom, pursuant to the President's orders, at the earliest practicable date."

Mr. Speaker, what would the adoption of any such resolution—and the language of the one I am suggesting is obviously subject to improvement—accomplish?

As I see it, it would accomplish a number of things, first and foremost among which would be joining together—at long last—of President and Congress, since the President would have to accept, unless he chose to veto the same, in this first attempt at a formal, public consensus respecting our Nation's plan for terminating this long and unfortunate conflict. One of the advantages of achieving such a consensus, if it can be achieved, is that the spoken and unspoken questions relating to "where we go from here" in Vietnam—and the chance of a divisive, partisan debate over those questions—might be ended. That possibility, alone, makes any such effort worth while.

Second, as I see it, we would be putting the Republic of South Vietnam—and its people—on notice, in a way that has not yet come home to them, concerning the finality of our intentions to disengage ourselves from this conflict, and to turn it back to them, with some confidence in the chance that they can, as the President put it, now "hack it."

Third—and assuredly we have to consider, Mr. Speaker, the growing morale problems pertaining to those troops we still have in Vietnam, and those that will arise in the minds of those being sent there to replace them—we would be inserting the word "terminate" into the Vietnam vocabulary, and assuring those who have been and will be carrying the personal risks of combat in Indochina that an end to those risks is in sight.

Personally, in this connection, I would like to go further than I have in setting a time-frame for any such termination. My colleagues will note that I have, as I did last year, fallen back to a "sense of Congress" approach to this difficult question—including an end to ground combat, for our people, except insofar as those remaining in Vietnam may have to defend themselves or their position, by this June 1, which is surely an attainable goal, and then have fallen even further back, as some may say, to a meaningless "earliest practicable date" for the withdrawal of all of the rest of our combat-support troops.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe such an expression of congressional policy would be altogether "meaningless," weak though it may seem on the surface.

Let us remember, in this connection, that we are searching for a consensus relative to our policy toward this war—a consensus not found, if indeed it was legislatively found then, since the ill-fated "Tonkin Gulf Resolution."

Let us also remember, in this connection, that we will be asking the President to accept, and sign, whatever policy statement we may be sending him in this regard; and that he, in considering the same, must be cognizant of his need to retain all the flexibility he can for directing our disengagement from Vietnam, both as Commander in Chief and as a prudent negotiator, with especial emphasis on his latter responsibilities since the pace of American withdrawals, along with the prisoner-of-war issue, may well be the key to whatever chance still remains of successful negotiations at Paris.

Surely, most of us have been around these parts long enough to know that legislation is, as has often been stated to be the case, the "art of the possible," I have had to compromise with myself, in several ways, in drafting my proposal. It is, in many respects, not what I might wish it to be. But, at the same time, I believe it to be a proper vehicle for at least beginning a dialog as to how we can bridge the gaps of attitudes and opinions that exist between us, as well as those that exist between the constituents we each, after our own fashions, do our best to understand and represent in this Chamber.

But, Mr. Speaker, we owe it to those constituents—as well as to the honor of this body—to attempt to bridge those gaps in the most constructive fashion possible; and these remarks, as well as my resolution, are offered in that spirit. If there are any among my colleagues who wish to join in such an effort, their assistance, their suggestions and advice, are earnestly solicited.

QUESTIONS SURROUNDING BONN'S "OSTPOLITIK"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, over a year has passed since West German Chancellor Willy Brandt obtained worldwide attention by announcing his new policy, "Ostpolitik," of seeking reconciliation with his nation's old enemies in Communist Eastern Europe. Because of the considerable U.S. investment and stake in European defense as well as our strong ties with the Republic of West Germany, I feel that it is appropriate for us to review the results of this policy during the past year and to examine its future, potentially far reaching, implications.

We are all, of course, aware of the tremendous controversy which has surrounded this policy. The outburst of domestic opposition in West Germany has been extremely widespread and fierce, involving, among others, members of the German Bundestag. The position of the U.S. Government has been continuously surrounded by confusion—with recurring press reports of official opposition accompanied by denials of the same by various government spokesmen.

By far the greatest attention and controversy has centered on two concrete results of "Ostpolitik" thus far—the Polish and Soviet treaties—and domestic opposition has centered on the feeling that in these treaties West Germany gave away a great deal and received nothing in return.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and one who feels both great friendship for the West German Republic and great concern for the future defense of the free world, I have particular reservations about the Soviet-German Nonaggression Treaty which was signed in Moscow on August 12, 1970.

Because the Soviet Union has never been known to enter into such agreements without the expected results accruing primarily to its advantage, and further because the Soviet Union has seldom abided by the treaty commitments to which it has agreed, I feel that this particular treaty should be viewed with a great deal of caution from the outset.

The nonaggression aspect of this treaty, furthermore, is cause for not only

caution but great wonderment as well. There is certainly no question but that West Germany, with its limited military offensive capability, represents no present or future military threat to the Soviet Union. And given the already-mentioned Soviet record—or "nonrecord"—of treaty compliance, it is difficult to believe that anyone could expect this treaty to deter the Soviets from aggression against West Germany.

It is an easy task indeed to discover some of the varied benefits which the Soviet Union would derive from such a treaty. The Soviet "image" has already benefited by the fact that many persons have seized upon the treaty as new evidence that the Soviet Union is becoming an increasingly amicable member of the world community of nations. The treaty, furthermore, essentially recognizes the status quo in Europe—dealing a critical blow to the hope held by countless West Germans, of assisting those Germans living under Soviet occupation in East Germany. Most of all, the troubled Soviet economy is strengthened through this treaty by its linkage with the strongest economy in Western Europe. The preamble of the treaty includes a very significant paragraph concerning "extension of economic cooperation" and separate economic negotiations and arrangements have already begun. This economic aspect of the treaty must also be viewed in a defense-security context, since any arrangements of economic benefit to the Soviet Union will obviously make it easier for them to fuel the arms race unhindered by domestic economic difficulties.

Discerning benefits which would accrue to West Germany from this treaty is obviously a far more difficult task and one in which I have been unsuccessful thus far. The treaty has not yet been ratified by the West German Bundestag and Chancellor Brandt has made a satisfactory solution of the Berlin problem a precondition to submitting the treaty for ratification. Those of us who share the above concerns will, however, continue to watch with great interest the debate in Germany on this important matter.

REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1971 AND FEDERALIZATION OF WELFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills that will provide the Ways and Means Committee with proposed legislation that will assure that States which carry a large tax burden and/or welfare burden receive an equitable share of any program that seeks to turn Federal taxes back to State and local governments.

Two suggestions that have gained support are the general revenue-sharing proposal of President Nixon and vague statements that would have the Federal Government take over all costs of welfare.

To alleviate some of the confusion, I am introducing two bills that have features which I feel should be incorporated into each proposal to assure that States like Connecticut, which carry a heavy tax burden and a heavy welfare burden, receive their fair share.

REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1971

As the President correctly pointed out, $9 out of $10 collected in personal income tax are collected by the Federal Government. However, the President does not take this factor into account when it comes to allocating the money under his revenue-sharing scheme; he only uses population and State and local taxation as the basis for local allocation of funds. In Connecticut, for example, $0.74 of every personal tax dollar goes to the Federal Government. Moreover, Connecticut ranks second in the Nation in Federal taxes collected per $1,000 of personal income.

I think these few statistics demonstrate that the President's allocation formula is deficient and that the total tax effort as well as population should be utilized in determining the overall allocation to the States. Therefore my bill proposes that funds will be allocated on population and total; that is, State, local, and Federal, tax effort.

There is a second feature of my bill that should be in any revenue-sharing bill. There should be special emphasis in areas of high population density. These areas should receive additional assistance. For this reason, in my bill I have earmarked 10 percent of the money for areas of high population density within the Nation to assure that our inner cities get additional funds.

These urban areas are the hardest hit. Faced with a dwindling tax base and accelerated demands for necessary goods and services, palpable needs of the inner city must be recognized and effectively dealt with. By reserving 10 percent of the revenue-sharing fund, a small but necessary step will be taken to meet these problems.

My bill also includes specific prohibition against either the State or local government unit from using revenue sharing in a discriminatory manner. If discrimination is found in the use of these revenue-sharing funds, the funds will be stopped immediately and will not be resumed until the governmental unit has proven that this condition has been fully corrected.

Let me pause briefly to outline the components of the bill:

A general revenue-sharing trust fund of $5 billion. This figure can be increased if there are adequate revenues.

An allocation formula that takes into account total—State, local and Federal—tax effort and population for 90 percent of the trust fund.

The 90 percent is to be divided equally between State and local governments.

Ten percent of the trust fund will be given to those areas of high population density in addition to their regular share of the revenue trust fund.

All funds must be used in such a manner that will not discriminate against any individual. Any discrimination will result in the termination of funds until the discrimination is fully removed.

FEDERALIZATION OF WELFARE

There is another bill that I am today introducing which would have the Federal Government assume the State and local share of welfare costs that are matched by the Federal Government. The legislation is drawn to give the State the option of either allowing Federal takeover or keeping the same system. If the State opts for Federal assumption—I believe that all States would—then the States must return one-half of the savings to the local government. Therefore this bill insures that all the money saved by the States would be equally shared by the State and local governments.

There are two potent arguments in favor of federalization of welfare. First and most important, it would provide direct relief to the overstrained State and local tax dollar. It would mean that those cities being crushed under spiraling welfare burdens would get needed assistance.

Second, it would create a more uniform welfare system. It is widely held, and correctly so, that the welfare system as presently constituted is an unmitigated disaster. Welfare reform is the highest congressional priority and I feel that there will be final congressional action this year. However, I do not feel that the problems will be solved in one bill. A Federal welfare system could make easier correction of problems in the Nation's welfare systems. Such a nationwide system could lessen migration to the inner cities that all too often places a citizen in an alien and hostile environment. In short, federalized welfare could be more easily changed than the 50 different State administrations that now become involved.

These changes are still far down the road, but the immediate effect would be to iree tax dollars. In Connecticut, for example, Federal assumption of welfare would release an estimated $96 million. Of this, $48 million would be returned to the local governments.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I am introducing these bills to place before the Ways and Means Committee alternative proposals that will insure big taxpaying States such as Connecticut their fair share of Federal-sharing moneys, whatever method is used.

I am confident that the members of Ways and Means and of this House will give serious attention to these proposals. Both proposals are offered in the hope that this Congress will not accept any program without understanding each of the components and problems. I am certain that this will be the case.

INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in some primitive societies, the old and the incapacitated are taken out and left to die.

In sophisticated, technological 20th-century America we are doing essentially the same thing.

