

gem of Killarney, not a reflex of heaven, but a bit of heaven itself."

Be sure to drive around the Ring of Kerry, through Kenmare. Lunch at Waterville. Visit Cahirciveen, the former home of Daniel O'Connell, who won emancipation for the Catholics. See Dingle Bay and Castlemaine. You will see why E. V. Morton referred to "the enchanted hills of Kerry, as the evening turns them purple."

Killarney is the ideal place for strolling, golfing, boating, sightseeing or just plain resting. Muckross Abbey (1348 A.D.) is there. So is Ross Castle, where Tennyson wrote "The splendor falls on castle walls. . . ." Wrote Macaulay: "The myrtle in Kerry loves the soil. The turf is of a livelier hue than elsewhere. The hills glow with a richer purple. . . . I never in my life saw anything more beautiful."

Drive on to Cork City via Glengarriff, Bantary Bay, Skibbereen, Bandon and Kinsale. The sights are as pretty as they are inter-

esting. "You can set God in every turn of the road in west Cork," say the people. So you can, for He is "nearer than the door."

The city of Cork was founded in the 8th century by St. Finbarr. All extroverts, Corkonians are sly of wit but their hearts are warm. When I asked a farmer in Macroom how come there were no Jesuits in Cork, he replied: "We attribute that to the power of prayer."

Drive to Cobh, then north to kiss the Blarney Stone. Cliodhna, queen of the fairies, gave it to Cormac: "Kiss it," she said, "and you'll never want for words." No one who kissed it ever has. Drive on to Youghal, where Sir Walter Raleigh was mayor in 1588. Visit the famous Cistercian Abbey at Mount Mellary. Then on to Waterford and the cut-glass factory.

Visit Tipperary and Wexford, birthplace of Commodore Barry, father of the American Navy. Be sure to see Glendalough, with its seven monastic ruins, where thousands of

Irish youths were trained as missionaries to the Continent.

Don't forget Dublin, which Morton described as "an aristocrat among cities, with an easy manner and a fine air of unstudied elegance." Added Lynn Doyle: "Dublin is easy to live in. If there is a pleasanter place in the world post me a ticket." Visit Galway Bay and watch the sun sinking in the west, filling the sky with brilliant gold.

Drive on to County Mayo, which furnished America's first Cardinal, a mayor of New York, and the father of the Argentine Navy. See the Belleek factory and press on to Donegal, where the air is so salubrious that no one ever dies, they say, "except the doctors, and they die of poverty."

They are good people in Ireland, and none have been stauncher to the one true Faith. Nor has any country in this century supplied more missionaries to the waiting world. There is not a mean man among them. But be careful; they'll steal your heart away!

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 18, 1971

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Wait on the Lord: be of good courage and He shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord.—Psalms 27:14.*

Our Father God, we come to Thee, troubled about the tensions of these times, fearful about the future, and with a deep concern about our Nation and our world. As we endeavor to do our work and play our part during these days of destiny, we bow at the altar of prayer seeking the guidance of Thy wise spirit.

"God of the strong, God of the weak,  
Lord of all lands and our own land,  
Light of all souls: from Thee we seek  
Light from Thy light, strength from  
Thy hand."

Thus empowered and sustained may we enter upon the labors of this day with souls restored and spirits renewed.

Bless our Nation with Thy favor and by Thy grace enable us to lead our people in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman let the Chair announce the approval of the Journal?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri insists on his point of order, and, of course, there is no quorum present in the Chamber.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 24]	
Alexander	Buchanan	Diggs
Anderson,	Clark	Dorn
Tenn.	Clay	Dowdy
Ashley	Conable	Edwards, La.
Badillo	Crane	Fraser
Baker	Davis, Ga.	Gallagher
Blaggi	Dent	Goldwater
Blatnik	Devine	Gray

Green, Oreg.	Landgrebe	Rostenkowski
Green, Pa.	McCulloch	Rousselot
Halpern	Macdonald,	Scheuer
Hansen, Idaho	Mass.	Skubitz
Hawkins	Madden	Steiger, Wis.
Heckler, Mass.	Mink	Stuckey
Hogan	Rhodes	Wilson, Bob
Jones, N.C.	Roberts	Wright
Kyl	Rosenthal	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### 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.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it. So the Journal was approved.

### PERSONAL STATEMENT

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said by those far wiser than I, that a politician's word is his greatest asset. I am sure this applies equally to elected public officials. I full well understand the apologies that were issued for "the leadership" here yesterday, referring to the promise last Thursday of no legislative business; in fact, the statement was that on Monday and on Tuesday those could be absent for other business, who would not attend the pro forma meetings.

I hold here in my hand those commitments. To involve the leadership, in addition to breaking the word, indicates some question of the quality of leadership and the planning program that we must expect hereafter.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of

prolonging the proceedings here today when we have come in early for the purposes of considering an alleged international emergency. However, I do want to serve notice on all concerned that if we are going to have violations of the public trust, indeed, of legislative program hereafter by any act of chicanery which involves renegation of the rules adopted by the last Congress and the law of the land, to say nothing of the given word—there will be objection per se, if not obstruction per se.

### ROLLCALL VOTES ON TUESDAY LAST

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and myself, discussed this matter. The gentleman from Missouri is correct. He did ask me specifically whether or not there would be any business on Tuesday and I replied categorically that there would not be business.

I said on yesterday, and I repeat today, that my office as late as 11:45 on Tuesday was telling people there would be no votes.

I went to the late Whitney Young's funeral. There I saw the minority leader. He asked me at 9 o'clock in the morning on Tuesday whether there would be a vote and I told him "No." We both missed the votes.

It was a matter over which I had no control. I again say what I said yesterday, I did not think the matter was of any special urgency to require a vote on Tuesday. I am sorry it happened and I apologize to the membership that it happened.

### THE SST AND MASS TRANSIT

(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, today the

House votes on whether to approve funds for the continued development of the supersonic transport while each day Americans struggle to get to work and back home again in slow and inadequate transportation facilities.

A number of Members have addressed themselves to the environmental hazards of the SST, and I share these concerns, but I would like to focus my remarks on the need to turn down the request for SST funds and reallocate these moneys to mass transit.

Last year the Congress passed a 5-year urban mass transportation assistance program to expand the Federal role in mass transit development. For fiscal year 1971 the Congress has appropriated \$214 million and authorized \$600 million in commitments under the new contract authority financing mechanism whereby the Department of Transportation can enter into long-term obligations that will be met with cash in later years. This long-term guaranteed funding is very important to our cities that require, before entering into any large project, a commitment that Federal funds will be forthcoming.

According to studies conducted for the Department of Transportation some \$35 billion will be needed to meet mass transit capital requirements during this decade. This suggests how minimal the \$3.1 billion 5-year program enacted by the Congress is.

Despite the modest commitment made by the Congress, however, the President, in the program's very first year, has cut back the level of commitments by one-third—from \$600 to \$400 million. This was one of the President's spending reduction cuts. I would respectfully submit, however, that in the long run this will prove to be very poor economy. It just delays for another year the commencement of \$200 million worth of public transportation improvements so desperately needed while billions of man-hours continue to be lost in traffic delays and construction costs mount at a rate of approximately 10 percent a year.

It is interesting to note that in actual dollars provided, more money has been recommended for the construction of two SST prototypes than for the entire country's mass transit needs.

Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with our priorities when our budget allocates more money for the development of a plane to shorten the trip to Europe for vacationers and a few businessmen than for the improvement of public transportation. The \$214 million was appropriated in the 1970 appropriations bill in forward funding for the urban mass transportation program in fiscal year 1971; then, the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970 was passed authorizing the appropriation of an additional \$80 million for this fiscal year. And yet, the President's budget calls for a supplemental appropriation of only \$15 million bringing the total mass transit budget to \$229 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the \$134 million appropriation for the SST be struck from today's bill, and that the President take the opportunity to redirect these funds into mass transit development. The investment of these funds in mass transit will benefit many more people—including

those who fly, but have to utilize some form of ground transportation to complete their journey.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, due to illness I was unable to be present at the session of the House on March 16, and missed two rollcall votes. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 20 and "yea" on rollcall No. 21.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY VOTE

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

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was very shocked to learn that the vote on the 10-percent increase in social security took place on Tuesday, March 16, in my absence. Only that morning I had been assured there would be no votes on the floor of the House and, therefore, I felt I could serve my constituents best by remaining in my Philadelphia office to meet with them personally.

I do want to state emphatically that I am very interested in a sizable increase in social security payments, and on March 10 I introduced H.R. 5811, to increase the benefits by 15 percent. On the same day I made a statement in the RECORD explaining this legislation. This statement appears on page 5895 in the RECORD.

You may be assured I would have actively supported the 10-percent increase on March 16 had I been here as I believe our social security annuitants have worked hard and are certainly entitled to comfortable security in their older years. Therefore, I am planning to stimulate the interest of my colleagues in raising the increase from 10 to 15 percent as outlined in my bill, H.R. 5811.

#### THE SOCIAL SECURITY VOTE

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, when the House voted Tuesday to increase social security payments I was at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., meeting with Army officials and black inmates of the stockade there. I arranged the meetings in Kansas, because I felt that the problems of the black prisoners there warranted my personal attention, and after these meetings, I think that progress is being made in improving communications between the Military Establishment and the inmates.

Of course, when I made my plans, the leadership had announced there would be no business to come before the House on Tuesday. I must admit it was a shock to be in Kansas Tuesday afternoon and hear on the radio news of the House taking a major vote.

I am quite upset that I missed a vital vote. I hope that the leadership can organize itself better in the future so that this sort of thing does not happen any more.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 70, the social security conference report. Indeed, I believe that just a 10-percent increase is inadequate for the millions of Americans dependent upon social security payments as their primary source of income, and I would hope that the Congress can act to raise these benefits—and broaden overall social security programs—even more during the coming months.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Tuesday, March 16, and was thus unable to vote on the conference report accompanying H.R. 4690.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of increasing social security benefits by 10 percent, retroactive to last January.

Additionally, I look forward to this House soon having the opportunity of raising benefits another 5 percent, providing a minimum monthly payment of \$100, increasing the outside earnings limitation to \$2,400 and providing coverage for prescription drugs through medicare. Let us hope that the great Committee on Ways and Means will soon complete its further deliberations on matters affecting senior Americans.

The commitment of this House must be absolute in assuring economic justice to hundreds of thousands of older Americans who have worked all their lives to contribute toward a better country. I pledge my unstinting support in this effort.

#### CERTAIN FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468) making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468), with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1, commencing on page 1, line 1, to line 6, page 2 of the joint resolution.

Under the rule, no amendments except committee amendments were in order to section 1, and the Chair had asked the

chairman of the committee whether there were any committee amendments, and the Chair was informed that there were no amendments.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. During the period from March 30, 1971, activities under the appropriation "Civil Supersonic Aircraft Development" may be conducted at a rate for operations not exceeding \$289,965,000, but otherwise to the extent and in the manner provided for in the bill (H.R. 17755, Ninety-first Congress) as modified by the House of Representatives on December 15, 1970.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss with the House and the Committee of the Whole the procedure that we may be able to follow in order to get to an expeditious conclusion of the matter before this body.

As I view the procedure at this moment the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) will be recognized next for the presentation of his motion to strike out section 2. This is probably the only amendment which will come before the Committee. It will present to the House the issue of whether or not we should go forward with the SST.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) would like to proceed for the usual 5 minutes, and then he will ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes, so that he will have 10 minutes in order to present his amendment.

Then I will rise to oppose the amendment, and I will ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 5 minutes, if necessary, in order to reply. At that point we will then ask unanimous consent for some kind of time limitation. We would propose that all Members who wish to speak on the amendment to please rise and we will count the number of people who want to talk and multiply that by 5, so that everyone will have 5 minutes to talk. We do not want to cut off debate on anyone, but we want to arrive at some expeditious way to conclude this matter.

Then, presumably, there will be a recorded teller vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inform the Committee of the Whole that the chairman of the subcommittee discussed this procedure with me before he spoke, and it is perfectly agreeable to our side with regard to the procedure. I imagine some Members may have some other feelings on it, but so far as we are concerned on this side, it is agreeable.

Mr. McFALL. Of course, at the time when unanimous consent is asked, everyone in the House will have to agree. If the situation is changed at that time, then we will just have to see what other alternative might be acceptable. But this is the suggested procedure that we have in mind after discussion on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page

2, line 7, strike out section 2 and renumber the following section.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to vote on the SST. There are five reasons why I believe the appropriations for the SST should be defeated.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

If Members would permit the gentleman in the well to present his arguments with a certain amount of solicitude, perhaps we would get this matter concluded much more expeditiously than otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The Committee will be in order.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) will proceed.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the first reason is the enormous expense of the SST program. The prototype stage in itself will cost "only"—and I put that in quotes—"only \$1½ billion." But this is only the first step in this huge outlay of the taxpayers' money. After the prototypes are completed, there still will be required to be expended before the first commercial SST can be turned out another \$3 to \$4 billion.

There is no doubt in my mind that even if the proponents say that the commitment of the Government will end with the prototype stage, that Boeing will be back—and the contractors will be back, to request funds from the Government with which to complete the commercial plane. Where else can the contractors go to get it? You know very well the financial conditions of the aerospace and airline industries today. They are in worse condition that they have ever been in their history. Where can Boeing and General Electric get their funds? They must do it not 5 or 6 years hence—when some argue that there will be a recovery of those industries—but almost immediately. Time is hard upon them. They must finance the later stages during the prototype flight phase—and the prototype is scheduled to fly in March 1973.

There are those who say about this program, "Well, we have gone so far, why do we not put another couple of million dollars into it in order to get the prototype?" Surely, those who make that argument will be back to the Congress after the prototype stage to make the same argument: "We have about \$1.5 billion in the prototypes. How can we stop now? We must help Boeing raise the additional amount of money so that we can have the commercial version of the plane."

Aircraft production is a quagmire. We learned that from the C-5A; we learned it from other aircraft programs. What makes us think that the SST will have a different fate than the C-5A or, a different fate than the Concorde—the Concorde, which originally started out with a limitation of \$400 million for its production and development, and now finds its cost escalating to above \$2 billion? Are our aircraft manufacturers so much better versed in costs and techniques than the French and the British that they can

avoid escalations in costs in this new and untried field?

The second reason we oppose this appropriation, Mr. Chairman, is that it is an appropriation of public money for a private purpose. Yes; we do call upon the taxpayers and ask for their funds to build military planes. But we own those military planes. We need those planes for national defense. The SST is not in that category. The SST will not belong to the United States. The SST will belong to Boeing. The prototypes will belong to Boeing. There is a substantial difference between appropriating funds for the purpose of developing and producing military craft and producing and developing a commercial plane for a private company. And that is exactly what this program is about.

The American people do not want this plane. They do not want their money to be used for this purpose. Every poll in the country shows that Americans, in overwhelming numbers, are opposed to Government financing of the SST, and I say outside of Seattle and Cincinnati—

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I would prefer to yield to the gentleman in a few moments.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. What is the gentleman's estimate of the percentage of the American population that would have the ability to afford a ride in this proposed plane? Would it be more than 1 or 2 percent?

Mr. YATES. I am coming to that point. If the American people had an opportunity to vote on this appropriation as they do on school bond issues, what do you think the fate of this program would be? Obviously, it would be turned down overwhelmingly. On the point that is raised so cogently by my friend from Maryland, the ironical part of the program is that only 3 percent of the taxpayers who are financing this plane will use it. I say 3 percent. How do I arrive at that percentage? Today only 10 percent of American air travelers fly internationally. About one-third of those who fly internationally fly first class. The SST will have a fare that is higher than the first-class fare of supersonic jets. If American taxpayers are not willing to pay a first-class fare to fly overseas, what makes you think that they would be willing to pay a superfare to fly overseas? The only ones who use the plane will be business executives who can charge their travel off as a business expense.

Why should this House vote American tax dollars against their owners' will for a frivolous purpose for the benefit of a few well-heeled travelers?

The third reason that we oppose the plane is because of the possibility of polluting the environment. Proponents of the SST keep feeding us soothing syrup. They tell us not to worry that the environment issue has been dissipated. The gentleman from Washington, my good friend, last night said, "The environmental bubble has been burst." Nothing is farther from the truth.

They take the position that an environmental committee of scientists has been organized by Mr. Magruder and will report in 2 or 2½ years about the results of their investigation. Only then

will we know, although I must say I am concerned that the research team is headed by a scientist who told our committee he was 95 percent sure of what the results will be. We ought to have totally open minds for this project.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, this is not true. The scientists are still concerned about the possible effect of fleets of SST's flying at stratospheric levels. There is a possibility of polluting that atmosphere and the result of that pollution being felt upon this earth.

They say, second, that noise pollution has been dissipated—and that, too, is not true. There is on the drafting board a design for a new engine which will not be in the prototype, but will be in the production version of the plane, in the event that can be financed. This is a new engine that is supposed to reduce the sideline noise to a level the FAA has established for subsonic jets in the future. But that, too, is in the future and is only a hope at the present time. That is why I say the environment issue is still very much with us and has to be taken into consideration.

Also, much has been said that the age of the SST is upon us, that if the SST does not fly under the American flag, it will fly under a foreign flag. They speak about the Concorde and about the Russian Tupolev. I do not know what the information is about the Tupolev. Our committee has little information about the Tupolev at all, and we had thousands of pages of testimony. We do not know anything about it except what the Russians have said about it, and what the Russians have said about the speed of it is that it flew at mach 2. The fact is, however, no country in the world has yet bought a Russian plane. No country is willing to take the chance of buying a Russian plane and then trying to get spare parts.

Insofar as the Corcorde is concerned, that is no threat. Most Members have read a few weeks ago about the comment of a BOAC official, a sad comment, in which he said that the operating costs of the Concorde are twice those of the 747. What airline executive in his right mind would buy a Concorde that has twice the operating costs of an American 747?

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, on March 29 of this month, less than 2 weeks from now, executives of the British and French companies building the Concorde will meet—will meet—in order to decide whether or not to continue production of the Concorde.

Finally, we are opposed to the appropriation for the SST because we consider that the money being allocated from the very restricted number of Federal dollars in the budget could be used for much more vital purposes. Almost every appropriation in the budget without exception has been cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YATES. But the SST program has not been cut. It receives its full amount. School funds have been cut. Health funds have been cut. Hospital funds have been cut. Antipollution funds have been cut.

Mass transit funds have been frozen. Funds for air navigation and equipment for airports that could go to relieve traffic congestion which plagues air travelers today have been cut. Housing funds have been cut. But not the SST, which flies on at supersonic speeds fully funded.

Why the rush? Why should the SST be a sacred cow that cannot be touched? Why does the SST deserve a higher priority than all the other programs that touch the lives of the American people much more vitally than does this aircraft?

I submit to the House, Mr. Chairman, this appropriation should be defeated. I urge the House to vote for my amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman say something about nobody in his right mind would fly the 747 if he could fly the Concorde. I have flown in a 747, and I think I am in my right mind.

Mr. YATES. I did not say that. I said no executive in his right mind would buy the Concorde if he could buy the 747. I fly the 747.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SPRINGER was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to all that has been said yesterday and today with reference to the SST.

Back in 1963 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted extensive hearings for several days extending far into the night on all of the problems with reference to the SST.

There are many here today who seem to be under the impression that flying at supersonic speeds is something new. The Air Force has been flying not hundreds but thousands of flights in the last 18 years over the United States. Extensive tests have been had by our experimental laboratory in Oklahoma City under the supervision of the Federal Aviation Administration. At the time of our hearings, the problems of the SST had been studied no end.

In 1963, where were all of these people who are today objecting to the SST? If there were substantial objections, those should have been voiced years ago and the project should have been stopped if those objections were justified. There may have been those who were against the SST before 2 years ago. If they were, they had not been registered with our committee. The first time I heard any objection to this matter was 2 years ago which was roughly 6 years after our hearings and the start of the SST. It seems to me that those who are now making objections are not only 7 years late, but are also \$1.1 billion late. The cost of producing the prototype is estimated at \$1.3 billion. We have spent approximately that figure up to now. Even if we stop the SST today, there would be an additional \$115 million necessary to close up present operations. This simply means that we would have plowed

over a billion dollars down a rathole when the program could be completed for approximately \$1.3 billion.

I am never one who has criticized the loss of the horse because someone did not close the barn door. But it seems to me that when this matter has been open since 1963 and suddenly the complaints only arose some 24 months ago, that those who are opposing the project have certainly been lacking in diligence. Personally, I am not trying to change anyone's opinion with reference as to how he believes he should conscientiously vote. I just wanted to be sure that those who are in doubt will have some background of how this whole matter originated and was studied extensively in the beginning. If you will go back and read the appropriations hearings and also the vote on this matter, insofar as I can find in the record, nothing was raised substantially as an objection until 2 years ago.

When our committee had hearings on this matter, the problem with which we were greatly concerned was the recoverable costs. We had about every cost accountant and everyone connected with the program before us in an attempt to determine whether or not we were going to be able to get back the cost plus a reasonable rate of interest. At that time, I stated I would not support the program unless evidence to that effect was presented to the committee. From the hearings that were conducted, it was my feeling that there would be a recovery of the costs plus a reasonable rate of interest. I do not believe that the committee itself would have considered the project further unless the members in their own minds were convinced of that particular fact.

The question has been raised on the floor as to why private capital could not do the job. Mr. Bow, the ranking minority member on the House Committee on Appropriations, and I, together presented to President Johnson a plan for private funding through Government guaranteed bonds. The bonds, although guaranteed by the Government, would be sold to the public. There would not have been any public appropriations or financial problems insofar as the Federal Government was concerned except in guaranteeing the bonds. The company which offered to finance it was convinced that it was a project which would pay off. And it was their feeling that it could be done in that manner. I will admit that President Johnson did give it thoughtful consideration but came to the conclusion that it was inadvisable to change the policy since the project had been underway for some 3 years. I want it to be known that I am not in any way critical of President Johnson's choice which was based upon the advice he had from his own advisers. They thought it would not be wise to change the financial structure of the program 3 years after starting. I merely point this out to the House that there was a plan presented to do this through some kind of private enterprise effort in connection with the Government.

It seems to me that a great deal of what has happened since 1963 has es-

caped the notice of the House and the purpose of my presentation of these facts is to give the background from the beginning.

It is true that after the hearings were over and before the committee could come to any conclusion as to the authorization, the Department of Transportation was created. Under the language of the Department of Transportation regulations and policies, their legal counsel came to the conclusion that it was not necessary to have the authorization of either the House or Senate Commerce Committees. On the advice of the legal counsel, the Secretary could go before the Appropriations Committee and seek the necessary funds. However, I am advised that there were rather extensive hearings on the SST each year before the Committee on Appropriations. There certainly were complete hearings this year. I hold in my hand the hearings which run into several hundred pages over weeks of time. I would suggest that if there is doubt in anyone's mind, that they read those hearings and determine the witnesses they choose to believe as being most thoughtful and reliable in determining how they should vote on this issue.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McFALL was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, one of the most remarkable things about the debate yesterday which many were unable to hear because of the St. Patrick's Day celebrations was the emphasis upon the economics of the SST. Many would have thought earlier that the emphasis would have been upon the environment. During the 4 days of open hearings in the subcommittee much information was provided that addressed the issue of the environment.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) says there are some problems yet to be solved. Yes, but there are some that the scientists believe can be easily solved. The main one has already been taken care of. They have designed a modified engine that will meet the noise requirements of FAR-36 which will make a quieter airplane than the present large subsonic jets which fly today.

Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is not an emotional matter of destroying the environment with technological progress. I think this has been our problem in the past. People in the United States want to see progress but they do not want to see this technological progress destroy the environment in which we live. I think we have put these fears to rest. So, what we are talking about here is a matter of economics. Now we can deal with the same kind of problem we have on this floor nearly every day.

There are economists who say we should not build this airplane. There are other economists who say we should. There has been over \$1 million in studies on the future market for the SST, a market which will be for the 1980's. Re-

member we are building an airplane for the 1980's.

Mr. Chairman, the important thing is that we decided over 7 years ago to go ahead with this program. When the late John Kennedy was the President, he recommended that we go ahead and build the supersonic transport because he thought it would be essential for transportation in the 1980's.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFALL. I will yield to the gentleman when I have finished my general statement.

President Kennedy also recommended that we go to the moon—and we have. I did not think we could at the time, but I said if the recommendation is that we should go to the moon, I am willing to try—and we have succeeded. And I believe we can build a supersonic transport and succeed. We are building a supersonic transport that will be a productive airplane for the 1980's.

The point is made that this is only the first step, and they will be back here for production funds. Well, production financing is a matter to be determined later. We have letters from banks indicating that they would be interested in private financing of the production plane. This will be considered by this body in further debate. But I would point out to you that the private sector and the taxpayers will have \$1.11 billion put into this by March 30. It will cost us another \$119 million to stop now. On the other hand, we will have less than \$350 million to go after this fiscal year.

When we get through with development, we will own about 90 percent of these airplanes, and Boeing will own about 10 percent—contrary to the statements made here on the floor that Boeing will own it all. We will own 90 percent and we will have the option on what to do with them.

The statement has been made that only a few people will fly in the airplane. Well, over 6 million Americans, secretaries and others, fly overseas. A large percent of the overseas flying is to Australia, to the Far East, and to Europe. By the 1980's there will be 25 million people flying overseas. While the aircraft industry is depressed now, overseas flight has continued in 1970 to increase by 15 percent as it has for the last 10 years. But we are building an airplane for the future.

It is said that we should not put public money into it—why, we put public money into any number of transportation modes that will produce for our economy. We started in transportation with the Panama Canal. Look at the money we put into our merchant marine. Look at the money we put into our airlines—and talking about airplanes, every airplane that we are flying today has been subsidized by the taxpayers. The 707 came through the B-52 technology, and the K-135 technology. It cost \$2 billion to develop that technology. But this is the first time where the taxpayers have had a contract where they are going to get back some of the money that is expended for the development of an airplane.

We are putting money into mass transit. The point was made that every other program has been cut back. There have been cutbacks. I have a list of them. I am not in favor of those cutbacks. I think the administration ought to go ahead and spend the money for those things.

We are spending \$400 million this year for mass transit, which is less than the amount we have allowed in the appropriation bill. We provided for a program level of \$600 million and I think we ought to spend it all. But should we cut back on this program because other programs have been cut back? It seems to me that is like cutting off your nose to spite your face, or rubbing salt in the wounds of American labor which now needs jobs.

We could spend more money on this program and produce more jobs. There are jobs involved. Yes, there are 13,000 jobs involved right now. The aerospace industry is in very bad shape and if we are going to cut these jobs back, it will have a multiplier effect throughout our economy.

In the future there are 50,000 direct jobs involved in this as well as leadership in the aerospace industry. So I say to you, if you are talking of the trade-offs in economics—and that is what we are talking about—we should go ahead as planned. We should build the prototypes and demonstrate that America can produce an airplane that will be the most productive airplane in our fleet for worldwide use during the 1980's.

Other countries are going ahead with their subsidized SST airplanes. Our airlines will have to buy these if they are going to compete, unless we have an American airplane. By going ahead with the SST we will keep our world leadership in the aerospace industry.

I would like to see if we can get some agreement on the discussion time.

I would propose that all those who wish to speak stand up.

I have counted 21 Members standing and assume 5 minutes each that makes 105 minutes or 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, end at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman's objective is to assure 5 minutes for each Member?

Mr. McFALL. That is right.

Debate will be concluded at 5 minutes after 2 p.m.

Mr. MOSS. It is not possible to do that within that time by merely multiplying by five the number of Members on the floor who desire to speak. If the gentleman's unanimous consent request is that those on their feet be entitled to at least 5 minutes, I would withdraw my objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that rather than setting the time at 1:45 p.m. or 2 o'clock, inasmuch as you might have a quorum

call and the time would be thus taken up by the quorum call, it is far better and far more equitable to set a definite total amount of time regardless of any quorum calls or any other interruption. I only make that as a suggestion to the gentleman.

Mr. McFALL. Would everyone agree to 2 hours?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, again reserving the right to object, I think Members on their feet should be assured that they will have 5 minutes each. This request has come very early in the debate today for a limitation of time and it has come after the gentleman now in the well has used 10 minutes of time and his predecessor in the well used 11 minutes. Some of us have very strong views on this and we would like very much to have the assurance of having 5 minutes.

Mr. McFALL. If you allow 5 minutes for everybody, then you do not have much of a limitation on the time.

Mr. MOSS. I am speaking of 5 minutes for those on their feet and that would be the limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) that he amend his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 2 hours with 5 minutes to be allotted to each Member standing at this time.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it implicit in that request that should a quorum call occur that it would not come out of the time?

Mr. McFALL. That is the reason for asking for the limitation by the time used rather than by the clock. The time would be 2 hours with everybody on their feet now to get 5 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why Members will support or will not support the SST, and I suppose we can find an excuse for any position that we take. I think you probably have heard all the arguments, and anything that is said now is just going to be something you heard before. So I am not going to use all of my 5 minutes.

I merely wish to leave with you one thought that I think is paramount. We can argue all day about how we got here, whether you voted for this or against it before. The fact is that we are here today having spent \$860 million on the SST, and the fact is that we stand today at a crossroads. Are we going to add to that \$860 million another \$100 million or so, for a total of about \$1 billion and have nothing, absolutely nothing, to show for it, or are we going to commit

ourselves to go the \$1.3 billion and have the two prototypes and have the 100 hours of testing and finally determine once and for all, all the questions that have been raised here today? I think it is that simple.

What is our responsibility to the taxpayers? Not to stand here and argue about the votes that were cast in the last 6, 7, or 8 years, but to face up to the fact that we have spent \$860 million, that it will cost the Federal Government a total of about \$1 billion to get out of the project for which we would have nothing, or spend about \$1.3 billion and finally carry to a conclusion that which we embarked upon 8 years ago.

When you listen to all the arguments about 300 planes, 500 planes, or what the payoff is going to be, or how much we are going to make, all the comments about the environment, that, literally, in my opinion, clouds the whole issue because we are not at that point.

We are trying to decide today the best course to follow as far as the taxpayers of the United States are concerned. I have sat in the hearings on the subcommittee, and I have heard the witnesses both pro and con, and I believe that the administration put forth the best case I have ever heard in any hearing I have ever been in.

I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not, having reached this point, follow through on this commitment and see it to a conclusion.

I will be very frank with the Members. If we follow through and the SST does not prove itself economically, if we cannot resolve the environmental questions, I am not going to be standing up here asking the Members to go forward. First of all, I think if it proves itself economically, we are going to have the leading lending institutions in there to finance the thing, and it will be built with private capital.

But that is beside the point. We must face today the simple question: Do we stop, having gone so far, or do we finally go over the last hurdle and complete the two prototypes and 100 hours of testing? I think it would be foolhardy to stop when we can see the light at the end of the tunnel.

I urge you to vote down the Yates amendment and vote to continue this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, in the summer of 1962 Najeeb Halaby, then FAA Administrator, appeared before the Government Activities Subcommittee, which I serve as chairman, and discussed in the most enthusiastic terms the development of an American supersonic transport. Even then the immense potential in terms of scientific advancement was readily apparent from such a project. As a general matter of policy, I accepted the supersonic transport concept as an advancement that would maintain American domination in the production and operation of commercial aircraft.

When FAA Administrator Halaby described how the leading edge of the wings of a supersonic transport would glow "cherry red" at top speed and that the aircraft would have to be constructed of titanium with even the most minor joint or moving part completely sealed from the searing heat and the bitter cold that would be the continually changing environment in commercial operation, I also realized there were formidable problems in translating such an aircraft from the prototype into an economically feasible commercial venture.

During the past several years, as the SST has been under discussion a number of other problems have arisen. Although considerable effort has been expended in research, the sonic boom has not been mastered. Questions have been raised as to national priority, pointing to the desperate need for more funds in the continuing struggle against poverty, ignorance, and disease.

All factors considered, the SST has been a close question requiring the most delicate judgment. Fundamentally, I believe that the need for continuously pushing forward through the spectrum of science and technology adequately supports the development of an SST and the investment of large sums of tax funds in the project.

Reluctantly, however, I must oppose appropriations for the SST in the absence of reasonable protection of the taxpayers' huge investment. Under the contract with Boeing, the taxpayers would not receive the normal royalty payment unless the production aircraft was designed for a speed of at least mach 2.2. If the airlines that would ultimately purchase and operate the SST's decide that the most economical speed of the aircraft would fall below mach 2.2, the taxpayers' huge investment would be limited to the recoupment of only 13 percent of the total investment, and this sum would be recovered only if 300 production models were produced.

Despite extensive efforts over a period of more than 2 years, detailed in Wednesday's RECORD on pages 6807 and 6916, I have not been able to obtain economic studies from the Department of Transportation reflecting a comparison of the incremental costs of increasing the aircraft's speed above mach 2.2 as contrasted to the economic benefit flowing from such increase in speed. Furthermore, even if studies were produced which indicated some potential economic benefit of the higher speed, there is absolutely no excuse for failing to protect the taxpayers' investment. There is no reason for arbitrarily limiting the definition of the SST to an aircraft capable of flight from mach 2.2 to mach 3.1.

The normal risk of investment in a project such as the SST is high in any event. However, to add to this risk serious loopholes in the contract with Boeing which deny the Government royalties on production aircraft falling squarely within the supersonic range is simply more than I can tolerate as a Representative of the taxpayers. I must

vote against this appropriation until obvious contract deficiencies are remedied.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the continued funding of the SST program.

As I have stated before, the question before us today is Will the United States develop the SST, and not will we have an SST. The fact is that the Concorde is an SST and it has been successfully flown by the British and the French. The fact is that the TU-144 is an SST and has been flown successfully by the Russians and the TU-144 will shortly be making commercial flights.

If we want to continue to be the leader in the aerospace industry, and not force our airlines to go abroad and buy many billions of dollars worth of aircraft, we have to maintain our position of leadership in the aerospace industry. This means tens of thousands of jobs for Americans, billions of dollars in a favorable balance of payments, and billions of dollars to the U.S. Treasury in taxes.

The return to the Federal Government of the Federal money in the SST will start with the sale of the first SST. Over \$4 million will be added to the price of each SST and this over \$4 million will come directly to the Federal Government. With the production of the 300th SST the Federal Government will have recovered all of its money invested and the sale of the SST's over the 300 mark will provide a most substantial return to the Federal Government, as we will continue to receive the over \$4 million on each SST sold after the 300th sale.

All of the talk about the pollution in the upper atmosphere and the harmful effect that the SST will have on our ecology is unfounded. Russia already has a variable sweep wing bomber with a speed exceeding the speed of sound. The American B-1 bomber being designed and built by North American Rockwell is also a supersonic aircraft.

Our B-52 bombers can cruise at altitudes up to 50,000 feet. We also have the SR-71 and the U-2, both of which fly at altitudes equal to or in excess of the altitudes at which the SST will fly and, I believe, the SR-71 is a supersonic aircraft.

There have been no reports of any harmful effects on our ecology being caused by these aircraft. We heard yesterday from Mr. KUYKENDALL that if the entire SST fleet reaches a total of 500 planes, which will have 2,000 separate engines, the total emission of pollutants from these 2,000 engines would be equivalent to the pollutants discharged from only 1,800 new 1971 model automobiles equipped with Government-approved emission control devices.

In view of these facts, I urge that this amendment be defeated and the funding of the SST be continued.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield

to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, last week at the hearings of the Subcommittee on Appropriations some opponents of the SST pulled out all of the stops in their hysterical opposition to this program. Prof. James McDonald of the University of Arizona testified that the SST would probably increase the number of skin cancer cases. Later witnesses put down this theory. Dr. William Kellogg, Associate Director of the National Institute for Atmospheric Research, stated that the amount of ozone increase by virtue of increased water vapor would be virtually imperceptible. Thus the ultraviolet radiation would not increase in the manner in which Dr. McDonald suggested. He showed how misleading the statistics mentioned by Dr. McDonald were when he showed that if one actually believed Dr. McDonald's theory, a girl in a bikini would have to wear a bathrobe once in 2,000 years in order to protect herself from the incremental effect of the SST. But apart from the answers to Dr. McDonald's theory—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE).

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I have concerns about the environmental consequences of the SST, but to be perfectly frank, I do not think a specific enough case has been made about those consequences that I personally would utilize that argument alone as a means of opposing the SST project.

Yet I am in opposition to it. I am in opposition to it, because I think the method of financing it was in error when it was first adopted. It does not seem to me, under our system of free enterprise, that the taxpayer ought to be asked to contribute investment risk capital to a project as risky as this one is. If this project is not risky, as is now the allegation from the proponents, then it does seem to me that private risk capital should be anxious and, indeed, enthusiastic to take over the remaining financing of this project, particularly now that we have sweetened up the risk by contributing the taxpayers' funds in the enormous amounts that we have done thus far and which we will be required to do in the future. Does it not make sense, then, at this point to say, "Look. We have done all that we could do with taxpayer funds to advance what is essentially a commercial project with very limited utilization for the people of this country. We are willing to forgo that tax money. We hope to recoup it, to get it back, because if the project is successful, we will receive the taxes that the production and utilization of these planes will generate, but for the time being we are willing to let that money go and allow private capital to take over this project. You who believe that this venture is such a glorious venture, which has such great hopes and promises, you put your money on the line and do not ask the taxpayers to put up their capital, which is far more limited than the risk and venture capital which is supposedly abounding in this

country." If we are going to spend \$390 million this year to create jobs, if we are seeking WPA-type projects, then let us spend it on a project that will utilize the money in a better way and provide more benefits to the American public as well as creating jobs. I can think of a number of such projects, but just in the transportation field alone, if we contributed that amount of capital to rapid transit in this country, we would create far more jobs than will be created under this project. In addition to that, we would be contributing to solving the environmental problems of the country by ridding ourselves of some utilization of the motor vehicle and substituting in lieu thereof a rapid transit system. We would be creating a far better quality of life for a far greater number of people in America in that way than we would be by the creation of an SST.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from California talks about the method of funding the development of the two prototypes. It is my understanding that the contract with Boeing gives the Government the right to start to recover its investment with the sale of the first aircraft and the option has been exercised to have the Federal Government start to recover its investment with the sale of the first aircraft.

Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. WALDIE. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say this to the gentleman. When we are talking about jobs, we are not talking about just the jobs to produce two prototypes of the SST. This bill specifically mandates the fact that once these two SST's are produced, the contractor will have to secure all of the financing with which to go into production, and that sum of money is going to run into billions of dollars.

I would also like to say to the gentleman that France and Britain and Russia have subsidized the production of the prototypes and they are investing money in the actual production of the aircraft.

Mr. WALDIE. I have heard that argument made throughout the last 2 days, that Russia is paying for the construction of it, but that is a Communist system. We should anticipate that to be the case. The British system with reference to transportation is a nationalized system.

If we are in fact a free enterprise system, please tell me why our risk capital people in this country were not willing to advance the capital with which to start this project. Why is that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The fact of the matter is that the outlay was too great for the development of the prototypes. We are talking about the free enterprise system. We are talking about a project

which will produce tens of thousands of jobs for a number of years.

Mr. WALDIE. The outlay we are talking about is not too large for private capital in this country unless the risk is too great. In other words, for the large amount of money involved, the risk is too excessive for private capital so the promoters of the SST seek public tax funds knowing full well that the guardians of public tax funds are not nearly as careful or cautious in their trust as are the guardians of private investment capital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time until a later time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reviewed rather carefully this morning the debate of yesterday on the SST, trying to find out if there was anything there that would encourage me to change my opinion in opposition to the further funding of this rather costly undertaking and nothing appeared.

I saw a great deal of comment about markets, and the need of this country to be preeminent, to continue to be preeminent, in the air transport equipment industry.

Now, I want this country to be preeminent, but nowhere was there any information as to proven markets or as to a potential market for this aircraft.

At this time in this Nation and throughout the world the air transport industry is sick. It has lost a great deal of money and it is going to lose a great deal more. So, I do not think that our airlines are in a position to buy the planes if they were available or when they ultimately become available, at the magnitude of 500 aircraft which they would have to do if this Government investment is to be returned. This appears to be not within the realm of probability.

The most successful aircraft produced, the 707, as of the end of 1970 sold 673 planes worldwide since 1958. A great many of those are not of the intercontinental variety.

Mr. Chairman, the following facts are supplied for the information of Members. They represent worldwide total sales for all jet aircraft of U.S. manufacture.

	In service	On order	Total by types
707.....	655	18	673
727.....	797	40	837
737.....	249	24	273
747.....	40	150	190
DC-8.....	529	18	547
DC-9.....	571	36	607
CV-820.....	52	1	53
CV-990.....	31	0	31

Source: Turbine Engine Fleets of World Air Lines ESSO Air World, May-June 1970.

Mr. Chairman, this SST aircraft is highly speculative, we are told it will be flying in 1973, and will have two prototypes, and we will test it for 100 hours,

and it will all be wrapped up with a total cost of \$1,591 million.

I do not think it is going to wrap up at a cost of \$1,591 million. This is an industry that has a remarkable record for understating costs, and you can see it repeated time and time again. I think it is going to cost much closer to \$2 billion to complete the prototypes—and then more money has to be found if these jobs which are conjured up as the second attraction are to be realized.

If the objective is jobs, we can utilize the funds far more effectively and produce far more jobs, and have them dispersed far more broadly around this Nation, than we can by investing further funds in a project which actually was never authorized by this Congress.

I have served for 14 years, I am now in my 15th year on the committee which would have had to authorize it. I was called down to the White House at the time of the presentation of the package back in 1963, and the package offered then was an entirely different package than the one that is before us today—75 percent industry financing, and 25 percent Government financing, with an absolute ceiling of \$750 million from the Federal Government, a ceiling long since exceeded, and one certain to be exceeded by at least 100 percent, or possibly 300 percent before we are finished. No, this is not a wise investment for tax dollars, which now are some of the most competitive dollars in the world. We have far too many demands at home and we need to reconsider some priorities, and I would suggest a few—and let me say again I am not at all impressed by the Concorde or the Tupelov, that they are going to be bought. The air industry of this country is sick, and a great many people traveling in the airlines of this country are disgusted and frustrated because they are called upon to go into facilities that are under par, and to travel airlines that are unsafe—airways that are unsafe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RONCALIO yielded 2 minutes of his time to Mr. Moss.)

Mr. MOSS. But instead of spending the money to improve these facilities, the very agency that comes in here and urges us to provide this money for the supersonic transport sits at this moment handcuffed in moving ahead on programs for the improving of airways of this Nation, and the airports of this Nation.

There is not a Member of this House, I do not believe, who does not fly, and who has not experienced the frustrations that are so common in air transportation today, which must be overcome by this industry if it is to attract a broader base of users and permit it to operate profitably.

Now, I know something whereof I speak. Because of my personal concern over the airlines, and with the sad financial condition of the airlines and the failure of the Civil Aeronautics Board to discharge its responsibilities, I instituted a suit in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and I won that suit—*Moss v. CAB* (430 F. 2d 281

(C.A.D.C. 1970))—to force the CAB to pay attention to some of the underlying problems of the air industry, and to recognize that the industry could not go on endlessly solving these problems by merely upping the fares, and that there were problems of management that need to be handled, such as the problem of over capacity.