We are leaving the old and the disabled to limp and wither economically while we go about our parliamentary gamesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on this special order to object to the ransoming of older Americans for passage of welfare reform. I urge this House to enact social security legislation—including the 10-percent increase and the cost-of-living escalation—quickly and separately from welfare reform.

I take notice of today's developments in which a Member of the other body suggests we attach the social security bill as a rider to the debt-limit increase to free it from the time-consuming maneuvering on welfare reform.

If that is a way to move quickly, I support it.

My only objection is to the necessity of tying social security legislation to something else, of hitching it to some other star. Why cannot this Congress simply honor this Nation's commitment to its retired workers free and clear of any cloakroom plots? Why cannot this Nation discharge its debt to these people, a recompense to which they are fully entitled by virtue of their contributions, financial and otherwise?

Mr. Speaker, the country hurtles forward in pursuit of its own grail. Those who have withdrawn from the chase are due some peace and comfort and security. Their fixed incomes should become unfixed to allow them freedom from the worry of keeping up with the economic pace which passes them by.

This House acted last year quickly and responsibly on this social security legislation. It became enmeshed in the other body in other considerations and died in the lameduck session. It was reintroduced in the 92d Congress as H.R. 1, the first bill on the first day. Now, 2 months later, it languishes while the legislative chess game is played out.

In the meantime, the cost of living goes up, higher and higher and our senior citizens fall further and further behind in trying to meet the requirements of ordinary daily living.

The promise that the benefits in the legislation are retroactive are of little consequence to people trying to match stationary pensions against multiplying food, rent, transportation, and medical bills. The retroactivity, when it comes, may not allow them to catch up, much less stay even.

And that raises another point. By the time older people get these increased benefits, the cost of living will have outdistanced them again and they will be in need of another increase. H.R. 1 is highly important but should include the cost-of-living escalation which will eliminate the need for this House to come riding over the hill with an increase every time disaster is about to overtake social security recipients.

This escalator clause should end the chronic fear of economic extinction and allow this House to say "We have permanently righted a wrong. We have solved a nagging national problem." That is a great deal for this House to be able to say to the American people.

It seems quite apparent that the senior citizens are being held hostage in the legislative chess game as we consider the total issue of changes in other segments of our society in the area of welfare, for example. If we can separate these sections of H.R. 1, it is important that this bill be improved. It is important that the increase be at least 10 percent. It is also important that the cost-of-living escalator clause be included.

It would be a great help to our senior citizens to have an increased earnings allowance. I would suggest it be increased to $3,000 for each individual. An unrealistically low limitation deprives society of the contribution senior citizens can make. Their skills and talents must be solicited rather than discouraged, as presently is the case.

If we increase the earnings allotment, we are saying to them: "If you are still willing to partly earn your own way, you can be more adequately compensated."

The entire legislation would then free them from their present helplessness of being able neither to receive adequate compensation nor earn enough to make it adequate.

These people, Mr. Speaker, are our mothers and fathers, aunts and uncles, grandmothers and grandfathers. They have given us the gift of life, the privilege of American citizenship in this the greatest country in the world, and the inestimable inheritance of this country for which they labored so long and so faithfully. We owe them a very great deal.

And we must not overlook the younger survivors and disabled who also receive benefits under social security and who are no less in need and no less deserving of help than their elders.

These are reasons enough for us to act quickly and decisively on this matter. Our original good faith of last year has become warped and frustrated; we must not permit social security to be a hostage to welfare reform.

I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to set this legislation free so we can pass it. Endless submersion in welfare reform will benefit neither program. Let us be able to consider each on its merits and enact each for its own reasons.

It seems to me that at this point we must acknowledge the contributions and the needs of our elder Americans, for many have waited too long. The time for enactment of this needed social security legislation is now.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I am happy to yeld to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. I commend the gentlewoman for bringing this to the attention of the House, and I wish to associate myself with her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with others here in attempting to call to the attention of the House of Representatives, the great need for a concerned effort to get action on increased social security benefits.

More than 26 million elderly Americans depend on social security benefits to meet living costs. And to most of these Americans, the low fixed income they receive is not sufficient to assure them a decent standard of living.

We have been promising these people an increase in benefits since last May, when the House first passed this legislation. It is now almost a year later, and we still can give no assurance of when this increase will come into being.

There is no logical explanation for failure to act on this legislation; we know that as well as our elderly citizens. These people deserve more than empty promises of help at a time when continued inflation eats away their income. They deserve more than a day-to-day existence.

We have been promising them help and it is long past time that we collectively illustrate that we do, indeed, intended to help them by making this the first order of business and enacting this legislation without any more delay.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I recall well that as we both first came to serve in this honorable body we then expressed the same concern for the senior citizens which prompts our action today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to participate in this important special order because the subject at hand is most important and pressing: Social security recipients all over this country continue to be forced to live on insufficient benefits while their important benefits increase remains bogged down in the Ways and Means Committee in legislation which includes the controversial and unrelated welfare reform program.

It is imperative that the social security increase be separated from the welfare program so that, as quickly as possible, those who depend on social security may receive a 10-percent increase in benefits, together with provisions for automatic cost-of-living increases.

As you know, this matter of increased social security benefits and automatic cost-of-living increases has already been the subject of long and unnecessary delaying tactics for almost a year. On May 21, 1970, the House passed legislation which provided for a benefits increase and automatic cost-of-living increases. This legislation then became the target of Senate delaying tactics, which stalled their passage until December 29, 1970, when it was passed with over 100 differences from the House-passed version.

In the 91st Congress the Senate was responsible for this high-priority legislation not being enacted. I urge my colleagues in this 92d Congress not to permit another such inexcusable delay to be caused by the action of the House in tying this important social security legislation to the highly controversial welfare reform program.

A 10-percent increase in social security benefits and provisions for automatic cost-of-living increases are needed by countless Americans right now.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has taken a special order to discuss a matter which has been of great concern to all Members of this body. Because of irreconcilable differences between the House and Senate versions of the Social

Security Act of 1970, it was never agreed upon by the Congress. This is indeed unfortunate since the ravages of inflation have continued to eat away at the fixed incomes of many of our senior citizens. I hope this body will take speedy action on House Resolution 1 when it is reported to the House floor.

I find that there is a basic philosophical inconsistency found in the Social Security Administration's position with regard to the income limits which are placed upon those receiving Old Age Survivors Insurance benefits. The Social Security Administration has supported the concept of a guaranteed annual income for all Americans which would guarantee a base income regardless of whether or not a person works or ever worked in his life. On the other hand, there are many senior citizens who have contributed to the growth of this nation and have paid into the social security system for over 30 years. It is their funds which have enabled Social Security to be as actuarially sound as it is now.

Under the present law, a person receiving social security benefits can earn an income of no more than $1,860 without losing part of one's benefits. As you might have noticed, I emphasized earned income. Funds from investments and annuities are not counted. Thus we have a situation facing us in which the Social Security Administration will pay people a guaranteed income whether they work or not, but at the same time workers who paid for their Old Age Survivors Insurance for over 30 years are being denied this benefit. I believe this inequity should be removed as soon as possible, and I plan to offer legislation within the near future to do so.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the distinguished Congresswoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) in her plea that the social security legislation providing increases in benefits be expedited, even if this means severing other matters including welfare reform from the bill before the House Ways and Means Committee and having the committee act on those portions separately.

I am aware of the great and desperate need for welfare reform—but I believe that proposals for welfare reform should be considered on their own merit. The controversy which has been stirred up regarding various welfare proposals should not be permitted to delay action on the social security benefit increases that should by all rights have been enacted last year.

True, the bill provides that whatever social security benefit increases are eventually provided will be retroactive to this January, the same effective date as was given in the legislation the House passed last year but which died in the other body. However, the elderly and disabled, caught in the intolerable crush of inflation, need these increased benefits now, not several months or perhaps a year from now. We cannot continue cruelly holding out false hope to social security beneficiaries, many of them so dependent entirely upon their social security checks that even a day or two delay in the delivery of a check can mean a very real and major personal economic crisis to them. Welfare reform and other proposals in the bill before the House Ways and Means Committee are important but are not of the same degree of urgency as is the necessity for immediate enactment of social security increases, preferably with built-in cost-of-living increases such as were adopted by House floor amendment in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Committee on Ways and Means for acting deliberately and with due circumspection regarding the various proposals in this omnibus bill, especially when far too often even amendments to the basic Constitution of this Nation are reported by other committees with little or no hearings and with little true study or discussion, under pressures of the moment and for the sake of expediency. However, the social security aspects of this bill have been thoroughly explored, and were acted upon during the previous Congress. I strongly urge, and on behalf of social security beneficiaries of northwest Iowa and throughout the Nation, I plead, that the social security provisions in H.R. 1 be divorced from other provisions in that legislation and be reported at the earliest possible moment, and that all necessary action be taken by the leadership in the House and in the other body to speed enactment of these social security amendments into law.

We owe it to the elderly and disabled of the Nation to act at least as quickly on meritorious social security proposals as this body has acted in the recent past on increases in pay and benefits for its own Members and employees.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CBS AND MIKE WALLACE DESERVE MUCH CREDIT FOR EXPOSING FHA ABUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, since early last summer, the Banking and Currency Committee has had the FHA 235 program under close scrutiny. We have been deeply concerned about apparent abuses stemming from extensive real estate speculation in this program. We have also been deeply concerned about the fact that FHA has allowed so many substandard dwellings to be approved for this program.

In many areas, it appears that the FHA 235 program is financing slums and enriching speculators rather than providing decent housing for low- and moderate-income families as the Congress intended.

On January 6, the Banking and Currency Committee issued a detailed report on these abuses in various cities across the land. Since that time, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, has suspended part of the FHA 235 program pending an investigation of the 235 projects nationwide. At the same time, the General Accounting Office is conducting an investigation. The Banking and Currency Committee is keeping a close watch on these investigations and is continuing to monitor complaints that are coming in from all over the Nation about the Department of Housing and Urban Development and FHA.

The Banking and Currency Committee has requested that Secretary Romney appear before it on March 31 to make a progress report on HUD's efforts to correct the abuses and to put this vital housing program back on the track.

Mr. Speaker, public opinion—and the public spotlight—are essential to gaining reform in these Federal housing programs so that the people—and not the speculators—are the beneficiaries of the tax moneys which must be expended. Many news media have done excellent jobs of investigating abuses in these housing programs in their areas. This investigative reporting has done much to bring the spotlight to bear on FHA and to prevent the Department of Housing and Urban Development from sweeping the facts under the rug.

Special commendation must go to the Columbia Broadcasting System which has done much to bring national attention to the abuses in the FHA 235 program. On January 5, the CBS program, "60 Minutes," carried an in-depth flim story about the FHA 235 program in several major U.S. cities. The commentary of Mike Wallace and the contents of this show angered the bureaucrats at HUD but it also brought action.

On March 2, "60 Minutes" returned to the FHA 235 program with a detailed analysis of the situation in Spokane, Wash. Once again, the CBS news team has evoked anger from the housing bureaucrats but this program has helped assure that HUD will not be able to hide the facts from the American public.

The investigators for the Banking and Currency Committee have looked at the FHA 235 program in Spokane and in other cities where CBS did its filming. The findings of the CBS investigative reporters coincide with those made by the investigators for the Banking and Currency Committee. Despite the angry outbursts by HUD, the facts are there and every bit of evidence I have seen would indicate that CBS has presented this story in a fair and objective manner.

Mr. Speaker, we often hear criticism of the television networks. Many times, television news programing is correctly criticized for its lack of courage and for the apparent dodging of controversial issues.

The handling of the FHA 235 story on "60 Minutes" provides an effective and strong answer to this criticism. When the abuses are corrected in the FHA 235

program, a lot of the credit must go to the courageous reporting of Mike Wallace and Jeff Gralnick, producer of these shows on "60 Minutes."

Mr. Speaker, some Members of the House did not have an opportunity to see these excellent news shows and I am placing in the RECORD the transcripts of the January 5, 1971, and the March 2, 1971 programs:

CBS: 60 MINUTES, JANUARY 5, 1971

WALLACE. The Department of Housing and Urban Development and its Federal Housing Administration may be well on the way toward insuring itself into a national scandal.

That charge is made in a scathing report by the House Banking and Currency Committee to be released in Washington tomorrow morning. The report focuses on the FHA 235 program, a program designed to make it possible for people who previously couldn't afford to own their own homes—to do just that.

Under FHA 235, with just $200 down, a low or moderate income family can buy a home. The FHA helps. It appraises the house, says the house is worth what the seller is asking. Then the FHA guarantees the mortgage and pays almost all the interest on it.

Since FHA 235 began two years ago, more than 100,000 homes—new and old—have been purchased under it. More than a billion and a half dollars have been committed by the taxpayer to back up those purchases, and all the while the Congress has received a stream of complaints from those who have bought these FHA 235 homes.

It is those complaints that triggered the investigation by the House committee. Its chairman, Wright Patman, is satisfied there is substance to the complaints and he told Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney just that.

PATMAN. I called Mr. Romney's attention to the fact that the law is not working. It's greatly abused. It contains many terrible scandals. It's a detriment to the people who are involved in the purchasing of homes under these contracts and possibly cause them great harm in the future. And something should be done about it immediately. It should be stopped. It's too much of a national scandal now to be allowed to go on.

WALLACE. When Chairman Patman says "national scandal" he is talking about a house like this one in Washington, D.C. Bought by a speculator for $10,000, sold by him three months later, with FHA approval and a 235 mortgage for $17,500, despite 30 major housing code violations.

Or this house in Washington. A speculator bought this one for $9,700. He got FHA approval for a 235 mortgage and sold it for $15,800, despite a dozen building code violations.

Or this rather nice looking house in Paterson, New Jersey, $1,900 and sold eight months later, after rehabilitation, for almost $19,000. Until a week ago the owner, a widow with six children, had no heat on the first floor.

We'll look more closely at an FHA 235 sale later in this report, but first let's take a look at some other aspects of what Chairman Patman calls "a national scandal."

Elmwood Park, a subdivision in St. Louis County, Missouri. New homes here, and FHA 235 guarantees mortgages on these, too. Thirty-two new homes bought by people trying to get out of public housing projects, trying to make a better life for themselves and their children. Thirty-two home owners—all disappointed, all angry.

Paul Broiles is typical. He is head of the newly formed Elmwood Park Homeowners Association.

BROILES. A year ago we bought these houses from $14,000 to $16,000. Sight unseen. And because the mortgages were guaranteed by the FHA, we felt as though the houses would be worth from $14,000 to $16,000. We were also told that the neighborhood would be integrated. But the houses aren't worth from $14,000 to $16,000 and the neighborhood isn't integrated. A lot of the houses have leaking basements. And if you're one of the lucky ones, then the builder gives you a pump, which pumps right out into the backyard. It's got the place looking like a swamp around here. The back steps are—from anywhere from, let's say, ten inches to almost two feet from the ground and if a child—for a small child or a crippled person, it's impossible to use them. So they're just totally useless. We even had one house where the—where the ceiling is beginning to come in, where the roof leaked on the plaster and, well, the ceiling is dropping. We have several of the basements with uncovered insulation. It was never covered up. It's coming out of the walls. And we asked the builder about it. He said they were finished. Well, they're not finished with me and they're not finished with the people that's buying them. Now, they all got showers but the builder never bothered to put the tile in the shower stall. We asked the builder about it and he comes out with "Supposed to be a waterproof paint." It's not waterproof and it just falls in. When you stop and think you got 30 years to pay for a house that's falling in in one year—in less than one year—well, what would it look like in ten?

WALLACE. After talking to Mr. Broiles and seeing the conditions in Elmwood Park, we tried to talk with the builder of these homes. He refused comment and hung up on us.

On the West Coast, a similar story, except at Frontier Homes outside Seattle the home owners are white. There are 57 homes in this subdivision, in the $13,000 to $18,000 range. Good-looking homes, it would seem to somebody driving through. But though they are just one year old, they have already been classified "an instant slum" by an investigator for the Banking and Currency Committee. Mrs. Donna Tetzlaff's $17,000 home is typical, she says:

Mrs. TETZLAFF. I have many problems with my house. It's a little over a year old and it's falling apart. Here is an example. This is common with these houses. I have water in my light fixtures from the bathtub upstairs. The water was coming out this outlet. It was repaired. Now, it's coming out here. They came out and fixed the floor. You'd walk in the front door, the whole house would shake. This is the patchwork repair. We've complained to the builder. We've complained to FHA. And we have complained to the Congress. All we get is a runaround and patchwork.

WALLACE. The Tetzlaffs and the rest of the homeowners here have organized, and they are suing. But many are not waiting. "For Sale" signs dot this community of new homes. But Frontier homeowners are having trouble selling, because the reputation of the subdivision is no secret. For them, and for the Elmwood Park homeowners, in Missouri, all the FHA says it can do is try to persuade the builder to take action by suggesting that he might—in the future—have trouble doing business with the FHA, unless he fixes what's wrong. Beyond that, the homeowners are simply stuck. But in even worse shape are some of the people who bought old houses with the help of FHA 235.

A case in point in Paterson, New Jersey. The 400 block on Graham Avenue, obviously in decay. "For Sale" signs on almost every house. And yet, there is a $20,000 house on this street, according to the FHA, which approved and helps to pay the mortgage on it, in that amount. Number 471 Graham Avenue. It used to be a condemned tavern. It was bought by a real estate speculator for $1800 in November of 1969. He did some electrical work, some plumbing and heating work, about three thousand dollars worth. He was notified by the City of Paterson that the work being done on this house, the conversion from tavern to residence, was in violation of the law. Still, he sold the house, had the FHA appraise it and the FHA approved a mortgage for $20,000.

Living in it now are William Gurley, a truck driver, his wife and six children. They like their home—even though the old bar lights are still on the ceiling and the old bar still lines their living room wall. They like it, but the City of Paterson says they have to leave it.

GURLEY. Well, the city's trying to get us out.

WALLACE. The City of Paterson? Why?

GURLEY. Because (indistinct) was a tavern and it wasn't fit for living quarters.

WALLACE. Do I understand that you want to sell this house now, Mr. Gurley?

GURLEY. Yes, I would sell it.

WALLACE. Why?

GURLEY. Well, because if it's not fit for living quarters, I'll sell it and get my money back out of it.

WALLACE. And the City of Paterson says it's not fit for living quarters?

GURLEY. That's right.

WALLACE. So the Gurleys won't be able to sell their house. The City of Paterson won't let another buyer take it. The FHA can do nothing for the Gurleys, so the Gurleys' only hope is to try to track down the original speculato and sue him. In the meantime, though, they have been ordered to vacate 471 Graham Avenue by February First. So they lose, the FHA loses, the taxpayer loses. The speculator does not.

How does all this happen? I talked with Eugene Gulledge, Assistant Secretary at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the man in charge of FHA 235.

235 can be a haven for a fast buck operator, a shoddy operator, a quick get-in, quick get-out artist.

GULLEDGE. I think it can be; it has been. I don't think it's going to continue to be. I think we, administratively, have been able to recognize the fact that this is drawing flies like honey, and as a consequence we've been able to erect some proper safeguards to—certainly reduce to a minimum the possibility that fast buck artists are operating in this particular field, to the detriment of the homeowner. We have been aware of some of these activities. We have moved to correct those of which we've been made aware. We've issued directives and instructions to warn our offices about the possibility of this type of activity going on. Another thing is that we have instituted steps to make certain that people who buy houses for the purpose of re-selling them, a purchaser-seller in this particular case, sometime called a speculator—but that's a—that's a language people don't like to use sometimes; it has unsavory connotations. But a purchaser-seller, he has got to certify to us now—he hasn't been doing it—but now he has to certify to us what he paid for it, what he's done for it and what his costs of repair were, all on a form which in case there—there is deception or fraud, he can be prosecuted for having done so.

WALLACE. How long ago did this regulation go into effect?

GULLEDGE. Oh, it's just gone into effect in the past two weeks.

WALLACE. How come it took almost two years to get this kind of watchdog regulation?

GULLEDGE. The reason we didn't do it two years ago instead of now is frankly we didn't know the problem existed two years ago.

WALLACE. During those two years the trouble in the 235 program developed almost unnoticed. Who's to blame? Let's go back to Wright Patman.

Who's at fault? Is it the FHA?

PATMAN. I think the FHA has been at least careless and negligent in the performance of their duties.

WALLACE. How?

PATMAN. I can't just say to someone that they are guilty of theft or extortion or corruption, but I know that there's bound to be corruption in this program somewhere. It couldn't exist that way otherwise. It lends itself to corruption. Potential corruption is all over the place.

WALLACE. When Chairman Patman talks of "corruption" it's not just speculation. His investigators have turned up more than one case that suggests a pattern to them. We talked with Patman's chief investigator, James Doherty.

DOHERTY. One appraiser contacted the committee and we sat down and talked with him. And he indicated that on these 235 appraisals, whenever he would make them, the real estate broker or dealer would meet him at the house, would make solicitous remarks about his future, about how little money he was making working for the government and how bright he was and this kind of thing. He, of course, would cut these conversations off. The implication being that if he carried them on, there would be something in it for him. And he summed up by saying that, "I can't say that my fellow—my colleagues in the office—take bribes," he says, "but I can say that the clear implication is that they're offered."