The best evidence of this overcapacity was the fact that just last week the CAB issued an order suspending the antitrust provisions in order to permit the air transport industry to get together and to discuss the overcapacity in the air industry and to discuss the canceling out of some of the schedules and rearranging others so that they would be able to operate fewer planes and fewer seats, and do it on the sort of plan, well, almost a cartel arrangement between the air carriers. Certainly, the suspension of the antitrust provisions indicates that there is going to be a lot of soul searching.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. YATES yielded 1 minute of his time to Mr. Moss.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the airlines cannot even sell all the capacity of the latest ariplanes they are putting in service today—even with wider seats, a greater selection of movies, more exotic meals, and fancier stewardess uniforms. I have here in my hands an order issued by the CAB, dockets 23137 and 21866.

[United States of America, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., Order 71-3-80]

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT

(Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 12th day of March 1971, B-747 coach seating configuration proposed by American Airlines, Inc., Dockets 23137 and 21866.)

By tariff revision<sup>1</sup> marked to become effective March 14, 1971, American Airlines, Inc. (American) proposes to establish a coach/economy lounge in its dual and triple configured B-747 aircraft. The lounge is to contain 17 seats, all of which are to be withheld from sale.

Trans World Airlines, Inc. (TWA) has filed a complaint requesting investigation and suspension. It is alleged that the proposal will necessitate removal of up to 40 seats; that this coupled with the fact that the seats would be withheld from sale will result in underutilization of B-747 capacity; and that American is attempting to gain a competitive advantage which could have a potentially adverse impact on all B-747 operators by increasing unit costs. Delta Air Lines, Inc. (Delta) has filed an answer in support of TWA's complaint, alleging essentially that seating configurations have a way of becoming "writ in stone"; and that if other carriers are forced to follow suit the B-747 could be frozen for years into wasteful underutilization of capacity, thereby preventing this aircraft's economic potential from ever being realized.

In answer to the complaint, American alleges that the B-747 has not lived up to expectations in terms of passenger appeal, and that until it becomes more attractive carriers will be reluctant to retire older aircraft and thereby alleviate airport congestion. It is further alleged that the proposed reconfiguration will result in a loss of only 13 seats available for sale; that the issue of

<sup>1</sup>Revisions to Airline Tariff Publishers, Inc., Agent, Tariff C.A.B. No. 65.

withholding the lounge seats from sale is academic at today's load factors; that its lounge seats cannot be sold because they do not satisfy FAA standards for take-off and landing; and that the lounge can be withdrawn within 48 hours and replaced by normal coach seats when demand so justifies.

Upon consideration of the tariff filing, the complaint and answer thereto, and other relevant matters, the Board finds that the complaint does not set forth sufficient facts to warrant suspension. Seating configurations are already under investigation in the *Domestic Passenger-Fare Investigation*, Docket 21866. If it does not prove possible to resolve the issues relating to American's present proposal in the course of the *Passenger-Fare* case, however, the Board intends at a subsequent time to issue an order setting down a separate investigation. In our view, it will be essential to explore the long-run implications of a possible trend toward removing substantial numbers of salable seats from this aircraft for a future period when renewed traffic growth will again begin to put pressure on capacity.

The primary issue raised by American's proposal is whether or not it should be permitted to withhold the lounge seats from sale. In the past, where lounges have been provided in coach/economy service the seats have been available for sale as necessary to accommodate traffic demand. However, in light of the current disparity between traffic and capacity, we do not believe that as a practical matter withholding the lounge seats from sale will undermine the economics of B-747 coach service at this time. We are also influenced by the fact that the lounge unit to be used by American can be replaced by normal coach seats within a relatively short period of time, should traffic demand during certain periods or on certain routes so justify.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and particularly sections 204(a) and 1002 thereof,

It is ordered that:

1. The complaint of Trans World Airlines, Inc., in Docket 23137 is hereby dismissed; and

2. A copy of this order be served upon American Airlines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Inc., and Trans World Airlines, Inc.

This Order shall be published in the Federal Register.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

HARRY J. ZINK,  
Secretary.

MURPHY, MEMBER, CONCURRING

I wish to set forth more precisely the basis for my determination to permit American's proposed coach lounge configuration to take effect. In its answer to the complaints, American states that the 747 aircraft are currently facing a "crisis in passenger appeal" and that load factors on the aircraft have fallen to reach the level to support economic operations. American states that at present even if the lounge seats were offered for sale, they would generally remain unsold. Accordingly, they contend the salability of the lounge seats is academic.

My decision is based on a *prima facie* acceptance of this representation by American. It will probably be some time before the traffic taxes the capacity of the B-747's and while load factors continue at the present low level, I see no practical advantage in trying to maximize seating density in the coach/economy section of these aircraft or any other aircraft. In these circumstances I am not willing to reject the decision of the American Airlines management and would allow them to provide the benefit of a 17-seat lounge to the traveling public.

ROBERT T. MURPHY.

American Airlines had applied for the right to remove 17 seats out of the B-747

in the coach section in order to give more room to the passengers and to make it a little more attractive. That was opposed by Trans World Airlines.

The Board found unanimously for American Airlines and they pointed out in answer to the complaint that "American Airlines B-747 has not lived up to expectations in terms of passenger appeal." The air transportation industry will not recover until we start attacking some of the fundamental ills of that industry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Will American Airlines exercise its option that it does have to purchase the Concorde?

Mr. MOSS. I do not think it will. I do not think the CAB should permit the airlines recover the costs of purchasing and operating either the Concorde or the Tupelov if they are not economical and efficient. That would be against the law. The public can only be charged fares that are based upon economical and efficient service.

One final point, I think it should be noted for the record that another major trunk airline, United, has so far first, canceled eight DC-10 aircraft, second, spread out the delivery of four Boeing 747 aircraft and eight DC-10 aircraft, and third, allowed its option on seven other Boeing 747 aircraft and 15 DC-10 aircraft to expire.

A tabulation follows:

Termination costs

[In millions]

New funds which must be appropriated to pay Boeing and General Electric....	\$97
Returned from escrow account at FAA (no appropriation of public funds)....	22
In addition, some parties claim a moral obligation to return the risk money invested by the airlines by appropriation from public funds.....	59
Total claim of certain parties as amount to be appropriated by Congress as new funds .....	178

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL).

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to elaborate on my opposition to continued Federal funding of the supersonic transport plane. While the environmental arguments against the SST have been well documented in several authoritative studies, I would like to emphasize the conclusions of a Massachusetts Institute of Technology study on the SST's impact on the upper atmosphere. As the Study Group on Critical Environmental Problems affirmed:

The projected SST's can have a clearly measurable effect in a large region of the world and quite possibly on a global scale.

After emphasizing that no one can be certain about the magnitude of the plane's various consequences, they urge that—

Uncertainties about SST contamination and its effects be resolved before large scale operation of SST's begin.

The production of SST prototypes, however, will not aid in resolving these uncertainties. For, as Dr. Richard Garvin of the President's Science Advisory Com-

mittee pointed out in recent testimony, the prototypes will not "serve to alleviate any environmental concerns, since the production of sulfur-bearing particulate matter, the influence of water vapor in the stratosphere, etc., can never be determined by a brief flight test of one or two aircraft, but must be investigated by real research not involving high-speed aircraft." I concur with the scientist's contention that to proceed with the Government's support of SST at this stage of scientific knowledge about its effects would not only constitute a callous disregard for the welfare of citizens worldwide but may well doom subsequent generations to the potentially tragic effects of any commitment we may make now to the supersonic transport.

In an attempt to cloud over the major environmental concerns just expressed, pro-SST advocates have emphasized the ostensive economic benefits for American workers to be derived from its production. Yet this argument is also subject to great question in that it assumes that any moneys earmarked for the production of these planes would not necessarily be used to employ workers for other more useful projects. In fact, as Walter Heller, a former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers points out:

On strictly economic grounds the SST is an enormously costly way to create jobs.

Rather than proposing the SST as a means to ameliorate the current crisis in the job market, the administration ought to direct the vast sums of money earmarked for the SST into public service job programs whose job-creating potential is immeasurably higher and more equitably distributed than the airplane's production could ever hope to be.

Another argument in defense of further Federal support of the SST which must be dispelled in its supposed beneficial effect on our trade balance with respect to other nations. While it is true that both the Soviets and Western Europe are already subsidizing planes similar to SST, these countries have no more evidence than we have that the plane will be either economically feasible to mass produce or environmentally safe. The English French Concorde supersonic jet, for example, has yet to find a buyer and significant segments of both English and French population I am informed are totally opposed to their government's further subsidizing of the plane's production.

What with the grave economic doubts surrounding the SST's ultimate marketability and attractiveness to transcontinental passengers, it is apparent to me that our balance-of-trade interest is better served by devoting our resources to their most efficient uses rather than undertaking a program requiring a \$1.3 billion subsidy to just get off the ground.

In conclusion, the SST will only contribute to an already unstable economy by contributing to the inflationary cycle caused by superfluous government spending. It is my belief that continued Federal support of such an economically unsound and ecologically unwise project as the supersonic transport would be a grave error and an injustice to our constituents

who look to us for reasoned judgments on public policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I share with many in the House the deep concern over the environmental problems that have been advanced in discussions of the SST. I also find myself in the position of not being an expert in environmental affairs, and I find that I can find experts on either side of the coin who will testify and state their positions, one, that there are no problems that cannot be resolved, and the other ones who state that we are going to bring about utter disaster by going ahead with the SST program. Because of this situation, and as a result of listening to the testimony of experts and reading reports, I personally have reached the conclusion that this project should move forward, but that it should move forward on the basis of a control.

I am going to introduce in the form of a bill, assuming that the appropriation for the SST is passed by the House today, proposed legislation which will call for the development and institution of an independent commission that will evaluate the full environmental effects of the SST when the two prototypes are completed, and that this commission will report back to the Congress. We will have to have, I believe, an affirmative kind of position. Certainly from my own point of view, the commission involved will have to give a clean bill of health, the environmental to the SST, in order that I would go ahead any further in allowing the SST's to fly.

I would hope that other Members of the House would be willing to join with me in this type of a proposal, and I intend to make it possible for every Member to join me in bringing this type of legislation about.

There is a point that I think has been brought up several times, and I would like to briefly speak to it, and that is the question of percentages.

It has been stated by some of my colleagues that only 3 percent of this country would utilize the SST, and, therefore, it is not a valid investment for all taxpayers. I think if we start evaluating programs of this Government on the basis of percentages of the people who are directly affected, we may be missing many very fine programs. One specifically I have introduced this year and which the President has spoken of is the development of the National Cancer Foundation, which I happen to support very strongly, and I very much support the allocation of \$100 million a year to fight the battle against cancer. But if we follow the percentage argument, the figures would show only one and one-half percent of our population dies each year from cancer. I think this is a horrible figure.

However, I think if we start discussing programs on the basis of their percentages and evaluate these figures in many programs—and I use cancer, because this is one that is going to be before the House—I think we will be making a ter-

rible mistake. So I urge Members to discount this area of the discussion dealing with percentages.

Finally, my feeling is that I agree completely with one of my colleagues who just preceded me, who said probably there are going to be very few people whose minds will be changed here, but there may be a few, and I think if the few involved will measure the points I am bringing out, namely an independent commission to evaluate the SST when completed and not being related to percentages of use, then perhaps they will find a way of supporting this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER assumed the chair.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 17, 1971, the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4690. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1971 for the Department of Labor, and for other purposes.

#### CERTAIN FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. RONCALIO.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, the supersonic transport plane has generated more response from Wyoming than any other national issue, and it is nearly unanimous in opposing another cent for the SST at this time.

There is no way to characterize the mail from Wyoming. It has come from medical doctors, ranchers, laborers, housewives, students, retired persons, from a genuine cross section of the population.

These letters, for the most part, have itemized arguments thoroughly familiar to this body. There are those who ask why the strain on the national debt be aggravated, and those who say the money is critically needed in more obvious programs of merit. There are those who question its value as a contribution to the American air superiority, and those who lament its possible effect on the environment, and on human life itself.

There is, however, another theme underlying these objections. Various stated, but with the same agonizing presence, is the question I address now, "Who shall determine how the public revenue shall be spent?"

Mr. Chairman, each and every one of us is familiar with the crisis of confidence which now grips the Nation, which

causes the people to wonder if the men who are elected to guide this Nation are, in fact, responsive to the public will.

They do not merely wonder how the funding for the supersonic transport plane is sewed up in the face of the great outcry against it, they wonder how Congress itself is mobilized to act for something when public opinion is so strongly against it.

Do we, the Members of Congress, reply to this situation with sincere action, with effort worthy to be called "thinking" and "working" or do we respond with another speech, or score "for the record" technique?

I am seriously concerned with this erosion of congressional reputation. We have allowed ritual and custom to engage us, and the resulting failure to work or think contributes to the troubled spirit of these times.

But, I am not here today to discuss this issue in historical terms, but rather to apply it to the issue before this House, the approval of continuing appropriations for the SST and for the Department of Transportation.

I have developed a special interest in the Department of Transportation in the short 2 months of this session. I had barely arrived from Wyoming, when I was confronted with the report of the Secretary of Transportation on a National Railroad Passenger Corporation and the basic system it would direct.

In that report, which purportedly concerns a national rail passenger system, my own State of Wyoming was threatened with exclusion. And, as Senator FRANK CHURCH pointed out in his speech in the Senate on February 26, this same, so-called national plan also threatens to exclude five other States: South Dakota, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, and Idaho.

In response to a groundswell of protest from Wyoming, I put full effort on this, and the results, I am sorry to say, have been very disappointing. I have received polite acknowledgements, and, in the case of my most recent letter to Federal Railroad Administrator, Mr. Carl V. Lyon, no reply at all.

During this entire time, my office was well supplied by the Department of Transportation with bulletins, briefings, and a buffet for funding the supersonic transport plane.

Also, on March 8, I wrote to Secretary Volpe inquiring about a news item in the February 21 issue of the Washington Star. The article reported the awarding of two \$100,000 contracts for development of a tracked air-cushioned vehicle to run from Dulles Airport to Dolley Madison Boulevard in McLean, Va.

Without even beginning inquiry into why the one most satisfactory stretch of road in this area—the one with the least traffic problem—should receive a rapid transit project, I asked only for the background on these contracts. I have not yet received a reply to this legitimate inquiry into the expenditure of Department of Transportation funds.

To put it bluntly, Mr. Chairman, I am tired of this blase attitude by Federal agency heads, whose responsibility to the

public is as great as mine, even if it is not as directly established.

I am not going to vote for this SST or any other present Department of Transportation project and I urge my colleagues to stand up to this kind of summary treatment by doing likewise.

If the individual Members of this body are treated as adverse parties, and if the House as a whole finds itself reacting to situations, instead of directing them, then the quality of lawmaking here descends to a charade, to theatrics, and brief moments of surly submission to the well-oiled machinery of persuasion and of "vote by rote."

I am voting against funding the SST and against any continuing appropriation to the Department of Transportation to protest this gradual subjection of the legislative branch of this Government.

In the matter of appropriations, the buck stops here, in the Congress. If we cannot respond to the public outrage against wasteful diversions of the National Treasury, then we fail our constituents, we fail ourselves, and we fail the Constitution.

There can be little hope for the peaceful, reasonable, and orderly realtering of national priorities if the House today bows down to the demand for funding the SST and the Department which is forcing its failure on us for continued support.

In conclusion, I remind my colleagues that in addition to the evidence against the SST on the basis of sound economics and ecology, there is the larger issue of out-of-time—of priorities. If we wish to right the wrongful present direction, we must begin by voting down this request for continuing appropriations. Let us look at this stage of SST development 3 years from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED).

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, when I went on this subcommittee 2 years ago I soon discovered that one of the major problems with which I was going to have to be concerned was this issue of the SST. Since that time up to now I have heard many witnesses and much discussion of this issue.

I approached it with an open mind. I had no strong feelings one way or the other. It is not a political issue in my district. It is not an employment issue in my district. So I was in a position to approach it on its own merits.

As I learned more and more about it I became more and more convinced that the issue before the House today is one on which I had to be in support.

I have been interested in all the great discussions, the many words that have been spoken, but I have also been equally surprised at how little of it has to do with what is before the House to be decided today.

We are not going to decide the environmental issues today, and we are not going to decide the economic viability of the planes today.

I believe I can describe this situation as it really faces us in this way: We are

in a stud poker game. Russia, England, France and the United States have hands in that game. We have already dealt four cards. We have called all bets up to this point. We have put into the pot, counting what we have already spent and what it will cost us to stop today, \$1.1 billion.

This information is in the hearings, and I specifically saw that the actual cost of quitting was in there.

So if we throw in the hand today we will have stuck the American taxpayers \$1.1 billion and they will have nothing on earth to show for it.

But if we draw that fifth card we can look at the exposed cards on the poker table. We know there is almost a certainty that we will win that pot. We are going to have to ante up another \$200 million or \$300 million, more than we are already stuck for.

I want America to stay in this poker game and to draw that fifth card and to win that pot.

What are we winning? Two prototype planes with 100 hours of testing.

If I were opposed to this because of environmental problems I would be here insisting that we go this far, because that would be where we would get the answers to prove my case.

If I were opposed to this on the problem of economic viability, I would want to go this one more step, because the testing of the prototypes would prove that point.

It is a strange thing to me why some want to stop right now. I ask the question: If we stop now who will benefit? Certainly not the American people, for they are going to be stuck for \$1.1 billion. Since England, France and Russia have gone as far as they have, if there is any winning to be done by our stopping it has to be them and not us.

I begin to wonder why so much of this smoke screening and straining at gnats.

We can make one of two decisions today: either to stop or to go ahead. All we are stopping or going ahead on is two prototype planes.

The only way this country will ever get to the bottom of this issue, as to whether it will be safe for the environment and whether it will have economic viability, after having spent \$1.1 billion, is to go ahead. What on earth is the reason why we will not give our Nation the rest of this answer for such a comparatively small additional cost?

Mr. HOLFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLFIELD. I want to aline myself with the gentleman's principles as enunciated here today. He is talking sense. He is talking along the line of every accomplishment this Nation has ever made in every field of research and development.

We can go back to the diesel engine, developed by the Navy, and the Wright airplane engine, and the Boeing jets, and all these things. These were all done by Government subsidy, and then turned over to the civil uses of the people of the United States.

I want the gentleman to know I appreciate his remarks. He is talking sense. Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

I want America to stay in this poker game until we get the answers that will be so important in the years ahead. I believe, having gone this far, there is no sensible or logical way in which you can justify throwing in the hand now and telling the American people that we have paid \$1.1 billion and have nothing to show for it. I am going to vote to go ahead, and when I do that I want you to know I have absolutely no commitment that I will go any further with any of this until prototypes have been built and tested and we get the answers that we are all arguing about here all over the lot today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the continuing appropriation, House Joint Resolution 468. I oppose the pending amendment. I do it primarily as a scientist. Inasmuch as we have the state of the art, I am convinced that we should use it. I think the technical breakthroughs have been adequately proven in the light of my long service on the Strategic Airlift Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and continuous service on the Research and Development Subcommittee of the same committee.

It was there, Mr. Chairman, that we saw the SR-70, the XB versions, to say nothing of the F-4's, the U-2's, and the SR-71's and others which overfly and perform surveillance missions here and around the world regularly. Without such support of Congress in the McNamara era in the Pentagon—a disaster in itself—our Nation would have few such aerial superiorities in its defense measures.

I have had the privilege of visiting the plants in which the mockups and the prototypes are developed. Indeed, much of this technical know-how has come out of the great McDonald-Douglas Aircraft and aerospace area in Missouri.

I would simply remind those who hesitate, Mr. Chairman, that given a technical breakthrough; those persons, whether they be individuals or nations that stand idly by, are surpassed by others who pick up the baton and pursue it in their sovereign national interest.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the further Federal funding of construction of civilian supersonic transports, and in support of the Yates amendment striking the SST subsidy provisions from the pending Department of Transportation continuing appropriation bill.

I have opposed this subsidy on previous occasions. While I appreciate the excellent arguments and presentations made on both sides of this issue, I remain unpersuaded that this controversial plane, despite costly "safeguards."

would not cause further deterioration of our environment and complicate the struggle against man-created pollution.

It appears to me that the proponents of this costly project have failed to present scientific proof that overflights by supersonic transports would not make life on this planet more hazardous through air and noise pollution. I can see no great and overriding benefit to mankind compensating for the potential dangers of this project.

Nor is continued subsidy of the SST sufficiently justified on any economic grounds, least of all as a glorified public work project. If ever actual need arises for Federal programs to provide work for the jobless, certainly projects could be devised that would enhance and protect the environment rather than contribute to its pollution and deterioration.

If the civilian supersonic transport succeeds, it will shave intercontinental travel by a few hours for the relatively few citizens desiring and able to afford the luxury of such travel. But how about the average citizen who cannot get decent railway passenger service or adequate highways for essential travel?

There must be reordering of priorities, with greater relevance to the most urgent needs of our cities and rural areas and with more realistic visualization of our true national values and interests.

If moneys proposed for the SST project were instead expended upon transportation for the masses instead of the few, for example in improving our railroad passenger service through networks more adequately serving the public throughout all these United States rather than the bare skeleton proposed by planners, far more good would be done the greatest number.

Funds diverted from continuation of the SST project can also be put to work in improving our educational system, in conserving our resources, in enriching the lives of all citizens through expanding opportunities for cultural growth and recreational experience.

Perhaps some thought could even be given to possibly letting the taxpayer keep more of his earnings.

In this time of crucial need to exercise fiscal responsibility and special stringency with regard to any Federal expenditures, and in view of the many other far more meritorious projects needing priority consideration, I see no justification for gambling further Federal investment in the SST.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote for the Yates amendment which strikes all funds for the SST from the pending bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in going on further about the distinguished Dr. James McDonald who appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, I think something in his history would be interesting for the House to know. It turns out that he is the same scientist who appeared before a House Committee

on Science and Astronautics in 1968 and testified about UFO's, that is, unidentified flying objects, which he said might have caused the blackout along the East Coast in the mid-sixties.

Now, Mr. McDonald also distributed a prepared statement, and I want to quote verbatim the whole paragraph:

An extremely unusual category of cases, those involving reports of humanoid occupants of landed UFO's . . . I have tended to skirt such cases on tactical grounds; the reports are bizarre . . . For the record, I should have to state that my interviewing results dispose me toward acceptance of the existence of humanoid occupants in some UFO's. My efforts over the past two years being aimed at arousing a new degree of scientific interests among my colleagues in the physical sciences, have led me to play down even the little I do know about occupant sightings. One or two early attempts to touch upon that point within the time limits of a one-hour colloquium taught me that one loses more than he gains in speaking briefly about UFO occupants, but occupants there seem to be, and contact (with them) of a limited sort may well have occurred.

Mr. Chairman, is this the best the SST opposition can bring up here, a man who spends a great deal of his time talking about little men flying around the sky? Mr. Chairman, this is a serious subject, the jobs of hundreds of thousands are in the balance, at least \$22 billion of trade balance is at stake, and the future sales market of our aerospace industry hangs in the balance.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider the responsible testimony of men like Dr. Will Kellogg, Associate Director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, and of Dr. Leo Beranek, chief scientist of Bolt, Beranek & Newman, who ranks among the Nation's top acoustics scientists. I am not saying that Professor McDonald is not qualified in the atmospheric sciences, but he is no more qualified to talk about skin cancer than I am; and, I would hope the opposition to the SST would have the courtesy to their colleagues to bring someone forward who has not confided to us that little men in flying saucers are causing our blackouts.

Or, are we about to now hear that flying saucers may be an impediment to safe SST flights in the stratosphere? Mr. Speaker, I submit that the reasoned and perceptive testimony of Dr. Kellogg, Dr. Fred Singer, and Dr. Leo Beranek is persuasive evidence that the environmental hysteria ought to be laid to rest.

Mr. HALL. My colleague from Kentucky speaks about facts with which both he and I are acquainted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, this is the type of appropriation that would be very simple and very easy to vote down. It is going to cost billions of dollars. There are other questionable concerns over the SST.

One question concerns the environment and another concerns the finances and whether the Federal Government should finance it rather than private industry.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we cannot take the easy way out in this appropriation. I think we have to think about what is going to be in the best long-term economic interest of our Nation.

I believe the environmental argument against the SST has been blown out of all proportion. This is not unusual. This happens whenever we have any new developments in any instance when we try to advance technological know-how, going back to the development of the iron horse in the United States in the last century.

I think there will be and there must be proper safeguards concerning the effects on the environment. I think that it will take time but that it will come about.

The question of financing implies that this is something novel, that this is the first time the Government has financed the development of a new type airplane. The fact of the matter is that the United States has financed with Federal funds the development of every major airplane that has ever been designed in this Nation, going back to the DC-3, the DC-6 and the Boeing 707.

In all of these cases the research and development was performed by the military and the developmental fallout and know-how was then handed over to the civil aviation industry of the Nation.

The result of all this has been that we are supreme in this highly technological field throughout the world. Eighty percent of all civilian aircraft in the world are American made, both planes and engines.

Now, many of us are concerned about trade. We want to see free trade prosper and thrive in the world. We are going to be able to compete with the Japanese and with others in the world only if we remain proficient in the highly technological items such as aviation, electronics and the like. We cannot compete in some other areas but we certainly cannot afford to give up our tremendous competitive advantage in highly technological areas such as aviation.

We are talking here about the airplane of the 1980's. The supersonic transport is the airplane of the next decade. The preparation for it must come now.

I say that we have got to get on with this plane and we must favor and support this appropriation so that we will maintain the tremendous economic and trade lead in aviation which we have worldwide.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) is, I think, one of the most thoughtful and intelligent Members of the entire Congress, and I almost always find the gentleman voting the way I do, but in this case we are on opposite sides of the question. I am wondering whether, if it were not for the fact that Connecticut is one of the six States, and there are only

six States out of the 50 States in the Union that would really benefit from this program, whether that has anything to do with the gentleman being on the opposite side of this question?

Mr. GIAIMO. Let me say this to the gentleman: that there are many people in this House who have a vested interest in the supersonic transport, but I happen to come from the only State in the Union which lost whatever great financial interest it might have had because in the competition for the engine for the supersonic transport, and this was between the General Electric Co. and the Pratt & Whitney Co. of United Aircraft in Connecticut, the Pratt & Whitney Co. and Connecticut lost. So we do not benefit from the SST contract except in a relatively minor capacity, perhaps.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is the gentleman saying that the figures I have given are wrong, and that the State of Connecticut does not get any benefit from the SST?

And that Connecticut does not get an important piece of this action?

Mr. GIAIMO. I think that the important piece of the action that Connecticut gets, to the best of my knowledge, is in the neighborhood of \$15 to \$35 million, which is a very small portion of the overall amount. If the Pratt & Whitney Co. rather than the General Electric Co. had won the engine contract then, of course, we would have had a tremendous economic interest affecting the workers of our State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am interested first of all, and above all else, in the economic feasibility of this plane, and what we are doing to the overburdened taxpayers of this country in continuing to spend millions for it. I heard almost every statement that was made on the floor yesterday, and again this afternoon, on the subject of this plane, and I have yet to hear a single individual supporter even come close to staking his reputation on the fact that this is economically feasible; that it will be able to carry a payload sufficient to pay for its operation and the costs to produce it.

Is there anyone here who wants to stake his reputation on the fact that it is going to be economically feasible?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will yield very briefly. The gentleman can say: "Yes, I stake my reputation on it," and that will take care of it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. No; I am not going to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Then I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. There are some things that are worth more than dollars to this country.

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield further, because the gentleman will not say that this aircraft will pay its way.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would stake my reputation on it, and I base it on the testimony of the conversations I have had with Withington, who is probably the world's foremost aeronautical engineer.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Washington, the home of Boeing, has a deep and unusual interest in this program, does he not?

Mr. ADAMS. I certainly do.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see any more Members who are ready, willing, and able to hit the sawdust trail.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. No; I decline to yield further at this time.

I am not unmindful of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that a few years ago we were confronted with the TFX, which later became the F-111.

It was to be a supersonic, dual purpose military aircraft capable of being operated from aircraft carriers as well as land bases. Thus it was to be used by both the Navy and Air Force. The Navy washed it out long ago as being unfitted for carrier use and the Air Force found it full of defects.

Because of the unending trouble the Air Force has with this plane, Members of the House were told, when the fiscal year 1970 funding was under consideration, that it would be the last funding for production of the F-111. Do you remember that?

Then came the 1971 fiscal year and lo and behold the funding for further production of this questionable airplane was before us again as big as life and I believe it was twice as much. And so it goes on and on.

And do you remember how we were told by General Dynamics that it would provide 1,726 of these F-111's for \$5.8 billion? Now we are told that we may get 514 of these supersonic planes for \$7.88 billion—nearly one-third fewer planes at a cost of \$3 billion more than estimated.

Yes; you bet your life we have subsidized aircraft in this country and the taxpayers have paid through the nose for them. I cannot recall the name of the St. Louis company that produced planes for the Government that would not fly and had to be towed by tractors through the streets of St. Louis to get them to the scrap heap.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman recall the FB 40 program where the Government spent \$1½ billion to produce two bomber prototypes and one of them crashed and one of them is now in the air museum?

Mr. GROSS. The time has come for the public to get what they are promised for their tax dollars. The time has come to put a stop to this program until somebody in authority tells us that this plane is economically feasible. Let the promoters of this SST organize some type of Comsat Corp. and those of you who

feel that this is such a good deal, then would have the opportunity to step up and put some of your capital to work by buying stock in this corporation. Let private risk capital take over from here and produce this plane if it is so good.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman makes a very valid point because the Department of Transportation which is pushing the funding of the SST so hard has the task as well of having to certify as to the safety and viability of the SST at such time as the prototype is completed.

I agree with the gentleman that there ought to be an outside agency, like a commission, that has the supervision as to whether or not this is a good plane.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; it is time to quit hornswagging the taxpayers with deals of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may reply before he starts his remarks.

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state in response to the gentleman that this program was transferred to the Department of Transportation and the certifying agency, is the FAA, and is separate from the Department of Transportation. So the gentleman was not correct, that the department that certifies is not the department in charge of monitoring the construction.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding to me briefly. I am sorry I did not have any time of my own.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this. In answer to the question of spending tax money for this, you might well look to all other facets of American industry and life to find where the subsidies are coming from.

We subsidize the merchant marine to the extent of \$750 million—and I voted for it every time because I think it is in the national interest.

We subsidized the Penn Central Railroad.

We subsidize the Lockheed Aircraft Co. We subsidized the development of the Boeing jet plane when it was first developed and the Wright diesel engine was developed by the Navy.

All of these things have been subsidized by tax moneys and they have returned to the American people in service and in dollars one hundredfold for every dollar that was spent.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, there have been some statements made here today which I think needs to be gone into in a little more depth. One of the most preposterous of those statements has been the

statement that only 3 percent of the people of the United States are going to use the SST. I do not know—maybe not even 3 percent will use it. But if it becomes an economically, commercial viable airplane—in time a lot of people are going to use it.

I rather imagine that the SST is at this time where some of the old planes built by the Wright brothers were shortly after they were built. Very few people were using those planes at that time. In a relative sense, I think ultimately as many people will be flying the SST as are flying in the available aircraft today. We have to start somewhere in this industry. We will not pounce into it full blown with 60 percent of the population using the first model. We must look ahead. We have to understand that we are making a start in this program. We have to start some place, and it is not going to be a full-blown venture at first.

Second—and I think Mr. HOLIFIELD mentioned the point here—I voted on the floor of the House a number of times each year for what I consider to be subsidies. I think they are good subsidies. I think they are necessary. The gentleman from Iowa made some remarks about the SST, but he supports the farm program, the farm subsidy. He feels it is essential. I feel the farm subsidy is essential, too, because it is an important part of our economy. But I also feel that the aircraft industry is an important part of our economy. I think there is an opportunity here for us, Mr. Chairman, to go into the next generation of aircraft, which is the supersonic aircraft, and to be a leader in that field, to continue and retain our world leadership in the aircraft transportation industry; I think we have a great deal at stake here.

I think the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) put it very well when he used the analogy of a poker hand. We have one more draw. It will cost us almost as much not to see the next card as it will to fold. We have an awful lot at stake, Mr. Chairman; so much at stake that I do not think we can afford to fold.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to strike funds for the SST and to deal specifically with one point which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) raised; namely, the pollution of the environment. This is not to say that my objection to the SST is based solely on environmental considerations. Although they are of great, and perhaps primary, importance, I also oppose the SST on the grounds of misplaced priorities: Specifically, that it would benefit only a small portion of our population, those engaged in overseas luxury travel, while it would adversely affect millions living near airports, suffering already from excessive air noise.

Specifically, regarding the environment, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the evidence and, indeed, the wisdom of Dr. Vincent Schaefer, the director of the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center at the State University of New York at Albany. Dr.

Schaefer is one of the very few cloud physicists in the United States and, so far as I know, he has done more research than anyone in the world on the question of microscopic particulate matter and the effect on the troposphere and the stratosphere of these particles. Specifically he has made the point that one of the greatest dangers of the SST is the possibility that the effluent from the SST engines will produce an increasing concentration of microscopic particles in the upper atmosphere which could modify the weather pattern of the globe.

This particulate matter ranging in size from 0.05 to 0.2 microns in diameter, move at random, unaffected by gravity. In other words, Dr. Schaefer says:

The bombardment of gaseous molecules play nearly as great a role in their motion as the force of gravity.

They therefore remain suspended in the stratosphere where the SST is scheduled to fly, for long periods of time. Unfortunately, there are no obvious cleansing mechanisms in the stratosphere, since only the area up to about 40,000 feet, the lowest part of the stratosphere, is affected by precipitation. Further, since the SST's particulates have little mass, the residue may remain for years.

Dr. Schaefer concludes that a high concentration of such particles could cause such a reduction in the incoming solar radiation as to have weather modification effects all over the globe and lead in time to a new ice age.

I would like to repeat that last point and to quote very precisely from Dr. Schaefer's research. He says:

A high concentration of very small particles in the stratosphere might cause such a reduction in the incoming solar radiation as to begin to have weather modification effects on a global scale. If this were to happen, a very large capital investment could be completely wasted, since further insult to the environment from this source would be intolerable since it would lead toward a new ice age.

I repeat—

It would lead toward a new ice age.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, all the scientists who appeared before the committee, Dr. Kellogg, Dr. Singer, and Dr. McDonald, the environmental scientists, agree that the stratosphere is effectively about 100 times more sensitive to technological contamination than the troposphere, the lower area, because its turnover is 100 times lower approximately than the lower level.

I think the House would do well to believe that the hazards of this operation are still very much a part of this debate.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the gentleman from Illinois first, I thank the gentleman for his comments. However, Dr. Schaefer goes on to say:

Our lower atmosphere is rapidly approaching a situation in which pollution is filling it up to the tropopause even though there are very active weather processes tending to remove the pollution particulates quite frequently.

This will not be the case, Dr. Schaefer points out, with the stable and cloudfree stratosphere—in other words, the upper environment does not have adequate processes of purging itself of these particles.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly correct.

That is the testimony that was presented to our committee as well, that is, the atmosphere in which we live is constantly washed by winds and rains, but the upper atmosphere is relatively calm and stable and when pollutants are deposited—and I include water vapor—they would remain there for 2 years before the possibility of their disappearing.

In sum, I would like to make clear that the environmental arguments are not tangential, but rather central and serious. Dr. Schaefer's testimony is corroborated by findings of other scientists, and is known to this administration. One may question how rapidly a number of SST's would affect solar radiation, but there is little doubt that it could happen.

Indeed, when similar buildups of particulate matter have already begun to saturate our lower atmosphere up to the tropopause, we should have received warning enough.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, on page 613 of the hearings, there is a statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and these are his exact words:

Mr. CONTE. \* \* \*

One fast observation: I just want to commend Dr. Singer for his testimony. I think he has done an excellent job. I think that after 3 days of hearings, I only have to resolve one question. I think the environment question has been put to rest. I think that you and the other scientists that came here have definitely put to rest the environment question. \* \* \*

Also, in yesterday's RECORD, on page 6819, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), the ranking Republican member of this subcommittee, said:

As far as the environmental issue is concerned, it became perfectly clear in the hearings that building and testing the two prototypes will pose no threat to the environment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin, (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, much has been made of the fact that we have already spent \$1.3 billion on this, and we cannot afford to back out. It is important to recognize, as I mentioned yesterday, that if that argument has any force whatsoever, it will be virtually unstoppable once the prototypes roll out of those hangars, because there is a \$3 to \$5 billion no man's land between prototype and production.

I think it is impossible to believe that once those shiny new airplanes roll out of those hangars, we are not going to be asked to come back and finance millions and even billions of dollars more for the next step.

Last December, after a meeting in New York, a number of top airline pres-

idents met in New York and expressed their belief that the United States should proceed with the program. Of those present, the president of Pan-Am posed the question: "Are we able to pay for our part of the program?" He then answered his own question. "We believe," he said, "that the Government and the aerospace industry and the airlines will be able to arrange for each to play its part in the time period 1976 to 1980." That sounds to me like a flat-out expectation that the taxpayer will be footing at least some portion of that bill years after the prototype and construction phase is passed.

A second point I would like to discuss, is the argument that has been made that if we build these two prototypes, we can settle questions concerning the environmental and economic feasibility of the development of this fleet of airplanes. Does anyone in this House really believe that flying those two planes for a total of 100 hours will answer any of the questions involved as to either the ecological consequences of the flight of a fleet of 500 planes or the economic possibility of selling that many planes? I really do not think anyone does, if he really and truly understands the worries raised by the economists and by the environmentalists.

I believe the biggest question we have to face here, Mr. Chairman, is purely a question of need. Do we really need to be able to fly to Europe in one-third the time we can do it today? Perhaps we do. I suppose it is possible we do. But I do not believe there is any doubt whatsoever that we do need 50,000 new doctors in this country and we do need 150,000 nurses in this country. I have 37 communities in my district which need now sewer and water programs and they cannot get them.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would not the gentleman also agree if we are talking about an airplane traveler his greatest need is to get back and forth from the airport a lot faster than we do rather than to travel faster once he gets onto the plane?

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely.

I believe we must recognize that despite the fact that we are the richest country in the world we cannot afford to do everything we would like to do. We simply cannot do it. When we face up to that fact we must recognize we have to do the things which are important. I submit that this program is not that important, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has made a very good statement. I believe it is important to point out that the proponents of this proposal have not been able to answer one fundamental question. Even after the prototypes are built and are found successful, the United

States will have to sell a minimum of 300 SST's at \$60 million apiece before we get back penny one of the taxpayers' money on this project, and there is no one who can state here with any degree of certainty that there is a market or will be a market in the next 10 or 15 years for 300 SST's at a minimum of \$60 million apiece. No airline can pay that kind of money now, nor in the foreseeable future, for one airplane.

Mr. OBEY. That is correct.

And I would emphasize again that flying two airplanes for 100 hours will not tell us one thing at all about the possible environmental damage that can be done by a fleet of 500 of these things flying at 60,000 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say at the outset that I have no Boeing or GE plants or significant SST subcontractors I know of in my district. So far as I know in my district I do not have more than a handful of employees of any company who will benefit from work in this project.

I do not represent the State of Ohio; I represent 500,000 people who live in Ohio in my congressional district.

I believe there is little point in continuing this debate in what is a relatively empty Chamber. Those of us who are here probably have all made up our minds. There are likely to be no new facts presented, and perhaps no new arguments developed nor any new methods of argument demonstrated.

But I have come to the conclusion that facts are not always persuasive in our peripatetic media-ridden society, for facts tend to lose their significance to emotional rhetoric these days.

Arguments against the SST have been full of misstatements and suspicions and what one television program my youngsters frequently watch calls nonfacts.

The suggestion has been made here today that the CAB should deny Pan American the right to buy any foreign-made SST. I believe CAB will have to do just that to keep Pan Am from buying foreign-made SST's, if we kill this project today. All of us know Airflot is now coming into New York with a New York-Moscow run. The Soviet TU-144 will soon be flying the SST into New York.

Pan American is going to have to "hawk" an awful lot of free "booze" for its old-fashioned 7½-hour trip to Europe to make up for the attractiveness of getting to Europe in 3 hours on Airflot.

The problem America faces in our modern society of speed is that U.S. airlines just simply will not be competitive if they take 2½ times as long to get to Europe. Otherwise Pan American might be successful by operating the *Queen Mary*.

Being slower or behind technologically is not a logical argument, gentlemen. I am sorry.

In the favorite words of the SST opponents I think, I suspect, I assume that TU-144's and Concorde will be sold in America next year because of the facts.

The facts are here. Here is a book on the Concorde which I was given by a Member of the English Parliament. Or, if you want the facts on the Russian TU-144, they are here in this advertising poster. The TU-144 is advertised for sale. The specifications are here if we are interested in facts. But I am not sure that we are.

The Joint Economic Committee, on which I sit, developed a study with regard to the SST in which they avoided facts pretty liberally. The committees developed no data from Concorde engineers or from British-French economists. The committee report quoted scientists and economists in this country out of context and in the reverse attitude of their positions. The committee report implied opposition when the actual posture was one of support. The most unfortunate twisting of facts occurred yesterday when one of my colleagues on that distinguished joint body charged a Government scientist opposed to the SST had been muzzled. The press, of course, gave full attention to that in spite of the fact that the scientist himself said he had not been muzzled.

Now, what kind of an argument is this? The SST will not belong to Boeing. If developed, it will bring gains back to the U.S. Government in the form of royalties: the \$1 billion initially invested by the Government and \$1 billion beyond that from added royalties if 300 to 500 planes are sold. There will also be \$6.5 billion available in the form of taxes not to mention the balance-of-trade situation.

How important is the balance-of-trade situation? One of the things I have learned from facts developed by the Joint Economic Committee is that last year we had a \$9.8 billion favorable trade balance in the high-technology intensive industries in this country. This is the only area in which we have a favorable trade balance of any significance. The reason why is that we are able to keep technologically ahead of other countries. Our aerospace industry has given us \$2.5 billion economic advantage in foreign trade balances. That pays a lot of taxes, and there are thousands of taxpaying workers working for the aerospace industry. That is where we get the money for housing, education, welfare payments for the unemployed. Where will such social support come from if we do not go ahead and develop this kind of industry?

Mr. Chairman, I am an environmentalist. If the SST is not desirable from an environmental standpoint, we want to go to the rest of the world and say "Here is the reason why the SST is environmentally harmful." We have invested \$1 billion and found out that it will be degrading to the world's atmosphere. If that is true, although I doubt it is true, it will be worth the investment. The present investment will give us the facts. I do not think the Russians, the Japanese, the English, or the French will be interested in nonfacts. They will want to know.

They will want to know facts if we want them to stop their SST's because of the danger of pollution. And they will not stop their SST's on suspicions be-

cause they know that the way to progress economically is to build a better mousetrap and they are making a national commitment to try to win that race—not just in aerospace, but in many industries which have seen them overtake America technologically and economically. And victory in that kind of race will eventually mean they will overtake us in social benefits.