WALLACE. Doherty adds that what he found in the Middle West he found elsewhere in the country, too. So, charges of scandal, hints of bribery and a lot of unhappy homeowners, as a result of FHA 235. How does the FHA view it? Eugene Gullege again.

WALLACE. Mr. Secretary, Chairman Patman has characterized this whole business as developing into a national scandal. Is that too serious a charge?

GULLEGE. I believe it's an overdrawn charge I think anything which—which is wrong is scandalous, but it's not a national scandal unless it's widespread and national pattern.

WALLACE. Washington, D.C., Paterson, New Jersey, St. Louis, Missouri, Seattle, Washington? That's national.

GULLEDGE. These are all the areas where complaints have been received. No attempt had been made to see what—what are the areas where complaints have not been received. I simply don't think it's a national scandal. It's scandalous but not a national scandal.

WALLACE. So even Mr. Gulledge of the FHA admits it's a scandal.

The dimensions of the scandal won't be known for sometime because the investigation is really just getting underway now. The FHA, we learn, is looking into every case we have cited tonight. The U.S. attorney's office in Newark, New Jersey, is looking into several of the FHA 235 transactions in Paterson. And the FBI has launched at least 30 separate investigations into possible fraud or bribery, not in all of the FHA's many programs, just in the 235 program.

The Committee report, as we said, comes out tomorrow morning. It is full of tales of greed and stupidity and bureaucratic ineptness, of a well-meaning notion gone wrong at a painful cost to the American taxpayer. An aide to the House Banking and Currency Committee sums it up this way: "Either the FHA is the most naive and inefficient agency in the Federal Government," he says, "or it is in bed with the real estate operators."

---

60 MINUTES, MARCH 2, 1971

MIKE WALLACE. Two months ago on 60 Minutes . . . we told the story of what Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee in a scathing report) called a national scandal.

The scandal he referred to involved shoddy workmanship and less than savory financial practices in a low and moderate income federal housing program called FHA 235.

Nine days after the broadcast, eight days after the chairman's report was published, Housing Secretary George Romney suspended a portion of FHA 235.

Seldom have we received more mail than after that broadcast. Some of it from real estate people who felt we had told too much of the bad and not enough of the good about FHA 235. . . . But most of it came from homeowners who told us more stories of how they had been bilked.

One of the angriest communications came from Spokane, Washington. Its subject: not just housing abuses but what the House Committee report and our broadcast had caused to happen in Spokane.

We thought we'd take a look.

To an outsider Spokane seems remarkably troublefree. No real racial problems. The city is 98 per cent white. No real trouble with the young, save for the usual . . . a little marihuana. Its unemployment is holding at about the national average and over-all business is pretty good, we're told. Not bad for an American city of 180,000 in the early seventies. Civic boosters of what they like to call the capital of the great inland empire are proud of it. But about six months ago a small group of church-financed social activists called Spokane Resource Advocates began digging into FHA 235 transactions.

Now, under FHA 235 with just $200 down a low or moderate income family can buy a house. The FHA helps. It appraises the house, and when it is satisfied the house is worth what the seller is asking, the FHA guarantees the mortgage and pays almost all the interest on it. Under FHA 235 $20 million in new mortgage money was funneled into Spokane. A million of that went for real estate commissions. But when Spokane Resource Advocates dug into a lot of these deals they found what an investigator for Chairman Patman's committee called "the worst money-grabbing and the worst attitude on the part of local FHA authorities" of any of the cities he'd investigated. For example, Spokane Resource Advocates brought this house to the attention of Chairman Patman's man. Bought for $750 in 1970 after it had been gutted by fire, it was sold six months later for over $13,000 with FHA approval. We tried to find out how much money had been put into rehabilitating this house, but the realtor involved wouldn't tell us. But what worries the old couple who bought it is not so much the money as their safety. Their home still sits shored up on the charred main beam left after the fire. Another exhibit, this house, bought for $6,900, then resold quickly for $11,000, with FHA approval. According to the FHA this house didn't need rehabilitating. So far the people who bought it have discovered the roof leaks and needs to be replaced; the wiring is faulty and needs to be replaced, as does the water heater. The FHA calls this house one of their "mistakes." There is another interesting house. It is a derelict, last occupied over a year ago. In 1966 its market value was a thousand dollars. Currently it carries an FHA appraisal of $14,000. A man who knows real estate looked at this house and laughed. The role of Spokane Resource Advocates in focusing congressional attention on Spokane and in drying up federal housing money infuriated the real estate community. They were especially angry at the man who heads up this small group of social activists. His name is Raymond Raschko, 32 years old, seven years a resident of Spokane, a graduate social worker, recipient of the Office of Economic Opportunities urban service award. (One of Raschko's chief critics, J. S. Rosemond, president of Far West Securities.)

J. S. ROSEMOND. I believe these statements were sent in to Mr. Patman's committee by the Spokane Resource Advocates. I do not know whether Mr. Raschko was the author of the statements. But I do believe they came from the Spokane Resource Advocates group. This is what I don't like the new media putting out in the city of Spokane, because it's falsehood, actual falsehoods. They're not true facts.

WALLACE. A group that calls itself the Spokane Self-Help Development Committee sat down last month to see what could be done to get FHA 235 money coming into Spokane again. Its angriest rhetoric revolved pro and con around Ray Raschko.

JAMES BLACK. And what has he accomplished? He's accomplished the stopping of a program. It—he's got the buyers all bugged. He's been in their houses—each of the buyers bugging him about these things. He sent out slanted questionnaires. He's got the people to the point where they wouldn't like Santa Claus.

RASCHKO. This is something that bothers me greatly, to somehow kick the evidence by kicking me. Now, that does not help the people themselves, you know, and if we say we're concerned about them, we—why do we do things like that? The entire proceedings today have been nothing more than an attempt to discredit the hearings that took place in October.

VOICE. I think that you must remember that you're taking in a lot of territory and it's unwarranted. You're charging this panel with anything, and we've got you back here by special permission and at our indulgence, and you can go ahead and talk about this thing, but you go ahead, but don't you charge us with anything, because you are wrong.

WALLACE. One thing was not brought up in this hearing. Two days after the Patman committee report was published Ray Raschko had received a death threat. According to the FBI, which entered the case because the mails were used, the threat is under active investigation. We asked Raschko if he takes it seriously.

RASCHKO. Well, to be honest with you, at first I did not take it seriously at all, maybe because sometimes I don't take myself that seriously, or as being that important in reference to a threat to some people. But it was in the last week . . . I find myself taking it a little more seriously than I did.

WALLACE. Then Raschko surmised why the community is so angry.

RASCHKO. They like Spokane as it is. They like to make money in Spokane. They like to live in Spokane. They like to be not bothered by other people.

WALLACE. John McClaughlin apparently was another bother. He is not a member of Raschko's group. He has been in the real estate business for fourteen years, managed a local title insurance company. He began to cooperate with Raschko after a conference in which his company's policy made clear.

MCCLAUGHLIN. But this was a very high level conference, at which we were posed with problems that existed in society, and we were told that we had to get involved in these solutions to these problems; that we were the solutions to these problems, and that nothing would be done unless we did get involved.

WALLACE. So John McClaughlin did get involved, agreed to serve on one of Raschko's panels. This is what happened.

MCCLAUGHLIN. When it was found that I was going to be a member of the panel, the real estate industry stopped support of TransAmerica Title Insurance Company, of which I was then manager. Our orders fell off from, say, twenty a day to five a day, and it continued like that.

This finally culminated in my being replaced as manager, and I believe that it finally culminated in my termination by TransAmerica. I've tried to get other jobs in Spokane along this line, but unfortu-

nately . . . I can't. I think that the people that are in this industry have said no, John McClaughlin can't get a job in Spokane.

WALLACE. The firm that fired McClaughlin would tell us only that it was a management decision. A similar company that almost hired him but didn't wouldn't comment, beyond the rhetorical question: Would you hire a man who gave your industry a black eye? Our investigation of what happened to this man led us to this man, Wallace Bostwick, director of the FHA office in Spokane. He refused to be interviewed on film, but he testified at this hearing. It turns out that Bostwick's name is on the shareholders' list of the same company that refused to hire John McClaughlin. Chairman Wright Patman regards the fact of Bostwick's stock ownership in the title insurance company as an apparent conflict of interest, and his committee is investigating. So we come back to the hearing. Fifteen hours of testimony, a lot of satisfied 235 home owners brought forward, and there are many in Spokane, as elsewhere in the country. But when it came down to questions about how many people felt they were abused by whom and how, this is what happened.

RASCHKO. We have received 87 formal written complaints of a serious nature concerning these homes, and this is approximately fifty-one per cent of all of these houses that have been brought into this program in Spokane today.

Mr. BLACK. Rashko says he has 87 or some major complaints. I suggest to you that he's been in these houses coaching these people on these complaints. We did go to every house that we were involved in at the start of this thing and we did have some complaints, but we felt that we came away with satisfaction from everybody. He's got the FHA so scared to death that right now—that they're so tough . . . that they—you can't get a program through them.

WOMAN. I have dealt with the very same people that the real estate men are sitting up here and saying, you know, I work overtime; you know, I do this and I do that. And these poor dumb folks, they just don't understand what's going on. The truth is, yes, that the poor dumb folk have not had an opportunity before to buy a home. But the very shrewd realtor has had a very good opportunity to take full advantage of the poor dumb folk.

J. S. ROSEMOND. I will not say that we are not whitewashing some of the abuses that we've been having, because there have been some abuses. But I will not stand for people making statements, that the program has not given decent housing to people in Spokane in ninety per cent or more of the cases.

RASCHKO. You know, we've been accused, you know, of exaggerating the amount of abuses in Spokane, you know, as if, you know—if it was only ten per cent, that's okay—you know, and I would seriously question that. But I also seriously question the ten per cent.

VOICE. Yet every single one of your abuses simply vanishes in smoke when you get down to the hard facts.

RASCHKO. Yes, I'm sure, with all the strawmen that—you know, that you've been putting together all day, and lighting, and if they go up in smoke, this looks very true. You can feel very comfortable. I only ask you to go out and physically view these houses.

WALLACE. And so this angry dispute goes on. In the meantime there are still families who live in substandard 235 homes. Robert Schroeder is one of them. He paid $10,000 for his home last year. Its previous market price had been $3,000 and the FHA had said it needed no rehabilitation.

SCHROEDER. To get any outlets to work in the diningroom we have to turn—it may sound funny, gentlemen, but it isn't—the basement lights on to make them work. Now we have no outlets whatsoever in the diningroom, except one, because all the lights in the basement have shorted out, except one, and that's the one over the washing machine. When the wind blows in this house—I don't know if any of you gentlemen. . . .

I'm sure you have been through Grand Canyon. I've got Grand Canyon through the front room.

WALLACE. Mr. Schroeder testified that he went to the local FHA office . . . to his congressman . . . even to his senator, Henry Jackson. He said they all told him there was nothing they could do.

That raises an important question: *Can* nothing be done for Mr. Schroeder . . . and hundreds . . . perhaps thousands of 235 homeowners like him around the country . . . perhaps in your hometown?

What is going to happen—as well—to men like Ray Raschko and John McClaughlin? Those are questions Housing Secretary George Romney will be asked to answer when he testifies later this month before Chairman Patman's committee.

WELFARE REFORM VERSUS REVENUE SHARING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for those people who have not read the newspapers during the past 24 hours, I will say we have learned that a special truth squad, so-called, has been set up by the Republican National Committee, and this squad is going to go around the country to sell revenue sharing. It is my understanding that a former head of the sales department of the Procter & Gamble Soap Co., is going to head this squad. I imagine that this group will be known for its soft soaping of the American public. I can imagine the type of soap opera that they will put on, trying to sell this nefarious scheme to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows how quickly things move today, one development leads to another and how briefly things remain the same. However, I am amazed at how quickly things have changed in the campaign for revenue sharing in the last few weeks. Just a short 3 weeks ago, I delivered a speech on the floor of the House discussing the exaggerated claims of the national budget and even more dangerous implications of revenue sharing. At that time, I had to admit that I was sticking my neck out and was inevitably going to be subjected to one of the truly great pressure campaigns in recent memory. At the time it seemed that in addition to the administration here in Washington, every local and State official across the country was clamoring for relief, not some time in the future, but here and now—right away. The ranks of the revenue-sharing forces seem solid, united, well-organized, and well-financed.

Today, just a short 4 weeks later, the change which has taken place is truly remarkable. The proponents of revenue sharing are fighting and arguing amongst themselves. Here in Washington, the Governors of diverse States and mayors of large cities, who a few weeks ago were beating the drums for an idea, a concept yet to be spelled out—revenue sharing—have been reported with notable frequency in the daily press as increasingly critical of the details of the administration's revenue-sharing proposals as they have been spelled out. Hardly a day goes by that some Senator or Representative in the legislature of my own State has not contacted me indicating that they, too, were developping serious reservations about revenue sharing, and were looking at some of the more attractive alternatives. A few weeks ago the news from Massachusetts seemed to be that the whole legislature was irrevocably committed to revenue sharing at all costs. Newspapers which had only a few weeks ago pictured the astute chairman of the Ways and Means Committee as out of touch with urban America of the 1970's and dragging his feet on much needed reforms are now praising him as the truly creative man we knew him to be all along, crediting him with fathering one of the potentially greatest pieces of legislation of the century, certainly the decade, and admitting for the first time that there is more than one way to take the States and cities and towns of this country out of the dilemma that confronts them, out of the fiscal chaos they are swimming in, out of the quicksand of ever-increasing burdens, both financial and administrative.

The fact is that some quarters in the last few hours have already begun to write the epitaph for what was for a short few months one of the most trend-setting ideas ever to be trotted in front of the grandstand of mass political appeal. Stripped of its trappings and more carefully thought-out alternatives substituted, the idea of revenue sharing must present a sorry sight, indeed, to those that a few short months ago were hailing it as the solution for most of the Nation's problems. Rather than watch it die a slow and ungainly death, observe it bogged down hopelessly in interminable controversy and discussion, some seem to have decided that the best thing is to abandon it and bury it as quickly as possible. A few weeks ago it was an idea whose time had come; today it seems to be in danger of being written off.

While I am not going to be quick to join those who have written it off completely or those who have observed it has not a chance of getting through Congress, I certainly do feel that the appeal is fast wearing off and the revenue sharing movement is not sweeping the country. It has become bogged down. It has suffered severe setbacks. Its very simplicity contained the seeds of its own downfall. Presented as a panacea for profound and deep-rooted problems, it ran into the justifiable skepticism it deserved. As I have said repeatedly, no one disagreed with the analysis of the problems which prompted the proposal. No one is disagreeing that the mayors and Governors around the Nation are confronted with some of the most staggering burdens shouldered by local officials in

our Nation's history. No one is disagreeing that one of the most alarming aspects of the situation is that there seems to be no end in sight. To me there was always something artificial about the enthusiasm for the proposal, something manufactured.

I readily confess that if I were a mayor confronted with the nightmare of staggering debt confronting many of our cities and towns, it would be a happy solution to wake up one morning to find a blank check from Uncle Sam in the mailbox. But while a mayor's enthusiasm would be understandable, I fail to see how this would necsesarily be translated into popular support.

Now some have been able to trace the origins of the idea of revenue sharing back to the early 1950's and to the economic advisers of former administrations. They have been credited with first proposing the idea in any elaborate or systematic form. Even if this is the case, there can be no denial that the idea only took on life in the past year. And then, suddenly it was an idea whose time had come. Suddenly no one needed to be a lawyer or an economist to understand a major revenue proposal. The man in the street could comprehend it as quickly as the Council of Economic Advisers.

If you stop to think about it, you could trace the basic concept behind revenue sharing to the early days of division in our Republic which saw the start of a debate which continues to the present. Although the succeeding years seem to have favored a strong National Government instead of a weak confederation of strong States, the debate has never been resolved. Behind the revenue-sharing camouflage, there is a strong bias for States' rights at the expense of a strong Central Government. There is really very little essential difference between today's new federalism with a return of power to the local components and old federalism with its distrust of a strong Central Government. I am convinced that one of the major reasons for the disaffection of large numbers of legislators who were publicly embracing the concept just a short while ago because it constituted a novel innovation is that they suddenly realized what it all boiled down to. If this idea was, in fact, to be the hallmark of the times, an idea whose time had come, then we would have been entering an era which would have witnessed the reversal of the whole constitutional thrust of the last 150 years, a trend toward decentralization and the gradual dismantling of the whole network of nationwide standards and programs that have developed over the Nation's history. For no one is foolish enough to believe that the $5 or $16 billion request this year is the real goal of this program. This is merely the opening round of a long drive to divert an increasingly larger percentage of Federal funds away from existing programs into the blank-check category.

With the only criterion of how the funds will be distributed, the mathematical test of which State is making the biggest tax effort, the great pockets of poverty, hunger, and illiteracy in this country are understandably worried about their future prospects. Similarly, are those forced to live in the jungles we call cities, strangled as they are by the chaos, violence, and breakdown that is the lot of city folk today across the Nation. What is there which could possibly attract them in a plan which is tantamount to asking them to turn their backs on the one place they could look to over the years for a helping hand? Mayors are beginning to express the view that too much of the proposed distributed revenues will stick in State hands. They are only too well aware that most of the great strides of the last 50 years in the field of social reform were accomplished only through concerted action at the national level. What evidence do we possess that every State has been so reformed during the last 50 years that the tenement dwellers of the cities across the Nation no longer have to look to the Federal Government to help them out of conditions more complicated than those presented 50 years ago by sweatshops and child labor?

The budget proposed for 1972—that same budget which proposes revenue sharing—displays a "constant pattern of cutbacks and reductions of urban programs and a low priority of funds for the cities." Facing the prospect of a future without the full force and power of the Federal Government behind the spending of Federal funds, organized labor at its recent convention was led to observe that, while responsive to needs, State and local school authorities "have tended to slight the serious educational needs" of minorities, the poor, the handicapped, and non-English-speaking children.

In other words, the thing to remember is that the rush of Federal programs which were passed during the Kennedy-Johnson era after years of debate and struggle did not spring out of thin air. They were only pushed through both Houses of Congress after it became painfully clear that serious problems had been neglected for far too long across this Nation. In proposing to divert funds from these approved programs simply because they have proved unworkable in isolated instances or produced volumes of redtape in others, is to turn one's back on the problems the programs were designed to solve. Simply to divert funds from programs which have been justifiably criticized because of specific shortcomings is to act too hastily. The problems they were designed to combat would still remain. Newspaper accounts of the past few years should have convinced every Member here by now that the problems are serious and cannot be wished away.

We should be absolutely sure before responsibility for their solution is abdicated to local government that local government is able to assume the responsibility. To judge from the past performance of local governments across the country in matters such as welfare, medicaid, and education, there is every reason to be doubtful that there are many cities, States, or towns that are ready for added responsibilities. I am not sure that the problems confronting the Nation are all superhuman, but I have a strong suspicion that many of them are superlocal. The approach of a rational man and a deliberative body in all of this, it seems, is to face the need to change existing programs in a spirit of constructive criticism and reform, not destructive.

As I have said before, many existing programs are properly described as revenue sharing, and in addition possess the invaluable plus which the present revenue-sharing proposals either lack or deliberately avoid. When funds are distributed under existing grants-in-aid, they are channeled in a manner so as to establish across the land minimum standards in certain categories. I, for one, do not intend to advocate the abdication by the Federal Government of its responsibilities for these standards. I, for one, do not intend to watch the hard-won gains of the past 50 years be wiped away with the passage of a bill or two this session. Ironically, I cannot help but observe that historically this Nation was only able to stomach the thought of a graduated income tax on the national level, the idea having proved too big for any State to swallow on its own. In fact, there are still some States—some of the States which are fighting the hardest for the revenue-sharing proposal—which have yet to put their own financial house in order to the extent of accepting a graduated State income tax, so hard do some prejudices die.

But it would be wrong to lose sight of the opportunity presented by the great national movement for revenue sharing. We should not forget that there is some good to be salvaged out of most situations no matter how problem ridden. I think that we are in a position to do today what was unthinkable just a few short months ago. Today the climate is right for a major reform by the Federal Government in what is perhaps the most controversial area imaginable—welfare. If we were to begin this year to take over the responsibility for the administration of a national system of welfare and foot the entire bill, then we would not only be tackling a problem which needs tackling at all costs, but we would also be accomplishing at the same time what the proponents of revenue sharing have set out to do—removing a significant financial burden from the shoulders of local officials across the Nation. It makes no sense to argue that in doing so we would be taking the burden off the shoulders of only the Governors and State officials, since in most States welfare is a State rather than a city matter. Relieved of their welfare burdens, the States around the country would then be in a position to use the freed financial resources at their command for worthwhile local projects. They would be spending locally generated funds for locally approved projects on both a statewide and local level. Whether the cities and towns get their fair share in a situation such as this will depend on the ability of the

cities and towns to see to it that their interests are considered in the State legislature.