The SST is a symbol for those who are not satisfied to use the golden eggs that our golden goose has been laying. They would like to kill that goose, too. We kill American technological advantage to our future peril. America cannot be the most advanced nation in the world in social progress and the development of the free human spirit without the economic strength which comes from our capacity to do things better, quicker, and cheaper. The SST is such an economic advantage for our Nation in the world—unless we stifle its development today and yield the race to the competition. I urge you not to do that for the sake of our Nation's future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, last year I voted against further funding of the SST not because I considered the SST to be a serious threat to the environment but because I did believe that the SST was not a sound proposition economically. I am still inclined to believe that the plane will never be placed in production.

I have a great deal of admiration for and wish to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), for the way in which he has led this debate. The gentleman from California has stated that he does have a strong belief that the plane will be successful as an economic proposition and that it will be put into production. I would like to ask the gentleman from California this question: One of my reasons for believing that it would not ever be put into production was the short range of the SST.

It is my understanding that the SST will not be able to fly from Great Britain to Miami, for example; that it will not have the range although it can fly from New York to Great Britain but not from Miami to Great Britain.

Mr. McFALL. I am advised that the range is in excess of 4,000 miles for the production SST.

There was an exhaustive study made as to the economic viability of this airplane and the testimony given the subcommittee is that it is an economically viable airplane with a range in excess of 4,000 miles for the production model.

Someone asked if we would stake our reputation on it. All we can say as politicians is that the testimony given to us, after much study by responsible people, is that it is an economically viable airplane.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his answer. However, there is no way that I can be certain as to the validity of my own beliefs until the two prototypes are completed.

I am inclined to believe that the hour of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has already passed. I have already spent \$864 million and only \$478 million is required to bring the prototypes to completion. If we stop now we will not only be liable for penalties but we also have the obligation to continue with the advanced payments. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that if the plane is to be eliminated, that action should have been taken before we reached the point of near completion today.

For these reasons, I have decided to support the further funding of the SST.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I recognize the soul searching the gentleman has been going through these last few years.

However, as the gentleman well knows I tried to stop the funding of the SST several years ago; I tried to stop it last year and I am trying again this year.

The point I am trying to make is that the gentleman proposes to vote for the prototypes because so much has been invested in them.

Mr. ICHORD. Does not the gentleman believe there is the possibility that if this plane is successful we will recoup the money that we have been spending, while if we stop at this time we will have lost \$900 million—some-odd.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the object is to let private enterprise enter the field and take over the burden. My amendment will give them that opportunity, assuming that the environmental hazards are not present.

The gentleman is looking at the amount of money which has already been invested and that same argument might move him to vote for production money at such time as the prototype is completed and Boeing comes back and asks for \$3 or \$4 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, while it would undoubtedly be an exaggeration to say that we have witnessed a total collapse of the ecologist argument, I think it is fair to say we have witnessed a considerable deflation of this argument. So, my very astute opponents have taken to the economic argument. We have heard them suggest that there is not even a remote possibility within the foreseeable future that American airlines will be able to purchase the required number of SST's that would enable the Federal Government to recoup its investment. Well, that is a rather astounding prediction, indeed. It is one that indicates a little less faith than I feel this afternoon in the resiliency of the American economy. I think that that argument upon a little closer analysis makes about as much sense as my friend who said, do not build this plane because of the decline that has occurred in the earnings of the American airline industry means they will not be able to afford it.

We might just as well say do not invest money in the great cities of America, do not invest money in urban renewal, or do not invest money in mass transit, because after all, our cities throughout the country are declining today, they are no longer economically viable as central cities.

Well, I do not accept that argument. I have more faith in the future of our American economy than some. Of course, there is a certain element of risk involved in this. Certainly we are talking about some gamble, just as we did back in 1961, when a bold, confident, young American President suggested that we launch a space program, and that some day we reach the moon. He was taking perhaps one of the most gigantic gambles in all history, and yet we succeeded in that particular venture.

One thought occurred to me as I have listened to the arguments of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, and that is that he is analyzing the situation totally within the context of 1971, and I would suggest that this is the exact fallacy of the argument that he is making.

As we have seen during the course of the research and development phase of this aircraft, I think that answers are going to be obtained to some of the very serious environmental questions that have disturbed me, and that disturbed the gentleman.

I would suggest—and I repeat—I would suggest that we do not live in a static world. This is a very dynamic world, and a very dynamic society indeed. We are talking about an airplane that is going to be flying during the decade of the 1980's and even into the 1990's. We are talking about an entirely different world than we have in 1971. A world where we will have burgeoning population, a world where changes in science and technology are going to take place at an ever-accelerating pace in every single phase of human endeavor.

Let me address myself, if I have time, to the argument that the gentleman makes that only 3 percent of the American people today could fly in this airplane, and that therefore we are guilty of constructing merely a rich man's plaything. Well, I suppose that back in the early part of the 20th century when that first heavier-than-air machine rose in very faltering fashion from the sands at Kitty Hawk that there were skeptics then who said that, well, there are not 3 percent of the people in the world who will ever fly in that kind of a contraption, why in the world are they building it?

So I would suggest the mere fact that in 1971 only 3 percent of the people have indicated that they are willing to fly does not mean that in 1980 or 1990 we are not going to be living in the kind of world where this is going to be the workhorse of the international air fleet of the world.

I myself am interested in the priorities of this Nation, and what these should be, so let me, if I have time, attempt to deal with the argument on priorities. There are those who suggest, and in fact,

they concede, that the aerospace industry, a great basic industry of our country, is in real trouble today, and we ought to do something to help it. Then they say let them turn to making air pollution equipment, or let them turn to making something else.

Well, let me say to you that that must be very, very scant comfort, my friend, to the man who lost a job yesterday or the day before yesterday. It does not represent very much comfort to the man who feels the hot breath of unemployment blowing on the back of his neck to be told, "You can go ahead and retrain yourself, you can easily do something else."

I will say that I am interested in the unemployment problem, and I will freely confess that we have lost 7,000 jobs in my immediate area in 1970, and I am worried, and I do not want to contribute to a further exacerbation of that unemployment problem, and that is why I intend to support this project today, and vote down the motion to strike this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that has disturbed me in this debate today has been some of the quick and easy comments that have been thrown out that are strictly against the facts as they were developed in the committee when the hearings were being held.

Somebody asked me if this is going to be an economically viable plane and would I stake my reputation on it. I answered "Yes." Not because of any information that I happen to have from the companies, but if you will look at the hearings on page 286 and 287, of the hearings, it was worked out in detail exactly where these planes will be sold and the number that will have to be sold and the price and where they are going to be sold.

Somebody stated that private industry has not been involved—and why not? Yet, in the hearings it was precisely stated that out of \$1,342,000,000 cost by the Federal Government, \$535 million is being put in by private industry. They have gone as far as they can. The airlines are in it and the manufacturers are in it. All of them have placed their money in the project.

Then there is this talk about productivity. When you talk about the productivity or pollution—productivity is the product of two things—the number of seats that you can put in an airplane and how fast it can fly. If we do not have this kind of an airplane in the 1980's, it would take 250,000 DC-3's to carry the same number of people.

The gentleman from Illinois just mentioned unemployment. Yes, I am concerned about unemployment. The gentleman said he lost 7,000 jobs in his district in the last year. There have been 70,000 jobs lost in the last 2 years in our general area as a result of unemployment in the aerospace industry alone.

There is this talk about shifting to other things and that we are going to

spend the Federal money someplace else, and if they did that you could put many people to work.

As I said yesterday when I stood in the well of this House, I have supported mass transportation. I have supported the subsidy program for the merchant marine. When it comes to the railroads, I was here with Penn Central and the Penn Central does not come within 3,000 miles of my district.

If we are going to have a viable transportation system in this country, we had better see to it that we are technologically alert. We let the railroads go. This House of Representatives is going to have to face the fact that within the next year we will probably have to spend an immense amount of money to maintain any type of ground transportation at all in the United States.

Another point has been made that we are not spending the urban mass transportation funds. You do not turn on those funds tomorrow. We had an absolute statement from Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe that these programs are now delayed to a degree because we have passed the ecological requirements that must be met and comprehensive plans are required before any program can be funded. They cannot allocate even the \$600 million we have already given them this year.

I can speak from experience on the local projects too. We had a plan in Seattle which requires matching funds and the matching funds were voted down by the local taxpayers and the Federal Government cannot allocate money to build an urban mass transit system there no matter how much they might want to do it.

We are all interested in the way things are going and how they may proceed but let us please stick with the facts.

There was developed, for example, in the hearings, the matter of the upper atmosphere effects of particulate matter. There is more particulate matter put into the atmosphere by one volcanic eruption than can be put in a fleet of 500 SST's if they fly for 2,500 years. If you want to hear the facts about it, they are there in the hearings.

EFFECT OF AN SST ON A CUBIC MILE OF AIR AT CRUISING ALTITUDE

Characteristic	Natural air content-pound	SST exhaust contribution pound
Nitrogen.....	755,000,000.0	0.1
Oxygen.....	231,000,000.0	192.
Argon.....	12,700,000.0	0.
Carbon dioxide.....	500,000.0	176.
Carbon monoxide.....	150.0	0.06
Water vapor.....	4,000.0	72.
Water vapor at saturation.....	156,000.0	
Oxides of nitrogen.....	600.0	0.3
Hydrocarbons.....	2,000.0	0.03
Particulate matter.....	2.7	10.015 20.015
Gaseous sulphur oxides.....	4,000.0	0.01
Total, Rounded.....	1,000,000,000.0	56.

<sup>1</sup> Sulfate.  
<sup>2</sup> Carbon.

Note: SST passage will occur once each 45 days average for northern hemisphere (60-70,000 feet altitude).

A cubic mile of air weighs about a billion pounds. Do you know how much an SST would distribute in that billion-pound mile of air by going through it? It is less than one-quarter of a pound out of 1 billion pounds.

How much goes in there already in natural form—2.7 pounds.

You could fly an SST through that cubic mile of air for many days to even vary the natural amount and a fleet of 500 planes would go through the same mile of air, even over the North Atlantic, only once in 3 or 4 weeks. This would allow plenty of time for the air to cleanse itself from any tiny amount that was deposited.

As to the ozone content we have checked that. It is in the hearings.

In Caribou, Maine, the ozone content of the atmosphere day by day varies over 50 percent. The facts are here.

The total effect of a 500-plane SST fleet—let alone the prototypes—would be less than 1 percent, and you can see the natural content varies over 50 percent per day.

You can take any position or prove anything with figures. When a man says that this is going to increase skin cancer, I can tell you this. If you want to stay outside 4 or 5 more days a year any day of the year in a climate that you are not used to, you will get between 4 and 15 times the effect of any SST fleet flying.

Please, let us stay with the facts in debate. The ecological and economic arguments in favor of the prototype program are clear. I urge the Members to support the SST prototype program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois and support the continuing resolution for the Department of Transportation. It was my honor to have chaired this subcommittee since its inception 4 years ago. This year I changed my assignment to chairmanship of the HUD, Space and Science Committee and was succeeded by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL). I join with my colleagues on that subcommittee and Members of this House in complimenting the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) on the manner in which he conducted the hearings and the testimony that was adduced and the reports that have been issued.

I am sure that there is very little I can say here to change anyone's mind on this subject. We have had votes in this House before on this matter. Some will say that they have been on procedural points. I am sure the Members of this House, when they vote on procedural points, know precisely what they are voting for. In a sense, they are voting up or down the real issue the House has to face.

It is not an easy task to carry this issue to this House; it has not been over the past 3 or 4 years and is not today. It does not help me in my district. I am not aware of many jobs in my area that are connected with the SST. So politically it would be a nice thing to walk away

from it. I have received many letters opposed to the SST.

But I sense the responsibility I have to this Nation, I sense the responsibility I have to provide the means in resolving the talk about priorities many complex problems this Nation faces. "Priorities" has been a word that has been much abused and over-used in this Congress and in the press. The fact of the matter is what we cannot pay for solution of the great problems we have in the areas of the environment, health, education, welfare, mass transit and crime—we cannot pay for those programs unless we have economic stability and the economic health to do so.

How do you do it? You do it by supporting research and development—by constantly improving and developing technology. Eighty percent of the commercial aircraft sold in the free world is built here in the United States. You can go to any airport in the free world and you will see standing there the magnificent 707's and the 747's that have been built by the brilliance and the technical know-how of the workers of America. We have been able to undertake and pay for many of the programs that assist the cities and assist the ghettos in our Nation because we have a healthy economy in this area.

As the gentleman from Illinois has indicated, there have been more untruths, more misstatements, and more half-truths in relation to this program than on almost any other issue that I can think of.

If anyone wants to build a house of horror with the statements that have been made by some of those who oppose the SST, just get the news clippings of the Washington papers or the New York papers or other papers around the country, the statements of some of the people who serve over in the other body. Witness the statement that appeared last night in the Washington Evening Star:

WHITE HOUSE SST GAG CHARGED

Well, it was easy for the person who made the charge to have called the doctor in NIH. He could easily have found out that Dr. Gori was not gagged, and that he was told by his superior that if he desired to appear at a press conference yesterday, it was up to him.

And yet the charge was made that he was gagged—that he was told not to go there. That was not so. That is an indication of the kind of opposition and the scare tactics that have been used by some who oppose this program.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that I have received considerable mail opposed to the SST. Practically all of the opposition is based on the plane's impact on the environment. It is good that there is a deep concern by so many of our people on the effect that men and machines have upon the environment. And because this was and is a genuine concern of the committee that considered funding the SST, considerable time and much testimony was spent on the ecological faction. While no one testified that the present program of two prototypes will harm the environment, some questions have been raised about the impact a fleet of SST's might have on the environment. Although not all these questions

can now be answered with absolute certainty, the evidence clearly indicates that any possible adverse effects of the SST on the environment can be resolved before any commercial U.S. SST's are flown.

Some of the most distinguished scientists in fields concerned with the environment testified before the committee. I present some of the issues raised and the conclusions of testimony by Dr. Beranek and Dr. Singer as well as Dr. Kellogg. Some of their testimony is summarized in the following excerpt from the committee report:

TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY DR. BERANEK AND DR. SINGER—EXCEPT ITEM No. 2

1. Engine noise: FAR-36 is a reasonable standard and the SST will be able to meet this requirement. Subsonic jets flying now are not able to meet this standard.

2. Sonic boom (flight over land): Testimony presented by DOT indicates that the SST will not be operated supersonically over the United States at speeds that will allow a sonic boom to reach the ground.

3. Sonic boom (flight over water): The effects below the surface of the water will not be significant.

4. Carbon dioxide: This is not judged to be a problem, because the contribution is minor compared to the carbon dioxide which is contributed by many other sources in the earth's atmosphere.

5. Nitrogen oxide: This is not judged to be a problem.

6. Water vapor and sulfates, hydrocarbons, and soot (immediate effects): Water vapor will radiate away some heat from the stratosphere and tend to cool it, while exhaust particles will absorb energy from the sun and heat the stratosphere, tending to offset the effect of the water vapor.

7. Effect of water vapor on ozone (skin cancer) (long-term effects): Water vapor may remove some of the ozone but the argument that this will increase the number of cases of skin cancer appears to be unsupported at the present time. This concern can be disposed of with some relatively simple additional measurements which will be conducted.

8. Long-range climatic effects: The weather modification questions are not considered to be serious but additional testing is planned.

Just as the work on the environmental problems must go forward, the committee feels that the prototype construction must also continue. As Dr. William Kellogg, Associate Director, National Center for Atmospheric Research and Chairman of the Climatic Effects Working Group for the Study of Critical Environmental Problems (SCEP) stated:

"I am very much disturbed over recent gross exaggerations and scientific mis-statements regarding the SST's potentially harmful effects upon the atmosphere and man's environment. Last August a group of scientists at the MIT Summer Study stated that there are indeed environmental uncertainties, caused in no little part by gaps in available information, which require additional research in order that they may be resolved. I pointed out at that time and want to strongly reaffirm that there is no environmental reason to delay construction of the two prototype SST's.

"It is my profound hope that the U.S. Congress will not be misled by these exaggerations or by scientific mis-statements. Dr. Ed David's statement, which Dr. Walter Roberts and I strongly endorse, says it well: 'Let's not suppress technological advances

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Edward E. David, Jr., the President's Science Adviser, in a statement issued Dec. 5, 1970.

<sup>2</sup> Director, National Center for Atmospheric Research.

but through research, development and experimentation make sure that those advances are obtained without undesirable side effects." I support a vigorous environmental research program in parallel with prototype SST construction. Don't downgrade the ability of American scientists and engineers to apply their genius to the successful resolution of uncertainty."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues of the House, this issue, as is the case with all others, is indeed controversial. There are two sides to the issue and some merits on each side. To demonstrate the magnitude of this controversy, first of all, I think it needs to be said that the two usually together in almost any scheme have found themselves on opposite sides of this issue, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL). But this in itself still does not indicate the magnitude of this controversy. We also find an alignment in which the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) are on the same side. But it is still a little bit worse than that. The gentleman from the Northwest, from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) are on the same side. So we do have a controversy.

People have talked about sticking with the facts and sticking with the truth in this particular issue. Everybody has made an allegation somewhere along the line, but everybody has tried to protect himself by saying it could do this or that, or it might do this or that.

Some of these things could happen if—and on and on we go.

The Members and I have listened to 2 days of arguments based upon the economics of the situation, and based upon environmental factors, and nobody has changed his mind in either instance, I am led to believe.

But I do want to say this and then I am through. What is wrong, now that we have \$864 million of the taxpayers' money already invested in the development of the SST, with spending a little bit more money and completing the development of the two prototypes to get some answers to some of these questions which have been raised? At least we would have something and if we quit we will have nothing. That is the time to make a final decision, not now.

I leave the Members with this warning, having asked that question: The day will come when we are going to conclude, as I have already concluded, that we are going to build it at some point in time or we are going to buy it. I prefer to build it. This Nation cannot afford to abandon its curiosity. We cannot forego the need for advancing our technology. This Nation is what it is because of our farsighted approach to our problem at home and abroad. We can never afford to be shortsighted because the road is too perilous.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I explained at length my reasons for voting against further Government funding of the SST program. Today, I will summarize my feelings about the main issues surrounding this controversy.

While I realize this is not a black-and-white proposition, my innermost convictions compel me to vote no. I have consistently opposed Government subsidy programs in the past, and I see no reason now for retreating from my position on this matter. If the supersonic transport is the economic marvel that its advocates claim it to be, let it stand the test of the marketplace.

Some have said that we who oppose it do not have a sense of responsibility. I take issue with that. I am not voting against the SST because some environmentalists from my district have written to me and have sent me telegrams.

I represent employees in the western part of Massachusetts who get a piece of this action from Boeing Aircraft. So I believe it takes a lot of "guts" to stand up here and vote against this particular issue.

Now, if private industry stands ready to reap the benefits of this project, then it should be willing to sow the financial seeds needed to bring it to a successful harvest.

Aside from my fundamental objections to Government subsidy of private industry, I have serious reservations about some of the economic arguments that are advanced by the plane's supporters.

I, for one, do not feel the hot breath of the Concorde or the Soviet TU-144 breathing down our economic necks. The economic soundness of these planes is by no means established, as is evidenced by the fact that not a single U.S. airline has made a definite commitment to purchase a foreign SST.

Nor have I resolved all the economic uncertainties concerning our own SST. For one thing, passenger statistics cited by proponents of the plane are misleading. If one person travels overseas 10 times in 1 year, he is counted as 10 passengers for statistical purposes. The fact of the matter is that only about one-half of 1 percent of the country's population travels internationally on a regular basis. Granted this may climb to 2 or 3 percent in the next 10 or 15 years, but this is hardly enough to make regular overseas travelers a significant portion of the population. I do not see how we can justify a governmental outlay of more than \$1.3 billion for a program that will benefit such a small segment of the traveling public.

The shaky financial condition of our domestic airlines makes me extremely skeptical about assurances that, should the Government continue financing the prototype phase of the program, its help would not be needed to finance full-scale production of the plane.

Under the terms of the original contract between Boeing and the Government, a financing plan for production

was to be submitted by June 30, 1968. First the date was put off until December 31, 1969. Now we are assured that the plan will be submitted in June of 1972. This hardly inspires confidence in me that Government financing for the production phase of the program would not ultimately be sought.

Apparently my lack of confidence is shared by at least two officials of the airline industry. Robert Six, president of Continental Airlines, has told the Senate Aviation Subcommittee that he does not think there is a rush for the SST. Even more amazing is the statement of former FAA head Elwood Quesada who declared before the House-Senate Subcommittee on Economy in Government that—

There are a lot of people that say that the airlines wish the airplane would go away. And I am one of them.

That same individual has predicted that the Government's share of the SST program could go as high as \$3 to \$5 billion.

Despite all these factors, supporters of the SST program insist that the Government will ultimately regain its investment with a \$1 billion profit. Let us assume for the moment that this will be the case. The \$1 billion profit, which in turn assumes the sale of 500 planes, represents a return of only 4.3 percent on the Government's money. Since the Government pays 6 percent to use its money, the \$1 billion return is actually a loss as far as the Government is concerned.

Let me answer another question. The gentleman from Louisiana quoted from the hearings in regard to the environmental issue. I tried to be fair. Those Members who heard me yesterday know I tried to give both sides of the argument. I said that anyone in this House could vote on either side of the issue, and I feel that way today, because I believe some of the proponents have made an excellent case and some of the opponents have also made an excellent case on this particular issue.

I narrow it down to one issue, and that is the economic issue. I fought with some of the Members of this House for the past 12 years on farm subsidies, and I feel this is a parallel case.

I said yesterday that my industry, the General Electric Co., makes heavy transformers and is in trouble because of heavy transformer imports into this country from France, England, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland, and now Japan. I said that this company is having a difficult time going to its stockholders and asking money for research and development; that unless something is done for this industry it is going to have to stop its research and development program.

Furthermore, the whole thing is compounded by the Federal Government's buying 95 percent of its transformers in the past 5 years from abroad.

Therefore, carrying this argument a bit further, why can we not come to the Federal Government and say, "Give us a billion dollars for research and development of the heavy transformer industry"? We have been the leaders in this industry. We have been in the forefront for decades and decades.

This is where we open up Pandora's box. This is where problems begin.

But let me go back to the environmental issue. We had 4 days of hearings. We heard everyone who wanted to testify. We heard some of the foremost scientists in the country before the committee. And they came to the conclusion that the environment was not in danger with respect to the two prototype SST's.

I believe my good friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and I, who team up on this, both agree on this particular point.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. But they did express concern that there may be an environmental hazard with fleets of SST's flying at that altitude, did they not?

Mr. CONTE. Yes, they did, and they said this was a part of their studies.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. McFALL. I believe the record also shows that the testimony went to 500 SST's, and the scientists believe there will be a minor chance of there being any environmental problem. That is the record.

Mr. CONTE. I believe Dr. Singer felt he was 95 percent certain there would not be any dangers to the environment even with a fleet of SST's.

I mentioned here yesterday that Dr. Kellogg, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, has testified that there is no environmental basis for delaying the SST program to develop these two prototypes. He said that preliminary studies regarding the climatic impact of large-scale SST operations indicate a negligible influence on the heat balance of the global atmosphere and a negligible increase in carbon dioxide. Particles added to the stratosphere could have a small, but possibly measurable, effect on stratospheric temperatures during periods of low volcanic activity but little or no influence on surface temperatures. Ozone in the atmosphere could decrease by 1 or 2 percent, but this would have a trivial effect on ultraviolet radiation reaching the ground, in his opinion.

In addition, Dr. Leo Beranek of the SST Community Noise Advisory Committee has testified that there does not appear to be any technical reasons why a commercial SST cannot be built which will meet Federal Aviation Administration noise standards for new, subsonic planes—108 decibels. Sonic booms should be no problem since the Department of Transportation indicates that the SST will not be allowed to fly supersonically over land areas of the United States. As for supersonic flights over water, studies indicate this will have a negligible effect below the surface.

Thus building the two prototypes poses no threat to the environment. Preliminary study indicates that large-scale SST operations would be environmentally safe but more research is needed and is being done. Results

should be in by the time a decision on full scale production has to be made.

To summarize, the comparatively small segment of the public which will use the SST, my skepticism regarding the alleged economic threat of the foreign SST's, and my reservations about our domestic airlines' being able to finance production of the plane and our Government's being able to recover its investment in this project—all this, when added to my fundamental objection to Government subsidy programs, compels me to vote against further funding for the SST.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment to strike out all funds for the supersonic transport.

Many of my colleagues oppose the SST because of the possibly dangerous environmental consequences of penetrating our atmosphere with polluting machinery. I, too, feel that sound arguments have been made about the ecological dangers of the SST, and many serious questions remain unanswered. Yet, I also believe that, with the technological capability of our country, these environmental problems can be solved.

I vote in favor of the Yates amendment because, in good conscience, I do not feel we can afford to appropriate millions of dollars directly out of the Federal budget for a program that can be financed with private capital. Far more pressing budgetary demands must be met and we cannot let this airplane, of benefit to relatively few people, preempt tax dollars that are more desperately needed in other areas.

Mr. Chairman, as early as 1969, I addressed my colleagues in this Chamber and proposed an alternative method of SST financing. I called upon the various companies involved in building the SST to work out a capital funding arrangement whereby the necessary money could be raised through the sale of federally-guaranteed bonds in the private sector. These bonds would fall due in the decade between 1980 and 1990, when the sales of the American SST should put developers in a position to repay the bonds. The Federal Government would stand behind these SST bonds with a guarantee equal to the total amount requested as the Federal share of SST development.

In this way, the Government would encourage immediate production of the necessary capital by attracting private investors who, in turn, would rely on a Federal guarantee of repayment to lessen their risk. If the SST is the financial success its proponents say it will be, the Federal Government would substantially reduce its direct dollar investment in the plane's development. At worst, the Federal investment would be postponed a full decade, with far less disastrous effects on the Federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to this proposal as I feel it is the most desirable solution to the SST dilemma.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert my letters to Transportation Secretary John Volpe

and the editor of the Washington Post on financing of the SST:

MARCH 16, 1971.

HON. JOHN A. VOLPE,  
Secretary of Transportation,  
Independence Avenue SW.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Since 1969, I have been proposing an alternative method of SST financing which places greater emphasis on private development and less strain on the Federal budget. Even if funds for the prototypes are appropriated by the Congress, I understand that final funding arrangements for actual SST production have not been fully worked out. Therefore, I would like to put forth my suggestion again.

Briefly, I propose that the government and the various companies involved in producing the SST work out a capital funding arrangement so that the necessary money can be raised through the sale of federally-guaranteed bonds in the private sector. Enclosed are two of my statements which detail the proposal. Such an approach would have reduced the problems we are encountering today with the SST issue. Moreover, the private financing approach with Federal guarantees lends itself to accommodating cost overruns and inflation far better than the direct appropriation process.

The technological and environmental problems of the SST are the kinds of problems that can be solved by American ingenuity. In my mind, the crucial issue is whether funds should be taken directly from the Federal budget at a time when there are still severe cutbacks in other areas of high priority. From this point of view, appropriations for the SST are very difficult to justify. This difficulty is illustrated by the number of conflicting studies that have been issued on the economic, environmental and social consequences of an American SST.

I would be happy to meet with you and discuss my proposal in greater detail if you feel it warrants further interest.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

FRANK HORTON.

[From The Washington Post, June 21, 1970]

#### FINANCING OF THE SST

Herblock's cartoon in the June 12 Washington Post makes a very valid point about the financing of the supersonic jet transport and one I have held for some time now. I cannot, in good conscience, approve direct Federal expenditure for the SST.

In a statement on the House floor on Nov. 18, 1969, I proposed that government and the various companies involved in building the SST work out a capital funding arrangement so that the necessary \$1.5 billion can be raised through the sale of federally-guaranteed bonds in the private sector.

Such bonds would fall due in the decade between 1980 and 1990 when the sales of the U.S. SST should put the developers in a position to repay the bonds.

It is obvious that the SST development cannot be undertaken without federal assistance. But I do not believe this airplane, already riddled with financial and environmental problems, should pre-empt tax dollars that are more desperately needed in other areas of our economy.

It would seem to me that the federal guarantee of SST bonds should be sufficient to encourage the production of the necessary capital. In this way, the direct and immediate expense to the federal government would be eliminated. If the airplane is successful, the bonds can be repaid by the corporate borrowers. At worst, the federal investment is postponed for a full decade with far less

disastrous effects on a very sensitive federal budget.

FRANK HORTON,  
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there is a mood of expectancy and excitement in the House of Representatives today which we seldom find.

We have been working on the SST program for quite a number of years. We do not have the SST today. We would not have it until the late 1970's. However, in our national legislative business we must look to the future with respect to the great interests of our country. That is what we are undertaking to do through the recommendations in the pending resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations has, I assume, been the closest to this matter in recent years. We have considered and debated this issue up and down from time to time. After another debate on Monday last, when we considered reporting this bill and recommending that the House pass it, the vote in committee came as to whether we should kill the SST program or whether we should proceed with the program. Three Members abstained from voting, but out of the 41 Members voting 26 voted for a continuation of this program and 15 against, showing quite a decisive vote in favor of continuation.

I realize that many Members have had some difficulties in trying to determine what should be done about this matter, but it is my judgment that, as of today, the issue is not very complex or very difficult. As has been pointed out time and time again, the issue here is, shall we capitalize on the \$800 million which we have already spent? Shall we realize that if we kill the program today the total cost to the Government, with little if anything coming in return, will be about \$1 billion? Or, shall we take the step of saying we will go forward and spend a total of about \$1.3 billion and develop two prototypes and see where we want to go from there?

It seems evident to me that, today, we have only one logical course of action—regardless of whether we are strong for the SST, or lukewarm for the SST, or even against the SST. Why do not those who are so strongly against the SST want to see it completed so that they can be vindicated and be able to point the finger of criticism at those who continue to support the program?

The press, the columnists, the television, and the radio commentators, are all very much interested in what we do here. The news at to what we do here today will be flashed around the globe very quickly. If we vote to stop this program, the leaders in the Soviet Union may well say, "Well, America has lost that spirit which made her great—the spirit of taking a gamble, the willingness to risk something for something to be gained." Of course, the Governments of France and Great Britain would take

heart to this extent: They will have a better chance to lead the world in commercial aircraft production in the future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that we not flash the news to the rest of the world that America is taking a back seat in anything potentially worthwhile or in anything potentially enduring. The stakes are very high.

The transportation industry is worthwhile and is enduring. We as a Nation are now foremost among the nations of the world in aviation development and progress.

So, I would repeat, let us not take a back seat to any nation in the world. Let us maintain the industrial preeminence which we now occupy. Let us vote down with a resounding vote the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a number of Members have come up to me expressing concern about whether the money for research on the environment and research on engine noise is contained in the money for the SST and would that be stricken by the success of my amendment. The answer to that is "No."

The money for the environment is in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation and environment research will go on if my amendment is successful or not.

The money for the noise abatement is in the appropriation for the Federal Aviation Administration and that too will go on.

So, with respect to the research that seeks the answers on environment and noise, that research will continue whether my amendment is successful or not. Nor, Mr. Chairman, will the prototypes be necessary to conduct that research. Witnesses before our committee stated positively that the prototypes are not necessary in order to conduct the atmospheric research, they are not necessary to conduct the research on noise.

My good friend and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), declared that the Committee on Appropriations had voted, as he said, overwhelmingly against the amendment which I offered. I do not agree with his conclusion.

The members of the Committee on Appropriations did vote 26 to 15 against my amendment. But I suggest to the distinguished chairman of our committee that that is two more votes than my amendment got last year, which is progress.

Second, of the three members who voted "present" two of them are going to vote against the SST. One member who voted against this amendment in committee has turned around and he is going to vote for my amendment on the floor.

Further, the Committee on Appropriations usually supports the reports of its subcommittees overwhelmingly, almost unanimously. When an amendment like mine can get 15 votes before the Committee on Appropriations one knows the amendment has a great deal of merit.

Now, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), waved a pamphlet and said, here are the facts regarding the Russian Tupolev. I have seen so many of these travel folders with pictures of planes and beautiful places, I suggest they do not always contain entirely factual information. The fact is that the testimony before our committee did not indicate—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In view of the fact that the gentleman used my name, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I shall yield to the gentleman in just a second, as soon as I finish my sentence.

The case before our committee did not indicate any testimony as to the Tupolev other than its speed, other than the fact that its wing configuration was the same as the Concorde.

If those characteristics are like the Concorde, and if it looks as though the operating expenses will be similar to the experience of the 747's, then I say any airline executive who buys one of those planes is out of his mind.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I will now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my comment has to do with reference to the facts related in the gentleman's comments earlier in that he had not seen the material on the Russian plane, how fast it would go, what its seating capacity would be, and so forth and so on, and I will state to the gentleman that that material is available in the pamphlet which I have.

Mr. YATES. I am glad to have that information, but I will tell the gentleman that that information was not in the record.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then I hope the gentleman will have the opportunity of looking at it afterward.

Mr. YATES. I will be glad to look at it later.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I think that this is an historic moment. We have reached the culmination of years of debate on the SST. In all those years the Members of the House have never had the opportunity to vote by rollcall on authorizations for the supersonic transport or on appropriations. This will be the first time. I say let us end the supersonic transport now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Bow yielded his time to Mr. GERALD R. FORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the Members of this body are interested in the most recent facts, then they should read the 709 pages of testimony and exhibits contained in this book of hearings

produced by the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations. And may I say that on the basis of the factual arguments and evidence presented here, pro and con, anyone, even those who in the past have voted against this proposal, if they are objective, could be and should be convinced that we should vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), and vote for the supersonic transport.

Mr. Chairman, the temptation is to appeal perhaps at this late hour to those on the Democratic side, and those on the Republican side on certain emotional grounds. The RECORD shows that a Democratic President in June of 1963 made the first recommendation for the supersonic transport before the Congress of the United States. And for 5 successive years President Lyndon B. Johnson recommended to the Congress that we approve the supersonic transport funding.

I say to my Republican friends, for the last 2 years a Republican President has joined with his predecessors, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, to support this project and this program. They had the vision and the courage and the dedication to know of its importance—not for today but in the future, for the United States to remain preeminent so far as the aircraft industry is concerned.

Yes, four Congresses—the 88th, the 89th, 90th, and the 91st Congresses have supported the requested appropriation for the SST and now this Congress in one of its very first tests has to make the decision whether it is a man or a mouse. This Congress is going to make up its mind whether it is going down the path and at the crossroad take the road to strength or the road of weakness for the future of America.

There are about five or six main issues involved in this vote.

As to the pending amendment, if you vote "yes" on this amendment, you in effect are giving layoff slips figuratively tomorrow to 13,000 employees who are currently engaged in various production jobs on the SST. You are in effect issuing layoff slips to a second tier of 50,000 employees who are now working on this project.

If you vote "yes" on this pending Yates amendment, in effect, you are denying 150,000 American jobs a year for the next 10 years. If you vote "no" on the Yates amendment then you are, in effect, insuring jobs today for 13,000 people and 150,000 American jobs each year for the next 10 years.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman repeat his statement for the benefit of the Members to the effect of the vote on the pending amendment?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

If you vote for the SST, you are insuring 13,000 jobs today plus a total of 50,000 current jobs in the second tier and 150,000 jobs each year over the next 10 years.

If you vote for the Yates amendment, you will be handing out layoff slips to those individuals who are currently employed in this project all over America.

As to the question of cost. If you vote against the SST, you are, in effect, insuring that the Federal Government will have to pay approximately \$176 million in cancellation costs and, in effect, you will be throwing down the drain approximately \$860 million of money that has already been spent.

Furthermore, if you vote for the SST, you are insuring when we get through with the investment that we have now, and the \$290 million that we propose to put into it with this proposal, we will end up with some worthwhile hardware, the two prototypes, which will give us an opportunity to do something affirmatively and to answer some of the questions and some of the problems that have been raised.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) exhibited for the members of the committee this sales material put out by the Soviet Union in favor of their version of the SST. This sheet shows the speed of the aircraft and the other flight characteristics of the Russian SST. It shows the other benefits of this aircraft which is on the market today and will be flown on commercial flights in October of 1971.

I have in my hand here a public announcement that the Soviet Union has signed a sales agreement with an American to market this aircraft in America.

Now the question comes right down to this—if you vote against an American SST, you are insuring that the Soviet Union, the British, and the French will dominate the market in advanced aircraft over the next two decades.

On the other hand, if you vote for the American SST, then you are insuring that the U.S. plane will be flying and that we will outdistance the competition of the British and the French and of the Soviet Union.

On the next issue, the question of the environment, I say now that I would not vote for the two prototypes if I was convinced that there was any problem in the area of the environment, and I say, categorically, right now that I will not support the production of an American SST if I believed there would be any problem in relation to environment in the future. The testimony that was heard by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations answers the environmental questions. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who is an opponent of this program, admits that the overwhelming weight of the evidence is against any environmental problems caused by an American SST.

Let me talk about the balance of payments. This country cannot subsist now or in the future if we do not have a net plus in our balance of payments. The record is clear that one of the biggest producers of an American favorable balance of payments has been the aircraft industry. If you ground the American SST, you, in effect, will kill any possibilities of our American aircraft indus-

try in the future producing a favorable balance of trade.

The argument has been made here, "Who is going to buy the American SST?" I have in my hand a copy of a statement made by Najeeb C. Halaby, president of Pan American Airways, a person known to many of us over many years. He, in this prepared statement, speaking for all of the U.S. commercial airlines, indicates that they, as a group, support the continued research, development, and production of the two prototypes of the SST. In a statement they say that it is essential for us as a nation to proceed with this project.

The question has been raised, will private industry finance the actual production of some 300 or 500 American versions of the American SST?

I have in my hand a copy of a letter from the executive vice president of the Bank of America, and a copy of a letter signed by Eugene R. Black and James B. Mitchell, all renowned bankers in this country, representing the largest financial institutions in America, and they say that private industry will finance an SST, an American version, if we have the courage to proceed with the prototypes that we are trying to proceed with at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude with this observation and comment: If we vote "yes" on the Yates amendment we are throwing down the drain \$1.34 billion of U.S. taxpayers' dollars. If we vote "no," if we vote for the SST, we are voting to keep the United States preeminent in the aircraft industry, and we are voting for a program to build and to sell American SST's rather than a program to buy foreign versions of an SST.

I urge, strongly urge, a vote against the Yates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McFALL yielded his time to Mr. Boggs).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I find myself on the same side of the aisle with the minority leader but for entirely different reasons. I would say to the Members that the SST—and 10 SST's—could not rescue the economic policies of the Nixon administration. This program is not a WPA. It is not designed to make work. It is not designed to give jobs. It either stands on its own as a scientific advancement necessary for the continuing movement ahead of the United States of America as a technological leader on this earth, or it has no justification whatsoever.

At another time and on another occasion I will deal with the economic policies of this interim administration in the White House. Suffice it to say that after 12 years of moving ahead in this economy the Nixon administration succeeded in giving us zero growth last year. Suffice it to say that with all the things we need in this country, in the cities, and in the urban areas and in the rural areas around this country, we have 6 million

able-bodied Americans, talented Americans, engineers, craftsmen, and nonunemployed. Twenty-five percent of the industrial capacity of the United States is unused. So, Mr. Chairman, please do not buy the minority leader's WPA argument for this project.

Let us take a look at the record, as Al Smith used to say. Let us see if we can separate the wheat from the chaff. What is involved here? What is the issue before us? The gentleman from Illinois, my old and dear friend, Mr. YATES, says this is a historic occasion, because never have the gentlemen as Members of the great House of Representatives had the opportunity to say "yes" or "no" on an SST. The Members know that is not so. The Members know over the years that the distinguished Committee on Appropriations has brought here the appropriation for the Transportation Department and anyone could have offered a motion to recommit where we would specifically strike the SST.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I do not yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman should yield. He used my name.

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Of course, the gentleman should yield. There has never been a vote on this in the House of Representatives directly on this question of striking the SST, and the minority had the motion to recommit, and we did not.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is technically correct. I know that the gentleman is perfectly sincere in his position.

But let us see what is proposed. We propose to build two prototypes of an aircraft that is already being flown by the Soviets and the French and the British.

Today I read in the press, in the New York Times, that if today we pass this bill, and we vote down the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, that we will increase the danger of skin cancer. I read down a little further in the story, and I discovered that one of the men making this assertion was the same man who allegedly made a statement a few years ago that the power failure in New York might be attributable to flying saucers.

I read also where Charles A. Lindbergh is opposed to this program.

Well, so be it. I sat in this House when Mr. Lindbergh said, "Let us make a deal with Hitler." I sat here when Mr. Lindbergh said it was impossible to defeat the Nazis. I do not find his testimony commanding.

Now, in truth and in fact one of few areas, since World War II, where the United States has prevailed has been in the field of aviation; and, thanks largely to the vision of the late President John F. Kennedy, in the field of space. By some strange coincidence I find so many people who are opposed to the SST program also opposed to the space program.

I know the arguments they make. They say, "We cannot afford both."

Well, I find that argument hard to buy. I find it hard to believe that in an economy of a trillion dollars—not a billion

dollars, not \$100 billion, not a half trillion dollars, but \$1 trillion—we cannot afford about \$300 million to maintain the scientific ingenuity of the United States of America.

I am for urban mass transit.  
I am for the poverty program.  
I am for model cities.  
I am for aid to education.  
I am for building hospitals.  
I am for cleaning up the slums.  
I am for helping the small towns and farms of this country.

I am for cleaning up the environment. But none of this will happen if we do not maintain the scientific ingenuity of this Nation.

Why, a few weeks ago we had here three brave men here who had gone to the moon, two had walked on the moon. They stood here and talked to us, and we were proud of them. I said to myself, repeating someone else, "Why did we go to the moon? Because of man's eternal quest for knowledge."

When the time comes that we in America turn back on that quest for knowledge when we say we do not have the know-how, we do not have the resources and we cannot do it, then we shall cease to move ahead. There is no such thing as a static society.

These two aircraft are admittedly experimental. No one who has studied the issue says with any degree of certainty that we should or should not build supersonic aircraft. But they do say: "Let us pursue the subject. Let the scientists and engineers and environmentalists and ecologists, after they are built, make that determination."

That is all we are saying. Now, the economic consequences flow naturally therefrom. We do have a balance-of-payments surplus on the sale of aircraft. We have been able to sell our aircraft when at the same time we have seen the complete demise of the American merchant marine and the decline of the American Navy. We are spending today billions of dollars to revive the merchant fleet of the United States. At the end of World War II the United States had more modern ships than all the other nations put together. But today we carry about 8 percent—mind you, 8 percent—of the foreign commerce of the United States in American bottoms.

We are now required to spend billions of dollars in order to modernize the American merchant fleet, and face the same situation with respect to the American Navy. It is obsolete, outmoded, out-gunned in the Mediterranean, as I speak to you, by the Soviet Navy.