Nor is there a State in this country whose welfare burden is not something the State would prefer to be without. Those that argue that some States would realize more than others under this program are overlooking the fact that those States with the heaviest welfare burdens also happen to be those States which contribute the most to the Central Government in Federal taxes. Far better to live with this inequity than to adopt the inequities of the administration's revenue-sharing proposals which, in my own State of Massachusetts, for instance, end up distributing to one of our most prosperous suburbs, Newton, twice the amount earmarked for either Fall River or New Bedford—classic examples of cities in desperate need for Federal financial relief where unemployment is staggering, industry is dying, ghettos exist, and riots have already occurred. Within the logical framework of the Federal revenue-sharing proposals, those cities and towns which can afford to raise more taxes will receive more Federal moneys. The old story once again of the haves getting more, while the have-nots get proportionately less.

In other words, granted we are in a situation where the country is ready for some dramatic redistribution of Federal funds to the local communities. Not only can we accomplish this but something else as well. We can do something in the field of welfare which should have been done some time ago. Today, this great country is experiencing the sorry situation of mass migration for no other reason than to take advantage of the differences in welfare payments in one community over another. Those communities which are doing the best job and sometimes the biggest job are forced to do an even bigger job, simply because of the absence of national standards in welfare administration. In this light, all of the publicity and effort expended in the revenue-sharing drive will not have been in vain, if, in the end, it contributed to creating the climate for major congressional action on this problem.

What I am saying is that there is pretty well widespread agreement on the need for some kind of revenue sharing. Where we disagree is on what kind of revenue sharing. We disagree on the best formula for distribution. These matters can be ironed out. I do not think anybody should be geared only to the first thought that comes along. Second thoughts are sometimes more mature and can be the result of sober reflection and serious consideration of possible alternatives. Considering the alternatives, I think welfare reform and assumption by the Federal Government is far and above the most substantial service we could perform for the American public this session. Talk about an idea whose time has come; you are talking about welfare reform.

We could be living in momentous times in the weeks and months ahead, which later Congresses will look back upon as days when Congress finally got down to some serious legislation. Presently, the Ways and Means Committee is considering H.R. 1 which contains in its original form the basis for discussion and seed for development of some form of welfare reform legislation. I refer to the family assistance plan provisions. These provisions can be refashioned and remade in such a manner as to approach meaningful welfare reform. Today it is difficult to predict what the final form will be. The main reason for speaking today is not to spell out the specifics which are still taking shape, but rather simply to let the country know that even the proponents of the administration's revenue-sharing bill should not lose hope because their measure has suffered severe setbacks. Things may well work out better than they ever dared hope.

I want to point out to the Members of the House that the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, in my opinion is one of the most solid and well informed Members of the U.S. Congress. He is a man who has given this subject a great deal of study and thought in depth, and I am sure he is going to come out of that committee before the Easter recess with a recommendation to help solve the problems of welfare in this Nation. I think we should all listen to him and pay attention to his recommendations. He has given unstintingly of his time toward the solution of this problem. He understands revenue sharing better, I believe, than any Governor in this Nation. WILBUR MILLS will come out with legislation that will be the hallmark of this Congress. It will be legislation that will be the first giant step taken in this great country of ours toward curing the ills and problems caused by welfare, and I believe the Governors of this Nation—and I refer specifically to my own Governor of Massachusetts and the Governor of New York —should wait and see and study the recommendations that are going to be made by the House Ways and Means Committee on this welfare problem, because it will be revenue sharing, it will relieve the States of the terrible burden they presently have, and it will be the first step taken in the last 50 years toward correcting the real problems of welfare.

PRESERVE BUFFALO'S RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE TO CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RONCALIO). Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last month Congressman KEMP introduced H.R. 4570 which would incorporate a rail passenger route from New York City to Chicago by way of Buffalo into the National Rail Passenger System now being formulated. I rise to add my support to Congressman KEMP's bill.

The new rail passenger program has been widely hailed as perhaps the best approach to the nationwide problem of vanishing passenger service by railroad. The consensus is that this program has a good chance of being successful, and if so, will mark a new chapter in the transportation of persons in this country. I agree with Congressman KEMP that this development is encouraging after so many years of receding train service.

I was greatly disappointed, however, when the Department of Transportation presented its proposed rail transportation network for consideration and found that direct Buffalo-Chicago rail passenger service was completely omitted.

For many years, Buffalo has enjoyed, and depended on, rail service to Chicago. The region in which Buffalo is centered has made decided progress in economic growth in past decades, and I am convinced that a large measure of this development is due to the rapport and direct communication with Chicago and points west, as well as with the cities which lie between Buffalo and Chicago. Accordingly, it follows that to sever this vital communication link with Chicago and other points could well damage and curtail further development for this important region of western New York.

I called attention to the fact that Buffalo has long had direct service to Chicago. The passenger trains linking Buffalo and Chicago were among those the Penn Central Railroad attempted to drop in its proposed discontinuance of 34 trains early in 1970. The Interstate Commerce Commission blocked the mass withdrawal of these trains.

Mr. President, the ICC for many years has had jurisdiction over rail passenger train matters. We must therefore acknowledge that the Commission has acquired a measure of expertise in evaluating the overall worth of particular segments of train service. Accordingly, I was greatly encouraged when the ICC urged the Secretary of Transportation to recommend the addition of certain points to be included in the National Rail Passenger System. Among the Commission's suggested additions was a direct run from Boston through Buffalo and on westward to Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this suggestion of the ICC most significant in that it provides for direct service between Buffalo and Chicago. I would like to point out that the network presently incorporated in the system already provides for direct New York to Buffalo service. Therefore, the addition of passenger service to points west of Buffalo would achieve the objective of H.R. 4570.

I believe it would be entirely wrong to cut off Buffalo's rail passenger service contact with points to the West, including Chicago. I strongly urge my fellow Members of the House to support H.R. 4570, which would make such curtailment impossible.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF HOUSE PASSAGE OF HAWAII STATEHOOD BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it was 12 years ago, on March 12, 1959, that the

House of Representatives approved legislation providing for the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union. The House action followed that of the Senate, which, on the preceding day, had passed the legislation by an overwhelming majority. It was highly gratifying to the people of Hawaii that the House vote was decisively in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

In the intervening period of a dozen years since that momentous occasion, the people of Hawaii have earnestly sought to translate their sense of profound gratitude into a program of responsible action. The record shows indisputably that they have achieved notable success in that effort.

They have helped others to realize that Hawaii's noncontiguous position, once thought to be a serious stumbling block to statehood, has absolutely no effect on its working efficiency as a State. They have demonstrated that people are not any the less Americans because they happen to live on an island.

They have shown that people of diverse cultural origins, instead of being a handicap on the rest of the Nation, can by their contributions make their State a showcase of American democracy. They have helped to weave a pattern of living which inspired the late beloved President John F. Kennedy, who chose the youngest State as the most appropriate site for his first major civil rights speech, to say, "Hawaii is what the United States is striving to be."

The record of achievements of the people of Hawaii since being granted statehood is a source of great pride to them, but they are not so interested in saying "didn't we tell you so," as they are in reaffirming their faith in the United States and in meeting their responsibilities to the Nation under statehood. They view the past 12 years as a period of fulfillment and accomplishment, but they also look forward eagerly to the challenges and promises that the future holds for Hawaii.

Looming large among Hawaii's major responsibilities of the future is the strengthening of the bridge that it represents between the east and the west for international cooperation and world peace. This is a role which will become increasingly vital as our withdrawal of troops from Southeast Asia falls to the point of no military involvement in that part of the world.

One of the Nation's greatest investments in peace, the East-West Center, brought into being in 1959 by the principal efforts of the then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, the then delegate to Congress from Hawaii, John A. Burns, and Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY of New York, finds its home in Hawaii. At this great institution Asians and Americans have been granted and continue to have an opportunity to meet one another in an academic and social environment which lends itself to a dynamic program of interchange in which the participants begin better to understand one another's problems, and to work out mutually acceptable solutions. How much better this is than deciding issues on the battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 12th anniversary of the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill by the Congress, therefore, I rise not only to express the gratitude of the people of Hawaii, but also to state their resolve to contribute their full share towards a greater America in a better world. It is the resolve of a young and vibrant State, one that will continue to take its place among the United States with pride and to serve with honor and distinction the Union of which it has become an inseparable part.

FULL SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR WOMEN AT AGE 62

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this Congress I introduced H.R. 62, legislation that gives a retirement break to women who have worked for most of their lives. It would change the social security law so that women with 30 years of coverage—120 quarters—could retire at age 62 without any reduction in their benefits. Under present law there is a financial penalty for retiring before 65. Thus, a person retiring at 62 is entitled to only 80 percent of normal retirement benefits.

Today I am reintroducing H.R. 62 with 100 cosponsors. It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee will take cognizance of this support from so many Members of the House, and include the provisions of H.R. 62 in this year's social security bill.

On February 2 I wrote to Chairman MILLS, noting that with the country's present critical unemployment situation, the passage of this bill would be especially timely. It would open up thousands of jobs for Americans who are now looking for work.

Though the Ways and Means Committee has requested departmental reports, a thorough cost analysis of the bill is not yet completed. From my own investigations, however, it is clear that the social security trust fund can easily absorb the added costs for the immediate future.

This bill is not a "giveaway." This legislation is a measure of recognition for hardworking, productive Americans who have already contributed far more to our country than any benefits they will draw from the social security fund. It is a recognition for the contribution which women have made toward the economic and social development of our Nation over the past generation.

On behalf of all the Members who have cosponsored this bill, and the thousands of women from every part of the country who have declared their support, I ask that this body act favorably and expeditiously on this legislation.

REVENUE SHARING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Government Operations Committee took the well of the House to discuss the President's proposal for general revenue sharing. The gentleman said that his purpose was to "help the people of this country understand a little more about revenue sharing than they now understand." I believe this concern that the public develop a better understanding of the complicated and far-reaching issues involved in revenue sharing is highly commendable—especially on the part of one already burdened with such a huge load of responsibilities as the gentleman from California. But in looking over the gentleman's statement and the colloquy that ensued with a number of his Democratic colleagues, I wonder whether or not more confusion than clarification resulted from that dialog.

To begin with, the chairman strongly implies that the present fiscal crisis of the States and localities—which has made revenue sharing necessary—results largely from what he conceives to be the misguided economic policies of the Nixon administration over the past 2 years. He states that the first act of the Nixon administration was to dismantle economic policies that had resulted in a "5½-percent average annual growth in productivity for 8 years" and replace them with "policies that have resulted in the highest unemployment in 20 years." Recognizing that everyone should be permitted to indulge in a little hyperbole and exaggeration for rhetorical effect, I must nevertheless point out that, according to this year's CEA report, productivity growth in the economy during the years of the past two Democratic administrations was actually about a little over half—3.5 percent annually—of what the chairman claims and that the last time we reached the current unemployment rate was 10 years ago—not 20.

But even after we have liberally discounted the gentleman's claim about economic growth under Democratic administrations, the question remains as to just how and in just what ways the state of the economy is of significance for the condition of State and local finances.

At this point, I believe the question of revenue elasticity enters into the picture; that is, the degree to which the tax base is responsive to changes in GNP. In an earlier statement I made to this body on revenue sharing, I pointed out that over 60 percent of State government tax revenue stems from sources that grow anywhere from 0.3 to 0.9 percent for every 1 percent of growth in GNP. Local governments, still dependent for over 80 percent of their revenues on the property tax, also must rely on tax sources that grow considerably slower than the GNP. Revenues from Federal corporate and income taxes, by contrast, grow considerably faster than the economy—from 1.3 to 1.5 percent for each 1 percent GNP increase—so that relatively speaking, it is the Federal Government that gets the real benefit from the high-level economic performance of which the gentleman speaks.

By contrast, let us consider what might be called the "inflation elasticities" of the two levels of government. Between 1960 and 1970, the price level for all sectors of the economy increased 31 percent. But the index for those goods and services which the Federal Government purchased rose 43 percent and for those of State and local government 54 percent. This means that for each 1-percent increase in the cost of living, the cost of goods and services purchased by the Federal Government increases 1.4 percent and those of the State and local government rise nearly 1.8 percent. The conclusion I draw from this is that the tax revenue and expenditure structures of State and local governments are such that their fiscal situation is injured much more by inflation than it is aided by economic growth. And that if overly rapid economic growth is purchased at the price of an overheated economy—which inevitably produces strong inflationary forces—State and local governments suffer.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us not blame the economic policies of the Nixon administration for the current fiscal crunch at the State and local level. As the above figures readily show, the gains State and local governments received as a result of the economic growth under Democratic economic policies were offset many times by the losses that stemmed from the rampant inflation touched off by these same policies. What President Nixon has attempted to do is put the brakes on this inflationary spiral and the 33½-percent reduction in the rate of the CPI increase from the first to the fourth quarter last year indicates that he is having no small amount of success.

But regardless of the state of the economy and of the relative impact of inflation and economic growth, there would still be a fiscal crisis at the local and State level simply because demands and needs are growing faster than revenues. Indeed, the gentleman from California seems to admit this by suggesting that if more revenue is needed, then it should be up to local and State officials to take the responsibility for raising it. To propose a system of revenue sharing, he argues, is only to pass the tax-levying buck from mayors and Governors to Congress:

> (The President) offers taxpayers the false hope of tax relief and the county supervisors, mayors and state legislators, the hope of immunity from the politically difficult job of raising taxes to meet rising local needs. At the same time he turns the burden of taxing the *same* local people over to Congress.

But are we in fact just transferring the job of "taxing the same local people"? I think not. The plain fact is that each dollar of Federal income tax levied falls on a quite different group than each dollar of State and local taxes. For as long as I can remember, the Democratic Party has touted itself as the champion of the "little guy"—the low and middle classes—yet here we have a leading spokesman of that party saying it would be better to raise additional revenue from taxes which bear much more heavily on the low-income groups. For example, those earning less than $6,000 annually contribute only 4.5 percent of the Federal income tax dollar, but almost 16 percent of the sales tax dollar and 17 percent of the property tax dollar—the two primary sources of local and State revenue. Put another way, in 1968 those between $2,000 and $4,000 annual income contributed about 3.5 percent of their income to Federal income taxes, but almost 16 percent to local and State taxes. So when we talk about shifting some of the tax burden to the Federal tax system we are not talking about merely passing the buck for taxing the "same local people." What we are in fact talking about is shifting the tax burden in the direction of greater equitability or toward those best able to pay. By being content to indulge in mere political sniping on this important issue, I am afraid the distinguished chairman has missed the important social policy issue implicit in this aspect of revenue sharing.

This takes me one step further. It was surprising enough to find the gentleman from California engaging in a stout defense of regressive taxation, but reading along further, I find that he is joined by another colleague in an odd colloquy on the virtues of the current deductibility allowance for local and State taxes. Since only about 1 percent of local taxes and less than 20 percent of State taxes come from income levies, the $8.5 billion boon that results from this provision accrues largely from property and consumption tax deductions. In light of the figures I have just presented on the incidence of these kinds of taxes among income levels, I wonder just how desirable this new source of "revenue sharing" found by these gentlemen is after all. Moreover, the gentlemen surely know that less than a quarter of those with incomes under $7,000 itemize, and therefore, potentially can make use of this deduction, whereas almost all taxpayers in higher income groups do.

In making these points my purpose has not been to make any all-out brief for progressive taxation, although I do think that is one important goal we must have in mind as we fashion our revenue systems. Rather it has been to show that there is a lot more involved in revenue sharing than passing the tax levying buck and that in their zeal to reduce the President's proposal to merely a political ploy, the gentleman from California and his colleagues have only added to the confusion, and have at least implicitly endorsed some propositions that I doubt very much they would adhere to in more sober moments.

As if one surprise were not enough, further scrutiny of the transcript of the chairman's revenue-sharing seminar yields still another. This time it is a round denunciation of "deficit sharing." Let me state candidly that I have heard this criticism on more than one occasion, but never before from the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Now let me say two things in response. No one contemplates financing revenue sharing out of a budget deficit indefinitely. This year the economy is in a state of slack and that requires—according to principles now accepted by most economists—that the Federal Government spend as if the economy were generating revenue at full employment. If the economy moves back in the direction of full employment as planned during the next 20 months, the deficit gap will be closed. Surely, the gentleman from California understands, and I daresay supports, this full employment budget concept and it, therefore, perplexes me as to why he should drag this "deficit sharing" red herring into the debate.

Beyond that I wonder if there is not a very blatant contradiction between the chairman's blast at "deficit sharing" and his advocacy of a number of added appropriations that the President felt necessary to veto or curtail on budgetary grounds during the past year. The gentleman suggests we should have spent a half billion more for education, a half billion more for urban development programs, a quarter of a billion more for health education, $350 million more for hospital construction and the $9 billion in various program funds the administration found it necessary to freeze during fiscal year 1971.

If we add up all these additional expenditures, my arithmetic suggests that the gentleman would be perfectly willing to add $11.6 on top of the expected $18 billion deficit for fiscal year 1971. However, if we net out the revenue sharing money from the expected $11.5 billion deficit for 1972 the deficit would be only $6.5 billion. Yet, it appears that the gentleman is scandalized by the thought of adding $5 billion for revenue sharing onto what would otherwise be a quite modest deficit. For the life of me, I simply cannot understand the logic of the gentleman's objection. Perhaps I should seek out the counsel of some teacher of the "new math" to help explain this budgetary legerdemain.

Finally, let me make one observation about the chart on the distribution of revenue-sharing money in Los Angeles county that the gentleman presents as evidence that under revenue sharing "from him that hath shall be taken away, even that little which he seems to have." I submit that even relying on the gentleman's own chart, I do not see the evidence for this assertion. The chart does point out that the revenue effort formula for distributing local funds is not without flaw, because it is biased in favor of the quite rare "industrial suburb" with a relatively small population and a high property tax base. But it does not follow from this that "what we are doing by this formula is giving to the rich cities a preponderant amount on this return of revenue, where the need does not exist."

According to my calculations, the average per capita revenue-sharing allocation for each of the 30 odd cities in Los Angeles County that have a median per capita income above the average for the county is $7.30. By contrast, the per capita return for the 30 cities below the median per capita income is $8.30. That

is, the poorer cities will be getting, on the average, 14 percent more per capital. To be sure, the gentleman's chart contains a few aberrant examples that would tend to question the equitability of the formula. But we must not confuse the atypical with the general pattern.

Indeed, rather than rely merely on statistics from Los Angeles County in evaluating the distribution formula, I believe it would be more justifiable to look at broad national patterns. Specifically, I would call your attention to some very revealing data contained in a recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This study compares the per capita local tax burden in the central cities of the 37 leading standard metropolitan statistical areas with the per capita tax burden in the noncentral city or suburban peripheries of these metropolitan areas. Since these 37 SMSA's account for 20 percent of the population of the Nation and over 50 percent of the local tax base, it is clear that we are dealing with the basic contours of the situation, not merely a few aberrant cases.

This study shows that the per capita local tax burden in the central cities of these major SMSA's average $200 per capita while the average for areas outside the central cities is only $150 per capita. As a percentage of per capita income these tax levels are 7.6 percent for the central city and 5.6 percent for the noncentral city. Overall, the noncentral city areas raise only about 75 percent per capita as much as the central cities do in local tax revenues. Since the pass-through formula is based solely on tax revenue effort this means that the central cities would average one-third more revenue sharing money per capita than the more affluent jurisdictions outside the central city. Chicago, for instance, raises $203 per capita in local revenue whereas other jurisdictions in the Chicago SMSA raise only $123; the pass-through distribution formula, of course, provides for proportional benefits. I am appending at the conclusion of my remarks a chart compiled from the ACIR study that provides more vivid illustration of this point by showing a comparison of per capita revenue efforts in selected major SMSA's. I believe that these figures should lay to rest once and for all the myth that revenue sharing will be merely a bonanza for the rich suburbs or that it scatters its benefits indiscriminately. The chart follows:

CHART I.—LOCAL TAX EFFORT AND PER CAPITA INCOME IN SELECTED SMSA'S

SMSA	Central city			Outside central city			
	Tax per capita	Income per capita	Tax per capita as percent of income per capita	Tax per capita	Income per capita	Tax per capita as percent of income per capita	Col. 6 as percent of col. 3
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Washington, D.C.	$291	$3,003	9.7	$129	$3,033	4.2	43
Miami	169	2,067	8.2	143	2,372	5.5	67
Chicago	203	2,755	7.4	123	3,072	4.0	54
Boston	223	2,421	9.2	167	2,756	6.1	67
St. Louis	167	2,292	7.3	110	2,634	4.2	57
Newark	273	2,049	13.3	205	3,171	6.5	49
New York	279	2,732	10.2	221	3,314	6.7	65
Cincinnati	190	2,462	7.7	108	2,345	4.6	60
Dayton	180	2,261	8.0	116	2,382	4.9	61
Pittsburgh	164	2,365	6.9	110	2,282	4.8	69
Providence	160	2,298	7.0	103	2,174	4.7	67
Milwaukee	193	2,349	8.2	122	2,803	4.4	54

Source: Fiscal Balance in the Federal System, ACIR.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to introduce for consideration by this body some needed amendments to the Social Security Act of 1935, as amended.

The purpose of these new amendments is to provide a level of assistance to our senior citizens commensurate with their longtime contributions to our society, and, more basically, to our revenue coffers.