So, my colleagues, the issue here is simple. It is not complex. This is not a WPA project. This is a question as to whether or not you have faith in the ingenuity of the people of this country and want to see this country move ahead.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Chairman, as a freshman in this great House, I have not before been recorded on the SST. I took the opportunity during the first weeks of this Congress to acquaint myself with the various components of the debate surrounding the SST. My review of the arguments, Mr. Chairman, has not been helped by the high emotional level of

both proponents and opponents of the SST. The rhetoric, frankly, has been a great source of disappointment to me as I have attempted to study conscientiously and with an open mind the economic, environmental and technological aspects of this most important decision. In almost 20 years of public service I have rarely faced a decision of such complexity. But the time for decision has come for me as well as many of my colleagues who have conscientiously studied this question.

Mr. Chairman, I have decided to support funds for the construction of two prototypes. I would like to share with you and the Members of this great body my reasons for this decision.

The debate, as is well known, centers on two separate but interlocking issues: the economic impact of the SST and the environmental aspect of the SST. I want to make this clear that my decision today is confined only to the development of two prototype aircraft. I am not convinced at this time that full production is economically feasible or environmentally sound. Let me repeat, we are not deciding today whether the SST will go into full production; we are deciding merely whether to provide continued support for research and development for two planes. This is an important distinction, and one which has unfortunately been overlooked by the proponents who promise billions of dollars in economic benefits and the opponents who conjure up visions of environmental cataclysms.

#### ECONOMICS OF THE SST

The prototype development will have a beneficial effect on the horrible unemployment in my district. Unemployment figures fluctuate, but it is reliably estimated that over 8 percent of the Connecticut work force is unemployed. I am informed by reliable authorities that to discontinue prototype development would mean that 1,200 to 1,500 more men and women would be out of work. That translates into the immediate loss of some \$15 million in contracts in Greater Hartford. I am frankly hard pressed to justify a vote that would deny these people employment when, as I have noted above, we are today deciding only to support money for research and development of two prototype aircraft. I will state just as firmly that I am willing to vote against any production beyond these two aircraft—no matter what the conse-

quence is to employment in my district—if the studies that result from production and testimony of the prototype indicate a serious threat to our environment. Again, let me repeat that I am basing my vote today on the immediate economic impact in my district, but I am willing to stand up and say "No" to my district if full production of the SST proves after testing to be harmful to our environment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been talking about and we are voting on funds for two and only two experimental planes. At this point, I would like to suggest to all-out supporters of the SST that I have serious doubts about the economic viability, as well as the environmental soundness, of mass production. Let me concentrate for a moment on the economics of the SST. For the U.S. Government to get its money back, there must be a sale of 300 SST's. This, I believe, is unrealistic, but I still support the need for R. & D. to keep the state of the art highly developed in the United States. Future mass production must pass rigid environmental tests, but even if prototypes secure answers to these vexing problems, the economic issues remain. These are:

First, there is a functioning high speed—not supersonic—aircraft with large passenger and load capacity. I refer, of course, to the 747. There are more "air-buses" on the way. I believe that airlines will not duplicate their inventories of air carriers, especially as the supersonic carrier has limitation of flight privileges—the SST cannot fly overland at top speed.

Second, in light of the need to sell 300 SST's, rumor of cutback in 747 acquisitions casts doubts on the ability to sell 300 SST's.

Third, I believe that the Soviet SST and French-English Concorde, which are nearly operational, will seriously reduce any market for the U.S. SST. In short, by 1978-79, the date for an operational U.S. SST, I feel there will not be a market for 300 such aircraft and the U.S. and aircraft companies will sustain great losses.

Fourth, economic viability is also based on desirability and cost factors. Let us look at each in turn. The SST is being supported on its increased speed. I have computed some statistics on estimates of SST capability and operational characteristics of the 747.

Plane	Passengers	Time to Europe (hours)	Speed (miles per hour)	Range (miles)	Cost
SST	298	3	1,800	4,000	\$40,000,000
747	350+	6	550	5,000	20,000,000

† Estimate.

Note in this table, column 2, time to Europe. The figures in both cases involve airport to airport and do not include waiting time over airports. There is approximately 3 hours difference, but, as can be seen by the chart, there is a difference in seating capacity. In my concern for economic viability of the SST, I called several airlines to find out if their

747's were not filled. I reasoned that, if existing 747's were not filled, there might not be a great demand—300 planes worth—for the SST with smaller but still large capacity. To my dismay, I found that on the most popular route, New York to London, 747's leave with almost 100 seats vacant! If this is a problem now, how much greater will it be when 747's,

other airbuses, Soviet and French-English SST's and U.S. SST's compete for a 1978 market? My estimate: The U.S. SST will not fare very well.

Still, I believe given the long lead time and life of supersonic aircraft, the U.S. must continue its R. & D. effort.

I am intrigued with the argument over termination costs. It will cost \$478 million to complete the R. & D. program. DOT says that termination will cost \$178 million; opponents say \$97 million. Whichever figures are accepted, I believe that the \$487 should be appropriated for the two test planes in order to maintain the state of the art in the United States.

I would warn the aviation industry including labor that any effort to place a "life saver" role on the SST is questionable at best and foolhardy at worst. I do believe that the technological aspects of prototype development are vital, but as I have noted, I have serious reservations about the future beneficial economic effects of mass production.

#### ECOLOGICAL CONCERNS

I wish to state categorically that I am opposed to full production of any U.S. SST until all environmental questions are satisfactorily resolved.

The chief concern of both proponents and opponents of the SST have been centered on sideline noise and atmospheric changes resulting in climatic changes.

It has been asserted by opponents that a fleet of high flying SST's will cause climatic changes by affecting the ozone layer in the stratosphere and by increasing the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. I have read the allegations and charges on both sides and I have neither the personal competence in analyzing meteorological and stratospheric assertions of the two groups to come to any informed decision on this problem, but I feel that two prototypes will answer these questions.

#### NOISE

It is with the concept of noise that I feel more comfortable, although scarcely more learned. The debate over noise has two components: ground noise and sonic booms. Let me discuss each in turn:

Ground noise—noise at or near the airport.

Community noise: Noise over communities after takeoff. Both proponents and opponents seem to argue that faster rate of climb will allow the SST to make less noise on takeoff than is presently required.

"Sideline" noise: Noise on the airfield before takeoff. Both sides initially agreed that the sideline noise was much too high to be acceptable. In recent weeks there have been announcements that sound suppressors have been discovered to eliminate this problem, although there is concern that the additional weight of these sound depressors will severely lower the seating capacity of the U.S. SST. Two prototypes will answer this question.

Sonic boom: The issue of the sonic boom has received the most publicity. The FAA has ruled that the SST is not allowed to fly at supersonic speeds over the continental United States. Both sup-

porters and opponents agree with this ruling. If this ruling is kept in effect, I believe there will have to be a tremendous increase in overseas passengers to make the SST economically viable. Opponents have pointed out that the sonic boom over the seas might affect the ecology in the oceans and cause discomfort to persons on the high seas.

I find convincing the argument that further research and development might answer the problems of ground noise and potential climatic changes. I remain skeptical that there are any answers to the sonic boom. If these problems are not resolved, I will fight production of the SST.

Finally, I wish to join with those of my colleagues who are demanding that the Office of Management and Budget release funds appropriated for urban mass transit. The OMB, it has been reported, is freezing more than half the moneys allocated for this purpose for this fiscal year. This must stop immediately. I believe that this Nation can afford to keep its primacy in aviation and develop an effective mass transit system.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against increased appropriations for the supersonic transport because the arguments advanced by its supporters are specious and because the social risks and hazards to the environment far outweigh any possible short-range advantages.

Supporters argue that continued development of the SST prototypes will preserve jobs and will protect the United States against a potential threat to her balance of payments. Toward these ends they would have us underwrite an unprecedented investment of U.S. tax dollars as a substitute for the private venture capital which the program has failed to attract. They project a two to one return on this public investment.

Taking the arguments in order, I do not believe the United States should invest in private, nondefense industries merely to create jobs, unless those jobs in some way contribute to the general social welfare. We cannot justify massive investment in a make-work project at a time when our taxpayers are screaming for relief, our schools are on the verge of bankruptcy, our cities are rife with crime and delinquency, when more than 20 percent of our citizens are ill clothed, ill housed, and ill fed, and when our very environment is endangered by civilized evils which we are only beginning to comprehend.

Second, no one can predict what our balance of payments will be in 1985 or 1990, but to argue that a favorable balance of payments depends on development of the SST is to carry the logic of the cold war and the arms race into the arena of economic competition. If the SST cannot stand the test of economic competition it should be abandoned. If it cannot attract private venture capital on its own merits, in sufficient quantity, we should take that as a warning and avoid sending good money after bad. If other nations want to gamble on such a risky proposition, let them do so. The United States has never been at a loss to capitalize on a technological break-

through and to remain on a sound competitive footing with other nations. We did not develop the subsonic jet transport but we are and will remain the world's leading producer. Finally, U.S. policy will largely determine whether there will be any world market for supersonic transports.

As I said in the beginning, the arguments for the SST are specious. The arguments against it are compelling. First, there is the moral question: How can we justify such an investment when there are so many unmet needs in our society? Second, there is the practical question: Can we afford to gamble further with our already threatened environment? When Mount Agung erupted in Bali in 1963, the resulting particles in the atmosphere raised the temperature of the equatorial stratosphere 6 to 7 degrees centigrade and the temperature remained 2 to 3 degrees above normal for several years after the eruption. According to the study of critical environmental problems sponsored by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology last July, a fleet of 500 SST's "could range from a small widespread continuous Agung effect to one as big as Agung." In short, we would be inviting a new ice age. Pro-SST propaganda to the contrary, the supersonic transport would not be quieter than subsonic transports. They would create a 50-mile wide sonic boom over the entire course of their flight, doing incalculable harm to man and his environment.

Finally, we must ask who would benefit from the SST. Only three States stand to make more in contracts and subcontracts than they would spend in tax dollars. Several thousand aviation industry workers would have their jobs a little longer, but their skills could be redirected into less risky enterprises or into new technologies such as high-speed ground transportation. If the SST ever did go into commercial use, a few select individuals would enjoy the privilege of making intercontinental junkets in one hour instead of several, at a cost that the common man could never hope to pay. But the common man would be asked to subsidize the new aircraft and the ground facilities to handle them and to suffer the noise and pollution for the benefit of the select few.

Obviously, those who conjured up the SST did not have the general welfare in mind. Their responsibility was less broad than ours. But we are responsible for the general welfare and can be held accountable for our action here today. We cannot go along with this boondoggle in good conscience.

Mr. ADLABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion to strike from House Joint Resolution 468 those funds for development of the supersonic transport. On a number of previous occasions I have made statements in the House on this subject and as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations I have voted against Federal funds for construction of prototypes of the SST.

As the Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of New York, in which Kennedy Airport is located, I have followed this issue closely and have op-

posed the project for several reasons, among them my conviction that there is no economic justification for the project, there are grave environmental problems connected with the program, and few projects deserve lower priority.

In light of the recent public relations campaign in support of the SST, I also want to remind my colleagues of optimistic statements in the past about the ability or willingness of the aircraft industry to control air and noise pollution and weigh this against the substantial costs involved and the number of Americans to be benefited. We should consider who will use the SST and the need for its development. We should consider not only our Nation's domestic priorities but those who need our help and those who do not.

No one disputes the fact that very few Americans will ever travel by supersonic aircraft. It is a luxury item we cannot afford—a luxury for the wealthy and a tax burden for Americans in middle- and low-income brackets. This is further brought out by a recent study. Those who support the SST tell us that fears about increased air and noise pollution are unwarranted. I remember when FAA officials told us in 1957 that jet aircraft at Kennedy International and other airports would be as quiet as prop aircraft. I have no reason to believe present optimistic statements about the SST are any more accurate.

The SST poses a threat to the environment which we must resist and this threat includes operations at U.S. airports by foreign supersonic aircraft. Instead of worrying about whether France or the Soviet Union will capture the SST market, we should concern ourselves with procedures to protect our environment from the air and noise pollution which any supersonic aircraft will cause.

If the SST will produce the return on investment and profits which its proponents would have us believe, then private industry should be more than willing to make the required financial investment without the need for Government subsidies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the further funding of the SST.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, the reasons for ending Government financing of the SST program at this time are legion. Among them are the steadily escalating costs which have plagued the SST during its developmental stage; the grave doubts as to whether this craft can be operated profitably by the airlines, should it be built; and the whole range of environmental issues which have been raised against it. However, in the short time remaining before this House votes on the SST, I would like to call to your attention the almost intolerable situation which now confronts those who reside near our major airports, and those characteristics of the SST which would actually result in a further deterioration.

#### AIR POLLUTION NEAR AIRPORTS

First, there is the problem of air pollution over the areas surrounding our airports. Research indicates that although these levels vary, air pollution in some airport areas is now as high as that in-

flicted upon central urban areas. SST engines operate in such a way that widespread use of the craft would increase greatly pollution of the air. Russell Train, Chairman of the President's Council of Environmental Quality, has written:

It is my understanding that [SST] operation at subsonic speeds, including speeds necessary for takeoff and landing, results in inefficient fuel combustion with a resulting heavy discharge of pollutants into the atmosphere. Both atmospheric pollution and ground contamination seem likely to result.

The fuel combustion problem for the SST is especially large because it consumes so much more oil than subsonic jets do. For example, in takeoff the SST burns 1 ton of fuel per minute. If this Congress is at all serious about preventing further contamination of the lower atmosphere, harsh action must be taken to reduce and eliminate this type of pollution which jet aircraft produce.

#### AIRPORT NOISE

Second, the tremendous amount of noise produced by the SST in takeoff and landing has attracted much attention lately. Department of Transportation officials have been boasting for the past month that they have solved the problem of community noise. Through some changes in the engine design, they say, the SST noise level has been reduced to approximately that of subsonic jets now in use. However, if these officials or anyone else believes that the present noise levels are acceptable in any way, let them ask the people who live near Cleveland's Hopkins Airport. For years these people have been subjected to the constant roar of jets as they fly immediately overhead after takeoff and before landing. Just last year hundreds of them signed petitions demanding that something be done about this noise.

And the views of these people have been backed up by scientific studies. Recently the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering called upon the Department of Transportation to establish maximum airport noise levels which are substantially below those now in effect. Let us be quite clear in what we are talking about when we speak of airport noise and the regulations governing it. Noise amounts are measured in units called decibels, a figure which also takes into account the length of time the noise is heard, and its pitch or tone. The FAA has ruled that the noise emitted by an aircraft into the community surrounding an airport cannot exceed 108 decibels. Subsonic jets presently in use are approximately at this level, and the SST is barely able to reach it. As a comparison, the amount of noise produced by the type of jackhammer used to break pavement is about 115 decibels near the operator's ears. At these levels, is it any wonder that there should be so much concern about noise?

Concern over noise pollution has been enhanced by recent findings of scientists who state that prolonged exposure to noise can result in serious damage to the human body. Thus not only is such noise annoying and distracting, it can also im-

pair hearing and other bodily functions. Much research remains to be done in this area, and during this time when noise pollution is a worsening problem for all cities, commonsense dictates that we call a halt to any program which might further harm our environment in this way.

In my past consideration of legislation involving commercial aircraft and the airports, I have always kept the well-being of those who reside near the airports foremost in my mind. I certainly cannot now justify the expenditure of \$1.3 billion of the taxpayers' money on such an unwise project that will actually worsen their situation. For this reason, I shall cast my vote against the SST.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, the question will shortly be before the Congress as to whether or not the Government will continue to finance the private development of a supersonic transport.

Arguments have raged back and forth with increasing intensity. Claim and counterclaim are made with a growing divergence between the various views. To me the choice is plain.

I do not believe that the taxpayers of the United States should be forced to take a \$1.4 billion risk that private enterprise is unable or unwilling to sustain.

It is increasingly obvious that a powerful, inextricably intertwined lobby is seeking to siphon this vast sum from the public treasury for the benefit of an aerospace complex that is already in deep financial difficulty because of its own poor judgment and past errors.

The airlines have no desire to have this craft, even if it were brought into being, upon them. Staggering from debts and interest rates incurred by overbuying of large jets, they look with horror upon the costs of this new mastodon of the air.

Yet the aerospace companies affected have attempted to force this monstrosity down the throats of an already balky public.

Who would utilize such a monster? Only the very wealthy. Why do we need such an aircraft? So we can cross the oceans faster and have the extra 2 hours to spend in traffic jams? That is the only use that comes to my mind.

Arguments are put forward by the smoothly functioning, well financed lobby about the Anglo-French Concorde. News from the other side of the Atlantic piles up to the effect that the British and French are stuck with a flying white elephant; a grossly expensive technical disaster that tears roofs off houses near airports, drives people half insane with its roars and shows no sign of ever approaching a financial breakeven point. Mr. Servan-Schreiber's communications of recent weeks are more than a little thought provoking.

Yet to me the ultimate argument centers around the environment as well as about priorities. Expert technical people have again and again raised pertinent questions about what long-term environmental effects this craft or a fleet of them will have upon the world we inhabit.

By daring to have the courage to raise these questions, the environmental groups and their allies have been at-

tacked, maligned and threatened. Their patriotism, judgment, and even sanity has been called into question along with their tax exempt status. Yet all they are doing is asking questions Americans should have begun asking years ago. Before pesticides ran wild, before subdivisions ran amuck, before all the forests were hewn down, before mercury began to be dumped in large quantities, before all sorts of chemical compounds began to be added to our food; *ad infinitum, ad nauseum.*

American industry has, in the name of technology and progress for progress' sake, perpetrated one atrocity after another upon the Nation, reaping vast profit from public indifference. Now that indifference is at an end, particularly when the very people who will be victimized by their latest little technical gimmick are being asked to subsidize it.

I represent a district in New York City's borough of Brooklyn. My constituents know what they require in terms of transportation requirements.

Mass urban transit that is safe, fast, cheap and dependable. Fewer traffic jams. Less lead in gasoline. Better and safer cars. Subsidies to help the beleaguered city and suburban dweller who cannot move with dispatch any longer in the confines of his own living area.

It is presently impossible for any large number of Americans to move safely, quickly and cheaply on urban mass transit with any consistency anywhere in the Nation. And we are now being asked to subsidize this ridiculous flying boondoggle for the benefit of the SST lobby? Not on anyone's life.

And what about the other national priorities crying out for attention and assistance? What of housing? What of antipollution? What of drug programs? What of the hungry among us? How about our schools and the millions of jobless citizens whose hopes drop lower daily?

Instead of these people's needs, we are asked to approve subsidies for the ultimate in noise pollution. Have any of the SST's proponents walked through downtown Manhattan on an average day? Let them have a treat in terms of noise, and then come back here and ask us for money for a chain of sonic booms stretching across the oceans and land areas.

Howls of anguish are heard on this score. They say they will never, never, never fly across the land routes. This is so much nonsense. All the lucrative routes for any such craft lie across land. If they do not fly such a plane across them, complete with sonic booms that would do nationally what already has been shown in Oklahoma City, the plane would lay an even bigger financial egg than we are assured it will do anyway.

The blather about how many jobs it would create or take with it is just that. Hollow, empty mouthings by public relations men who are frightening apprehensive aerospace workers into lobbying on behalf of the vested interests.

The Russian SST is obviously going to become as great a cropper as the Concorde. Attempts to scare us into massive subsidies because of national pride are

as empty as the other claims on behalf of the SST.

My home State of New York already contributes more than \$23 billion annually into the Federal Treasury. In return we receive less than \$3 billion in Federal programs. I for one am outraged at the thought of having to pay for such a venture. If private industry wants it, then let them pay for it as they have done in previous instances.

Finally, if this atrocity is foisted upon the public in spite of their expressed wishes, then it is my fervent hope that my home city will insure the passage of a measure now pending before the New York State Legislature. It would prevent the use by any SST of any airport facilities in the New York area. Without such privileges, there will be no SST.

Let the forces lobbying on behalf of this incredibly brazen project be aware that this is not isolated opposition they face. The harder they fight, the greater the forces they rouse in opposition to the entire range of attacks upon the environment. Americans have passed the point of no return in regard to awareness of the finite nature of clean air, water, and other irreplaceable resources.

Future SST's and any other projects similar to it will have to run the same gauntlet. Those struggling on behalf of the environment and a restructuring of priorities have tasted victory again and again in recent months. We shall not rest until we have turned this particular parade around. Let those who are immediately affected take note.

Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I shall cast my vote against any further subsidy for the SST.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in the last few weeks my office has been besieged by telephone calls, letters, newsletters, and advertisements both for and against the supersonic transport. I frankly believe that the issue has been so charged with emotion that it is necessary for me to explain why I am voting today to continue Federal financing of the two prototypes.

The Federal Government has a contract to finance the prototypes. Whether a fleet of SST's is finally produced or not, it is my understanding that we are obligated to fulfill the financial terms of that contract. Thus we would save nothing by failing to fund the prototypes.

Many claims have been made concerning the aircraft. Proponents allegedly have spent millions of dollars in newspaper and radio advertising directed at our constituents. While I doubt the propriety of such expensive pressures—which may well have come from Federal funds as have been charged—the plane's opponents have also expended a great deal of time, energy and money in making their case. I have taken the advice of a columnist writing in a recent issue of the New York Times and applied what he called the "mendacity discount rate."

The claims on both sides of the issue have been found wanting.

Mr. Chairman, even assuming the truth and ultimate validity of the arguments of either the proponents or the

opponents, it seems to me one fact stands out: If we fail to finish the prototypes, about 14,000 employees, directly or indirectly involved with services and production, would be quickly laid off.

Considering that we are now experiencing one of the highest unemployment rates in the last 25 years, I cannot in good conscience at this time vote to cut off the funds. The Federal Government has not only a legal obligation to the company under the contract, it has an obligation to the workers and the public not to exacerbate an already intolerable employment and economic situation which is not their fault.

Even if the Federal Government reneges on the contract, it is my understanding that we will have to pay the company the same amount we are obligated to spend to complete construction. In voting the way I do today, I have chosen to complete the prototype, whatever its merits, and insure that those now employed in its construction will remain employed and not become additions to the welfare rolls. In fact, according to the administration, if we were to merely stop construction of the plane, we would be handing over to the companies involved upwards of \$200 million in cash to bail them out of a program they started and which has caused them to deplete their own capital resources. I do not believe it is the function of the Federal Government to indemnify private industry for mismanaged risks. In this case, I would prefer to utilize the money to insure the employment of those working on the plane rather than to bail out the company.

My vote in favor of building the prototype should not be interpreted as being in favor of the Federal Government's continued involvement with the plane, nor should it be interpreted as even being in favor of the plane itself. The ultimate decision of whether the plane ought to be built must be based on whether there is a commercial market for the final version, rather than on whether somebody else may build it first. I should like to remind my colleagues that in another age the United States put all its resources into the construction and development of fast clipper sailing ships in order to build a sleeker, faster ship before anyone else. Meanwhile, other countries developed slower but steadier steamships which carried more cargo and go to their destination with greater dependability in spite of the wind and at any time of the year. As a result, we had a fancier ship before anyone else. The other countries, with their ugly steamers, however, carried the commerce.

In addition to the marketability question, we must also consider the effect of this plane on the public, many of whom will never be able to afford to fly in it. The noise, the supersonic boom, possible effects on the environment and weather, the pollution and smog all must be weighed against the need to carry 130 persons to Europe a few hours faster.

Therefore, it should be clearly understood that my vote today will not prevent me from taking a fresh look at any future requests for further appropriations as well as Federal restrictions on the plane's use of the public air space.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, for me the vote on the SST is a difficult one.

There are persuasive arguments on both sides, and I have listened to them all and have considered them to the best of my ability.

I set the environment-ecology argument largely to one side, not because it is not important—it is important—but because it is, to my mind, inconclusive and highly speculative in character.

I set the balance-of-payments arguments to one side, for somewhat similar reasons; and I am not willing to spend billions solely for the purpose of artificially stimulating employment, unless the project involved—here the SST—is itself an important and worthwhile objective for public expenditure. Any and all moneys spent for any purpose whatsoever will, of course, create some temporary employment. This can hardly be a determinative argument in respect to the merits of the SST.

The Federal budget is unbalanced; it is a deficit budget. It is deep in red ink. It is an inflationary budget. The SST is costly—and any additional expense makes for bigger deficits and more inflation, or for higher taxes. This consideration weighs against the SST. It may not be determinative if a strong national interest nevertheless demands the expense. A military aircraft, for example, might in some cases be a necessity, regardless of expense. The SST, however, is not a military plane.

In the final analysis it seems to me that there are two determinative arguments.

First. The strongest argument for the SST is the contention that to go ahead with the American SST today, and by means of this appropriation of funds, is essential to the future maintenance of our country's leading position in manufacturing and sales in the field of civil aviation. If I were fully persuaded of this I might well vote to fund the SST. It has not been demonstrated, however, that our foreign competition is itself viable from an economic point of view, or that we cannot in the end compete successfully by means of private enterprise alone.

Second. The strongest argument against the SST—and one which meets my fundamental beliefs—is that public funds ought not to be spent to finance private enterprise or private interest, and that this is a field where private enterprise and private financing should prevail. Coupled with this view is the visceral feeling—despite all the arguments that this is beyond the financial capacity of private enterprise—that private enterprise will, in the end, find a way to the necessary financing if it has to do so, and if in fact the SST can be commercially profitable, as its proponents all say that it can be.

This feeling is heightened when we consider that, on the basis of figures submitted, private industry would only have to find an additional \$480 million between now and 1973 to bring the prototypes to completion, than it is contemplated that it would spend if it has continued Government assistance.

Surely private enterprise can find an additional \$480 million if there is fair

prospect of a profit. If there is no such prospect ought the taxpayer to foot the bill?

I cannot demonstrate in a Euclidian fashion the soundness of my conclusions. But, on balance, I am persuaded, on the foregoing basis, that if the SST is sound American private industry ultimately will build it. If so, I think that is how it should be done; and I am not persuaded that there is an overriding need to vote today to abandon this route in favor of a subsidy which I believe, if granted now, will, in all reasonable probability, be increased in the future and increased again, and yet again.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the Yates amendment and in favor of the committee recommendation to continue the SST for the balance of this fiscal year.

Frankly, I had hoped that the committee would come in with a smaller figure for the SST, so that we might slow the program down a bit. But, unfortunately, that recommendation was not made; the only question before us is whether we are going to continue the SST at the present rate or whether we are going to stop the program altogether—immediately—with the loss of some 13,000 jobs in industries, including the General Electric Company, already working on the SST program, and some 50,000 other jobs in industries related to the current SST development effort.

Mr. Chairman, I believe several points need to be made clear. First of all, it ought to be clearly understood that the SST is not a plane for tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. Certainly we do not need an SST today to travel around the world. The 707's, the DC-8's, the 747's, and the other aircraft are filling our current aviation needs at the present time.

But in air travel, as with automobiles, we always have to look ahead to the future. The Model T does not meet our needs today, and so we have constantly sought to develop new and better and more effective models to meet the increasing and more complex requirements of the future. The SST is not being built for the 1970's; it is being built for the 1980's and the 1990's. And if we do not get going now, in terms of technology, to keep America's technical lead two decades ahead, we could find ourselves in real trouble a generation from today.

Second, many people have suggested that this project, desirable as it may be, ought to be financed by private industry, not by the Government. But the fact is that in today's depressed aircraft industry market, the additional necessary funds are just not available. Either the Government furnishes the money, or else the project comes to a full stop.

Besides that, whether rightly or wrongly, we have now spent over \$800 million of Federal money on this project already. If we end it today, the termination costs will bring the total to \$1.1 billion, with nothing at all to show for our money. If we complete the Government's commitment, it will cost us \$1.3 billion—just \$200 million more—and we will then have two prototypes that just might succeed in keeping our American predomi-

nance in the international commercial aircraft field.

Many people have expressed concern about the environmental impact of the SST. But one thing has come out of this debate today: two prototype planes will not have any adverse impact on our environment, but two prototypes will enable us, as I see it, to find the answers to some of these environmental questions that cannot be fully answered in the laboratory.

And we ought not to forget, by the way, that the present research work on these environmental questions, including the noise factor, is being carried out at the General Electric Research Center in Schenectady, in my district. Just in the past few weeks, they have come up with impressive results in reducing the sideline noise level of the SST engines to a level even below the present 707 jet airplane.

So, Mr. Chairman, I shall support continued research on the SST, and shall oppose the Yates amendment, in an effort to preserve our technology, to keep the jobs we have, to prevent doing anything that, by some domino effect, might depress our great aerospace industry still further. And I intend to cast my vote as an expression of faith in progress and in the future.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is with great hesitancy and reluctance that I rise in opposition to the appropriation of additional funds for construction of a supersonic transport prototype. This represents a change in my prior position, is a matter of grave concern to me, and comes as a result of countless hours of study and research on the subject.

I have agreed in the past with the proponents of this project about the desirability of maintaining a leading role for the United States in air travel, the probable benefits to our economy, the fact that the Russians are constructing their own supersonic TU-144 and the French and British are constructing a British-French Concorde, which if successful in production and sales will result in supersonic transports being flown in the stratosphere whether we want them there or not. On the other hand, I do not believe the proponents of the project have effectively and convincingly answered the many questions concerning threats to the environment which could and should be answered by additional research. Furthermore, with development of the jumbo jet 747, I do not believe there will be public demand by a sufficient number of people for supersonic speed in the immediate future to justify the financial investment.

Eventually, of course, it may well become economically feasible. But if so, I am convinced that this vibrant, healthy, free-enterprise system of ours can and will provide the necessary additional private risk capital. Most certainly the more than \$800 million of Federal funds we have already committed to this project should represent a sufficient public contribution.

I feel, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that no harm will be done in delaying further Federal participation in this project until

more answers can be obtained, particularly when such a large number of the American people are expressing grave concern about it. My vote today is not a vote against progress or against maintaining leadership in the field of air travel, but a vote to stop, look and listen, and then proceed with caution.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, proponents of the SST are currently petitioning Congress for \$290 million in Federal funding for fiscal 1971. This is approximately \$80 million more than what was requested last December to continue development on the SST prototypes for 1971. These additional expenditures will have to be totally subsidized by the Federal Government owing to the severe economic woes of the air industry.

Last year the airlines lost \$123 million and their projected loss for 1971 is \$192 million. In 1963, when the SST program was first initiated, an agreement was made whereby the Federal Government would be paid back in full after the first 500 SST planes were sold. To date only 122 planes have been ordered and this does not necessarily mean that they will be sold.

Since the SST project was first begun, the costs have doubled the original \$750 million guidelines. The complete cost is expected to total \$1.8 billion with Federal Government providing 85 percent, or \$1.3 billion of it. Now cost experts are estimating that the total expenditures for the SST could go as high as \$5 billion and the SST plane is expected to cost between \$40 to \$50 million each. An additional \$30 million has just been spent for experimental testing to reduce the noise level of the SST engines at takeoffs and landings.

I think it is the time to evaluate the Federal Government's priorities in its subsidizing of the SST. We have paid millions of the taxpayers' dollars for the SST already and it is expected to cost millions more before the project is completed.

The SST has not been designed for military purposes, therefore, it is not a question of priority concerning national defense. Neither will the future of the country be dependent on the SST.

Essentially what is being developed is a high-speed plane designed to travel at 1,800 miles per hour—faster than the speed of sound. A trans-Atlantic flight would save the passenger 2 to 2½ hours in traveltime. Primarily the people who would benefit from this are the international travelers and businessmen. This is very impressive, but it would be much more advantageous to build adequate mass transit and improve other forms of transportation which could be used by more people than would be traveling on the SST. There are statistics which indicate that 95 percent of the population will never fly in the SST.

In terms of public needs which now face our Nation, the SST does not meet a high priority. The funds that are being spent for the SST could be channeled into programs such as the housing industry, social security, and welfare reform. I hope the Congress will make a very serious examination of the SST project before they vote millions of dollars more of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I support this appropriation so that work on the supersonic transport may continue without a damaging delay. As one of the members representing Greater Chicago, I do so with my region as well as the basic matter in mind.

Those of us who reside in Chicagoland are very much aware of the importance of transportation. While Washington, D.C., has been the political capital of the United States since the early days of the Republic, Chicago, which is much nearer the center of population, is the transportation capital. No matter how you wish to travel—by land, by water, or by air—we have the most up-to-date facilities for accommodating travels to and from Chicago.

More than a dozen major highways, tollways, and expressways and more than 20 trunkline railroads serve Chicago. Its location on Lake Michigan makes it the link between the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Mississippi River. More than 100 steamship lines serve the Port of Chicago. Twenty-eight scheduled commercial airlines are served by the world's largest and busiest commercial airport which is located in Chicago.

The importance of transportation is, of course, not limited to Chicago—it is important to all 50 States. Our Nation grew in size, population, and wealth as it took advantage, first of the steamboat and the locomotive, then of the automobile, and finally of the airplane.

While helping us to solve the problems of time and distance, the various transportation systems inevitably created new problems. Fortunately, for the well-being of the American people, we did not permit these problems to frustrate us; instead they were challenges to America's inventive genius. We made the rivers navigable, built railroads and highways from coast to coast, and constructed airports.

Improvements in the various modes of transportation made them faster and safer. The outstanding example of a vehicle combining speed and safety is the space capsule that has enabled man to reach the moon. The problem which immediately concerns us, however, is how to enable the ordinary American to travel quickly and safely, not to the moon, but to other parts of the United States and to nations all over the globe.

The critics of the supersonic transport are sincere in their arguments and I am convinced that constructive criticism has helped the aviation industry in building a cleaner and quieter plane as well as a safer and faster one. Some of the opposition, however, has come from ill-informed opponents.

Let us consider first of all the problem of noise. Inasmuch as the supersonic transport will remain at subsonic levels while flying over populated areas, the worry over the damage to people and buildings that might be caused by sonic booms can be calmed. The new planes will travel supersonically—at altitudes between 60,000 and 70,000 feet—only while flying over the oceans and such uninhabited regions as the polar zones.

Next let us consider the problem of pollution. Three automobiles traveling

at a rate of 60 miles per hour will emit as much pollutant material as one supersonic transport carrying 298 passengers at 1,798 miles per hour. There are, of course, millions of automobiles in use in the United States every day, most of them in highly congested areas. All the commercial jet transport aircraft presently in existence could stop flying today and the instruments that measure pollution would detect no change in the atmosphere.

We now turn to the problem of weather modification. A fleet of 500 supersonic transports that made five daily flights would produce approximately 200,000 tons of water vapor—about as much as one large thunderstorm. Between 3,000 and 6,000 thunderstorms occur around the world every day. According to the National Academy of Science and the Office of Meteorological Research, a fleet of supersonic planes will have no appreciable effect on the normal atmospheric balance of the earth.

The next question should not be, "Can we afford to build it?", but "Can we afford not to build it?" especially when we realize that foreign countries are already producing similar planes.

France and the United Kingdom, working in partnership, are already building the Concorde, which, while carrying only 128 passengers and flying but 1,350 miles per hour, will be available in 1973. While we are debating the issue, the Soviet Union is building the Tupolev. It will carry 120 passengers, two-fifths as many as the SST, and will fly 1,550 miles per hour, slower than the SST, but with this important difference—it will be ready for use next year, 6 years earlier than the American product.

Soviet experts have predicted that by the year 2000 they will produce an SST which could circle the globe in an hour with a passenger load three times that of any version now being tested.

Obviously, if we decide not to build supersonic transports and foreign nations continue to build them, our balance of trade will be adversely affected.

We could, of course, bar the new planes, but the victims of the embargo could retaliate by barring our planes. Even if banning made sense, we could not persuade Canada to join us in such action.

Both foreign nations and domestic airlines are hoping that we will proceed with the manufacture of the supersonic transport.

Turning on the green light for production of the supersonic transport will benefit not only the aviation industry, which is presently suffering from financial and other difficulties, but also its workers, many of whom are now unemployed. About 150,000 jobs are involved in the SST controversy.

One of the most serious problems that confronts the airlines and one that is very annoying to those who use their facilities is airport congestion. The supersonic transport would help relieve such congestion, as a 298-passenger SST could make 27 New York-London round trips in the same flying time that the new Boeing 747 requires for 10 such round trips.

Air travel became cheaper while it was becoming faster and safer. Although the purchasing power of the dollar decreased 28 percent between 1959 and 1969, the average air passenger fare remained about the same. In terms of constant dollars, air travel in 1969 was 25 percent cheaper than in 1959. Do we want such progress to continue or do we want to force increases in air fares by stifling progress?

Contrary to interpretations that have been circulated, the supersonic transport program is not being subsidized, as were the railroads, highways, and waterways. The Federal Government is not subsidizing, but investing, in the case of the SST. It will receive a royalty of approximately \$4,000,000 on each plane that is sold. The first 300 will result in royalties totaling \$1,200,000,000, almost as much as the Federal Government's \$1,300,000,000 investment. When 500 planes have been sold, the Government will receive an additional \$1,000,000,000 as interest. Royalties will continue as more planes are sold.

Mr. Chairman, Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon all favored production of the supersonic transport, believing that the airplane is here to stay. Let those of us who have the power of the purse demonstrate our desire for a faster, safer, cleaner, quieter, and, in the long run, cheaper airplane by voting for the pending measure. Let us cast a vote of confidence for the twentieth century.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, for the third time since my election to Congress the House is voting on whether or not we should appropriate funds for the two prototypes of the supersonic transport. In the past I have had sufficient doubts in my mind regarding the economic feasibility of the plane, as well as questions regarding its effect upon the environment, to warrant withholding my support for its funding.

I have attempted to follow the progress of the plane's development and the issues surrounding it and found on each occasion the situation to be charged. In 1970, although I felt the environmental arguments against the SST were being washed out, I continued to be concerned over the effect of this large expenditure of Government funds when other worthwhile programs were being cut to the bone to curb Government spending and rising inflation.

Today, the economic situation is further changed. The economy has slowed to a standstill, the unemployment rate is high and President Nixon has proposed to Congress a deficit-spending budget which it is hoped will revitalize the economy and restore full employment.

In a further attempt to resolve all questions in my mind regarding the economic impact of the program, I have reviewed all available facts and figures, including several current studies, and I have satisfied myself that the following facts are true and pertinent to the decision we will be making—

Over \$1 billion has been appropriated to date for the two SST prototypes, as a research and development project.

It would only cost approximately \$300 million more to complete the prototypes than to close down the project.

Any stretchout or delay in the funding of the prototypes will result in greater costs to the project.

Government funds are being invested in the prototypes as a loan only, to be repaid with interest. The Government's investment will be recovered when the 300th plane is delivered and the Government will receive an additional billion when the 500th plane is delivered, as well as royalties on additional planes.

World air travel will triple by the 1980's, and, unless the United States develops the SST to compete with foreign models, most of this will be in foreign air carriers.

Commercial air carrier sales by U.S. producers contribute to the balance of payments; in 1970 the United States sold \$3.4 billion worth of aerospace products overseas, including \$1.5 billion in commercial transport planes alone.

Export of the production SST is expected to create a \$22 billion to \$50 billion favorable trade balance for the United States.

Cutbacks in defense and aerospace spending in 1970 alone resulted in the loss of 168,000 jobs, and the industry is presently in a serious state of depression.

The SST prototype project provides more than 13,000 jobs directly and when in production will provide 50,000 jobs which would aid in reviving the industry.

The plane is not going to be flown over land at supersonic speeds, thereby voiding the concern over sonic boom. Furthermore, close scrutiny by environmentalists such as Russell B. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, and Dr. William Kellogg, Associate Director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, and other studies into the environmental effects have concluded that the SST poses no major threat to the environment. The air lines have given assurances that the production SST will meet noise standards and the administration has pledged that, should the plane not get a clean bill of health from scientific research, it will not be produced. As the administration and the aviation industry have acknowledged, we will not really know how economically feasible the SST will be until the prototypes are completed and tested.

The decision we make today appears to me to be whether we want to drop the project completely and write off approximately \$1 billion already spent for the prototypes, leaving it up to the industry to come up with the means to complete the prototypes. The delay which would result could greatly reduce the economic benefits to be realized by the United States. Or the decision is whether we want to complete the investment when all the odds appear to be in our favor to derive substantial economic gain for the country on a long-range basis.

My decision is to vote against the crippling amendment and support continued limited Federal funding of the SST prototypes.

I would like to point out that the request for the SST in fiscal year 1971, amounts to about 3 percent of the transportation outlays of the Department of

Transportation. The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 provides authority for the next 5 years to fund airport development at \$295 million per year and airway facilities development at \$250 million per year. In fiscal year 1971, the ground transportation category, a \$4.8 billion outlay is planned for highways. Urban mass transportation has a \$400 million program level in fiscal year 1971 and \$600 million in fiscal year 1972 as part of the \$3.1 billion authorized over the next 5 years. A revitalization of water transportation is planned with over \$400 million authorized in fiscal year 1971 for maritime research and development and for subsidies of ship construction and operation with plans following to construct 30 merchant marine ships a year over the coming decade.

With regard to national priorities, the SST funding represents only about one-tenth of 1 percent of the total fiscal year 1971 U.S. Government outlays. Billions are planned for social and welfare programs. On the other hand, in fiscal year 1971 with trust funds included, support for human resource programs will surpass national defense and account for the largest percentage or about 42 percent of the total year's outlays. This funding supports programs such as education and manpower, health, income security, and veterans' benefits and services.

It is my belief that completion of the SST is an investment in the economic growth of our country that should be made, as other investments must be made to insure the jobs and taxes needed to fund the domestic and social programs of the future.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Yates amendment, which would delete the \$134 million provided for the SST in House Joint Resolution 468.

As has been pointed out repeatedly in recent weeks, we still have not solved the monstrous difficulties and dangers of the SST. We should not continue with its construction while the problems of noise, environment, and economics remain.

The plane as now designed produces a sonic boom that will not be tolerated over land in any country where the inhabitants can vote. On takeoff, the SST noise problem is much greater than with ordinary jets—and though proponents of the program claim that the problem of sideline noise has been "solved" in recent weeks, the noise level will be reduced only from 124 decibels to 108 decibels. Even at this level, the SST would barely reach the interim standard set by the FAA in December 1969, and would be unable to meet the limit of 98 decibels which the National Academy of Sciences has recommended be set for John F. Kennedy Airport in New York by 1975.

The unresolved economic questions associated with the plane are enormous. The president of the American Economics Association, Prof. Wassily Leontief, of Harvard, estimates that the project would create less than 3,000 jobs in the next few years. Certainly no one can deny that there is a serious unemployment problem in this country—but if we

are going to create new jobs through "make work" projects, there are many products which are more important than the SST. Housing, improved waste treatment systems, and new health facilities are all urgently needed in this country. We should encourage our scientists and engineers to concentrate their efforts on these vital areas; and if the Government is to fund public service projects, those projects should be geared to meet our domestic needs.

Walter Heller, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, points out that, if the SST is supposed to be such a profitable undertaking, the taxpayer should not have to pay 80 to 90 percent of the development costs—private industry, which will make the profits which are being predicted, should underwrite the project. Paul Samuelson, professor of economics at MIT, says:

Any realistic cost-benefit analysis will reach the conclusion that . . . Government subsidy of the SST or similar supersonic aircraft is at this stage of technology and economic development both an economic and a human disaster.