No segment of our population has felt the adverse effects of inflation more keenly than our senior citizens, most of whom live on fixed incomes gleaned from social security benefits and marginal employment.

This Nation's elders have for too long been shortchanged and their needs too long neglected. I believe it is past time we remedied those conditions.

This legislation, in essence, provides for five major improvements in the social security system as presently constituted:

First, it provides for a 10-percent, across-the-board benefits increase for all social security clients, retroactive to January 1, 1971;

Second, it provides for automatic annual cost-of-living increases, according to the same formula prescribed in the social security amendments bill passed by this House in the 91st Congress;

Third, it liberalizes the earnings test determining the amount of income a social security client can receive, making it possible for these clients to earn $2,000 a year, rather than the present $1,680, without suffering a reduction in benefits;

Fourth, it lowers from 72 to 70 the age at which the earnings test ceases to apply and benefits are provided at the maximum level, regardless of how much money a client earns; and

Fifth, it provides payment for outpatient prescription drugs under the same formula regulating inpatient drugs as prescribed under medicare.

Major credit for these proposals, Mr. Speaker, should go to the large number of social security beneficiaries in the Fifth District of North Carolina who suggested some of these improvements in correspondence with me.

It was on the basis of these suggestions that I undertook this legislative project, and I very much appreciate the wisdom and the counsel and the practical experience that only our senior citizens can provide.

I consider their advice a personal and professional treasure from which I can continue to draw in dealing with this issue and others as well.

We have been working on this legislation for quite some time, trying to incorporate those provisions that would provide the maximum good and meet the most serious needs of the greatest number of people.

I believe that as a result of working with social security beneficiaries themselves, I have prepared just such a bill.

I am personally indebted to them for their participation in this effort, and I believe it is time we repayed all 25 million senior citizens in this country for their tremendous contributions to our national life.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The increased commitment we have made to educating this Nation's youth is reflected in the fact that in 1968 we spent $659 for each elementary and secondary pupil in the country. This is compared to the $95 per pupil we spent in 1920.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCKINNEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MIZELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JAMES V. STANTON), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCKINNEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORSE.
Mr. PRICE of Texas in three instances.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. HALPERN.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. KEMP in three instances.
Mr. BROTZMAN.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona
Mr. SPRINGER.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. ERLENBORN.
Mr. FRENZEL in three instances.
Mr. MIZELL in two instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.
Mr. PODELL in three instances.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. DIGGS.
Mr. CASEY of Texas in two instances.
Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
Mr. SISK.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.
Mr. RYAN in five instances.
Mr. BENNETT.
Mrs. ABZUG.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. DRINAN.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 15

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 15, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

403. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a quarterly report of actual procurement receipts for the medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment, covering the period ended December 31, 1970, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

404. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the statistical supplement to the stockpile report, for the period ended December 31, 1970, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

405. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a quarterly report on the programing and obligation of contingency funds by the Agency, covering the period ended December 31, 1970, pursuant to section 451(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

406. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report on the final conclusion of judicial proceedings in docket No. 326–I, *Lemhi Tribe, Represented by the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Plaintiff*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

407. A letter from the regional solicitor, Tulsa region, U.S. Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the decision on appeal in the matter of the heirship determination of Adel Lessert Belimard, deceased halfbreed Kaw Indian allottee, pursuant to Private Law 90–318; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

408. A letter from the regional solicitor, Tulsa region, U.S. Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the decision on appeal in the matter of the heirship determination of Clement Lessert, deceased halfbreed Kaw Indian allottee, pursuant to Private Law 90–318; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

409. A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual adjustments authorized by the NASA Contract Adjustment Board during 1970, pursuant to 72 Stat. 972; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

410. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration of contracts and grants for cancer research by the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to a request of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5928. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an aid and attendance allowance to any parent entitled to dependency and indemnity compensation who is helpless or blind or a patient in a nursing home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 5929. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5930. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 5931. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code in order to extend medical care to any child with respect to whom a member of the Armed Forces stands in the relationship of legal guardian, to treat such children as natural children for purposes of computing allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself and Mr. MCKEVITT):

H.R. 5932. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to review as to its suitability for preservation as wilderness, the area commonly known as the Indian Peaks Area in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5933. A bill to provide elective coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 5934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG (for himself and Mr. RUPPE):

H.R. 5935. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating certain rivers in the State of Michigan for potential additions to the national wild and scenic rivers system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 5936. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,680 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5937. A bill to amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of government, by providing Federal cooperation and assistance in the establishment and strengthening of State and local offices of consumer protection; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5936. A bill to make prohibitions against the advertising of prescription drug prices an unfair act or practice in commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5939. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of packaged consumer commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5940. A bill to require that durable cnosumer products be labeled as to durability and performance life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5941. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to further promote the reliability, abundance, economy, and efficiency of bulk electric power supplies through regional and interregional coordination; to encourage the installation and use of improved extra-high-voltage facilities; to preserve the environment and conserve natural resources; to establish the Electric Power Environmental Council; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5942. A bill to provide minimum dis-

closure standards for written consumer product warranties against defect or malfunction; to define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties; to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act in order to improve its consumer protection activities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5943. A bill to protect the Nation's consumers and to assist the commercial fishing industry through the inspection of establishments processing fish and fishery products in commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5944. A bill to amend the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 to expedite its implementation and to provide 100 percent Federal financing of the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REES, Mr. SISK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 5945. A bill to extend unemployment insurance coverage to employers employing four or more agricultural workers for each of 20 or more weeks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 5946. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of Federal revenues with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5947. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the full Federal payment of all costs incurred under an approved State plan for old-age assistance, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or medical assistance, if the State agrees to share the savings it realizes as a result thereof with its cities and other political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KEITH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 5948. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 5949. A bill to provide for regulation of public exposure to sonic booms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 5950. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Kalispell Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5951. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ESCH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 5952. A bill making appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year 1972 to carry out the provisions of the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 5953. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5954. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to entitle veterans of World War I and their widows and children to pension on the same basis as veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows and children, respectively; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5955. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 5956. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 5957. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to entitle veterans of World War I and their widows and children to pension on the same basis as veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows and children, respectively; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ZION, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. POFF, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 5958. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYATT, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. LENT, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. WINN, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. COLLINS of Texas):

H.R. 5959. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. FISH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. KEITH, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. FREY, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 5960. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. WARE, Mr. QUIE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. POFF, Mr. KING, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 5961. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. ZION, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. POFF, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 5962. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYATT, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. LENT, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. WINN, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. COLLINS of Texas):

H.R. 5963. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. FISH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. KEITH, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. FREY, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 5964. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. WARE, Mr. QUIE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. POFF, Mr. KING, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 5965. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ZION, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. POFF, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 5966. A bill to amend Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYATT, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. LENT, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. WINN, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. COLLINS of Texas):

H.R. 5967. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. FISH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ESHELMAN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. KEITH, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. FREY, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 5968. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. WARE, Mr. QUIE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. POFF, Mr. KING, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 5969. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ZION, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. POFF, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 5970. A bill to establish an environmental financing authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYATT, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. LENT, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. WINN, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. COLLINS of Texas):

H.R. 5971. A bill to establish an environmental financing authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. FISH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. KEITH, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. FREY, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 5972. A bill to establish an environmental financing authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. WARE, Mr. QUIE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. POFF, Mr. KING, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 5973. A bill to establish an environmental financing authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 5974. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 5975. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government operations.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CONTE, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MCCLURE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SISK, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. THONE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 5976. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 5977. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCLURE:

H.R. 5978. A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5979. A bill to provide a mechanism for equitable adjustments in the price of gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5980. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 5981. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases, wheat domestic allotments, and upland cotton base acreage allotments for certain growers of sugarbeets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 5982. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.R. 5983. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits, with subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living, and to liberalize the earnings test and lower the age at which it ceases to apply, and to amend title XVIII of such act to provide payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for outpatient prescription drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide a comprehensive program of health care for the 1970's by strengthening the organization and delivery of health care nationwide and by making comprehensive health care insurance available to all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 5985. A bill to amend section 8339(1) of title 5, United States Code, to restore to an annuitant for any period after retirement in which the annuitant is not married the amount of annuity reduction made under such section for surviving spouse annuity purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5986. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional increases in certain civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5987. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the Government contribution for health benefits for enrolled Government employees and annuitants to 66⅔ percent of the subscription charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 5988. A bill to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 5989. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. COTTER):

H.R. 5990. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DORN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 5991. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KARTH, Mr.

KYROS, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. NEDZI):

H.R. 5992. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. RONCALIO):

H.R. 5993. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEED, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 5994. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5995. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, and Mr. ESHLEMAN):

H.R. 5996. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAGAN, Mr HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KEE, Mr. KING, and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H.R. 5997. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. THONE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 5998. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 5999. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 6000. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 6001. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 6002. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of noise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 6003. A bill authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1971 and the years leading up to and through the bicentennial year, 1976, as a period of "Discover America," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6004. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate Federal assistance for employable persons under the AFDC program, to provide all needed rehabilitation and employment asssistance for such persons, to provide adequate child care through a newly established Federal Child Care Corporation, to provide temporary emergency assistance to States to help them meet rising costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 6005. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for Federal parking facilities and parking areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.J. Res. 459. Joint resolution adopting the American marigold as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 460. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

My Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.J. Res. 461. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.J. Res. 462. Joint resolution declaring it the sense of Congress that all American servicemen be withdrawn from Indochina at the earliest practicable date; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.J. Res. 463. Joint resolution amending the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to insure the safety of U.S. commercial fishing vessels, crews, and equipment against illegal harassment and seizure; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 464. Joint resolution amending title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide certain assistance in the establishment of new State medical schools and the improvement of existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies concerning the rights of Soviet jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with regard to the treatment of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H. Res. 292. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives relating to financial disclosure; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. BOW, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 293. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 294. Resolution to provide for an investigation by the Committee on House Administration of an alarm system for the Capitol Building and the House Office Buildings; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL (by request):

H.R. 6006. A bill for the relief of Kelly Shannon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 6007. A bill for the relief of Betty Mancilla Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 6008. A bill for the relief of Virgillio Valdecanas and Erlinda L. Valdecanas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 6009. A bill for the relief of the S. & K. Masonry Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 6010. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Jaime C. Avecilla, Sr., and their children, Jaime Gayla Avecilla and Delia Gayla Avecilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

57. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the territory of Guam, relative to the proposed acquisition of Sella Bay for an ammunition wharf; to the Committee on Armed Services.

58. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to dust abatement in the Canyon Ferry unit, Helena-Great Falls division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program of the Missouri River Basin project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

59. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to the financial responsibility of any individual for an applicant for public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

60. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the certification of medical care facilities under medicare and medicaid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.