With regard to broad environmental questions, the risks the SST would pose to the oceans and the atmosphere are still unknown. In routine operation on the New York to Paris run, planes flying at supersonic speed could cover more than half the North Atlantic with sonic booms of an intensity of 2 to 4 pounds per square foot as often as every half hour during peak travel seasons. The effect on migratory birds, fish, and other marine life, and the ocean itself is still unknown.

The SST will discharge vapor into the thin air of the stratosphere, leading to unknown effects on health and climate. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) pointed out in his separate views in the report on House Joint Resolution 468 that prototypes are not necessary to carry out atmospheric research to determine the SST's probable effect on the atmosphere. I, therefore, urge that we have the necessary research conducted, and look at the results, before we continue with this project. We have already discovered the havoc a man can wreak when he pursues technology for the sake of advancement, without assessing the harmful affects of his technological triumphs. To testify to our folly, we have DDT in our fruit and mercury in our tuna; and our lakes are choking from the effects of detergent phosphates. The radiological hazards associated with nuclear powerplants are still unknown.

There is no point in continuing construction of the prototype SST, when there are so many questions about the value of the ultimate product, and so many valid arguments against the project. We should take a good hard look at the possible effects before we pursue a questionable technological goal.

I urge adoption of the Yates amendment, to delete SST funds from this continuing resolution.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, disturbed by predictions of environmental and economic disaster, I have scrutinized my previous support of funding for the development of an American supersonic

transport. Compelled by the urging of many constituents, I have searched for facts that would justify a reversal of my position.

Most of the arguments against continuing Government support of the SST have not withstood careful examination. They have often been obscured by emotion and supported by inaccurate or unsubstantiated information. Yet some cannot, for lack of conclusive data, be lightly dismissed.

The prospect of a fleet of supersonic aircraft cannot, at this time, be judged all good or all bad. There is much evidence that such aircraft could prove beneficial to our economy. Yet there are disturbing possibilities that such a fleet could have unacceptable consequences.

Environmental opponents of the SST contend that it will generate excessive noise. Furthermore, they fear that the current regulation banning overland flights at speeds that would cause sonic booms will be relaxed should the industry exert pressure to do so. There are also warnings that the amount of moisture introduced into the stratosphere by SST's will significantly reduce the ozone content, thereby dangerously increasing our exposure to ultraviolet radiation and, perhaps, drastically altering the weather.

Experiments on the American SST engine indicate that this aircraft will be quieter than subsonic jets when flying over the community. Excessive sideline noise, however, has not been completely eliminated and there is admittedly no guarantee that the regulation banning overland flights at supersonic speeds will never be relaxed.

Although an SST fleet would undeniably add moisture, and other elements, to the stratosphere, the consequences of these intrusions remain speculative. Proof of adverse effects simply does not exist.

The programs of other nations to develop supersonic aircraft must here be considered. Both the Soviet Union and Britain, in cooperation with France, have already test-flown their versions of the SST. If supersonic flights should damage the stratosphere, our environment will be harmed—whether or not we produce and fly an American product.

It would seem imperative, then, that our prototype phase be completed so that all possible safeguards can be devised. In the event of unsolvable problems, we can confront the nations of the world with valid evidence that an international banning of SST's is required.

Economic questions involve many areas of dispute: balance of payments; employment; Government involvement; and return on the Government's investment, as well as questions involving the profitability of the aircraft in commercial operation.

In regard to maintaining a favorable balance of payments, critics argue that this is not currently a problem and that the impact of the SST could never be sufficient to justify the expense involved in its development.

However, we must consider the fact that foreign countries are now flying, and plan to market their models of the SST. It would be unrealistic to assume that we could retain our 84-percent

corner on the free world aircraft market if we fall behind the competition technologically. Moreover, it would be fallacious to assume that a loss of any portion of this vital market would not adversely affect our balance of payments.

Critics contend that the impact of the SST program on unemployment would be negligible. They also argue that the Government would do better to spend such funds on domestic programs.

It must be realized, however, that the Government plans to spend 42 percent of its total budget for human resource programs this year. Yet due to cutbacks in defense spending, our scientific and technological community is faced with an unemployment crisis. A full-scale SST program, contingent on sound estimates of market demand, would relieve this pressing situation. It would not be a "make-work" program. Employment of a wide range of people in the SST program would also have a positive effect on other jobs and help create the revenue required to further increase Government activity in domestic fields.

Some opponents believe that the Government should not be involved in a commercial, profitmaking venture. However, the Government has often provided financial assistance to major transportation programs: railroads; highways; previous commercial aircraft. In addition, the SST proposes to be the first of these programs to return the Government's investment to the taxpayers with interest.

Will the Government recoup its investment in the SST?

Adversaries of the program suggest that the SST will never prove to be a profitable, self-supporting venture, and that the Government will be forced to support production of the fleet. As evidence they cite the production company's inability to present, at this time, a plan showing that adequate private financial backing will be available.

Under the existing contract, royalties are due the Government on every SST sold until the Government has earned 6 percent on its investment. Production of a viable SST would also generate substantial Federal, State, and local tax revenues. As I cited earlier, these funds are urgently needed to help support domestic programs.

The magnitude of possible economic effects that the country could reap from the SST program is a compelling reason to continue examining and refining this aircraft. While there are always risks involved in such undertakings, we cannot ignore the fact that two-thirds of the estimated Government portion of the SST program has already been committed. If the program is abandoned now, an \$884 million "downpayment" will have been totally wasted. We will have neither a viable aircraft nor proof that such an aircraft would be contrary to the public interest. In addition, the Government would have to pay substantial closing costs if the program were halted now.

I can only conclude that possible benefits and the importance of resolving disputed issues urge completion of the prototype program.

The authentic hazards of continuation of the SST program must, however, be eliminated. I have therefore introduced legislation that will mitigate problems of: Excessive noise, continued presentation of conjecture as fact—by both sides, and Government assumption of an increasingly greater share of financial responsibility.

The SST represents a technological advance. To insure, however, that it does not betray those it should serve, I have proposed the statutory prohibition of overland flights at speeds that would cause sonic booms to reach the surface. To further protect the public from exposure to excessive noise, my bill stipulates that the SST demonstrate its ability to meet required noise levels before production is inaugurated.

Future decisions regarding the SST must be based on reliable data. Completion of the prototype phase, rather than representing a threat, is a means by which questions can be answered and threatening unknowns resolved. To stimulate compilation of objective data, I have proposed the formation of an independent, interdisciplinary group of non-Government scientists and economists. It would be the duty of this group to monitor all aspects of development of a civil SST and assess each innovation objectively to determine its long-range consequences.

To further insure a concerned public that all evidence will be weighed before actual production begins, my bill would require that the Secretary of Transportation make available to the Congress and the public a report on all aspects of the prototype phase when it is completed.

Not until these two reports have been submitted to and evaluated by the Congress could a single SST be produced, according to a provision of my bill.

If any benefits are to be derived from the SST, the aircraft must prove itself in the competitive market. I have consequently proposed that the major production companies be required to submit a plan showing evidence of adequate private financial backing before the production of SST's is initiated.

To prevent continuous cost revisions and ever increasing appropriations, my bill would place a \$1.5 billion ceiling on the amount which the Government could invest in developing the SST.

In conclusion, I express the hope that we can all rise above the emotionalism in which the SST debate has become mired. I am convinced that the overall national interest requires that we determine to do two things: First, proceed with completion of the SST prototypes; and second, reserve final judgment on commercial production until more conclusive data is available.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee to provide further funding for the SST program for the development of two prototypes, and I feel that this section should be deleted from the bill.

It seems to me that the recommendation to pour more money into this program represents a misplaced set of priorities. Many Federal programs have

suffered cutbacks in funds because of the administration's desire to curb Federal spending as an anti-inflation measure. I have generally supported these efforts, and I feel that the level of spending requested for the SST is not in line with them.

One program in which I have had a particular interest is the Hill-Burton program for hospital construction grants. Under the proposed allocation of funds for the current fiscal year, my State of North Carolina's share will be reduced by nearly 20 percent. Surely a program of hospital construction is of more direct benefit to a greater number of people than the construction of the SST.

Proponents of the SST reason that by investing Federal money in this project, the Federal Government will realize profits from royalties on SST sales and taxes. I have studied the record of hearings conducted by the House Appropriations Committee, and I feel there is serious question that private industry will be able to finance the very high cost of commercial production of the SST, even if a successful prototype is developed.

I urge my colleagues to support the deletion of funds for the SST from this continuing appropriation.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the SST funding because I believe in technological advancement, but more so because I support continued U.S. air strength.

Like many other Members, I likewise share concern over the unemployment statistics and the constant partisan use of unemployment figures by some as if an insinuation that we in Congress are not doing everything we can to curb inflation and curb unemployment.

I think very shortly we will be receiving a program labeled the Public Service Employment Act which will be sold to us as a community employment scheme to train the hard-core unemployed by getting them used to working—even if they are doing nothing constructive.

Yet, today, opposing the SST funding program are many of those who are most vocal in spreading the hysteria of unemployment, joblessness, malnutrition, and lack of opportunity. Certainly it seems contradictory to express concern over unemployment and then oppose the SST program.

Had I been in Congress when the enabling act to nationalize aviation was considered, I would probably have opposed it. However, in the present technological race, I am convinced that the SST program is performing a needed vital purpose which because of related scientific experimentation and development will offer many benefits to humanity far exceeding the supersonic aircraft itself.

Additionally, I might add that I much prefer spending tax dollars for salaries for constructive workers rather than rewarding those who produce nothing.

I most certainly urge defeat of the amendment to delete all funds from the SST program and plan to cast my people's vote for continuation of the SST program.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment.

I do so even though I am not one of those who believes that the SST will be the prime instrument which will inevitably bring about irreversible environmental collapse. This issue is so precariously balanced even now that a number of Volkswagens added to the highways will probably suffice as the instrument of our destruction as well as a number of SST's, and I shall leave it to more competent experts than I to delineate the fatal equation with scientific precision. I simply concede that the SST or, for that matter, the highly touted "airbus" now in the offing, will both make a dubious contribution to the air we breathe.

The most compelling arguments for continued funding of the SST project can be summed up in one word: "JOBS." It would be callous indeed to ignore the unemployment picture, especially in the hard-hit aerospace industry—and pretend that continued funding would have other than a beneficial effect in this industry—and pretend that continued funding would have other than a beneficial effect in this industry. Proponents say it could mean as many as 150,000 jobs, and despite the criticism that this involves a generous use of "multiplier" factors, and that the employment effort is concentrated in a very specialized field, it is not a prospect to be lightly ignored.

If we resort to this means, however, of economically stimulating the depressed aerospace industry, there are certain long-range implications inherent in the course of action we will have embarked upon. One noted Harvard economist has spotlighted these by asking the following question:

If we overcome some employment or balance-of-payments problems by subsidizing SST development, what happens when the SST demand is fulfilled? Will there be another demand for something to keep this industry occupied and happy?

Prof. Walter Heller predicts that "private producers are likely to return to the Federal well again and again."

A University of Chicago economist, Milton Friedman, puts it succinctly, if tartly:

Our objective should not be jobs but *productive* jobs and that objective is best achieved by the test of the market, not by government subsidization of "leaf-raking" jobs—and if the SST is not commercially viable, then jobs in producing it are the economic equivalent of "leaf-raking."

Arthur Okun, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, forecasts the ultimate reduction and absurdity of the jobs argument—

Used to prove that jobs would be created by a Federal appropriation for digging holes and filling them, or for dynamiting buildings and rebuilding them.

How useful, how viable will be the SST?

Arguments over this are likely to rage for a long time to come, regardless of the outcome of these debates. But I am struck by another observation of Professor Heller's that—

The benefits (of the SST) will go mostly to . . . travelers for whom "time is money"—

for whom a 3-hour instead of a 6-hour ocean crossing is meaningful—while the risks and costs will be borne by taxpayers generally (most of whom will never fly an SST).

If we look at the choice before us steadily and unflinchingly, we are obliged to admit that considerations of creating more jobs and maintaining American technical excellence are ultimately focused in the service of that traveler "for whom a 3-hour instead of a 6-hour ocean crossing is meaningful."

Let us not forget that point. We are not voting for continued unemployment in the aerospace industry. We are not voting to concede a technological lead to the Russians, the French, or the British. We are not voting for skin cancer. We are not voting for further environmental degradation.

We are being asked now to vote on continuing appropriations not exceeding \$289,965,000 in fiscal year 1971 for SST development based on its own merits and in relation to other outstanding appropriations requests in a rational order of priority.

It is, of course, absolutely essential that we consider SST appropriations in the broad context of national priorities. If this were not a factor, then we could proceed to act favorably at once on all proposals worthy of our immediate attention: Further and more realistic increases in social security; improved care for veterans; increased Federal aid to education; an improved system of national health care; salary increases to members of the Armed Forces to hasten implementation of the all-volunteer army concept and the end of selective service; increased national security; increased Federal aid in the war on crime and drug abuse; better manpower training programs; and so on.

The list is endless and each proposal carries with it its special urgency and demand for priority consideration. The SST has a natural order of priority among these, and it is our task to establish it.

Earlier this week we considered social security increases. The 10 percent this body approved and already signed into law by the President is a lot less generous than many of us had hoped it would be. No one is more buffeted by the cruel blows of inflation than the elderly poor, yet in real terms the raises we voted can amount to as little as \$6.40 a month—hardly enough to cover rising medicare costs they have experienced while waiting for us to take action.

There is a genuine crisis in proper nursing care in the Veterans' Hospital in my hometown of Portland. The same problem undoubtedly exists in many of your districts, too. Chairman TEAGUE will tell you that it boils down to appropriations for veterans' hospitals, and I know no one who has fought more compassionately and ably than he to gain the necessary appropriations.

The crisis in education continues to mount. Colleges are failing and the middle-income families, the same ones who are to principally foot whatever bill is forthcoming for SST, are apparently at the bottom of the totem pole in consideration of tax dollars—pri-

marily their own—to aid them in sending their sons and daughters to college.

The son who cannot go to college, of course, is especially vulnerable to the continuing inequity—and iniquity—of the draft—which his parents' hard-earned tax dollars might help eliminate; if we decide on this priority for their allocation.

Meanwhile, many of our citizens, especially the elderly poor exposed to soaring medical costs, are finding, literally, that it is cheaper to die. It would not be, of course, if we assign a proper priority to a system of national health care.

The housing picture has begun to brighten perceptibly in recent months, but all of us realize that we still have a far way to go in realizing the housing requirements of this Nation.

President Nixon himself has said that to keep up with the housing requirements of our expanding population, we shall have to build the equivalent of a new city of 250,000 persons each month from now until the end of the century. I would hope that we would have the will, the wit, and the wisdom to utilize available and otherwise unemployed skills to the undertaking of so vast and worthwhile an enterprise. And who would deny that the skills are more easily converted from aerospace industry to housing than the opposite direction? If jobs are the most compelling argument for the SST, we had better examine all the arguments again.

I have.

I have examined each of the priority items already discussed and how they will benefit the vast majority of our tax-paying citizens. Relative to how they would be served in concentrating on programs for increased social security, veterans' care, aid to education, housing, youth opportunity, crime-fighting capability, and national security, I find that the requirements of the citizen to whom a 3-hour as opposed to a 6-hour oceanic crossing is meaningful are significantly wanting in priority of our attention.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support House Joint Resolution 468. I do so after careful consideration of most recent arguments by both the proponents and the opponents of the supersonic transport.

I have listened to such diverse considerations as the matter of national priorities, the question of balance of trade, the loss of jobs, sonic boom, the effects on the atmosphere, and a lot of others.

I intend to follow the same course I did when this issue was before us last fall, not simply to be undeviating or to avoid being self-contradictory, but because I believe the issues are about the same as they were then and after listening to all of the arguments all over again I have reached the same conclusion.

But regardless of what may have been contemplated in the past, today we are not talking about the manufacture at any time in the future at Government expense of any given number of SST's. We are talking about only two prototypes and the expense of 100 hours of testing. No more. The money provided in section 2 of House Joint Resolution 468 in the amount of \$289 million will provide

for the SST to be taken out of the realm of speculation and placed into a laboratory status. The U.S. SST is designed to carry 298 passengers as against 128 for the Concorde and only 120 for the Russian TU-144. Ours will have a speed of 1,800 miles per hour as compared with 1,350 miles per hour for the Concorde and 1,550 for the TU-144.

The U.S. SST is a better plane than the TU-144 and the Concorde. We know the world will buy our version if only we get to build it. If the Congress grounds the SST now it will mean the Russians and British and French will literally take over the skies of our world in the years ahead.

Where do we stand timewise so far as our plane and that of the British, French, and Russian competitors? Well, the Russians have their first flight scheduled for October of 1971. The Russians are taking delivery orders now and the British and French are close behind. It is not a question anymore of someone's guess or speculation because the French accomplished a successful test flight in March of 1969. They estimate that in the not too distant future, they can offer their plane for sale. They say they can expect delivery for commercial sale not later than the first few months of 1974.

Foreign competition is only one issue that should be considered. We have heard a lot about the loss of jobs to American workmen. I would hope that we would not at this time make the job issue the only issue. The SST should not be thought of as only a make-work project. It has a far better justification than that. The real reason for continuing research and development on SST is to assure that our country will continue to be the technological and scientific leader of the world. If we have faith in our scientific community then we should have faith enough to maintain American leadership by voting for continuing technological and scientific advances made possible by SST which will benefit not only our aircraft industry but our entire country, and yes, because of willingness to share knowledge, it will benefit all mankind.

Oh, there are so many arguments which must be considered and answered that it is impossible to consider them in any particular sequence or any relative order of importance. There is the environmental issue. There has been a lot of hysteria brought into the campaign against development or commercial use of supersonic flight. After I have listened to all the evidence I am convinced any additional pollution from supersonic travel will be offset by shorter travel time required by these planes for covering any given distance. I know that our country has an environmental consciousness at the present time but I also know we are continuing to go ahead on research and development in air pollution and much of the money in section 2 of House Joint Resolution 468 will be helpful to the field of antipollution research. I introduced in the last Congress and again in this Congress a measure to prohibit supersonic flight over the continental United States. The facts are the SST will fly at subsonic speed over land and accelerate

to 1,800 miles per hour only when it is well over the ocean or over the poles.

Despite the boost to our economy, I would be opposed to the SST if I seriously believed it would be environmentally offensive. I mean by that if I thought that it would be responsible for some of the scare charges that have been made against the plane in recent days. At least two Government studies assure us that even a large fleet of SST's will not threaten the earth's atmosphere. In further consideration of the environmental issue I believe that if there is as much evidence as the critics of the SST suggest then instead of wanting to stop building our SST these same critics should be seeking international abolition of the SST. Unilaterally grounding our own U.S. planes is not enough. But all of us ought to know, and if we are fair with ourselves, do know, there are no environmental risks involved in the proposition to proceed with two SST prototypes.

Another question has been raised of priorities. Mr. Chairman, I think I have had a rather consistent record of voting for programs to try to attain what is regarded as our top national priorities. I have voted for improved health programs. I have voted for increased funding for hospital construction. I have voted in favor of larger appropriations for aid to education and to override the President's veto last year. I have voted for hundreds of millions of dollars to assist environmental cleanup in the field of water pollution. I have supported an increased Federal gasoline tax to build better highways. I have supported urban mass transit.

In proper perspective, Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of having these progressive programs or the SST. Rather it becomes a question of needing both. Soon we will have a \$1 trillion gross national product. Surely, we can afford the \$289 million provided by section 2 of House Joint Resolution 468. Rather than the either/or approach it is a matter of a balance between the two. We can have both. We have reordered our priorities. Recently we have been spending more on those things we hope lead to social programs. But we must also continue to spend enough money to be sure that the inventiveness, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of our scientific community is not neglected. In other words, we must also maintain American technological leadership.

Someone has asked the question, Just what is at stake in this vote today on House Joint Resolution 468? Is it just a question of \$289 million? The answer is an emphatic "No." The reason is that to vote no today means not only the issuance of termination slips to 20,000 aerospace workers. It means a matter of the loss of 150,000 jobs over the next 10 years. It has been said that to stop now means millions and millions of dollars down the drain with nothing to show for it except some incomplete prototypes. At stake is a chance to make \$31 billion made up of \$10 billion in a favorable trade balance between 1978 and 1990; a \$12 billion trade loss avoided between 1978 and 1990, if we continue on now. At

stake is \$6.7 billion to be lost in State and Federal tax revenues and over a billion in royalties to be made from the sale of our SST.

Without itemizing all of the constituent items in the total, if we stop now most of the total investment of Government contractors and the airlines may be lost. This totals over \$1.1 billion, and over and above that is the opportunity or a chance for this country to have \$31 billion in benefits in the period from 1978 to 1990. Moreover, if the SST is canceled now, it is not a question of adverse balance of trade alone and tax revenues lost, but it may well be the permanent loss of the world aircraft market.

I know that figures and statistics are confusing and sometimes even misleading. But one thing we can point to that does not require any reference to statistics. That is the fact there is little or no question but that a commercial SST will be built. The only question is who will build it? If we in America turn around and run away from this present opportunity it will be a permanent and irrevocable loss to our country.

Sure there are obstacles to be surmounted in SST construction. Some are real. Others have been manufactured by critics of the SST. Yet, over the years since the time of our Revolution, the American way has been to recognize the obstacles and they find a way to surmount them. We can, I am confident, solve the problems of sonic boom noise and potential pollution.

Reliable economists estimate that in the next 20 years the volume of commercial air travel will multiply six times because of population growth, renewed business activity, increased personal income and more leisure time. At this moment because our American air carriers are faced with the uncertainties of whether our country will meet this newest of air challenges by the Anglo-French Concorde and the Russian TU-144 they have had no other choice but to consider purchase of one of these other model SST's. But that is not the American way.

We know that these airliners will be flying around the world regardless of what is done here in the United States. The age of commercial SST flight is upon us. There is no way to turn back the clock. A vote for the American SST is clearly a vote in the American interest. We must not be left behind in this area of travel development. To vote to retain section 2 of House Joint Resolution 468 is not only a vote to keep America first in commercial SST but it is a vote of faith that we can and will in the years ahead maintain our technological and scientific leadership of the world.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to again voice my support for American efforts to develop a supersonic transport aircraft.

I am convinced that those efforts cannot be effective or productive unless there is substantial financial assistance from the Federal Government.

Two foreign competitors, the Soviet Union's TU-144 and the British/French Concorde, are being developed solely with government funds, with no financial

participation by private companies at all.

In the United States, the Federal Government has for the past 8 years been working as a team member with several of the Nation's commercial airlines and engine industries, and those efforts have brought us almost to the prototype stage of development.

Before I came to Congress, more than \$800 million had already been spent to finance those efforts. Regardless of how we vote on this additional appropriation today, another \$178 million will have to be spent to cover contract cancellation costs.

For \$112 million more, we could have two prototypes in the air, testing environmental effects such as noise and air pollution and conducting other experiments to answer other questions that are being posed today.

With the answers to those questions, based on hard facts rather than theories, we can make a much more knowledgeable decision on whether mass production of the SST is warranted or not.

But if we fail to appropriate these additional funds, we will have sent more than \$1 billion down the drain, the questions will still not be answered, the United States will lose the lead in aviation, 150,000 jobs will be lost. This is clearly not the solution to the current controversy over the SST.

On the other hand, if we do continue the project, the result will be the safest, most comfortable and fastest commercial transportation ever devised, a \$1 billion return on Government investments, additional billions in tax revenues generated by the SST, and a vital shot in the arm for our ailing aerospace industry.

Surely, we can see that this is the more responsible course. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the continued development of an American supersonic transport.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, once again the House is being asked to fund the supersonic transport program. The blitz which has accompanied the forthcoming vote has attempted with slick, high-flying propaganda to suggest that the major questions which have hounded this program since its inception have somehow gone away.

In addition to this tactic, I object to the current campaign seeking to brand opposition to Government subsidization of the SST as anti-America.

But all the full-page advertisements, all the tricky little radio spots, all the high-pressure tactics that public relations men can dream up cannot erase the serious problems which militate against the SST.

I am personally concerned with the argument that jobs by the thousands will vanish if the SST is junked. But after careful examination, I am convinced the proponents are misleading Congress on this point.

This is the job picture as outlined by the Department of Transportation with relation to the SST project:

Presently employed .....	14,000
Presently providing services.....	40,000
Mid-1971 employment.....	20,000
Full production employment (1978) ..	50,000
Full production service employment ..	100,000

These figures will add up to President

Nixon's full-production total of 150,000, but they are based on two broad pre-summptions.

One, that the SST will be technically feasible.

Second, that there will be sufficient world market to require 300 to 500 SST's, which is, by the way, in the range which must be sold for the Federal Government to anticipate some payback on the funds which are under consideration.

Taking into account the big competition argument with which the proponents of this plane are drowning Congress, I find it doubtful that 300, much less 500, of the American version of this craft will be ordered.

The employment figures alone would make the ditching of the project seem alarming. But the silent sums do not ask the important question: If the SST program is not continued, will the Government funds presently dedicated to the program not be spent? With the number of critical needs facing this country, I do not expect that these funds will lie fallow.

Federal funds that would be spent on the SST should create as many jobs when spent for manpower programs, or health, or mass transit.

A report of the Democratic Study Group on the SST comments:

The employment situation depends on the willingness of consumers and businesses to spend their incomes and on the stimulus of Federal budget and monetary policy. If the SST is not produced, airline passengers and airlines will keep spending money in job-creating ways. Even if airlines invest less, adjustments to monetary policy can enable other industries to invest more and thereby create other jobs. The issue is where to spend public funds—not whether to spend them.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the question this House faces.

Will we strap the taxpayers of this Nation to a program that the industry itself will not fund—or will this Nation begin to move to correct the grave ills that those of us who spend most of our time on the ground face daily.

Every poll shows that if the taxpayers of this Nation could speak directly on this subject, they would say "No." That, Mr. Chairman, should clearly be the answer of this House.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, like every Member of the House of Representatives, I have given long and considered attention to the SST issue. In the past, I have supported the requests of both President Johnson and President Nixon for SST appropriations. I am philosophically in agreement with the contention that the supersonic aircraft is the plane of the future and that the United States should be in the forefront of its development.

The Federal Government has already made a substantial investment in the SST, and I would hope that the remaining investment can be generated from private capital.

There are considerations present in this round of debate on the SST which were not necessarily so weighty in past debates. Certainly one of the most compelling is the question of priorities. I believe that the SST is important, but I also believe that there are much greater needs within the transportation field it-

self; for example, the development of mass transit systems for urban and metropolitan areas. There are other areas of pressing public need which have a much higher priority on public funds than the SST. Environmental protection, urban and rural community development, narcotics control and rehabilitation, law enforcement, health and education, to mention a few.

If we are sincere in our declarations about establishing meaningful priorities, we must exercise responsibility and make hard choices.

It is impossible to ignore the weight of testimony from concerned environmentalists. The United States already has a supersonic aircraft resting in an air museum, I refer to the B-70. I would assume that this aircraft could be utilized extensively to test and to develop information about the impact of supersonic flight on the environment. The SR-71 is a mach 3 aircraft, and perhaps it would be feasible to employ these planes in the testing phase.

For these reasons, I voted in favor of the Yates amendment to the Department of Transportation appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. YATES, EDWARDS of Alabama, McFALL, and CONTE.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 217, noes 204, not voting, 12, as follows:

[Recorded teller vote No. 2]

AYES—217

Abourezk	Conable	Gaydos
Abzug	Conte	Gibbons
Addabbo	Conyers	Goodling
Alexander	Corbett	Grasso
Anderson,	Coughlin	Green, Oreg.
Tenn.	Culver	Griffiths
Andrews, Ala.	Danielson	Gross
Andrews,	Davis, Ga.	Gude
N. Dak.	Davis, Wis.	Halpern
Ashley	de la Garza	Hamilton
Aspin	Dellenback	Hammer-
Badillo	Dellums	schmidt
Begich	Denholm	Hanley
Bennett	Dennis	Harrington
Bergland	Dent	Harvey
Bevill	Diggs	Hastings
Biaggi	Dingell	Hathaway
Blester	Donohue	Hechler, W. Va.
Bingham	Dow	Heckler, Mass.
Blatnik	Drinan	Helstoski
Bolling	Dulski	Hicks, Mass.
Brademas	Duncan	Horton
Brasco	duPont	Howard
Brooks	Dwyer	Hungate
Broomfield	Eckhardt	Hunt
Brotzman	Edwards, Calif.	Hutchinson
Brown, Mich.	Esch	Jacobs
Broyhill, N.C.	Eshleman	Jones, Tenn.
Broyhill, Va.	Evans, Colo.	Karth
Burke, Fla.	Evins, Tenn.	Kastenmeier
Burke, Mass.	Findley	King
Burlison, Mo.	Fish	Koch
Burton	Ford,	Kyros
Byrnes, Wis.	William D.	Latta
Caffery	Forsythe	Lent
Carey, N.Y.	Fraser	Link
Celler	Frelinghuysen	Long, Md.
Chisholm	Frenzel	Lujan
Clay	Fulton, Tenn.	McCloskey
Cleveland	Fuqua	McClosister
Collier	Galifianakis	McDonald,
Collins, Ill.	Gallagher	Mich.

McKevitt	Preyer, N.C.	Sisk
McKinney	Pryor, Ark.	Smith, Calif.
Macdonald,	Pucinski	Smith, Iowa
Mass.	Quie	Smith, N.Y.
Madden	Rallsback	Stafford
Matsunaga	Rangel	Stanton,
Mayne	Rees	J. William
Mazzoli	Reid, N.Y.	Stanton,
Melcher	Reuss	James V.
Metcalfe	Rhodes	Steele
Michel	Riegle	Steiger, Ariz.
Mikva	Robison, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Miller, Ohio	Rodino	Stokes
Minish	Rogers	Sullivan
Mink	Roncallo	Symington
Minshall	Rooney, Pa.	Talcott
Mitchell	Rosenthal	Taylor
Monagan	Roush	Thompson, N.J.
Moorhead	Roy	Thomson, Wis.
Morse	Roybal	Thone
Mosher	Runnels	Tiernan
Moss	Ruppe	Udall
Murphy, Ill.	Ruth	Vander Jagt
Myers	Ryan	Vanik
Nedzi	St Germain	Waldie
Obey	Sarbanes	Wampler
O'Hara	Saylor	Widnall
O'Neill	Scherle	Wolff
Patman	Scheuer	Wylder
Patten	Schneebeil	Wylie
Pike	Schwengel	Yates
Podell	Seiberling	Yatron
Poff	Shoup	Zwach

NOES—204

Abbutt	Gialmo	O'Konski
Abernethy	Goldwater	Passman
Adams	Gonzalez	Pelly
Albert	Gray	Pepper
Anderson,	Griffin	Perkins
Calif.	Grover	Pettis
Anderson, Ill.	Gubser	Peyster
Annunzio	Hagan	Pickle
Archer	Haley	Pirnie
Arends	Hall	Poage
Ashbrook	Hanna	Powell
Aspinall	Hansen, Idaho	Price, Ill.
Baker	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Tex.
Baring	Harsha	Purcell
Belcher	Hawkins	Quillen
Bell	Hays	Randall
Betts	Hébert	Rarick
Blackburn	Henderson	Reid, Ill.
Blanton	Hicks, Wash.	Roberts
Boggs	Hillis	Robinson, Va.
Boland	Hogan	Roe
Bow	Holifield	Rooney, N.Y.
Bray	Hosmer	Sandman
Brinkley	Hull	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Schmitz
Buchanan	Jarman	Scott
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Sebellus
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Pa.	Shipley
Byron	Jonas	Shriver
Cabell	Jonas, Ala.	Sikes
Camp	Kazen	Skubitz
Carney	Keating	Slack
Carter	Kee	Snyder
Casey, Tex.	Keith	Spence
Cederberg	Kemp	Springer
Chamberlain	Kluczynski	Staggers
Chappell	Kuykendall	Steed
Clancy	Landgrebe	Stephens
Clark	Landrum	Stratton
Clausen,	Leggett	Stubblefield
Don H.	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Clawson, Del	Lloyd	Teague, Tex.
Collins, Tex.	Long, La.	Terry
Colmer	McClory	Thompson, Ga.
Corman	McClure	Ullman
Cotter	McCormack	Van Deerlin
Daniel, Va.	McDade	Veysey
Daniels, N.J.	McEwen	Vigorito
Delaney	McFall	Waggonner
Derwinski	McKay	Ware
Devine	McMillan	Watts
Dickinson	Mahon	Whalen
Downing	Mailliard	Whalley
Edmondson	Mann	White
Edwards, Ala.	Martin	Whitehurst
Ellberg	Mathias, Calif.	Whitten
Erlenborn	Mathis, Ga.	Wiggins
Fascell	Meeds	Williams
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Flood	Mills	Wilson,
Flowers	Mizell	Charles H.
Flynt	Mollohan	Winn
Foley	Montgomery	Wright
Ford, Gerald R.	Morgan	Wyatt
Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyman
Frey	Natcher	Young, Fla.
Fulton, Pa.	Neisen	Young, Tex.
Garmatz	Nichols	Zablocki
Gettys	Nix	Zion

## NOT VOTING—12

Barrett  
Crane  
Dorn  
Dowdy

Edwards, La.  
Green, Pa.  
Jones, N.C.  
Kyl

McCulloch  
Rostenkowski  
Rousselot  
Stuckey

Collier  
Collins, Ill.  
Conable  
Conte  
Conyers  
Corbett  
Coughlin  
Culver  
Danielson  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
de la Garza  
Dellenback  
Dellums  
Denholm  
Dennis  
Dent  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dow  
Drinan  
Dulski  
Duncan  
duPont  
Dwyer  
Eckhardt  
Edwards, Calif.  
Esch  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.  
Evins, Tenn.  
Flindley  
Fish  
Ford,  
William D.

Forsythe  
Fraser  
Frelinghuysen  
Frenzel  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Fuqua  
Galifianakis  
Gallagher  
Gaydos  
Gibbons  
Goodling  
Grasso  
Green, Oreg.  
Griffiths  
Gross  
Gude  
Haley  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hanley  
Harrington  
Harvey  
Hastings  
Hathaway

Hechler, W. Va.  
Heckler, Mass.  
Helstoski  
Hicks, Mass.  
Horton  
Howard  
Hungate  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Jacobs  
Jones, Tenn.  
Karth  
Kastenmeter  
King  
Koch  
Kyros  
Lent  
Link  
Long, Md.  
Lujan  
McCloskey  
McCollister  
McDonald,  
Mich.  
McKevitt  
McKinney  
Macdonald,  
Mass.  
Madden  
Matsunaga  
Mayne  
Mazzoli  
Melcher  
Metcalfe  
Michel  
Mikva  
Miller, Ohio  
Minish  
Mink  
Minshall  
Mitchell  
Monagan  
Moorhead  
Morse  
Mosher  
Moss  
Murphy, Ill.  
Myers  
Nedzi  
Obey  
O'Hara  
O'Neill  
Patman  
Patten  
Pike  
Podell  
Poff  
Preyer, N.C.  
Pryor, Ark.  
Pucinski  
Quie  
Railsback

## NAYS—203

Abbutt  
Abernethy  
Adams  
Anderson,  
Calif.  
Anderson, Ill.  
Annunzio  
Archer  
Arends  
Ashbrook  
Aspinall  
Baker  
Baring  
Barrett  
Belcher  
Bell  
Betts  
Blackburn  
Blanton  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bow  
Bray  
Brinkley  
Brown, Ohio  
Buchanan  
Burleson, Tex.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Byron  
Cabell  
Camp  
Carney  
Carter  
Casey, Tex.  
Cederberg  
Chamberlain  
Chappell  
Clancy  
Clark  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del

Collins, Tex.  
Colmer  
Corman  
Cotter  
Daniel, Va.  
Daniels, N.J.  
Delaney  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Downing  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Ala.  
Ellberg  
Erlenborn  
Fascell  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flowers  
Flynt  
Foley  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Fountain  
Frey  
Fulton, Pa.  
Garmatz  
Gettys  
Gialmo  
Goldwater  
Gonzalez  
Gray  
Griffin  
Grover  
Gubser  
Hagan  
Hall  
Hanna  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harsha  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hebert

Rangel  
Rees  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Riegler  
Robinson, N.Y.  
Rodino  
Rogers  
Roncalio  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Roush  
Roy  
Roybal  
Runnels  
Ruppe  
Ruth  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Sarbanes  
Saylor  
Scherle  
Scheuer  
Schneebeli  
Schwengel  
Seiberling  
Shoup  
Sisk  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Stafford  
Stanton,  
J. William  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Steele  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stokes  
Sullivan  
Symington  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Thone  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Wampler  
Widnall  
Wolf  
Wylder  
Yllie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Zwach

Mizell  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Morgan  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nelsen  
Nichols  
Nix  
O'Konski  
Passman  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Peyster  
Pickle  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Powell  
Price, Ill.  
Price, Tex.  
Purcell  
Quillen  
Randall  
Rarick

Reid, Ill.  
Robinson, Va.  
Roe  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Sandman  
Satterfield  
Schmitz  
Scott  
Sebelius  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Snyder  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Terry  
Thompson, Ga.

Ullman  
Van Deerin  
Veysey  
Vigorito  
Waggonner  
Ware  
Watts  
Whalen  
Whalley  
White  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Winn  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wyman  
Young, Fla.  
Young, Tex.  
Zablocki  
Zion

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Latta

## NOT VOTING—12

Crane  
Dorn  
Dowdy  
Edwards, La.

Green, Pa.  
Jones, N.C.  
Kyl  
McCulloch

Roberts  
Rostenkowski  
Rousselot  
Stuckey

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Latta for, with Mr. Rousselot against.  
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Crane.

Mr. SCHEUER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT). If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Yates amendment to the SST section of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468) making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained re-

So the amendment was agreed to.  
Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I voted "aye" by mistake in all the confusion. I want to be recorded as voting "no" and ask unanimous consent that my vote be corrected accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be recorded as voting for the amendment instead of against it. I voted against it, and I ask unanimous consent to correct my vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. None of the funds provided by this joint resolution shall be available for the execution of a program for commercial production of a civil supersonic aircraft.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468) making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 300, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 2, line 7, strike out all of section 2 and renumber the following section.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, an "aye" vote will be a vote in favor of the Yates amendment; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 203, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

## YEAS—216

Abourezk  
Abzug  
Addabbo  
Alexander  
Anderson,  
Tenn.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Ashley  
Aspin  
Badillo  
Begich

Bennett  
Bergland  
Bevill  
Blaggi  
Blester  
Bingham  
Bolling  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Brooks  
Brookfield  
Brotzman  
Brown, Mich.

Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Burke, Fla.  
Burke, Mass.  
Burlison, Mo.  
Burton  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Caffery  
Carey, N.Y.  
Celler  
Chisholm  
Clay  
Cleveland

turning from the State of North Carolina on official business. Had I been present, on rollcall 25 I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished majority whip inform the House what is the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week?

Mr. O'NEILL. At the close of business today, there will be nothing scheduled for tomorrow.

The program for the week of March 22 is as follows:

- Monday is District Day, no bills.
- Tuesday, funding resolutions from House Administration Committee:
- House Resolution 149, Committee on Veterans' Affairs;
- House Resolution 175, Committee on the Judiciary;
- House Resolution 202, Committee on Armed Services;
- House Resolution 210, Committee on Rules;
- House Resolution 218, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries;
- House Resolution 225, Committee on Ways and Means;
- House Resolution 226, Committee on Banking and Currency;
- House Resolution 236, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;
- House Resolution 253, Committee on Agriculture;
- House Resolution 272, Committee on Education and Labor;
- House Resolution 279, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;
- House Resolution 285, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;
- House Resolution 290, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and
- House Resolution 301, Committee on House Administration.

House Joint Resolution 223, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older. Open rule, 2 hours debate.

Wednesday and the balance of the week:

House Resolution 304, Committee on Government Operations investigating authority; and

House Resolution 7, Rural Telephone Bank, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts indicate whether there is any more business today and for the rest of the week?

Mr. O'NEILL. There is no further business scheduled for today or for the rest of the week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The program the gentleman from Massachusetts has just read off is the program for next week?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority whip.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would just like to know whether or not, in view of no District business or other listed business for Monday, it is contemplated that there might or might not be any votes, inasmuch as conference reports are eligible at any time. Is the acting majority leader advised by the leadership as to whether or not there is liable to be a vote on Monday? Would the gentleman care to make a commitment and, if so, can it be backed up?

Mr. O'NEILL. It is my understanding that no votes are contemplated on Monday, and no conference reports are contemplated on Monday.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I believe he has the best of intent. I hope it will be borne out better than when some Members demand of the Speaker that votes be taken regardless of prior commitment.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Missouri must understand that there is no such thing as an iron-clad commitment. There is always the question of a matter of high priority or a matter of national emergency. I had great reservations about whether or not the vote on Tuesday was a matter of national emergency, but the Speaker was confronted by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking Republican member of that committee, and they assured him that there was an emergency. The gentleman from Missouri is a Member of this body and he is subject to the possibility of voting on questions of national emergency at any time, regardless of any type of assurance that we might try to make.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority leader's going to the microphone and rationalizing the position in which the leadership finds itself for its broken commitment of last week. One can claim national emergency, and that is subject to definition. I am just about as handy with semantics as anyone around here, if you want to bandy words on that basis. One can claim that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is running the House and is, in fact, the leadership thereof instead of the majority leader. One can claim that the Parliamentarian makes demands on the Speaker to which traditionally he has had to bow. But the final question will come up as to who is the leadership and whether its word is violate or not, and whether that word has been broken, be it in the name of expediency or be it in the name of any

other rationalizing term that you want to use. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the colloquy which has just occurred developed the information that apparently there will be no legislative business on Monday next. However, I should like to take this opportunity to announce that in room 340 of the Cannon Building there will be a reception for the wives and families of prisoners of war. This is pursuant to the proclamation of the President that the week of March 21 through March 27 is National Families of Prisoners of War Week. I should certainly hope that every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle would accept the invitation in writing that has now been extended by the distinguished chairman of the Democratic caucus, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), and myself, and attend that reception at 11 o'clock next Monday in room 340 of the Cannon Building.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that 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.

SPECIAL REVENUE-SHARING PROGRAM FOR TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-71)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

When the early settlers first encountered the American wilderness, a man's mobility was dependent upon his strong legs and the sharp axe with which he cleared his path. But even in those pioneering times, Americans quickly came to realize that good roads and docks and bridges were community concerns.

Over the years, government has become increasingly involved in improving the Nation's transportation systems, from the building of post roads and canals

in the early periods of our history, to the construction of airports and superhighways in recent years. The question we face today, therefore, is not *whether* government should participate in transportation matters, but *how* government should participate—and *which levels* of government should undertake which responsibilities. These are the central questions I am addressing in this message as I outline a new Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation.

#### GROWING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS AND GROWING PROBLEMS

As the demand for mobility has mushroomed and as new means of transportation have been invented in recent years, the size of our transportation system has reached staggering proportions. It has been less than 70 years, for example, since the Wright brothers flew at Kitty Hawk. In that time, our aviation system has grown to the point that last year it served over 173 million commercial passengers and handled more than 4 billion ton miles of air freight. An open field with a wind sock was a sufficient airport for most communities only a few decades ago. Today many airports are cities in themselves and air traffic is controlled by highly sophisticated electronic systems.

At the turn of the century there were only 8,000 automobiles in America. By 1920 nearly 8 million cars traveled our highways and today we have more than 100 million registered vehicles which travel over one trillion miles annually. The people of our Nation are driving more than twice as many automobiles as they did just 20 years ago.

These two technological developments—the airplane and the automobile—give dramatic evidence of both the successes and the failures of American transportation. The automobile and the airplane are mechanized masterpieces. The highways and airports which they use are often glowing displays of America's engineering genius. But behind the mystique of jet travel and the convenience of the family car lie serious problems that have been growing more acute in recent years.

The airplane means fast travel over great distances, to be sure. But it also can mean harmful noise and air pollution, congested terminals, misplaced luggage and airports that are difficult to reach. Highways that speed motorists between cities can become long and narrow parking lots where cars are stalled for hours within urban areas. It often takes longer to move by "horseless carriage" across our major cities today as it did by horsedrawn carriage a century ago. Efforts to improve this situation by building new highways often have the effect of destroying neighborhoods and disrupting lives. It is estimated, moreover, that automobiles are responsible for almost half of our air pollution—a growing problem that is slowly choking our central cities.

And there is another serious problem, as well. For with our heavy investment in automobiles and air transportation has come a sharp decline in rail passen-

ger service and in public mass transit systems.

The first electric street car lines and the first subway appeared at about the same time as the automobile and, like the automobile, they grew in popularity during the first quarter of this century. In 1905, local urban transit systems carried 5 billion passengers. By 1926, ridership had more than trebled, but that was the peak of mass transit's popularity—except for a brief period during World War II. After 1945, public transit ridership, revenue and service declined steadily. In 1950, there were still some 1,400 urban transit companies operating 87,000 vehicles and carrying 17.25 billion passengers. By 1970, however, there were 327 fewer companies and 25,500 fewer vehicles carrying only 7.3 billion passengers.

Public transportation has been caught up in a vicious cycle of increasing costs, rising fares, shrinking profits, decreasing quality, and declining ridership. Ironically, this decline in mass transit has come at the same time that the need for fast, convenient, economical public transportation has become greater than ever before. This Nation has the technology to provide such transportation. If we can move three men a quarter million miles to the moon, then surely we can also find ways to move millions of men and women over short distances in our cities. This is another of the great transportation challenges of our time.

#### HOW HAVE THESE PROBLEMS BEEN MET?

All of these problems—pollution, congestion, inefficiency, and the lack of sufficient mass transit services—have been recognized for years. And for years the Federal Government has been working to alleviate them. In the past two years, this administration has recommended a number of new programs to improve American transportation. As a result, we now have an accelerated program to develop urban mass transit systems, new authorizations for the expansion and improvement of airports and airways, and a quasi-public corporation to operate a national rail passenger system.

It is clear, however, that more money and more regulations alone will not solve our transportation problems. Nor will they make the Federal Government more responsive to local needs and local aspirations. It is equally clear that the established relationships among Federal, State and local governments are unsuitable for achieving the goals we pursue.

What are those goals? They can be usefully described under the general heading of "balanced transportation."

#### ACHIEVING BALANCED TRANSPORTATION

A balanced transportation system is essentially one that provides adequate transportation not just for *some* of the people in a community but for *all* the people in a community. A balanced system also recognizes that an individual can have different transportation needs at different times. Such a system treats speed as only one of the factors in the transportation equation and does not

ignore the importance of other qualities such as comfort, safety, and reliability.

Despite our technological capacity, we do not enjoy a fully balanced transportation system in modern America, particularly in our larger cities. We have relied too much in our cities on cars and on highways; we have given too little attention to other modes of travel. Approximately 94 percent of all travel in urbanized areas is by automobile, yet only about 25 percent of our people—especially the old, the very young, the poor and the handicapped—do not drive a car. They have been poorly served by our transportation strategy.

#### DISTORTIONS CAUSED BY MATCHING REQUIREMENTS

One of the most disturbing elements in the present transportation picture is the fact that such inequities have often been reinforced and even precipitated by the Federal Government. One reason is that Federal dollars have been relatively easy to obtain for highway building but more difficult to obtain for other transportation purposes. The Federal Government now pays 90 percent of the costs for a new interstate expressway, for example, but only 67 percent of the costs for a new mass transit system and only 50 percent of the costs of building an airport. It is little wonder that State and local planners are encouraged to cover the landscape with ribbons of concrete. Such distortions of local priorities are among the major problems that this administration is seeking to correct.

#### EXCESSIVE FEDERAL CONTROL

But local priorities are not only distorted by Federal requirements concerning matching funds. Local determinations of what is needed most must constantly yield to Federal judgments about what a local community should do with the money it receives from Washington.

The Federal Government has a great influence on the particular *mixture* of transportation spending in any locale, for it carefully allocates so much of its money for one kind of transportation and so much for another. Each program is funded separately—and even at the State and local level, different agencies frequently administer monies which are designated for different purposes. As a result, it is extremely difficult to achieve sound intermodal planning of comprehensive transportation systems. There is no single place where sufficient resources and authority are available for making wise choices between various transportation alternatives. Nor can anyone effectively coordinate investments in any one mode of transportation with efforts in other transportation fields. We err, in short, by treating the transportation challenge as a series of separate problems rather than as a single problem with many interrelated parts.

The hard fact is that the best mixture of transportation modes is not something that remote officials in Washington can determine in advance for all cities, of all sizes and descriptions, in all parts of the country. Nor do the Federal officials who grant money for specific proj-

ects understand local needs well enough to justify their strong influence over how local projects should be planned and run.

As I have contended in a number of messages to the Congress in the past two years, our society has become too complex and too diversified to profit from such highly centralized control. This is not to deny that improving our transportation systems is a national concern. It is a national concern and that is why it should continue to be funded in part from Federal tax resources. But the specific manner in which any city or metropolitan area goes about achieving this goal is not something that can be most effectively determined at the Federal level. In fact, transportation needs are among the social and economic factors that vary most widely from one place to another. That is why many of our Federal transportation programs can profit so much from conversion to the Special Revenue Sharing approach.

Community organizations, concerned individuals and local units of government should not have to shout all the way to Washington for attention. Community standards and community transportation goals are changing and some of those who only five years ago welcomed the prospect of a new highway or airport are now protesting in front of bulldozers. Transportation planning and appropriations mechanisms must be flexible enough to meet the challenge of changing community values. This flexibility can best be achieved by concentrating more decisionmaking power in the States and the localities.

The purpose of Special Revenue Sharing is to focus Federal resources on major public problems and at the same time maximize flexibility of choice at the State and local level. The Special Revenue Sharing approach provides an ideal means for addressing national problems that have local solutions.

A SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM FOR TRANSPORTATION

The proposal I am submitting today would establish a new Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation. In simplest terms, this program means returning Federal tax dollars to States and to local communities for investment in transportation—without the usual Federal controls and restraints. It signals a philosophical return to the days when the man who best understood the local terrain was the man who blazed the trail.

FUNDING

I propose that the Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation become effective on January 1, 1972, and that it be funded initially at an annual level of \$2.566 billion. All funds that would be included in this new program would come from twenty-three existing Federal grant-in-aid programs which are now grouped under five major headings: Urban Mass Transit Grants, Airport Grants, Highway Safety Grants, Federal Aid for Highways (but not the Interstate System), and Highway Beautification Grants. The size of these pro-

grams in my proposed budget for Fiscal Year 1972 is as follows:

	Millions of dollars
Urban mass transit.....	\$525
Airport grants.....	220
Highway safety grants.....	130
Federal aid for highways (except for the interstate system).....	1,625
Highway beautification grants.....	66
	2,566

The money for these programs presently comes from three different funding sources: general tax revenues, the Highway Trust Fund and the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. The two trust funds were established so that money could be collected directly from those who use highways or airports—through special taxes on gasoline and on air tickets—and then used to improve the related transportation mode.

This principle would continue to be observed under Special Revenue Sharing. In the first year of operation, Special Revenue Sharing money would be drawn from the two trust funds and from general revenues in the same proportion as under the existing categorical grant system, though it could be spent as the localities see fit. After that, however, the portion of the Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation derived from the trust funds in any year would equal the portion of the program that was used for highways and for aviation-related purposes in the preceding year. Thus the money in the trust funds would still go to achieve the general purposes for which the funds were established. General funds would pay for all other transportation activities.

The National System of Interstate and Defense Highways would not be included in this Special Revenue Sharing Program. This 42,500-mile system is now 74 percent finished and is scheduled for completion in 1978. The Interstate highways that have been built under this program have helped to open America to new dimensions of intercity travel. The system has advanced the cause of highway safety while at the same time permitting unparalleled individual mobility. In my judgment, it would not be in the national interest to alter the basic funding mechanism for the construction of this system at this time.

Although all Special Revenue Sharing funds would be assigned to governmental units, the recipient government could, in turn, channel the funds to private enterprises which meet public transportation needs. This would include the many urban bus systems that are privately owned and operated.

No State or local matching funds would be required under this program. The Federal Government would not rigidly apportion funds among a variety of narrow transportation programs nor would it approve specific local projects. Thus the Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation would stimulate State and local governments to take the initiative in meeting transportation needs, to experiment with new and more

creative projects, to listen to local opinion and to mobilize local energies which are often stifled under present arrangements.

I would emphasize in addition that each State would receive at least as much money from the new Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation as it has been receiving under the current categorical grant programs. Each State would thus be "held harmless" against any reduction in the overall level of support it receives from programs which become a part of this Special Revenue Sharing fund.

TWO FUND ELEMENTS

The Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation would consist of two elements, one for General Transportation activities and one for Mass Transit Capital Investment.

GENERAL TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The General Transportation element would total \$2.041 billion for the first full year of revenue sharing. This money could be spent for the planning, construction, acquisition, improvement, operation and maintenance of a broad spectrum of transportation systems and services, including highway, aviation and mass transit.

The money in this General Transportation element would be distributed in the following manner: Ten percent would be allocated among the States and localities at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation. This money would be used to encourage planning, to fund research development and demonstration projects, and to finance other activities related to the development and implementation of national transportation objectives.

The remaining 90 percent of this General Transportation element would be allocated to the States according to the following four-part formula: 25 percent of this remainder would be distributed according to the ratio of each State's total population to the total population of the United States; 35 percent would go to States according to the ratio of their population in urban places (over 2,500 in population) to the Nation's total population in urban places; 20 percent would be given out according to the ratio of the geographic area of each State to the total area of the United States; and the remaining 20 percent would be allocated according to the ratio of each State's star and rural post route mileage to the total of that mileage in the country.

This formula, which resembles formulas which are used under current categorical grants, would provide the best means for distributing Special Revenue Sharing funds in a similar pattern as under the present system. In addition to the guarantee that it would be held harmless against any reduction in support, each State would be guaranteed a minimum allocation of one-half of one percent of this General Transportation element.

As I have noted above, a percentage of the General Transportation element would be distributed among the States

according to their share of the Nation's population that lives in urban areas. Each State would be required to pass along its share of *this* money directly to its communities of more than 2,500 persons to spend as their local governments think best. If we are to restore confidence in local government then we must give public officials at the local level a reasonable opportunity to make sound plans and courageous investment decisions. This means that they must be able to rely upon a certain amount of funding. Our "pass-through" formula is designed to provide this needed assurance.

#### MASS TRANSIT CAPITAL INVESTMENT ELEMENT

The second part of the new Special Revenue Sharing fund is the Mass Transit Capital Investment element—which would total \$525 million for the first full year. This money would be distributed to each State according to its share of the Nation's population that lives in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA). An SMSA is defined as an area which contains a central city or cities with an aggregate population of 50,000 or more and those surrounding counties which have a metropolitan character and are socially and economically integrated with the central city. There are 247 such areas in the United States.

Eighty percent of the funds in this Mass Transit Capital Investment element would be distributed according to each State's share of the Nation's population that lives in SMSA's of *over one million persons*. The remaining 20 percent would be allocated according to each State's share of the Nation's population that lives in SMSA's of *less than one million persons*. Every State would be guaranteed a minimum allocation of \$250,000.

In the Mass Transit Capital Investment element as in the General Transportation fund element, I propose that a portion of the funds be passed through the States directly to urban areas. Of the 80 percent distributed to States on the basis of SMSA's of more than one million in population, I proposed that half go directly to the local governments within these SMSA's to spend for mass transit purposes as they see fit. The other half of this money would also have to be spent within these same larger SMSA's, but it would be spent at the State's discretion. Currently, there are 33 SMSA's with more than a million persons in the United States and these are the areas that would automatically receive "pass-through" funds for Mass Transit Capital Investment.

In 1969, I submitted to the Congress a proposal for establishing an Urban Mass Transportation Assistance program. The passage of that legislation helped to create a significant momentum for the rejuvenation of public transit systems. I feel very strongly that this momentum must not be lost and that is why I propose that a part of this new Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation be devoted to this purpose.

I believe that this Mass Transit Capital Investment element would assure

continued support and enthusiasm for mass transit initiatives. It would also provide fast relief for many systems which now suffer from inadequate equipment, allowing them to undertake the essential work of modernization without further delay.

#### COMBINING OLD AND NEW STRENGTHS

Special Revenue Sharing would strengthen our transportation efforts in many significant ways without sacrificing the strengths of our present programs. Any transportation project that is working well today could be continued, and in all probability expanded, under the new arrangements. While narrow grant categories would be eliminated, none of the programs which they now support need be discontinued if the State or locality believes they are worthwhile.

In recent years, governments at all levels—and private groups and individuals as well—have become more sensitive to problems such as transportation safety and the environmental impact of transportation. Our whole society can be proud, for example, of the fact that there were no fatalities from commercial airline accidents in the United States last year. We can be grateful, too, that despite increasing traffic on our highways, automobile fatalities in 1970 decreased significantly for the first time since 1958.

We have also become more alert to the effects which transportation has on the beauty of the landscape and the quality of the environment. Our traditional economic concerns have been complemented by our growing esthetic concerns and the result has been a strong effort at all levels of society to improve the quality of American life.

There is no reason why growing sensitivity on matters such as safety and environmental quality should not continue to grow under this new Special Revenue Sharing program. State and local governments, after all, have often been particularly responsive to citizen pressure in these areas and they have frequently acted as bold pioneers in meeting these concerns. I am confident that as more responsibility is given to governments closer to the people, the true and abiding interests of the people will be even better reflected in public policy decisions.

I would emphasize again, as I have in presenting each of my revenue sharing programs, that there could be no discrimination in the use of any of these monies. All of the funds included in this Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation would be subject to the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANNING

No transportation system—on the national, regional, or local level—can serve the public with maximum effectiveness unless there is a great deal of cooperative planning between various modes of conveyance and between various levels of government. A multitude of government jurisdictions, public authorities and private companies must learn to work closely together if our needs are to be

met in a comprehensive manner. The legislation I present to the Congress will therefore require that transportation plans be developed in coordination with the development plans prepared under my proposed Special Revenue Sharing Programs for Urban and Rural Community Development.

#### RECOGNIZING DIVERSITY

Just as each unique individual has unique transportation problems, so do cities, States, and other governmental jurisdictions. The single most important fact about our Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation is that it recognizes this diversity. It combines the resources of the Federal Government with the flexibility of State and local governments. It provides the best way to meet the problems which diversity implies by utilizing the energies which diversity produces.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 18, 1971.

#### DIVERSION OF DOT TRUST FUNDS

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate during this debate on a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Transportation to call attention of my colleagues that virtually every fixed-base operator in general aviation throughout America has registered his indignation over the diversion of aviation trust funds collected for capital improvements and spent for administration last year under the Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Act of 1970.

To many aircraft owners, to their friends, to employees around the many airports of America this action was a breach of trust and one which demands correction. Now, we are called upon to vote for an additional \$2,398,000,000 as a continuing deficiency appropriation for a Department that appears to be doing a less and less satisfactory job and I think Members would be interested in this matter. It is an outright breach of trust. The Department of Transportation dipped into the till to use for its administrative purposes the moneys that were collected under a law passed by this Congress and specifically earmarked for airways and airport improvements only.

Following is an excellent summation of this sorry case. It was prepared by Mr. Robert E. Monroe, congressional liaison officer for the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. I submit it today in the hopes that my colleagues will consider it well before just voting willy-nilly another vote by rote. A shrugging approval of this \$2¼ billion will be another step in the pell-mell road to ungovernability which seems to be in store for us. The patterns of voting about which I formerly addressed this House and which are apparent in this very debate today on the SST should not be continued in this Congress.

The article follows:

DIVERSION OF AVIATION TRUST FUND  
TAX REVENUES

P. L. 91-258, the Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Acts of 1970, as a study of the hearings, reports and debates will reveal, was justified and enacted because extensive capital investments were considered to be essential and needed to be made as quickly as possible to alleviate an existing crisis in air commerce and prevent it from becoming worse as air traffic continued to increase in the future.

Administration witnesses, as well as others, placed great emphasis on the need for immediate action to expand and improve the nation's aviation system.

Special taxes were imposed upon selected users of the airport and airway system to finance this expansion program and a trust fund was established to make sure that these special tax revenues were available and used for that purpose.

Since enactment of the law, the Administration has not followed through as it should. It has delayed action. It has managed to divert tax revenues from their intended purposes. And it has confused the issue as much as possible.

It is true that Section 208(f) (1) of the law is written in such a way that trust funds may be appropriated and expended for day-to-day routine expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration for administration, operations, maintenance, research and development, as well as for capital investments for expansion and improvements, but the approach pursued by the Administration is neither in full conformance with the entire language of the law or the spirit and rationale for its enactment.

Section 208(f) (1) (A) is the first of three subsections dealing with expenditures from the trust fund for aviation purposes. It specifically refers to "title I of this Act" and the reference is principally to Sections 13 and 14 which authorize expenditures.

Section 14 is particularly important since it contains the largest authorizations and states the ground rules for their application. Note that this language authorizes "not less than" \$250,000,000 and \$30,000,000 respectively, a total of \$280,000,000, for development of two categories of airports for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1975; "not less than \$250,000,000" for purchase, installation and improvement of airway facilities each year for the same years; and authorizes only "The balance of the moneys available in the trust fund" to be used for administrative, maintenance, operations, research and development expenses. (Emphasis supplied.)

In other words, at least \$530,000,000, more if needed, but at least that much, must be devoted to capital investment in airport development and airway facilities and only whatever amount remains may be used for routine purposes.

Thus, it appears to us that, Section 208 (f) (1) must be read and interpreted in the light of the requirements contained in Section 14. The Administration has not done this. Instead, it has relied solely upon the language of Section 208(f) (1) and imposed its own ideas, rather than those of the law, as to the amounts which should be allocated to the purposes set forth in subsections (A), (B) and (C) of that section. As a result, the basic objectives of the law have been frustrated and tax revenues intended for capital investment in airports and airway facilities have been diverted to finance routine expenses of the FAA.

The first application under this law went to Congress as a request (H. Doc. 91-408) for supplemental appropriations for F.Y. 1971, almost six months after the law was signed on May 21, 1970. This was not very expeditious action in response to what had been described as a "pressing crisis."

Parentetically, it must be noted that the regular Transportation appropriations bill (H.R. 17755) was already in process, had passed the House on May 21, 1970, still awaited action by the Senate, contained an appropriation of only \$190,000,000 for airway capital investment, and also, in prospect of enactment of P.L. 91-258, carried a provision which had the effect of limiting potential contract authority obligations for airport assistance to \$220,000,000, the amount which the 1971 Budget said would be requested if the airport-airway legislation and aviation user taxes were enacted. The Administration delayed and did not so request.

Instead, the supplemental message requested only \$10,000,000 for airport planning pursuant to Section 13 in contrast to the maximum allowable authorization of \$15,000,000.

With respect to airport development pursuant to Section 14, the message indicated that only \$100,000,000 of the \$840,000,000 authorized in contract authority would be used and requested only \$40,000,000 in contract liquidation cash instead of the \$280,000,000 authorized for such liquidations. Thus, in no case could the requirement for the use of "not less than" \$280,000,000 for airport development in F.Y. 1971 be met.

With respect to investment in airway facilities pursuant to Section 14, the message requested only \$36,000,000, in addition to the \$190,000,000 already in the regular bill, making a total of \$226,000,000, instead of the \$250,000,000 required by the "not less than" phrase.

The Administration proposed to use the difference between the amounts requested and the amounts required, \$284,000,000, for routine expenses. The message also completely restructured the appropriation accounts in a very confusing but hardly essential way.

Congress did not permit the FAA to completely restructure its accounts in the manner requested and limited diversion of trust funds appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1971 (P.L. 91-665) to \$6,000,000 in the routine operations account.

However, in dealing with the regular bill for Transportation Appropriations for 1971—which still has not been enacted, though operations are permitted until March 30, 1971 under the terms of a continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 1421) according to the compromises reached in the Conference (H. Rept. 91-1730)—Congress allowed diversion of another \$28,000,000 to finance anti-hijacking guards on airline aircraft; an activity which may be justifiable in itself but which does not seem to come within the scope of the activities authorized or intended by P.L. 91-258. Moreover, Congress denied an Administration request for a tax increase to cover the cost of these guards.

The second request under this law went to Congress January 29, 1971, in the President's Budget for F.Y. 1972. Again, the FAA restructured the appropriation accounts in the manner previously denied.

The Budget requests full funding of airport planning grants pursuant to Section 13 at the \$15,000,000 authorized.

With respect to airport development pursuant to Section 14 however, the Budget indicates that contract authority obligations will be administratively limited to \$205,000,000 and the request for liquidating cash for these contracts is only \$92,000,000. Again, the minimum requirement of "not less than" \$280,000,000 will not be satisfied unless Congress decrees otherwise.

With respect to airway capital investment pursuant to Section 14, the Budget requests \$274,000,000 which meets the minimum requirement and picks up the shortage from the previous year.

Thus, the total capital investment in airports, including airport planning grants, and

airways requested by the Budget amounts to \$381,000,000 in contrast to the minimum required of \$530,000,000 exclusive of airport planning.

The Budget requests that the entire balance of tax revenues in the trust fund be allocated to routine expenses.

The balance in the trust fund is substantial. Due to the treatment of the 1971 appropriations outlined above, the Budget shows a balance carried forward from 1971 of \$402,500,000 in user tax revenues. Trust fund revenues for 1972 from existing user taxes are estimated at \$673,000,000 making with the carry-over a total of \$1,075,500,000. The Budget also envisions enactment of the additional taxes to support anti-hijacking guards, previously denied, for another \$53,000,000. This addition would make a total of \$1,128,500,000 in tax revenues.

The Budget is clear that the Administration intends to exhaust the trust fund completely for it shows no ending balance for 1972. This means that \$1,128,500,000 minus \$381,000,000 or \$747,500,000 of user tax revenues is to be used for day-to-day operations and expenses of the FAA. It also means that \$188,000,000 which should have been used in 1972 alone for required capital investments in airport development will not be so used or preserved for such use.

If we aggregate the amounts for the two years, 1971 and 1972, we find the cumulative results even more abusive. As pointed out above, the law calls for minimum annual expenditures for airports and airways of \$280 and \$250 millions respectively, and if we add the \$15 millions for planning grants these total \$545 million per year or \$1,090 million for the two year period. Omitting the book-keeping recycling of previous appropriations, FAA will use only \$475 million for these purposes during the two year period while collections of existing user taxes will total \$1,247 million. The total diversion of funds which should be used for capital investment will amount to \$615 million. Even counting the amount appropriated from the general fund last year for airways investment, in order to place the best possible face on the entire capital investment program, the total capital investment in airport planning and development and airways facilities would only amount to \$677 million and the program would still be short of the total intended by \$413 million.

Further verification of this state of affairs is provided by the fact that in the 1971 Supplemental request, the FAA asked for an appropriation, which was denied, from general funds to the trust fund of \$576,989,000 to make up the difference between trust fund tax revenues and what the FAA intended to spend from the trust fund, whereas in the 1972 Budget the request is for only \$293,144,000 for this purpose even though the intended spending level is some \$200,000,000 higher.

It is clearly apparent that aviation trust fund tax revenues have been diverted from the purposes intended by the law which imposed those taxes and that the DOT/FAA are incorrect in their view of the matter. It is also apparent that the Administration intends to pursue this course unless prevented from doing so by Congress.

If the Administration will not administer the law in the manner intended, the law and its accompanying taxes should be repealed.

**NEED FOR DEVELOPING A METHOD  
OF EXAMINING THE CROSS  
IMPACT OF MANY PROGRAMS  
ENACTED IN CONGRESS**

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

Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. Speaker, recently, an incident in my district demonstrated to me the need for developing a method of examining the cross impact of many of the programs we enact in Congress. This could be done either through a legislative or executive mechanism. I strongly suspect that in some cases one Government program cancels out the impact of another program. It also appears that one Government agency, working to implement its programs, can have a detrimental effect on other Government agencies and the overall well-being of the Nation and its economy.

The specific incident that brings this to mind concerns a manufacturer of raincoats in Boston. This case is of serious consequence in the Boston area because of the many people involved, but it is also important as an example of the complexities of our Government.

This company, Blauer Manufacturing, was located in Boston for many years, was a large manufacturer and had a skilled and stable labor force. The employer was under union contract with the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union for 30 years.

For the past several years, Blauer Manufacturing has been cutting down its Boston work force and opening up production facilities in other areas. Finally, they completely closed the Boston factory and terminated all of its workers. The move was a shift from an area of higher wages to an area of lower wages.

The reason I am discussing this particular case is that Blauer Manufacturing produced rainwear, a product which was purchased almost exclusively by various Government agencies. The largest purchases were made by the Defense Department. The purchase policy under which this rainwear was acquired is that of making contract awards to the lowest bidder.

Of course, we all support economy in Government, but this is false economy that ends up costing the Government more in unemployment compensation, lost taxes, and training and retraining programs. Whatever benefits this firm may have derived from the move away from the Boston area, and whatever harm to the work force, the immediate cost to the Government is obvious. Whereas the Defense Department as a separate entity may have economized, Government as a whole is losing a great deal more than these small and illusionary savings. Unemployment compensation has to be paid to those people who lose their jobs, and in this period of high unemployment, it seems likely that other jobs will not be easily found.

During this period of decreased earning or no earnings, the Government loses revenue because these former taxpayers no longer have income on which to be taxed. There are various manpower programs for which many of these people would be eligible and of course that will cost money for job training in new fields.

All levels of government, local, State, and Federal, will lose revenue because of this move, and it is all caused by a Gov-

ernment policy that is supposed to save money—that is awarding contracts to the lowest bidder. But if we award these contracts without examining the practices of a firm that may be injurious to a local community or to the national economy, we are perhaps not pursuing the most economically feasible course. By making cost the sole factor, we are, unwittingly, encouraging firms to move from higher to lower wage areas, to pursue policies that injure employees, create unemployment, and multiply many costs of local, State, and Federal Government.

The purpose of this policy is to save money, but if one agency of Government saves money by multiplying other costs of Government and the demands on other agencies' resources, then the people and its Government as a whole have not saved money.

With this particular example very much in mind, but also with an eye to the ramifications of this practice multiplied all over the country, I suggest that the Congress of the United States should make a much more thorough investigation of the purchasing policies of the Department of Defense. What should be taken into consideration is how those policies affect unemployment and indirect costs to Government.

When unemployment is increasing in so many parts of the Nation, in so many sectors of the economy, I think it is imperative that we begin this now. I think what we are seeing is a policy that removes jobs from one area of the country and takes them to another. There are no new jobs created, and if the move is for lower wages, tax money is lost as well as the loss from unemployment compensation and other benefits.

I think it is extremely important that we do not accept apparent savings that may indeed be actual losses.

#### REPRESENTATIVE CEDERBERG COSPONSORS LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD ENCOURAGE STATES TO ESTABLISH ABANDONED AUTOMOBILE REMOVAL PROGRAM

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 5646, legislation which would encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs. I believe this type of program is needed now and I want to take these few minutes to expand on the provisions of this measure and to describe how it can help solve a very difficult environmental problem.

In a recent flight over one of the small counties in my congressional district, approximately 2,500 to 3,000 derelict automobiles were spotted. Undoubtedly there were many, many more which were not located due to deep snow. This situation is not unique to Michigan or Mecosta County. I have driven through many parts of the United States and these

heaps of metal stick out like a sore thumb. This littering of the American landscape can no longer be tolerated as it is a constant drain on our natural resources.

The crux of the problem is that our smaller counties and cities throughout the Nation do not have the funds to finance a project of the magnitude it would take to clear away these eyesores. I believe Mecosta County is typical of many others across the Nation whose citizens have recognized the problem and want to do something about it. The citizens of this county have made a valiant effort to solve the problem on the local level, with local funds; however, in spite of their hard work, they are unable to continue the project due to the lack of funds.

In relating their story I hope that I can demonstrate the need for action on H.R. 5646. Mecosta County is a rural county of native beauty, of splendid streams and lakes which its citizens set out to protect. Their stated goal was, "Getting these junked vehicles back into productive use via the scrap route."

Appeals were made through local newspapers for public support and assistance. They employed 4-H groups, Boy Scouts, and other youth groups, setting a \$2 fee for every old car they could get county residents to donate to the cause. It was at this point that several legal problems arose: How to find the legal owner of the car and transfer the title to the State so that the junked car could be recycled. My bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe regulations for effective means of transferring titles of abandoned automobiles to a public agency or private business which will dispose of such automobiles.

Another major problem is the machinery that will be needed to crush the old cars into a compact unit, which is then loaded on a tilted bed winch truck and hauled to a commercial reclamation center where the metal would be reclaimed for further use. My legislation would offer rapid amortization tax benefits to scrap processors who install modern, more effective equipment with which to reduce old cars to reusable scrap. In this way the local units of government will not be strapped with the high cost of providing this type of machinery.

In the case to which I have been referring, the county had access to the recycling equipment but as the officials informed me, "We have the depot sites ready throughout the county but what we need is equipment to transport cars to these sites." H.R. 5646 provides that the State removal plan should include means for the prompt removal to scrap-processing facilities of all abandoned automobiles in the State.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress one more time that action on this legislation is absolutely necessary and that the need is not restricted to one area of the country. Passage of H.R. 5646 would greatly benefit not only individual districts but the Nation and its citizens as a whole.

**TO EVOKE DISCUSSION AND CLOSER STUDY OF A REVENUE-SHARING FORMULA**

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday—March 10—in a discussion of the administration's general revenue-sharing plan, the esteemed dean of the

California delegation (Mr. HOLIFIELD) included in his remarks a table which I had developed showing relative projected per capita allocations for cities within Los Angeles County.

This little study has caused a good deal of interest and, for this reason, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a slightly revised and more accurate version of what was a rather hastily prepared document designed to show broad comparisons more than fine details.

I think that the table has served its primary purpose, which is to evoke discussion and closer study of a revenue-sharing formula which results in glaring inequities such as are so readily evident. I welcome suggestions as to how these inequities can be eliminated if, in the end, we do adopt the administration formula substantially as it has been proposed.

The revised document follows:

**PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS UNDER THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S GENERAL REVENUE SHARING PLAN**

[Prepared by Congressman George E. Danielson (California, 29th)]

	Per capita allocation	Total allocation	1970 population	1960 median income		Per capita allocation	Total allocation	1970 population	1960 median income
County of Los Angeles.....	\$9.13	\$64,206,019	7,032,075	\$7,046	Sierra Madre.....	\$6.12	\$74,277	12,140	\$8,172
Commerce.....	47.78	503,444	10,536	5,827	South El Monte.....	5.82	78,266	13,443	4,834
Beverly Hills.....	24.30	811,871	33,416	11,977	Monterey Park.....	5.70	280,398	49,166	7,650
Long Beach.....	20.05	7,191,917	358,633	6,570	San Gabriel.....	5.60	163,323	29,176	7,814
Signal Hill.....	19.29	1,107,696	5,582	5,542	Claremont.....	5.59	131,089	23,464	8,188
El Segundo.....	19.17	299,479	15,620	7,783	Downey.....	5.35	472,828	88,445	8,265
Santa Fe Springs.....	19.15	282,446	14,750	6,986	West Covina.....	5.23	355,537	68,034	8,580
Culver City.....	15.90	493,526	31,035	7,862	Glendora.....	5.08	159,226	31,349	7,557
Santa Monica.....	13.78	1,216,458	88,289	6,845	Compton.....	5.06	398,012	78,611	6,256
Los Angeles.....	12.33	34,721,456	2,816,061	6,896	El Monte.....	4.98	348,099	69,837	6,559
Pasadena.....	12.31	1,394,982	113,327	6,922	Rolling Hills Estates.....	4.90	29,538	6,027	10,000
Burbank.....	11.54	1,025,646	88,871	7,757	La Verne.....	4.84	62,742	12,965	6,013
Redondo Beach.....	10.40	583,003	56,075	6,880	Bell.....	4.70	102,521	21,836	6,438
San Fernando.....	9.71	160,843	16,571	6,270	Lynwood.....	3.90	169,036	43,353	7,182
San Marino.....	9.29	131,736	14,177	16,728	Maywood.....	3.63	61,772	16,996	5,951
Covina.....	9.11	276,732	30,380	7,865	Lakewood.....	3.15	261,316	82,973	7,600
Alhambra.....	8.82	547,751	62,125	7,185	Bellflower.....	3.02	155,561	51,454	6,834
South Pasadena.....	8.70	199,868	22,979	8,245	Duarte.....	2.84	42,475	14,981	6,810
Montebello.....	8.52	364,808	42,807	7,351	Palmdale.....	2.72	23,178	8,511	7,325
Pomona.....	8.45	738,348	87,384	6,585	Paramount.....	2.60	90,232	34,734	6,230
Monrovia.....	8.35	250,752	30,015	6,630	Baldwin Park.....	2.57	121,711	47,285	6,186
Glendale.....	8.19	1,086,770	132,752	7,563	Pico Rivera.....	2.52	136,372	54,170	7,069
Arcadia.....	8.04	344,649	42,868	9,526	La Mirada.....	2.34	72,013	30,808	.....
Huntington Park.....	7.98	269,186	33,744	6,285	La Puente.....	2.31	71,690	31,092	6,718
Inglewood.....	7.84	705,899	89,985	7,764	Norwalk.....	2.11	193,616	91,827	7,015
Hawthorne.....	7.78	414,937	53,304	7,645	Lawndale.....	1.89	46,895	24,825	6,303
Torrance.....	7.54	1,015,296	134,584	8,050	Artesia.....	1.87	27,598	14,757	5,732
Azusa.....	7.39	186,393	25,217	6,501	Rosemead.....	1.81	74,169	40,972	6,924
Whittier.....	6.87	500,857	72,863	7,740	Hawaiian Gardens.....	1.73	15,200	8,811	.....
Manhattan Beach.....	6.86	242,343	35,352	8,289	Bell Gardens.....	1.71	50,021	29,308	5,567
Gardena.....	6.82	279,643	41,021	7,741	San Dimas.....	1.67	26,196	15,692	.....
Hermosa Beach.....	6.72	116,967	17,412	7,050	Lomita.....	1.64	32,449	19,784	6,194
Palos Verdes Estates.....	6.64	90,555	13,641	10,000	Temple City.....	1.42	42,259	29,673	7,782
South Gate.....	6.24	355,214	56,909	6,892	Cudahy.....	1.31	22,315	16,998	.....

**ARMS LIMITATION IN LATIN AMERICA**

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, according to some observers, newspaper readers in Washington are better informed and more exacting than media audiences in some other urban centers of our country. They are also exposed to more bad news.

It is for that reason that Mr. Louis H. Diuguid's story in yesterday morning's edition of the Washington Post provided such a refreshing and exciting contrast to the news which we are accustomed to digesting with our breakfast coffee.

The story, filed in Bogotá, Colombia, describes the Colombian President's proposal for an OAS review of military expenditures in Latin America with a view to arriving at a regional arms limitation agreement.

This is exciting news, indeed; for if our neighbors to the south can demonstrate self-restraint and self-denial in the area of military spending, could not their example become the turning point in the world armaments race?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that President Misael Pastrana Borrero is to be commended for his daring proposals—and the foreign ministers of our hemisphere, who will be meeting next month in San Jose, Costa Rica, should be urged to give

him the thorough consideration that they deserve.

The Colombian proposal singles out three areas of military expenditures for particular study of the OAS system. They include—

First, the influence of unnecessary military spending on economic and social development of the countries of our hemisphere;

Second, expenditures on arms which, because of their excessive cost and clearly offensive nature, are disproportionate to the requirements of internal security and could, by common agreement, be eliminated; and

Third, the adoption of the principle of proportionality between the arms, territorial area, population, and economic potential on the one hand, and the basic requirements of national security on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, these proposals may be said to flow from, and certainly are consistent with, the declaration of the Presidents of the Americas, drawn up at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in 1967.

In my view, they are to be welcomed and supported.

I sincerely hope that the U.S. delegation to the forthcoming meeting of the OAS General Assembly will address itself to this matter with the energy, enthusiasm and openmindedness it deserves.

For the information of my colleagues, I

should like to place in the RECORD a translation of the Spanish text of the Colombian arms control proposal.

**MEMORANDUM FROM THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF COLOMBIA**

1. The Declaration of the Presidents of America drawn up at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in 1967 dealt amply with the problem of the Latin American Common Market, the incorporation into our hemisphere of the benefits of scientific and technological progress, and the fundamental role of the utilization of all resources in order to promote economic and social development.

2. The presidents of America also expressed "their intention to limit military expenditures in proportion to the actual demands of national security in accordance with each country's constitutional provisions, avoiding those expenditures that are not indispensable for the performance of the specific duties of the armed forces and, where pertinent, of international commitments that obligate their respective governments."

3. The foregoing statement was the object of the recommendation contained in chapter VI of the declaration of Punta del Este concerning the elimination of unnecessary military expenditures.

4. Colombia feels that the moment has come to study measures that will implement the intentions of the presidents of America. Unquestionably, this is not a case of speaking of disarming Latin America, in view of the internal security needs of each country, as well as the commitments of mutual assistance deriving for each of them from the obligations of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Rio, but is rather a

matter of studying the problem of unnecessary military expenditures with relation to:

A. The influence of unnecessary military expenses on economic and social development;

B. Arms which, because of their excessive cost and clearly offensive nature, are disproportionate to internal security, could, by common accords, be eliminated.

C. The adoption of a criterion of proportionality between the arms, territorial area, population, and economic potential on the one hand, and the basic requirements of national security on the other hand.

Undoubtedly, these questions cannot be examined immediately without a thorough study of the problem, and for that purpose it would be advisable to establish a special committee, on which all the member states of the Inter-American system would be represented and which would submit specific proposals to the regular general assembly of the Organization of American States next year.

5. To this end, Colombia wishes to place the following topic before the regular general assembly of the Organization of American States, to be held in San Jose, Costa Rica, beginning April 14 of this year: "Study of measures designed to implement chapter VI of the Declaration of the Presidents of America, issued at Punta Del Este, Uruguay, in 1967, for the elimination of unnecessary military expenditures."

6. At the same time, Colombia believes that it is essential to obtain the fullest possible cooperation from all the states forming part of the Inter-American system to support the inclusion of the topic in the agenda of the Inter-American general assembly and to study gradually the measures that will contribute to the implementation of the purposes of the Presidents of America concerning the elimination of unnecessary military expenditures in Latin America, as an encouraging factor for peace and economic and social development.

7. Colombia is earnestly engaged in an undertaking for social progress and economic development and does not wish to invest in arms any more than is needed to meet its real requirements for national security. Hence, it is ready to cooperate with the member states of the inter-American system in studying the most appropriate procedures and solutions, in harmony with the desire of the nations of this Hemisphere to improve their present standards of living.

8. This proposal is consistent with Colombia's steadfast adherence to the principles of international law and, especially, the free determination of peoples, and its fervent desire always to utilize the procedures of peaceful settlement of international differences. In its judgment, the strengthening of the inter-American system requires an irrevocable commitment to the maintenance of peace in the Americas and a greater effort to limit unnecessary military expenditures that endanger economic and social development.

9. Colombia awaits with interest the replies or comments that the governments of the member states of the regional organization may wish to make on the proposal for the presentation and discussion of the aforementioned topic, as set forth in this memorandum.

#### LEGISLATION TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT A PERSON CAN EARN AND STILL OBTAIN SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing legislation which would remove the limits on the amount a person can earn as wages and still obtain social security benefits. My bill would also provide that once a person reaches 65 and has paid into social security for at least 30 years, no social security taxes will be deducted from his pay.

Under the present law, one can earn as wages a maximum of \$1,680 without a reduction in social security payments. Earned income above that figure decreases one's benefits. One dollar in benefits is withheld for every \$2 that is earned between \$1,680 and \$2,880 but above \$2,880, \$1 in benefits is withheld for each dollar in earnings.

As you know, a person must work for 30 years in order to be eligible for full social security benefits. Many of our older citizens have worked for these 30 years but wish to continue to work on a full- or part-time basis. Yet do they not deserve to receive their social security benefits?

In 1936, when the Social Security Act was passed, the old age survivor's insurance program was established. The original concept was that this was to be an insurance program in order to provide supplemental income for our senior citizens. If this is to be an insurance program similar to that which is available in private industry, the same principles of equity should apply. Thus, the income limitation should be removed.

In private industry or even the military, a person can retire and continue to receive earned income from some endeavor without any reduction in one's benefits. This is a matter of equity which they have built up over numerous years of service.

In researching the reasons for the original implementation of this limit, I found the economic conditions of the time to be the cause. The Government was trying to encourage our older citizens to retire and make room in the labor market for younger men. In a time of depression, this was considered a very feasible way to reduce high unemployment. These conditions no longer exist today. In many of our industries, the experience and knowledge of our senior citizens would be appreciated and is needed. Furthermore, many of our senior citizens feel that they should not be forced to live out their last years in idle complacency when they would rather work and attempt to do something useful.

Another great inequity which is imposed on our older citizens is that if they choose to continue to work even though they paid into social security for over 30 years, they must continue to pay social security taxes on the money they earn. Thus, the working elderly are being discriminated against on two counts. In my opinion, this tax is equal to a "penalty tax."

Most of these elderly who are still working have been paying into social security since its inception. Thus, every month they continue to work, they reduce the Federal Government's liability

to provide them with the benefits they more than deserve.

Therefore, as part of the legislation which I am introducing, I have included a provision which would prevent social security taxes from being deducted from the pay of a person who has reached 65 and has paid into social security for at least 30 years.

This House, last year, passed a bill which would guarantee an annual income to all citizens whether or not they wish to work. I cannot see how we can logically guarantee an income to people who may refuse to work and then turn around and penalize those who have worked for over 30 years in order to receive their full social security benefits.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my bill is promptly enacted into law.

#### DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE REORGANIZED

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Democratic steering committee held its organization meeting this afternoon. Representative RAY J. MADDEN was reelected as chairman while Representative SPARK M. MATSUNAGA was reelected secretary. John E. Barriere was reappointed as executive director.

The committee voted to hold regular meetings during the 92d Congress on the first and third Wednesdays of the month at 2 p.m.

The committee agreed unanimously that in the future the committee would keep in continuous contact with the chairmen of the various legislative committees so as to assist the majority leadership in better apprising the Democratic Members of the House as to content and status of the legislative program.

#### SUPPORT FOR ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, support for the Atlantic Union Resolution has reached a record high. For the first time since the resolution was introduced over 20 years ago, the number of sponsors in the House of Representatives has topped 100. The additional resolution which I am introducing today is sponsored by 21 Members of the House. They are:

WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

BOB BERGLAND, Democrat of Minnesota.

HUGH L. CAREY, Democrat of New York.

FRANK M. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican of Pennsylvania.

HAMILTON FISH, JR., Republican of New York.

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Democrat of Washington.

WILLIAM D. FORD, Democrat of Michigan.

MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat of Michigan.

JAMES M. HANLEY, Democrat of New York.

JAMES HARVEY, Republican of Michigan.

TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Democrat of Massachusetts.

JOHN MELCHER, Democrat of Montana.

LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat of Michigan.

ROBERT N. C. NIX, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat of Florida.

OGDEN R. REID, Republican of New York.

PHILIP E. RUPPE, Republican of Michigan.

B. F. SISK, Democrat of California.

HENRY P. SMITH III, Republican of New York.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat of New York.

This brings to 105 the total number of Representatives who have this year co-sponsored identical resolutions urging the exploration of Atlantic Union.

I am confident the list will lengthen. In ensuing days, I anticipate that additional resolutions will be introduced by other Members. In addition, several Members have informed me that, while they have not become sponsors of the resolution, it has their support and will receive their vote.

Support for Atlantic Union also is growing across the Nation. On February 26, 1971. The Des Moines Register editorialized:

The major arguments for Atlantic union have been political and economic. It could be a gigantic nucleus of political strength. It could be a huge co-prosperity sphere as a common market with a single currency, a single banking system and union-wide opportunities for employment and sales and purchases.

Representative Jim Wright (D-Tex) has also added a new argument. The Atlantic countries consume 80 per cent of the world's annual production and cause about 80 per cent of the world's population. "If we can find an effective way to attack these problems together," he said, "there is much that we can do for the future of the human race; but it cannot be done through any existing institution."

The Register reminded its readers that:

President Nixon in 1966 (then a private citizen) made a strong statement in support of a very similar resolution to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. "It is fitting," said Citizen Richard Nixon on September 1, 1966, "that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be the main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations."

The Register then asked rhetorically:

Does President Nixon in 1971 still see the issue as Citizen Nixon did in 1966?

The Cincinnati Enquirer, which has spoken out in the past in favor of the Atlantic Union resolution, did so again on March 11, 1971, and that editorial follows:

ATLANTIC UNION—AGAIN

There is no longer a great deal of news value in the introduction of the Atlantic Union resolution in Congress. It has occurred in every congressional session since 1949. The news lies in the circumstance that each year finds a larger and more broadly based group of legislators supporting the resolution.

The original sponsor was Sen. Estes Kefauver (D-Tenn.), who later became the Democratic Party's vice-presidential nominee in 1956. This year no fewer than 71 representatives are urging favorable congressional action. They come from both parties, from 25 states and from every region of the country. Ohioans among the sponsors are Reps. Charles A. Mosher (R) and Thomas L. Ashley (D).

In essence, the Atlantic Union resolution calls for the creation of an Atlantic Union delegation of 18 eminent Americans to meet with similar delegations from the other nation identified with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Together the Atlantic Union delegates, in the language of the resolution, would explore the possibility of agreement on:

"A declaration that the goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union.

"A timetable for the transition to this goal.

"Democratic institutions to expedite the necessary stages and achieve the objective in time to save their citizens from another war or depression, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought free people in the past."

Any plan devised by such an assemblage of delegates from the Atlantic nations, of course, would be subject to approval by the constitutional processes of the nations involved.

The Atlantic Union idea had its origins in the fertile, creative mind of Clarence K. Streit, who, during the span between World Wars I and II, covered the League of Nations for the New York Times. As the menace of Nazi Germany grew unchecked, Mr. Streit was struck by the manner in which the Western democracies were dissipating their strength and influence by failing to act together. The product of his concern was a book, "Union Now." Later when Hitler had overrun most of Europe, he produced another volume, "Union Now with Britain."

The supporters of the Atlantic Union idea see an arresting parallel between the democracies of the contemporary world and the individual states of the United States in the years immediately following the revolution—states that were bound together by nothing more than a "league of friendship." Only when their freedom was imperiled by internal quarrels and external threats did they see the prudence of establishing a federal union to make them one nation. The federal-union idea became, in consequence, the United States' most distinctive contribution to the world of political thought.

It seems only logical that there should now be a formal effort to determine whether the same principle has any applicability to today's world.

The Atlantic Union resolution, which has earned the support of political figures ranking from former Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy (DFL-Minn.) to President Nixon and from Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York to Sen. Barry M. Goldwater (R-Ariz.), opens doors the free world can ill afford to see remain closed.

YATES AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point a telegram from Michigan's Governor, William G. Milliken, in support of the Yates amendment. The telegram follows:

LANSING, MICH.,  
March 18, 1971.

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I understand the debate and vote on the Supersonic Transport will be coming up shortly in Congress. Although many of the environmental questions now appear to have answers, most will take large additional sums of money and research. The SST program is clearly one of misplaced priorities for limited tax dollars. There is a much greater need for research and development on short take-off and landing aircraft and rapid transit systems which would provide an equal number of jobs in our economy. I am opposed to further spending for SST development at this time and therefore urge you to vote yes on the Yates amendment.

Gov. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,  
State of Michigan.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post last Tuesday joined the chorus of those complaining about recent improvements made in the food stamp program jointly by the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I think the Congress should be aware of some key facts involved in this situation so that the progress the food stamp administrators have made is not obscured by well-intentioned, but misleading news stories and editorial writers.

Following a joint request by the Food and Nutrition Service—the agency within the Department of Agriculture which administers the food stamp program—and the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources, the Agriculture Department's Office of Inspector General conducted a special audit of the District of Columbia program. Both agencies were concerned about long delays involved in the certification process and the very high number of irregularities incurred in over-the-counter issuances of authorizations to purchase food stamps.

The auditors quickly became aware that significant numbers of recipients were obtaining duplicate authorization cards and, therefore, multiple issuances of food stamps. In June of last year alone, the overissuance of food stamps in the District of Columbia approximated \$50,000. Based on that information, the program administrators clearly were obli-

gated to take corrective actions. After lengthy exploration of a variety of alternatives, Federal and District of Columbia officials agreed on the new system which became effective February 1.

The new system is designed to provide the card needed to buy stamps within 3 days. A new application is checked the evening of the same day it is received to insure that the applicant is not already participating in the program. The food stamp authorization card is mailed the next morning. In emergency cases where the processing and mailing delay will create hardship, the District provides a small cash allotment to cover the period until the authorization card is received. During the first month of the new system, these emergency payments amounted to a little over \$5,000. The early estimate of \$33,000 per month erroneously repeated as fact by the Post was obviously grossly overstated.

Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources claims that this is the perfect system. Continuing efforts are being made to improve the current process, and a major project has been initiated to establish a model food stamp program within the District. One thing is clear, however: The current system is a vast improvement over the previous one, and the efforts of community leaders should be directed toward supporting and accelerating the positive steps which are being taken.

Finally, the Post editorial suggests that the distribution of free food demonstrates that large numbers of people are going hungry. It seems to me more likely it demonstrates that one can always find a market for free goods.

#### EXTENDING LIFE OF REGIONAL COMMISSIONS UNDER PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. RUPPE, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to extend the life of the five regional commissions originally created under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. These commissions are: The Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, the Four Corners Regional Commission, the Ozarks Regional Commission, the New England Regional Commission, and the Coastal Plains Regional Commission. The current authorization for these commissions will expire on June 30 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has offered the Nation a comprehensive program of Special Revenue Sharing for Rural Community Development. I laud the President's concern and effort. I believe he is the first President to concentrate national efforts to stem the migration from rural America to the urban centers and to give this vast segment of the Nation equal opportunity for better jobs, better education, and improved com-

munity environment. Certainly, any success we realize in meeting the urban crisis will necessarily entail the concurrent strengthening of our nonurban economy.

I support the President's program for rural America. By sharing Federal resources with the State and local governments, the President will have broadened the scope of aid to rural communities and families. At the same time, we will have given those States and communities enough flexibility to deal with local problems more effectively.

My bill today will add to the President's program the Regional Commissions. I do not believe that these commissions are at all incompatible with the concept of Special Revenue Sharing. These commissions, including the Appalachia Regional Commission, were created because the Congress recognized that special problems existed in certain identifiable areas. These problems were not confined to single States, and they were of such magnitude that they require a multi-State approach, including multi-State or regional planning, and special or supplemental resources over and beyond those already available under existing Federal and State programs.

I believe that those special problem areas still exist, and that Congress, in establishing a comprehensive program for all of rural America, must take particular account of these economically lagging areas. I am convinced that these regions still require the special consideration that Congress gave them in 1965.

In fact, the regional commissions as they exist today constitute a viable form of Federal revenue sharing. They utilize Federal funds to provide better regional planning and to augment existing programs within their prescribed areas. Decisions on the use of these Federal funds are not made in Washington. Rather, these decisions are made by the Governors of the States involved, who are regional cochairmen. Not only are these decisions made at the State level, they are greatly facilitated by the built-in flexibility which the Congress envisioned in establishing the commissions. This, incidentally, is the same kind of flexibility to which President Nixon addressed himself in his Rural Community Development message to the Congress.

There is a key provision of the regional commission authorization which I would like to discuss here. This is known as "maintenance of effort." Briefly, it states that commission resources are not provided to replace existing State and Federal programs, but to augment them. This is the key to solving regional problems. These regions have been singled out for special attention. The regional commissions were not created to solve those special problems all alone. They were created to add to the regular and Federal effort regional planning and supplemental funding capabilities. Therefore, I find nothing in the retention of the regional commissions which is inconsistent with the President's Special Revenue Sharing approach. The States, in President Nixon's program, will assume the responsibility for all the major Federal

efforts to help rural communities. The regional commissions, as they have done in the past, would add to the efforts generated by the various States. They would also assist those States which share similar problems with other States in a given region by assuming responsibility for multi-State planning.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the Senate acted to extend the authorization for the Appalachia Regional Commission, as well as the five so-called title V regions. I do not question the decision to continue the Appalachia Commission; I fully expect that it will be authorized by the 92d Congress. Yet, if we are to continue the Appalachia program recognizing our special responsibilities to that area, then I believe the other 5 regional commissions, which have particular problems of their own, deserve no less attention by the Congress. Not only must we in the House act to extend the lives of these commissions; we must, at long last, fund them adequately so that they can carry out their assigned tasks within the designated areas.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit the text of my bill to extend the authorization of the title V regional commissions.

A bill to extend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for two additional years

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$255,000,000."*

#### SUPPORT GROWS FOR STUDY OF NATION'S ENERGY PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my House Joint Resolution to establish a Select House Committee to study the Nation's energy problems. The text of the resolution follows the conclusion of my remarks.

I am particularly pleased to be able to report that joining with me in co-sponsorship of the Energy Study Resolution are 94 of our colleagues.

The names of these cosponsors will appear in that portion of today's Record devoted to the introduction of new legislation. Therefore, I will not crowd the Record at this point by including their names.

However, it should be noted that this is not regional or partisan groups. It is a bipartisan expression of support extending from Maine to California and from Michigan to Mississippi.

This is gratifying but not surprising because almost every section of the Nation faces the continued threat of power

shortages during the peak load periods which are coming up this summer.

In fact, the Federal Power Commission warns:

Some areas of the country may experience power supply shortages this coming summer as a result of inadequate installed capacity to meet forecasted summer peak loads.

This is quoted from the FPC's Preliminary Reports on Summer 1971 Electric Load-Supply Situation which was released February 22.

This report goes on to state:

Reports filed with the Federal Power Commission by the Nation's major electric utility systems and pools indicate that some areas of the country may experience tight power supply problems during this coming summer as a result of inadequate installed capacity to meet forecasted summer peak loads.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the expected demands on our Nation's electric power generating capacity are going to be greater, in all probability, than existing capacity can provide. This means, according to the FPC, if everything goes well and there are no breakdowns, shortages of fuel, or unexpected eventualities, then we may just squeak by this summer.

It also means that in all probability there are going to be blackouts, brownouts, power cutbacks, and reductions such as were experienced this past winter, particularly in the New York metropolitan area, simply because everything did not go well and eventualities did occur.

Just what is the outlook for this summer? Well, on a region-by-region basis, it looks something like this, according to the Federal Power Commission.

#### Northeast region:

The Power supply of the Northeast Region appears to be better than last summer, however, conditions are considered to be tight.

#### East central region:

This region has less than desirable reserves and some utilities or pools may face a tight supply situation this summer if an appreciable amount of the 3,748 megawatts of new capacity scheduled for service before the end of May is delayed.

#### Southeast region:

The reserves of this area are less than desirable . . .

#### West central region:

This region has less than desired reserves, but the addition of 867 megawatts scheduled for June and July should raise the reserve margin to 6,551 megawatts or 17.7 percent. A number of areas in the region have low reserves and problems could develop if some large units were to be forced out of service.

#### South central region:

The load-supply situation of the Region for the coming summer appears to be satisfactory . . .

**West region:** Without quoting from the FPC report, the situation for the west region for the summer appears to be good.

Thus, we can see that far more than half the people of this Nation could face the threat of serious power shortages this coming summer.

The reason for all this, according to the Federal Power Commission, is a shortage of adequate generating capacity to meet peak demand.

This is a major national energy problem and by itself it would be worthy of immediate attention.

But this is just one of many, many problems existing in the national energy picture today. These problems grow more numerous and more complex with each passing season.

There is the problem of environmental integrity and of pollution as they relate to power production.

There are the problems of power fuel resources and how they can and should best be utilized in the production of power for our immediate needs today, our intermediate needs of tomorrow and our long-range requirements in the next and following generations.

There are the problems of financing new power facilities and the distribution of the power which these facilities will produce.

There is the problem of financing the research required to enable us to learn to better manage our power production and pollution and to devise methods to reach our objective of low-cost electricity and high-quality environment.

There is the problem of assuring an adequate and dependable long-range, low-cost supply of power fuels as well as the means and methods of transporting them to power production facilities.

There is the problem of ownership of power fuel resources and the necessity of maintaining a viable and financially strong and independent power fuel industry.

We are going to have to face these problems and either solve or alleviate them because over the next 20 years our power demands are going to be tremendous.

Over the next 20 years America is going to increase its electric energy appetite by 248 percent.

To meet this demand our electric utility industry must quadruple its existing capacity requiring the addition of nearly 1 billion kilowatts.

These problems cannot be solved nor will these demands be met without the help of the Federal Government and the Congress.

That is why I propose the establishment of this Select Committee to investigate the energy resources of the United States.

Right here I would like to restate and emphasize two points I stressed when this resolution was first introduced earlier this year.

First, this is not a witch hunt. It would not be the purpose of the Committee or study to seek out and hold up for public scorn some preconceived villain or some fabricated strawman. What we are after and what is demanded is a clear picture of the condition of our national energy capabilities today and how they must be expanded, reshaped and modernized to meet the demands of the future.

Second, and this is of paramount importance, it would be my intent to have this Committee complete its work and re-

port back to this body within 2 years. Once that report was made, I can foresee no reason at this time for the continued existence of the Committee and would recommend that it be terminated.

Mr. Speaker, the Members co-sponsoring this resolution today represent somewhere between 40 and 50 million Americans. They each recognize the need for this Committee and the work which it would undertake.

The so-called "energy crisis" in America has been apparent for almost a year now but what has or is being done?

There have been proposals for Commissions. There have been proposals for studies. There have been demands for investigations and there have been outraged calls for antitrust actions.

Many proposals and suggestions have been offered but like the weather, everyone complains about the energy crisis but no one seems to be able to do much about it.

The primary reason for this, I believe, is that too many agencies and bodies have jurisdiction over some portion of the problem but no one body has overall jurisdiction. This is perhaps as it should be for administrative purposes and I have no quarrel to offer in this regard.

However, for purposes of providing an overall in-depth study of the energy resources of the Nation, these able but dispersed jurisdictions simply are not oriented, staffed, or constituted to undertake such a task.

Thus, the need for and task of a short-term select committee to investigate the Nation's energy resources; to provide this body with a full, factual and fair report upon which our various standing committees could draw in working toward a common goal for the future to insure and assure that we will have the energy capacity and energy resources required to meet our power needs of tomorrow and achieve our dual objective of low-cost energy and high-quality environment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the text of House Resolution 155 as it is being reintroduced today and also the Federal Power Commission report of February 22, 1971.

#### H. RES. 155

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources in the United States, including (1) the availability of oil, gas, coal, and nuclear energy reserves; (2) the identification of the ownership of such reserves; (3) the reasons and possible solutions for the delay in new starts of fossil fueled powerplants; (4) the effect of pricing practices by the owners of energy reserves; (5) the effect of the import of low sulfur fuels; (6) measures to increase the availability of pipelines, railways, barges, and ships needed to transport fuel materials; (7) measures to close the gap between the supply and demand for electric energy; and (8) the identification of the environmental effects of the electricity industry.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

#### FPC RELEASES STAFF ANALYSIS OF PRELIMINARY REPORTS ON SUMMER 1971 ELECTRIC LOAD-SUPPLY SITUATION

Some areas of the country may experience power supply shortages this coming summer as a result of inadequate installed capacity to meet forecasted summer peak loads, according to an analysis by the Federal Power Commission staff of preliminary reports filed with the FPC by the Nation's major electric utility systems and pools.

The staff analysis indicates that the capacity shortage is due primarily to delays in placing new generating facilities in service. To make up for the delayed capacity utilities are installing large blocks of gas turbine capacity, which while well suited to carry peak loads for short periods, are not completely satisfactory for carrying loads for an extended time, the staff reported.

The staff report emphasizes that the analysis is based on preliminary data. There will be a continuing review and further reports will be issued this spring.

In addition, the staff said, the Nation's electric supply is dependent upon the availability of an adequate fossil fuel supply. Utility stocks of coal are better than last fall, and the outlook for the availability of coal and oil for the coming summer appears good, the analysis shows. However, it is dependent on the rigidity, extent, and timing of air pollution standards, the staff said.

The natural gas supply remains tight and cannot effectively fill the gaps in fossil fuel supply which may develop as a result of coal or residual fuel oil shortage, the staff said. Any delays in scheduling nuclear generating capacity additions or unavailability of existing nuclear capacity could place added strain on the fossil fuel supply for utility generation, according to the report.

The summer's fuel supply is contingent on the availability of continuing transportation, and on the supply from foreign sources.

The FPC report covers 181 major utility systems and pools in all states except Alaska and Hawaii. These major systems and pools include about 350 individual utilities and account for approximately 98 percent of the Nation's total power production.

The accompanying FPC staff analysis compares estimated 1971 summer peak loads with generating capacity scheduled to be in service as of May 31, 1971, increased or decreased by firm purchases or obligations expected to be in effect at the time of the summer peak. Any capacity which becomes available after May 31 to carry load dependably in advance of summer peaks would increase the indicated reserve margins.

The staff analysis reflects only those inter-system transfers that are reported to be covered by firm contracts. The staff made no attempt to account for emergency measures that might be resorted to for the purpose of matching power requirements and supply, such as dropping interruptible loads and reducing voltage. Similarly, the report does not consider any reduction in dependable capacity resulting from scheduled maintenance of units, or other factors.

The staff report points out that to provide a continuity of supply, all power systems must have available more generating capacity than their aggregate loads. The desirable amount of this spare capacity, known as "reserve," varies from system to system. It is affected by a number of factors, including system size, the sizes and types of generating units, extent of interconnections, system load characteristics, required maintenance, uncertainties in load forecasting, delays in placing generating facilities in service, and other contingencies. In some instances, the staff noted, systems that appear to have adequate reserves may experience difficulty if one or more large units is forced out of service. For purposes of this analysis, reserve margins amounting to about 20 percent of expected peak load demands are considered necessary to compensate for these factors.

The following table summarizes the load-supply situation for the summer of 1971:

LOAD-SUPPLY SITUATION FOR SUMMER 1971

Region	Net dependable capacity (megawatts)	Estimated peak (megawatts)	Capacity available for reserves		Additional capacity scheduled for service during June, July, August	
			Megawatts	Percent of peak	Megawatts	Percent of peak
Northeast.....	68,119	57,198	10,921	19.1	1,006	1.8
East Central.....	54,355	47,727	6,628	13.9	177	0.4
Southeast.....	65,979	58,872	7,107	12.1	2,640	4.5
West Central.....	42,621	36,937	5,684	15.4	867	2.3
South Central.....	49,147	42,702	6,445	15.1	2,894	6.8
West.....	64,196	52,788	11,408	21.6	1,285	2.4
Contiguous United States.....	344,417	296,224	48,193	16.3	8,870	3.0

#### ANALYSIS BY FPC OF PRELIMINARY REPORTS FILED WITH FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION BY MAJOR ELECTRIC UTILITIES ON SUMMER 1971 LOAD SUPPLY SITUATION

Reports filed with the Federal Power Commission by the Nation's major electric utility systems and pools indicate that some areas of the country may experience tight power supply problems during this coming summer as a result of inadequate installed capacity to meet forecasted summer peak loads. The shortage of capacity is due primarily to de-

lays being experienced in placing new generating facilities in service. To make up for the capacity being delayed, the utilities have been and are continuing to install large blocks of gas turbine capacity. While this capacity is well suited to carry peak loads for short periods of time, it is not entirely satisfactory for carrying loads for extended periods of time. In addition, the Nation's electric supply is contingent upon the availability of an adequate fossil fuel supply. Utility stocks of coal are better than last

fall. The outlook for the availability of coal and oil for the coming summer appears good but is dependent on the rigidity, extent, and timing of air pollution standards.

It should be emphasized that this analysis is based on preliminary data. There will be a continuing review and further reports will be issued this spring.

Owing to the delays experienced in completing some scheduled major transmission lines, it is imperative that power systems operations be coordinated adequately to assure the delivery of available supplemental power when needed.

The natural gas supply remains tight and cannot effectively fill the gaps in fossil fuel supply which may develop as a result of coal or residual fuel oil shortage. Any delays in scheduled nuclear generating capacity additions of unavailability of existing nuclear capacity could place added strain on the fossil fuel supply for utility generation.

The summer's fuel supply is contingent on the availability of continuing transportation, and on the supply from foreign sources.

The report covers 181 major utility systems and pools in all states except Alaska and Hawaii. These major systems and pools include about 350 individual utilities and account for approximately 98 percent of the Nation's total power production.

The FPC staff analysis compares estimated 1971 summer peak loads with generating capacity scheduled to be in service as of May 31, 1971, increased or decreased by firm purchases or obligations expected to be in effect at the time of the summer peak. Any capacity which becomes available after May 31 to carry load dependably in advance of summer peaks would increase the indicated reserve margins. The analysis reflect only those intersystem transfers that are reported to be covered by firm contracts. No endeavor has been made to account for emergency measures that might be restored to for the purpose of matching power requirements and supply, such as dropping interruptible loads and reducing voltage. Likewise, no reduction in dependable capacity has been considered due to scheduled maintenance of units or other factors.

In order to provide a continuity of supply, all power systems must have available more generating capacity than their aggregate loads. The desirable amount of this spare capacity known as "reserves," varies from system to system. It is affected by a number of factors, including system size, the size and types of generating units, extent of interconnections, system load characteristics, required maintenance, uncertainties in load forecasting, delays in placing generating facilities in service, and other contingencies. In some instances, systems that appear to have adequate reserves may experience difficulty if one or more large units are forced out of service. For purposes of these analyses, reserve margins amounting to about 20 percent of expected peak load demands are considered necessary to compensate for these factors.

The staff analysis of potential company or system wide problem areas are summarized on a regional basis below. A map showing the regions and Power Supply Areas is attached.

#### Northeast region

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity.....	68,119
Load .....	57,198
Reserves (19.1 percent).....	10,921

The power supply situation of the Northeast Region appears to be better than last summer, however, conditions are considered to be tight. The capacity for the summer includes 4,124 megawatts of capacity scheduled for this summer's peak period but not yet in service. It also includes 2,560 megawatts of capacity out of service with extensive damage which is also scheduled

back in service before the peak period. Each of the three groups of utilities comprising the region will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

*New England pool (PSA 1 and 2)*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	12,711
Load -----	10,253
Reserves (24 percent)-----	2,458

The New England Pool peaks in the winter, and summer loads are slightly less than those experienced during the preceding winter. The pool will enter the summer period with about the same capacity as that available last winter, but some of this capacity must be taken out of service for maintenance. During the past winter it was not uncommon for the pool to have 2,000 megawatts out of service because of forced outages of equipment. On eight occasions during January and February 1971, it was necessary to institute load curtailment measures because capacity was limited, however, the load curtailment on one occasion was called primarily to assist a neighboring pool. A new 400-megawatt Montville unit No. 6 at Montville, Connecticut, scheduled for service in June 1971, will improve the power supply situation above that shown. It is probable that this pool may face very tight capacity situations this summer when loads approach or exceed the estimated peak and if large amounts of capacity are forced out of service.

*New York power pool (PSA 3 and 4)*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	22,754
Load -----	18,800
Reserves (21 percent)-----	3,954

On the basis of capacity and load data, the New York Pool appears to have satisfactory reserve generating capacity. However, conditions are not as satisfactory as indicated. The problem area of the pool is the Consolidated Edison's system around New York City. It is quite likely that the pool will be required to reduce voltage and possibly use other load curtailment procedures at times during the summer. The main cause of Consolidated Edison's condition is due to the company's inability to locate and place in service large generating units in or adjacent to its service area because of environmental controversies. The load-supply situation of the Consolidated Edison's system is as follows:

*Consolidated Edison Co. (PSA 4)*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	10,119
Load -----	8,125
Reserves (24.5 percent)-----	1,994

The reserves of 1,994 megawatts or 24.5 percent appear satisfactory. This capacity, however, includes 597 megawatts of new gas turbine capacity, all of which may not be available before the summer peak. The 1,000-megawatt Ravenswood unit is currently out of service because of a damaged generator. It is now being repaired, and is scheduled to be in service by mid-May. However, the labor contract covering the repair crews expires on March 10 and there is a possibility that a strike may ensue. Should this happen, the Ravenswood report could be delayed beyond the peak load period.

In view of the difficulties that have been encountered with this large unit, the large amount of gas turbine capacity under construction, and the large amount of over-aged capacity still in operation on the Company's system, the load-supply situation for this summer on the Consolidated Edison Company's system is expected to be one of continuing difficulty.

During January and February the company had 3,000 megawatts or more of capacity unavailable for service almost daily in addition to the Ravenswood unit, and it is reasonable to assume that the company will continue to be plagued with forced outages this summer. The company's 873-megawatt Indian Point unit No. 2 was originally scheduled for service in 1969. It is now about ready for service and is only awaiting an AEC operating permit. Since the unit can be put in service about two months after the permit is issued, a speed-up in the licensing process would greatly enhance the capacity situation in the area.

Consolidated Edison has completed arrangements with Canadian sources in Ontario and Quebec under which they believe they can receive 300 megawatts of power until the end of the summer peak period, but this anticipated importation is not reflected in the dependable capacity shown above.

*Pennsylvania - New Jersey - Maryland*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	31,499
Load -----	27,285
Reserves (15.4 percent)-----	4,214

The PJM Interconnection should be in a slightly better position than it was last summer, provided the new 558-megawatt Morgantown unit No. 2, near Washington, D.C., and the 820-megawatt Conemaugh unit No. 2, near Johnstown, Pennsylvania, are placed in service as scheduled and are fully dependable. The 820-megawatt Keystone unit No. 1, near Indiana, Pennsylvania, and the 556-megawatt Morgantown unit No. 1 and the 184-megawatt Dickerson unit No. 2, both in the environs of Washington, D.C., are currently out of service for extensive repairs. All, however, are expected to be returned to service before the coming summer peak. It appears that the PJM Interconnection may be facing a difficult power-supply situation for the summer 1971, especially if some of the new large units are delayed or if a large amount of forced outages are experienced.

*East central region*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	54,355
Load -----	47,727
Reserves (13.9 percent)-----	6,628

This region has less than desirable reserves and some utilities or pools may face a tight supply situation this summer if an appreciable amount of the 3,748 megawatts of new capacity scheduled for service before the end of May is delayed. An additional 180 megawatts of capacity is scheduled for June which will add to the available capacity. There are only four large utilities in the area with less than ten percent reserves, but the indicated reserves of six utilities could vanish if capacity scheduled for service before the summer peak is delayed until after the peak period.

*Southeast region*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	65,979
Load -----	58,872
Reserves (12.1 percent)-----	7,107

The reserves of this area are less than desirable particularly in view of the fact that 3,729 megawatts of new capacity is scheduled for service during the first five months of the year. This new capacity is equal to about 6.3 percent of the estimated peak load and over half of the indicated reserves. An additional 2,640 megawatts of capacity is scheduled for service in June, July, and August and will improve the reserve capacity situation to the extent that it becomes available before the summer peak.

*Virginia-Carolinas pool (PSA 18 and 21)*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	19,420
Load -----	18,272
Reserves (6.3 percent)-----	1,148

The Virginia-Carolinas Pool consists of Virginia Electric and Power Company, Duke Power Company, Carolina Power and Light Company, and South Carolina Electric and Gas Company. The pool has only 1,148 megawatts of reserves or 6.3 percent of peak demand. The new H. B. Robinson nuclear unit No. 2 near Hartsville, South Carolina, scheduled for February 1971, has a capacity of 700 megawatts which is equal to 3.8 percent of the pool's peak demand. This area could experience problems this summer if the Robinson unit is not fully dependable or if one or two large units are forced out of service. The pool has an additional 1,416 megawatts of capacity scheduled for service in June, July and August. This new capacity if fully dependable before the summer peak would raise the reserve margin to 14.0 percent.

With regard to individual members of the pool, the Virginia Electric Power Company, considering its firm commitments only, has no reserves for the summer period. The company has, however, 141 megawatts of gas turbine capacity scheduled for June, which would bring reserve margins to about one percent. Duke Power Company's reserve margin is 4.6 percent, but it has 53 megawatts scheduled for July and 922 megawatts scheduled for August which would bring its reserve margin to about 20 percent. Both companies can call on the pool's limited reserves as required.

*Florida pool (PSA 24)*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	12,274
Load -----	10,867
Reserves (12.9 percent)-----	1,407

The pool reserve of 12.9 percent is less than desirable, but the new 725-megawatt Turkey Point nuclear unit No. 3 near Miami, Florida, is scheduled for service in June. The installation of this unit will raise the reserve margin to 19.6 percent. The Florida Power Corporation's reserve is only 5.1 percent. The Florida Power & Light Company's reserve is 3.5 percent. This margin will be improved considerably if the company's Turkey Point nuclear unit becomes available before the summer peak.

*West central region*

	<i>Megawatts</i>
Net dependable capacity-----	42,621
Load -----	36,937
Reserves (15.4 percent)-----	5,684

This region has less than desired reserves, but the addition of 867 megawatts scheduled for June and July should raise the reserve margin to 6.551 megawatts or 17.7 percent. A number of areas in the region have low reserves and problems could develop if some large units were to be forced out of service.

These areas are: (1) Eastern Wisconsin (PSA-13) with reserves of 612 megawatts or 12.9 percent; (2) Western Wisconsin and Minnesota (PSA-16) with reserves of 636 megawatts or 13.8 percent; (3) Iowa (PSA-17) with reserves of 277 megawatts or 9.6 percent; and (4) Nebraska (PSA-28) with reserves of 266 megawatts or 12.9 percent.

Commonwealth Edison Company has 1,935 megawatts of reserves or 17.4 percent, but these reserves are based on the availability of the new 809-megawatt Dresden nuclear unit No. 3 which is scheduled for May and 200 additional megawatts from Dresden nuclear unit No. 2 which went in service on a limited basis last August. A delay in the availability of Dresden nuclear unit No. 3 would cause problems. The new 809-mega-

watt Quad City nuclear unit No. 1, near Cordova, Illinois, scheduled for July would improve the power supply situation of both Commonwealth Edison and the Iowa Interconnection if it becomes available before the summer peak.

*South central region*

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity.....	49,147
Load .....	42,702
Reserve (15.1 percent).....	6,445

The reserves in the South Central Region include 2,894 megawatts of new capacity which is scheduled for service in the first five months of the year. An additional 1,056 megawatts of new capacity is scheduled for service during June, July and August. This capacity would increase the available reserves to 17.6 percent of peak load if brought into service before the summer peak.

Of the individual systems within the pool, nine systems will have less than 15 percent reserves at the summer peak. However, one of these systems will have reserves of only 10.7 percent.

The load-supply situation of the Region for the coming summer appears to be satisfactory with no significant problems apparent at this time. The situation can change however, if delays are encountered in the completion of new capacity construction programs. If such unforeseen delays should develop, at least six systems could face the summer peaking season without reserves. No nuclear units are among those scheduled for completion in the region prior to summer 1971.

*West region*

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity.....	64,196
Load .....	52,788
Reserves (21.6 percent).....	11,408

LOAD-SUPPLY SITUATION FOR SUMMER 1971

Region	Net dependable capacity (megawatts)	Estimated peak (megawatts)	Capacity available for reserves		Additional capacity scheduled for service during June, July, August	
			Megawatts	Percent of peak	Megawatts	Percent of peak
Northeast.....	68,119	57,198	10,921	19.1	1,006	1.8
East Central.....	54,355	47,727	6,628	13.9	177	0.4
Southeast.....	65,979	58,872	7,107	12.1	2,640	4.5
West Central.....	42,621	36,937	5,684	15.4	867	2.3
South Central.....	49,147	42,702	6,445	15.1	2,894	6.8
West.....	64,196	52,788	11,408	21.6	1,286	2.4
Contiguous United States.....	344,417	296,224	48,193	16.3	8,870	3.0

**PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 16, the House considered the conference report on H.R. 4690 which included a 10-percent increase in social security benefits. I understood there would be no legislative business on Tuesday and was unavoidably detained in Chicago when an emergency callup of the bill was requested and granted.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the record show that had I been present I would have voted "yea."

**CAREER INCENTIVES FOR ARMED FORCES OFFICERS**

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced two bills of vital importance to the recruitment and retention

The Pacific Northwest with reserves of 1,559 megawatts, equal to 11.4 percent of the peak demand, has the lowest reserves of any area in the West Region. These reserves should be ample since the region has 1,546 megawatts of interruptible loads which can be dropped when capacity is not available. The region has 907 megawatts of idle generating capacity in its hydro plants which could be used during periods when other generating equipment is removed for maintenance or repair.

The 800-megawatt Hanford dual purpose nuclear plant was shutdown during the latter part of January. The loss of the electric power from this plant should not be critical this summer because water conditions in the Pacific Northwest are good and because summer is the low load period for the area. The loss of Hanford will be critical during the winter seasons.

The 750-kilovolt D. C. Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie was lost during the Los Angeles earthquake of February 9th. The dc Terminal and Converter (which converts direct to alternating current) Station at Sylmar suffered extensive damage and may be out of service some six to twelve months or longer. A second substation in the same area, which is the receiving point for 212 MW of hydro power was heavily damaged and will have to be rebuilt. The utility is bypassing the sub-station with temporary transmission service.

The two 500 kV alternating current lines are expected to provide reasonable adequate transfer capacity, north and south, for at least the immediate future. Studies are being made of alternative transmission capability to meet peak power transfer requirements over the long term while the dc terminal facilities are being repaired.

The following table summarizes the load-supply situation for the summer of 1971:

of professionally trained specialists in the Armed Forces.

My first bill—H.R. 6374—provides for the extension to judge advocates and legal specialists of pay incentives now available to doctors, dentists, and veterinarians in the Armed Forces. Hopefully, these incentives would make service careers more attractive to legal specialists who are presently hesitant to extend their service terms because of the huge discrepancy in pay between civilian law practice and military legal careers.

When this bill was first introduced in 1969, the Department of Defense reported a shortage of 737 lawyers. Today, that figure is a startling 842 and the services report they are far below the manpower they consider adequate to staff the large number of JAG posts with experienced and knowledgeable specialists.

Draft pressures have been instrumental in attracting lawyers to the services, but the sizable financial disadvantages

of military legal careers has produced a disabling turnover rate in the JAG department. Pay incentives would be at least a partial solution to this problem.

The incentive pay would provide for \$50 per month for grades O-1 through O-3, \$150 for grades O-4 and O-5, and \$200 per month for O-6 and above. The continuation pay would be paid to those judge advocates who extend their service on active duty for at least 3 years but not more than 6 years, at the rate of 2 months' pay for each additional year he agrees to remain on active duty. The bonus is payable upon the completion of 4 years' active duty.

My other career incentive bill—H.R. 6373—would provide service credit for time in school for professionals who are ophthalmologists, pharmacists, engineers, and lawyers. This bill would credit servicemen with up to 3 years of active commissioned status if he is enrolled in a program of professional study that requires more than 4 years of college. For example, a captain who is an engineer with 4 years of service time would get the pay of a captain with 6 years of service time.

We must act promptly and definitely to make service careers more attractive to professionals and to encourage servicemen to pursue professional courses of study while they are in service. My bills are a step in this direction.

**CRITICAL DAYS FOR ISRAEL**

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, these are critical days for the State of Israel: not as dramatic perhaps as the 6-day war but more important for the future of that nation. As Abba Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel, visits the United States this week and Israel considers the question of whether it should agree to a return to her old insecure borders, I believe it is appropriate to state my views about this important issue.

The question of Israel's borders must be considered in the context of recent history, and I think history is clear on one point: from its origins through the 1948 United Nations partition to the present day, Israel has sought only one thing—to live at peace with its neighbors and to get on with its work of creating a vibrant and progressive society. Its military actions have been a reluctant and expensive reaction to Arab aggression and terrorism for the Arab nations have never wavered from the announced goal of the destruction of Israel. The history of the Middle East since 1948 demonstrates that if it is to survive Israel cannot rely on the United Nations or on great power guarantees. It must rely on its own power. These are the facts of history.

Because I believe that the fate of Israel is in jeopardy I am fearful of the cavalier attitude being taken by our State Department toward the Jarring negotiations. Our State Department is exerting pressure on Israel to force it to sacrifice its minimum requirements for secure borders in exchange for flimsy international guarantees. I call this a cavalier attitude.

Indeed it is worse—it is hypocritical and desperately dangerous. How different it is from our posture in Southeast Asia. There, in a area where we have no business and where U.S. security is in no way at stake, we are investing tens of thousands of American lives and billions of dollars and are taking a tough uncompromising negotiating stance. In the Middle East, on the other hand, we expect Israel to jeopardize its very existence. There are some who suspect that oil interests which formerly dominated the State Department are ascending again in the formulation of Middle East policy.

It is noteworthy that many of the nations which now call upon Israel to abandon Jerusalem, Sharm el Sheikh, Gaza and the Golan Heights are nations which themselves have relatively recently obtained secure borders. The Soviet Union, for example, does not consider returning portions of Finland, Japan, East Prussia, Poland, and Rumania. And we should not forget that our Southwestern border is the result of a war with Mexico whose causes were by no means altruistic on our part.

I do not wish to oversimplify the Middle Eastern situation. But let us not be deluded by its complexities into forgetting the simple fact that Israel is now engaged in a diplomatic struggle for its survival. The United States should support, not thwart, Israel's efforts to assure a secure future. I want the people and Government of Israel to know that not all Americans agree with our State Department when it presses for a return to the past. The past is the past and the perils that it held should not be revived. The future must be negotiated, and it must be negotiated by Israel with the objectives of permanent peace and security.

**THE ADMINISTRATION CUTS IN HEALTH CARE MUST BE STOPPED**

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days we have been advised that the administration has cut the budget of the New York metropolitan regional medical program so that a number of very worthwhile programs which were financed by the Federal Government will have to come to an end.

St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center of New York is one of the outstanding hospitals in this country furnishing great service to the community. I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues two of the programs which are being terminated as a result of the Nixon administration's cutbacks. One is St. Vincent's Hospital Mobile Coronary Care Unit and the second which will be dropped is the asthma detection program which is primarily for poor youngsters in the community. These two programs cost very modest sums. The coronary care unit has been funded at the rate of \$62,262 a year since its establishment, and it will now be required to terminate July 1, 1971, for lack of funding. The asthma detection program costs \$59,962 a year and it, too, will

come to an end unless the Federal funding is continued.

Mr. Speaker, considering the enormous sums being spent by our country for destructive purposes we cannot in good conscience terminate these two life-saving programs which are so modest in cost. These reductions by the Nixon administration in health programs are not limited to the city of New York. That administration is wielding a butcher knife on health programs and I hope we here in the Congress will be successful in resisting the Nixon administration's cuts and compelling the necessary funding of these vital programs.

I have asked Sister Margaret Sweeney, director of St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center of New York, to prepare a statement on the two programs in detail so as to better acquaint our colleagues with the good works of that hospital. The statement with additional matters is appended:

**STATEMENT BY MARGARET SWEENEY**

St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center of New York protests that this Administration has cut the budget of the New York Metropolitan Regional Medical Program and thereby has put a halt to federal financing for two highly successful programs run by the hospital. The Regional Medical Programs are funded through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare whose budget has been seriously reduced.

One victim of the cut is the hospital's Mobile Coronary Care Unit, the first of its kind in the United States and the model for other such heart teams now used across the country. Dr. William Grace, Director of the hospital's Department of Medicine, says that since his project began three years ago they have noted a reduction of the mortality rate for heart attack victims from 20%, the City's overall average, down to 6%, with no deaths on the coronary ambulance. The Coronary Care Unit had been funded at the rate of \$62,262 a year since it was established.

The coronary program, which is due to terminate July 1, 1971 is popularly said to make Greenwich Village and Chelsea the safest places in the United States to suffer a heart attack.

The second project to be dropped is the Asthma Detection Program for poor youngsters in the community.

Dr. Vincent Fontana, Director of the Department of Pediatrics, says the Asthma Detection Program, which costs \$59,962 a year, has made unusual progress since its inception in October 1968.

This is a joint project of St. Vincent's Hospital with St. Mary's Hospital in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn.

Asthma teams seek out youngsters for treatment in deprived areas and give them complete physical examinations as well. The majority of these children never see a physician except in a crisis. Not only have undetected asthma cases been discovered but many other diseases as well which have been followed up and treated.

Dr. Fontana declared: "The erratic approach in the provision of medical care to the indigent does not recognize the fears and feelings of the people served by the programs.

"The hard, cold, impersonal approach to these people with the turning of programs on and off, dictated by an uncertain budgetary picture and changing priorities only causes further deterioration of already fragmented health programs and unrest among the people of the ghetto."

The Sisters of Charity came to Greenwich Village in 1849 to care for the sick and indigent people here. This has been our mission for all of these years. How can we continue to fulfill this mission if programs as important

as the M.C.C.U. and the Asthma Program are cut entirely with so little advance notice?"

In the case of the coronary program, it has taken a great deal of time to educate the public to become aware of the signs of heart attack and to act promptly to obtain prompt medical care.

The Asthma Program is really just becoming accepted by the people it is meant for and mutual trust has developed, she noted.

**ST. VINCENT'S HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER OF NEW YORK  
FACT SHEET**

**Mobile coronary care unit:**

Total Calls—	
October 15, 1968, through December 31, 1970	1,203
Dead on arrivals	109
Died at scene after arrival	7
Arrived alive	956
None died en route.	
Discharge from emergency room not requiring hospitalization	375
Hospitalized:	
Coronary care unit	256
Intensive care unit	132
Other hospital beds	192

11 definite cases where ventricular fibrillation was done on patients on the scene of their attack definitely saved their lives.

**STATEMENT BY DR. VINCENT J. FONTANA, DIRECTOR PEDIATRICS ST. VINCENT'S HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER**

The Metropolitan Regional Medical Program for the fiscal year 1971 has been reduced by \$500,000 because of a severe budget squeeze in Washington. Reduced funding has resulted in terminating our contract for the Pediatric Asthma Program at St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center of New York and St. Mary's Hospital in Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant section. We were notified on March 3 of a March 31st termination date after a letter was sent to the Director of the Regional Medical Program stating:

"We unfortunately extend ourselves to the people with a program which is oftentimes short-lived. This is now again happening. Its effects on the community as well as on the Regional Medical Program can only be most harmful.

"Our commitments to the community and to those who are actually involved in the program necessitate that funds for this program be continued through July 1, 1971."

We have attempted in our program at St. Vincent's and St. Mary's Hospital to bring to the children of the slum and ghetto areas the benefits of modern medicine related to bronchial asthma and other chronic lung diseases. Children have been examined in the community schools, in day-care centers, and in neighborhood parks in an attempt to uncover previously undetected lung problems in children. Medical histories were obtained, complete physical examinations done, lung function breathing tests performed, and testing for tuberculosis completed the evaluation.

Teaching programs for the parents, teachers, school nurses, and doctors in the management of the child with asthma was another means utilized to improve the health needs of these children from low income families—only half of whom see any doctor during the span of one year.

I do not know who is to blame for this poor planning that is resulting in the denial of better health care to the children in the ghetto areas.

The Federal government's interest in health is obvious but what can be seriously questioned is whether they properly recognize the realistic needs of the poor neglected sick of the community.

There are dozens of programs on a national level that have been established to promote better health for the people of our nation.

For the most part, the record indicates that they are fragmented, disorganized, and short-lived. This erratic approach in the provisions of medical care to the indigent does not recognize the fears and feelings of the people for which the programs are for. The hard, cold, impersonal approach to these people with the turning of programs on and off dictated by a hodgepodge budgetary picture and changing priorities only causes further deterioration of already fragmented health programs in the community and unrest among the peoples of the ghetto areas. Splintered health services that last for short periods of time and are not ongoing on a continuous basis can only discourage people's confidence in our health programs and encourage the continuance of the health care crisis that our nation and city is faced with at the present time. We cannot deny these children the basic right to health because of budgetary changes and changing priorities dictated by political pressures and not community health needs.

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST TAKE ACTIVE ROLE IN PROMOTING THE USE OF RECYCLED PAPER IN EVERY DAY BUSINESS

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, recycling is a national environment issue that is of increasing concern to all Americans.

In my study of what the Federal Government is doing to keep its own house in order, I have been dismayed to learn that only a very limited effort is being given to the purchase of recycled products by the General Services Administration and the Defense Supply Agency.

I am today offering a bill to require maximum use of recycled paper for all General Services purchases. My recycling bill directs the Administrator of the General Services Administration to proscribe regulations for the purchase of paper to provide for the maximum use of recycled material consistent with the use of the paper.

Because the problem usually falls into the area of definition of recycled material, I have worked out a definition which is supported by those who produce recycled materials. The definition requires the percentage of paper to be computed from that paper which has been previously manufactured, served its purpose, and been scrapped or discarded. The language can be found in the text of the bill at the end of these remarks.

My colleagues do not need to be reminded of the flexibility that is often found between the intent of legislation or administrative fiat and its implementation. This bill assumes that no official will be able to misconstrue the desire of the Congress to move effectively in the area of recycling.

The Federal Government should boost the use of recycled paper in its everyday business to help improve the environment.

Recycled paper can be used for almost any purpose, but the Federal specifications require almost totally virgin material in the paper it buys.

The General Services Administration buys more than 400,000 tons of paper each year at a cost of \$140 million. This

would be a tremendous market for the recycling industry which could produce an economical product that would also use up the growing supply of waste paper.

The major complaint of the recycling industry is that there is no market for their product; and the Federal Government as the largest single user is the biggest offender.

I feel that as legislators we must set the example, not follow it. The Government by changing its purchasing policies can demonstrate the feasibility of recycled materials both economically and ecologically.

The President's message on the environment sent to the Congress on February 8 stated that the General Services Administration is reviewing the Government's purchasing policies. I applaud these efforts. Martin Skala in the Christian Science Monitor on February 13, 1971, reported that the new specifications will contain a minimum of from 3 to 50 percent reclaimed fibers.

I submit, however, that the effort currently underway needs to be shored up by legislation to assure that the best efforts of the Government are realized. The economic changes caused by an emphasis on recycled use are bound to have their economic effect. Virgin products have been sold for years on the premise that the paper using virgin timber was of superior quality. However, present industry capability has the capacity to produce products of equal quality from recycled materials.

To demonstrate this fact I have decided to print the newsletter I send to constituents in the 27th District of New York, that I am privileged to represent, on recycled paper. I believe that I am the first Member of Congress to take this step.

These efforts are not enough. I am presently drafting additional legislation to require all governmental purchasing agencies to study and report back on what steps they are taking to use recycled material. When this legislation is prepared I will solicit other Members who would like to join me in the effort to emphasize better use of our natural resources at the Federal level.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 6368

A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured by executive agencies

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) The Administrator shall prescribe regulations establishing standards with respect to the contents of any paper procured by, or for, executive agencies. Such regulations shall specify that the contents of such paper shall consist of as great an amount of recycled material as is possible consistent with the purpose for which such paper is procured.

"(2) For the purposes of any regulations prescribed by the Administrator under this subsection the term 'recycled material' means any paper that meets the following criteria:

"(a) has served the purpose for which it was originally manufactured; and

"(b) has been scrapped or otherwise discarded as an element of solid waste; and

"(c) has been recovered in whole or in part and reprocessed into a new raw material element for the manufacture of a paper product.

"However, for the purposes of the regulations to be established, 'recycled content' shall not include those materials generated and reused within a plant (intraplant) as part of its own manufacturing process."

#### FLOOR DEBATE ON SST APPROPRIATION

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the question of the supersonic jet transport comes before the House again today and I feel strongly that it is time to halt this program. Over the past few months, I have studied this issue carefully, looking at arguments on both sides and have reached the conclusion that there are still too many unanswered questions.

In addition to the noise factor and other abuse to the environment, I believe that continued Federal funding of the SST will use funds that are more greatly needed in domestic areas. The SST is a subsidy by poor people to permit wealthy people to go to Paris in half the time.

Rather than continuing to dump Federal tax dollars into the SST, we could better spend the money on providing training for doctors and nurses, for more and improved health care facilities, on education and job training, on cancer research, and other long delayed programs.

There may be some reasons to build an SST, but not from Federal funds at a time when there is greater priority on other projects.

A rough sampling of my mail has shown a preponderance of opposition to the SST. In the past few weeks I have had 76 letters from constituents against further funding of the SST and five in favor. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Richard T. Lumb of Poughkeepsie, N.Y. He sums up the issue nicely when he says:

To put it simply—there's not enough money to do all we'd like to do. So let's put what there is where it will do the most good.

Mr. Lumb's point as you will see is that we should move faster to improve mass transit facilities before pumping more money into the SST:

MARCH 8, 1971.

Representative JOHN G. DOW,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOW: The only reasoning I can support for pressing ahead with the development of the SST is to maintain technical parity with France, Great Britain and Russia. It is all too obvious that the commercial airlines will not be able to digest what they have now for many years. In fact, it would appear that there are several airborne Penn Centrals in the making through a combination of governmental support, permissiveness and restrictive controls, and by very short-sighted industry planning. And

there will never be more than limited need for an SST.

There can, of course, be no prediction at this time of the payload possibilities of the SST—if it should become economically feasible in the future. It seems to me that at best it could provide practical service for very few passengers.

The real need—now and urgent—is to pay more than lip service to millions of today's harried commuters—bus, air shuttle and, especially, rail. If the SST development is desirable, direct government assistance to mass transit facilities in massive amounts is required—and at once.

(a) Provide every rider with a comfortable seat under all conditions.

(b) Make it possible for the various transportation authorities or companies to offer fast, frequent, on-time service.

(c) Allow Railpax the money required to include some of the extra amenities to return inter-city passenger travel to respectability—and desirability.

(d) Give equal emphasis to research and development for all sectors of the airline industry.

In other words, I would suggest that the SST program be funded only from the surplus of the money and effort needed now merely to give today's travelers a decent ride to work. To put it simply—there's not enough money to do all we'd like to. So let's put what there is where it will do the most good now.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD T. LUMB.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to tell my colleagues about a group of students from Marist College in Poughkeepsie who came into my district office with a petition signed by 1,300 persons. I am taking the liberty of sharing this petition with Secretary Volpe.

I think I can speak for most Members of the House when I say that we should not be swayed totally by those people who write for and against an issue. As Federal legislators we are called upon to study all sides of an issue and then vote our conscience.

For my own part I strongly believe there are more reasons to vote "no" on the SST appropriation than to vote "yes." For these reasons, I am voting for the amendment to eliminate the SST funds from the Department of Transportation appropriation measure.

#### POW WEEK SHOULD BE MORE THAN HOT AIR

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, next week has been designated "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action." I have signed the resolution sponsoring this week. But I hope we will be able to do more than simply "show concern." Concern is all very good, but it is not what the POW's and their families need.

I have talked a great deal with many POW-MIA wives. They have told me they have had more than enough of being patted on the head and praised for their bravery. They have had enough of writing letters to Hanoi. None of this has brought their husbands one step nearer to release. What they want is a concrete plan to bring their husbands home.

A number of us have developed such a plan, which we call "proportional repatriation." It involves trading the POW's for the only thing the other side wants from us: Our absence. We shall be introducing it as a concurrent resolution next week. I insert the text of the resolution in the RECORD at this point:

#### H. CON. RES. 212

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed "Proportionate Repatriation" plan for obtaining the release of American prisoners held in Southeast Asia

Whereas the Government of the United States has indicated it will not totally withdraw from Vietnam until the American prisoners held in Southeast Asia have been released; and

Whereas the National Liberation Front and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have indicated they will discuss the return of American prisoners once a date for total American military withdrawal from Vietnam has been set; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has an obligation to secure the release of those American citizens held as prisoners in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas the American national interest would best be served by termination of the war in Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that American troops should be withdrawn from Southeast Asia and American prisoners in Southeast Asia should be released simultaneously.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to inform the representatives of the forces holding American prisoners in Southeast Asia that the United States is prepared to—

(1) withdraw military and paramilitary personnel from Southeast Asia, including offshore naval air and naval artillery support forces, in proportionate numbers, by stages, each stage equal in percentage to the percentage of American prisoners concurrently released by the forces holding American prisoners in Southeast Asia;

(2) accept the good offices of an intermediary, who would be a neutral nation or international agency acceptable both to the United States and to the forces holding American prisoners in Southeast Asia, whose function would be to (A) receive and hold each contingent of American prisoners as they were released, (B) verify that the appropriate number of American military and paramilitary personnel had left Vietnam, and then to (C) turn the American prisoners over to the American forces;

(3) permit the intermediary to perform whatever unannounced checks and inspections considered necessary by the intermediary to verify that withdrawn American troops are not being replaced under the guise of rotation;

(4) publish, twice monthly, a list of the total number of American military and paramilitary personnel in Southeast Asia; and

(5) complete the withdrawal of all American military and paramilitary personnel, including offshore naval air and artillery support forces, from Southeast Asia by a specified date to be determined by negotiation, which date shall not be later than December 24, 1971.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that actions by the United States to implement the proposals described in section 2 of this concurrent resolution should be contingent upon an agreement on the part of the forces holding American prisoners in Southeast Asia to—

(1) publish a complete list of all American prisoners they hold, including a description of the physical condition of each prisoner;

(2) publish a complete list of American prisoners who died in captivity, including date and cause of death;

(3) return all American prisoners in proportionate numbers, by stages, each stage equal in percentage to the percentage of American military and paramilitary personnel withdrawn from Southeast Asia;

(4) accept the good offices of an intermediary, as outlined in paragraph (2) of section 2 of this concurrent resolution;

(5) allow the intermediary to perform whatever unannounced checks and inspections considered necessary by the intermediary to verify that there are not more American prisoners than were named in the list provided under paragraph (1) of this section;

(6) repatriate American prisoners in the order of the length of their captivity, with the exception that those in serious need of medical attention be returned first;

(7) refrain from initiating military action against departing American troops;

(8) send all Chinese and Soviet military advisers out of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and permit the intermediary to verify that this had been done; and

(9) complete the repatriation of all American prisoners on or before the date of completion of the withdrawal of American military and paramilitary personnel from Southeast Asia.

#### LEGISLATION OFFERED TO DISCOURAGE PAID BROADCAST TIME BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Army has received extensive publicity about its new \$10.6 million campaign to saturate the commercial airwaves with paid-for commercials, aimed at the young and intended to stimulate enlistments.

The notices have been definitely mixed, although the other armed services are understandably intrigued by the Army's enterprise in buying up all that time.

Heretofore, of course, the Army and its sister services have relied on donated time to convey their radio and television messages to the public. Broadcast licenses traditionally have provided such time, at no cost and as a public service, for messages by Government agencies.

I am deeply concerned about the implications of what the Army is doing now.

Accordingly, I am today offering a "sense of Congress" resolution to express the opposition of the House and Senate to the use of public funds at any level of Government for purchase of time on commercial stations.

The wording of my resolution is intentionally vague, because at this point I concede that I do not have all the answers.

While I am strongly opposed in principle to any public agency buying time in this fashion on what are supposed to be the public's airwaves, there may nevertheless be rare instances in which this practice can be justified.

Hearings, involving the Army and any other concerned Federal departments, as well as broadcasters, would at least shed light on existing policies and provide for whatever actions may be necessary in

the future. My proposal is submitted with the hope that it might serve as the vehicle for hearings to explore this complex problem.

A number of broadcasters have turned down the Army's money for the commercials, on grounds they are obligated to provide the time without charge. They should be given the opportunity to testify, as well as the radio and television executives who have agreed to sell the time.

We should also attempt to find out exactly what precedents, if any, exist for the Army's campaign. Have Federal agencies or departments bought time in the past, and under what circumstances?

In drafting the resolution, I have chosen an approach which does not have the force of law—rather than offer prohibitory legislation. This will permit some leeway as we deliberate the propriety of the Army's actions.

The warning implicit in my proposal would apply only to purely governmental agencies, not to quasi-public corporations such as the new Railpax Corp., which are funded by a mix of private and public money.

The text of the resolution follows:

**CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO PAID ADVERTISEMENTS BROADCAST FOR THE FEDERAL OR STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OR DEPARTMENTS OR AGENCIES**

Whereas, radio and television broadcasters are licensed to serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity; and

Whereas, the Advertising Council and numerous radio and television broadcasters have, voluntarily and without charge, cooperated in presenting public service announcements for the Federal and State and local governments, and departments and agencies thereof; and

Whereas, the United States Army Recruiting Command has committed itself to the expenditure of \$10.6 million for a four month radio and television recruiting campaign; and

Whereas, freedom of expression and vigorous and unfettered media for the dissemination of news, views, and information are essential parts of this Nation's legal and social traditions and are absolutely necessary to the existence of any free democratic society; and

Whereas, the receipt of significant sums of money by radio and television broadcasters from a department of the Federal Government raises the spectre of government influence over this sensitive media: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government, State and local governments, and departments and agencies thereof should not expend public funds to purchase time for the carriage of advertisements by radio or television broadcast stations.*

**NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORP. ACT**

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

Mr. MEEDS, Mr. Speaker, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin and I along with more than 100 other Members in both Houses of Congress are today introducing legislation to give independent status to the Office of Economic Opportunity's legal services program.

Legal services has proven itself as one of our most effective tools in redressing the problems of poverty. It has given millions of our Nation's poor renewed hope and developed new confidence in the American system of law and government. "Equal justice under law" is now within reach for everyone.

Despite the program's success, legal services attorneys are confronted with conflict-of-interest problems and political interference because the program is located in OEO and the executive branch. Special problems have arisen when suits were brought against agencies of the Federal Government or against State and municipal governments.

The bill being introduced today is designed to remove legal services from the political arena. The measure would provide legal services through a private, nonprofit corporation—the National Corporation for Legal Services. The 19-member board of directors would operate the corporation free of the veto power of State Governors that has caused major poverty law battles of recent years.

This plan has been endorsed in principle by two committees of the American Bar Association and by the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization.

The corporation would be funded through the Economic Opportunity Act; \$140,000,000 is authorized for the first year of operation. This amount is nearly twice that now spent by Legal Services, but former OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld generously estimated that only 28 percent of the legal assistance need of low-income Americans is presently being met. This legislation would more fully meet the need for new programs and additional services in existing programs.

The National Corporation for Legal Services will insure unfettered legal representation for low-income Americans. Only when the attorney-client relationship is free from political manipulation will we truly have "equal justice under law."

At this point in the RECORD, I request that the bill for a National Legal Services Corporation be printed in full.

The bill follows:

H.R. 6361

A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Legal Services Corporation Act".*

SEC. 2. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

**"TITLE IX—NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION**

**"DECLARATION OF POLICY**

"Sec. 901. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

"(1) it is in the public interest to encourage and promote resort to attorneys and appropriate institutions for the orderly resolution of grievances and as a means of securing orderly change, responsiveness and reform;

"(2) many low income Americans are unable to afford the cost of legal services or of access to appropriate institutions;

"(3) access to legal services and appropri-

ate institutions for all citizens of the United States not only is a matter of private and local concern, but also is of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

"(4) the integrity of the attorney-client relationship and of the adversary system of justice in the United States require that there be no political interference with the provision and performance of legal services;

"(5) existing legal services programs have provided economical, effective, and comprehensive legal services to the client community so as to bring about a peaceful resolution of grievances through resort to orderly means of change;

"(6) a private nonprofit corporation should be created to encourage the availability of legal services and legal institutions to all citizens of the United States, free from extraneous interference and control.

**"ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION**

"Sec. 902. (a) There is established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the 'National Legal Services Corporation' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation') which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this title, and, to the extent consistent with this title, to the District of Columbia Non-profit Corporation Act. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this title is expressly reserved.

"(b) No part of the net earnings of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any private person, and it shall qualify as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

**"PROCESS OF INCORPORATION AND ORGANIZATION**

"Sec. 903. (a) There shall be a transition period of six months following the date of enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act for the process of incorporation and initial organization of the Corporation.

"(b) There is established an incorporating trusteeship composed of the following persons: the president of the American Bar Association, the president elect of the American Bar Association, the president of the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association, the president of the American Association of Law Schools, the president of the American Trial Lawyers Association, and the president of the National Bar Association. The incorporating trusteeship shall meet within 30 days after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(c) (1) Not later than sixty days after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act the Incorporating Trusteeship shall establish the Initial Clients Advisory Council to be composed of 11 members who are selected, in accordance with procedures established by the Incorporating Trusteeship, from among individuals recommended by the governing boards of existing legal services programs who are representative of the class of clients served by any such program.

"(2) Not later than sixty days after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act the Incorporating Trusteeship shall establish the Initial Project Attorneys Advisory Council to be composed of 11 members to be selected, in accordance with procedures established by the Incorporating Trusteeship, by attorneys who are actively engaged in providing legal services under any existing legal services programs from among individuals who are attorneys actively engaged in providing such services.

"(3) To assist in carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall compile a list of all legal services programs publicly funded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the subsequent fiscal year and

furnish such list to the Incorporating Trusteeship. In order to carry out the provisions of this subsection the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall make available to the Incorporating Trusteeship such administrative services as it may require.

"(d) Not later than ninety days after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act the Clients Advisory Council and the project Attorneys Advisory Council shall each meet and each appoint three representatives to serve on the initial Board of Directors of the National Legal Services Corporation.

"(e) During the ninety day period of incorporation of the Corporation the Incorporating Trusteeship shall take whatever actions are necessary to incorporate the Corporation, including the filing of Articles of Incorporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, and to prepare for the first meeting of the Board of Directors, except the selection of the Executive Director of the Corporation.

"(f) During the 90 day period immediately following the period specified in subsection (e) of this section the Board shall take whatever action is necessary to prepare to begin to carry out the activities of the Corporation six months after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act.

"DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

"Sec. 904. (a) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors consisting of 19 individuals, one of whom shall be elected annually by the Board to serve as Chairman. Members of the Board shall be appointed as follows:

"(1) Public Members. Five members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one member shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States. After giving due consideration to individuals recommended by associations of attorneys whose membership is actively engaged in conducting legal services programs the President shall make the appointments under this paragraph to the initial Board of Directors. After giving due consideration to recommendations of individuals recommended by the Board the President shall make the appointments under this paragraph for any Board subsequent to the initial Board.

"(2) Legal organization members. Six individuals shall be members of the Board by virtue of holding the following offices:

"(A) The President of the American Bar Association.

"(B) The President-elect of the American Bar Association.

"(C) The President of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association.

"(D) The President of the American Association of Law Schools.

"(E) The President of the American Trial Lawyers Association.

"(F) The President of the National Bar Association.

"(3) Attorney-client members. Six members of whom three shall be selected by the Clients Advisory Council and three shall be selected by the Project Attorneys Advisory Council. Any Board after the initial Board shall, in consultation with the respective Advisory Councils, provide for the rules with respect to the subsequent meetings of the Clients Advisory Council and the Attorneys Advisory Council and the process of selection of members of the Board in accordance with this paragraph.

"(4) The Executive Director of the Corporation.

"(b) (1) Members appointed under paragraph (1) of the preceding subsection shall be appointed for terms of three years except that—

"(A) the terms of the directors first taking office shall be effective on the ninety-first day after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act and shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of three years, two at the end of two years, and in the case of the Director appointed by the Chief Justice two years; and

"(B) any director so appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of the term, two years; and

"(2) The members selected under paragraph (2) of the preceding subsection shall serve for the term of office for which they are elected and by virtue of which they become members of the Board except in no case shall a term exceed three years. If any one of the organizational members' term will exceed three years by virtue of holding a position more than three years, the Board shall provide for the appointment of a successor by the appropriate organization.

"(3) The members selected pursuant to paragraph (3) of the preceding subsection shall serve for a term of three years except that—

"(A) the terms of the directors first taking office shall be effective on the ninety-first day after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act and shall expire as designated by the selecting Advisory Council, one at the end of one year, one at the end of two years, and one at the end of three years after such date; and

"(B) any director so appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(C) The Corporation shall have an Executive Director, who shall be an attorney, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board of Directors, at rates of compensation fixed by the Board, and serve at the pleasure of the Board. No individual shall serve as Executive Director of the Corporation for a period in excess of 6 years.

"(d) No political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, or promoting any officer, attorney or employee of the Corporation. No officers or employees of the Corporation shall receive any salary from any source other than the Corporation during the period of employment by the Corporation.

"ADVISORY COUNCIL: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

"Sec. 905. (a) The Board shall provide for the selection of a Clients Advisory Council subsequent to the first such Council to be composed of not more than 11 members, selected in accordance with procedures established by the Board, from among individuals who are representative of the class of clients served by the legal services programs conducted or assisted by the Corporation. The Clients Advisory Council shall be available to advise the President on general policy matters relating to the needs of the members of the client community and to select members of the Board in accordance with section 904.

"(b) The Board shall provide for a Project Attorneys Advisory Council subsequent to the first such project. Project Attorneys Advisory Council shall be composed of not more than 11 members to be selected in accordance with procedures established by the Board, from among individuals who are attorneys actively engaged in providing legal services conducted by the Corporation. The Project Attorneys Advisory Council shall be available to advise the President on general policy relating to the furnishing of legal services to members of the client community and to select members of the Board in accordance with section 904.

"(c) The Board may establish an Executive Committee of not less than five members

nor more than seven members which shall consist of the Chairman of the Board, the Executive Director of the Corporation, one director appointed pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 904(a), one director appointed pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 904(a), and one director appointed pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 904(a).

"ACTIVITIES AND POWERS OF THE CORPORATION

"Sec. 906. (a) Effective six months after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act, in order to carry out the purposes of this title, the Corporation is authorized to—

"(1) provide financial assistance to qualified programs furnishing legal service to members of the client community;

"(2) provide financial assistance to pay the costs of contracts or other agreements made pursuant to section 3 of the National Legal Services Corporation Act;

"(3) carry out research, training, technical assistance, experimental and clinical assistance programs designed to improve the provisions of legal services to members of the client community;

"(4) increase opportunities for legal education among individuals who are members of a minority group or individuals who are economically disadvantaged;

"(5) collect and disseminate information designed to coordinate and evaluate the effectiveness of the activities and programs for legal service in various parts of the country;

"(6) assist and coordinate all programs for the provision of legal service and legal assistance to the client community conducted or assisted by the Federal Government including—

"(A) reviewing all grants and contracts for the provision of legal services to the client community made under other provisions of Federal law by any agency of the Federal Government together with making recommendations to the appropriate Federal agency;

"(B) reviewing and making recommendations to the President and Congress concerning any proposal, whether by legislation or executive action, to establish a federally assisted program for the provision of legal services to the client community; and

"(C) upon request of the President, providing training, technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation services to any federally assisted legal services program;

"(7) establish such procedures and take such other measures as may be necessary to assure that attorneys employed by the Corporation and attorneys paid in whole or in part from funds provided by the Corporation carry out the same duties to their clients and enjoy the same protection from interference as if such an attorney was hired directly by the client;

"(8) establish standards of eligibility for the provision of legal services to be rendered by any grantee or contractee of the Corporation with special provision for priority for members of the client community whose means are least adequate to obtain private legal services;

"(9) establish policies consistent with the best standards of the legal profession to assure the integrity, effectiveness and professional quality of the attorneys providing legal services under this title; and

"(10) carry on such other activities as would further the purpose of this title.

"(b) In the performance of the functions set forth in subsection (a) the Corporation is authorized to—

"(1) make grants, enter into contracts, leases, cooperative agreements or other transactions, in accordance with by-laws established by the Board of Directors appropriate to conduct the activities of the Corporation;

"(2) accept unconditional gifts or donations of services, money or property, real, per-

sonal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, and use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the purpose of carrying out its activities;

"(3) appoint such attorneys and other professional and clerical personnel as may be required and fix their compensation;

"(4) promulgate regulations containing criteria specifying the manner of approval of applications for grants based upon the following considerations—

"(A) the most economical, effective and comprehensive delivery of legal services to the client community;

"(B) peaceful resolution of grievances and resort to orderly means of seeking change; and

"(C) maximum utilization of the expertise and facilities of organizations presently specializing in the delivery of legal services to the client community;

"(5) establish and maintain a law library;

"(6) establish procedures for the conduct of legal services programs assisted by the Corporation containing a requirement that the applicant will give assurances that the program will be supervised by a policymaking board on which the members of the legal profession constitute a majority and members of the client community constitute at least one-third of the members of such Board.

"(c) In any case in which services are performed for the Federal Government by the Corporation the Corporation shall be reimbursed for the cost of such services pursuant to an agreement between the executive director of the Corporation and the head of the agency of the Federal Government concerned.

#### "NON-PROFIT AND NON-POLITICAL NATURE OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 907. (a) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"(b) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any Director, officer, employee or any other individual except as reasonable compensation for services.

"(c) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

#### "ACCESS TO RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 908. (a) Copies of all records and documents pertinent to each grant and contract made by the Corporation shall be maintained in a place readily accessible and open to public inspection during ordinary working hours for a period of at least five years subsequent to the making of such grant or contract.

"(b) Copies of all reports pertinent to the evaluation, inspection or monitoring of grantees and contractees shall be maintained for a period of at least three years, subsequent to such evaluation, inspection or monitoring visit. Upon request, substance of such reports shall be furnished to the grantee or contractee who is the subject of the evaluation, inspection or monitoring visit.

"(c) The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act.

#### "FINANCING OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 909. In addition to any funds reserved and made available for payment to the Corporation from appropriations for carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for any fiscal year, there are further authorized to be appropriated for payment to the Corporation such sums as may be necessary for any fiscal year. Funds made available to the Corporation from appropriations for any fiscal year shall remain available until expended.

#### "RECORD AND AUDIT OF THE CORPORATION AND THE RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 910. (a) The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited annually in accord-

ance with generally accepted auditing standards by any independent licensed public accountant certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. Each such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person conducting the audit, and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balance, or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents and custodians shall be afforded to any such person. The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required under this title. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit of the Corporation, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the income and expenses of the Corporation during the year, and a statement of the sources and application of funds, together with the opinion of the independent auditor of those statements.

"(b) (1) The financial transactions of the Corporation for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of its operations may be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. The representative of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers and property of the Corporation shall remain in the possession and custody of the Corporation.

"(2) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto, as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the Executive Director and to each member of the Board at the time submitted to the Congress.

"(c) (1) Each grantee or contractee, other than a recipient of a fixed price contract awarded pursuant to competitive bidding procedures, under this section shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(2) The Corporation or any of its duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination of

any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this section. The Comptroller General of the United States, or any of his duly authorized representatives shall also have access thereto for such purpose during any fiscal year for which Federal funds are available to the Corporation.

#### "REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 911. The Corporation shall prepare an annual report for transmittal to the President and the Congress on or before the thirtieth day of January of each year, summarizing the activities of the Corporation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. This report shall include findings and recommendations concerning the preservation of the attorney-client relationships and adherence to the Code of Professional Responsibility of the American Bar Association in the conduct of programs supported by the Corporation. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the operations, activities, financial condition and accomplishments of the Corporation together with dissenting views and recommendations, if any, of Members of the Board.

"SEC. 912. As used in this title the term—  
"(1) 'client community' means individuals unable to obtain private legal counsel because of inadequate financial means;

#### "DEFINITIONS

"(2) 'member of the client community' includes any person unable to obtain private legal counsel because of inadequate means;

"(3) 'representative of the client community' includes any person who is selected by members of the client community whether or not a member of that community;

"(4) 'legal services' includes legal advice, legal representation, legal research, education concerning legal rights and responsibilities and similar activities;

"(5) 'legal profession' refers to that body composed of all persons admitted to practice before the highest court of at least one State of the United States;

"(6) 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(7) 'nonprofit' as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual;

"(8) 'Corporation' means the National Legal Services Corporation to be established pursuant to this title.

#### "FEDERAL CONTROL

"SEC. 913. Nothing contained in this title shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the Corporation or any of its grantees or contractors or employees, or over the charter or bylaws of the Corporation, or over the attorneys providing legal services pursuant to this title, or over the members of the client community receiving legal services pursuant to this title."

SEC. 3. (a) During the fiscal year 1972 the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall take such action as may be necessary, in cooperation with the Executive Director of the National Legal Services Corporation, to arrange for the orderly continuance by such Corporation of financial assistance to legal services programs assisted pursuant to sections 222(a)(3), 230, 232 or any other provision, of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Whenever the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity determines that an obligation to provide financial assistance pursuant to any contract or grant agreement for such legal services will extend beyond six months after the date of enactment of this Act, he shall include in

any such contract or agreement provisions to assure that the obligation to provide such financial assistance may be assumed by the National Legal Services Corporation, subject to such modifications of the terms and conditions of that contract or grant agreement as the Corporation determines to be necessary.

(b) Effective six months after the date of enactment of this Act, section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is repealed.

SEC. 4. (a) Of the amounts appropriated to the Office of Economic Opportunity for carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, there shall be reserved and made available to the Legal Services Corporation established pursuant to title IX of such Act, not less than the sums of \$140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after the enactment of this Act but prior to the enactment of appropriations to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall, out of appropriations then available to him, make funds available to assist in meeting the organizational expenses of the Corporation and in carrying out its activities.

SEC. 5. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after section 622 thereof the following new section:

"RESPONSIBILITY FOR NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

"SEC. 623. Nothing in this Act, except title IX, and no reference to this Act unless such reference refers to title IX, shall be construed to affect the powers and activities of the National Legal Services Corporation."

### THE REVENUE SHARING TRAP

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1971, I was privileged to address this House for 60 minutes on the politics and pitfalls of the administration's revenue sharing proposals. Subsequent to my speech, three articles in the Sacramento Bee have been brought to my attention. These articles clearly point out the folly of approaching solutions to national problems through the distribution of Federal funds to State and local governments with little or no Federal control.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting these articles in the RECORD, and I highly commend them to my colleagues:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Mar. 7, 1971]

#### OPPONENTS MISS POINT OF NIXON PROGRAM FOR REVENUE SHARING

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's plan to return "power to the people" by sharing federal revenues with state and local governments deserves a better critique than it has received so far from political opponents.

Many Democrats in Congress have been quick to reject the proposal simply on the ground that state legislatures and city councils cannot be trusted to handle major new responsibilities.

Evidence of corruption and malfeasance is being compiled gleefully on Capitol Hill to show how the taxpayers' money would be squandered if Washington began to turn it over to state and local officials with no strings attached.

This crude attack, however, completely misses its target. Every lapse of virtue in statehouses and city halls can be duplicated by an instance of wrongdoing at the federal level. It would be difficult to pick the winner between Washington and other levels of government in a contest centering on honesty, intelligence or dedication.

But that is not—and should not be—the decisive criterion. What matters is whether at this stage in American history major problems lend themselves better to solutions at the national level—or can be neatly cut up and treated within the confines of state and local jurisdictions.

The question really boils down to one of practicality. Which approach is likely to produce a greater measure of success?

#### EASILY RESOLVED

Viewed in that light, the issue is easily resolved. Given the increasing "national" character of most of our social and economic problems, it is sheer delusion to pretend that a return to simpler days offers any real hope.

State and local governments cannot regulate conglomerate empires, oil cartels and utility combines which stretch across many states and even take on global dimensions. Nor can they cope with problems of economic dislocation, poverty, welfare dependence, rural migration and inadequate health care, which are rooted in developments hundreds and thousands of miles beyond their immediate borders.

Nixon himself has recognized this unavoidable set of affairs by a number of actions which have tended to centralize and expand power at the national level—in complete disregard of his official rhetoric.

It was under his administration that rail passenger service became effectively nationalized with the creation of Railpax—a move which abolishes the last vestiges of state control in this vital field.

It is under this administration that the federal government is expanding by quantum leaps its authority to control air and water pollution.

And it was Nixon who only recently recommended a new comprehensive health care system which for the first time would set national standards for the insurance industry and impose additional federal requirements on practically every employer in the nation.

Similarly, the President continues to fight for a welfare reform plan which would go a long way toward eliminating states and counties from any effective decisionmaking roles regarding public assistance programs. In education, he is recommending creation of national research institutes which could undermine much of the curriculum diversity now evident at elementary, secondary and university levels.

All these actions, of course, are triggered as practical responses to national problems which simply will not go away. The federal government may not have the best possible solutions. Or sometimes not even workable ones. But in these, as in so many other fields, it often turns out to be the only place where a critical problem can be tackled with some realistic expectation of success.

Even Gov. Ronald Reagan, whose rhetoric at times borders on secessionism, now clamors for federal action to solve farm labor disputes—a rank admission that "sovereign" California occasionally must turn to Washington for help.

#### WHY THE PUSH?

Why then the big push for revenue sharing, less power in Washington and a rebirth of state and local governments?

To some extent, this rhetoric satisfies a romantic longing in all of us for less complicated institutional mechanisms.

To the President it offers a potential means of dumping unpopular problems and decisions on state and local officials, while it camouflages his opposite moves in the direction of concentrating power along the banks of the Potomac.

After all, revenue sharing and decentralization are being recommended by a President who so far has doubled the White House staff and tripled its budget.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee Mar. 9, 1971]

#### SHARING PLAN FAVORS LEAST NEEDY CITIES (By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Beverly Hills would receive \$24 for every resident under President Nixon's revenue sharing plan—twice as much as Sacramento's \$12-per-capita share.

The municipal treasury of Palm Springs would be enriched by \$26 for each inhabitant of that plush resort—double the \$13-a-head slice earmarked for Fresno.

The City of Commerce in Los Angeles County, with one of the wealthiest tax bases in California, could claim \$47 a person—more than five times as much as Modesto's \$9 level.

These sharp disparities, which are just coming to light, are expected to intensify Democratic opposition to the President's tax-sharing plan—the cornerstone of his domestic program.

#### CENSUS FIGURES

A check of 1970 census figures shows practically every section of California would experience wide variations in revenue-sharing allocations from one city to another.

In many instances, communities with high levels of poverty would end up at the bottom of the list.

For example, affluent Carmel would qualify for \$19 per capita while neighboring Monterey, faced with a growing list of urban problems, would be compensated only at the rate of \$11.

In Los Angeles County, comparatively well-off Long Beach would receive \$20 a person while economically depressed Compton would have to settle for a \$5 level.

Even so, Compton would be more fortunate than several other communities in its county, including Norwalk, \$2.10; Culver City, \$1.60; Hawaiian Gardens, \$1.70, and Cudahy, \$1.30.

#### BASIS OF FORMULA

The highly varied pattern of per-capita rates is due to a White House decision to distribute revenue-sharing sums within each state on the basis of the tax effort of each jurisdiction.

The formula ignores such factors as population and need.

Thus, a city with a high tax base which has an easy time raising sufficient funds for municipal services would fare better than a community struggling with a rising population and low assessments.

#### STATE GOVERNMENT

California would receive \$590 million in unrestricted grants under Nixon's plan to share \$5 billion a year with smaller parts for state, county and city governments.

In determining each state's allocation, population would count as a major factor. But, when it comes to dividing those slices into smaller parts of state, county and city governments, each jurisdiction's revenue-raising effort becomes the governing element.

Thus, California's state government would keep \$273 million—or about 46 per cent—because its tax collections are slightly less than the combined total of all revenues raised by city and county governments.

In turn, cities and counties would split the rest—\$317 million, or 54 per cent of California's over-all allocation.

Of the \$317 million, the cities would keep \$154 million and the counties \$163 million—again a split reflecting their respective tax-raising efforts.

Finally, the share of each city and county also would be determined by its relative performance in raising revenues.

For example, the Treasury Department places current revenues of the City of Sacramento at \$29.5 million—about \$116 a person.

#### SOME EXAMPLES

Beverly Hill's revenues are figured at \$7.5 million—about \$224 per capita, or just about double Sacramento's rate.

Thus, Beverly Hills would be entitled to \$811,871 for its 33,416 residents under revenue sharing—or \$24 per capita—while Sacramento would receive \$3,179,135 for its 254,413 inhabitants—a rate of \$12.

With eight times the population of Beverly Hills, Sacramento would receive only four times as much from Washington in revenue-sharing money.

In contrast, San Francisco would top them both—with \$33 per capita. The bay city's high standing under the President's plan is traceable to two factors—a declining population and a fast rising commercial tax base.

Oakland would receive only \$15 per capita.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Mar. 8, 1971]

#### STATE HAD RECORD YEAR GAIN IN U.S. FUNDS (By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Figures released by the Treasury Department show California registered a record one-year gain of \$775 million in federal grants to its state and local governments.

California's share rose to \$2.998 billion in the last fiscal year, compared with \$2.223 billion in the previous year.

Federal support for the state's welfare programs accounted for the lion's share of the new total and the huge jump.

#### FROM HUD

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare funneled \$1.446 billion into California for various public assistance programs, an increase of \$342 million over fiscal 1969.

Another major jump took place in federal highway aid, with payments to the state rising from \$300 million to \$495 million.

In contrast, California received \$20.9 million for urban mass transportation, a drop of \$3.3 million from the year prior.

#### 12% OF TOTAL

The state's overall take of nearly \$3 billion represents more than 12 per cent of a national total of \$24.2 billion.

Nationally, grants to state and local governments rose by about \$4 billion with California accounting for nearly 20 per cent of the increase.

New York remained in No. 2 position with \$2.365 billion—\$633 million behind California, New York's one-year gain totaled \$318 million, less than half the increase registered by California.

#### BOUND TO INTENSIFY

By putting into sharp relief California's huge stake in existing federal grant-in-aid programs, the new figures are bound to intensify questions about the state's potential gains or losses under President Nixon's \$5 billion revenue-sharing plan.

Under the President's proposal, California's state and local governments would receive \$590 million a year in unrestricted funds. The White House maintains this money would be on top of the amounts the state now receives from grant-in-aid programs.

But critics contend congressional approval of revenue sharing inevitably would lead to

a contraction or leveling off of existing grants. Were this to happen, California would be accepting an additional \$590 million under revenue sharing but having to forego much bigger annual jumps in existing grants-in-aid.

#### BY NJ SOLON

The new statistics on federal grants were obtained by Rep. Charles W. Sandman Jr., R-NJ, in advance of official publication. Treasury officials said they remain subject to final review.

The congressman, who inserted each state's total in the Congressional Record, said the information should prove "most interesting" in the consideration of Nixon's revenue-sharing plan.

The grant totals are limited strictly to funds channeled to state and local agencies. They do not include federal payments to individuals, such as Social Security and veterans' benefits.

#### NOT REFLECTED

Nor do they reflect defense and other outlays for federal activities in the various states.

Thus, California's share of nearly \$3 billion in federal grants represents only about 10 per cent of the estimated amount actually spent in the state by Washington in the last fiscal year.

The Treasury figures show the following changes in California's grant allocations from 1968-69 to 1969-70:

Agriculture—Food stamps, up from \$20.6 million to \$60.6 million; surplus commodities distribution, up from \$13.4 million to \$16.1 million; child nutrition, up from \$8.6 million to \$22.7 million.

Disaster relief—Up from \$2.2 million to \$60.9 million.

War on Poverty—Community action programs down from \$91.6 million to \$77.2 million; adult work training, up from \$16.7 million to \$18.6 million; Neighborhood Youth Corps, up from \$22.9 million to \$23.2 million; work experience training, up from \$791,000 to \$25.5 million.

Education—Elementary and secondary programs, \$106 million, no change; "impact" aid to districts near federal installations, up from \$55.8 million to \$95.4 million; vocational education, up from \$20.2 million to \$22.5 million.

Health—Hospital, health research and health education facilities, down from \$23.4 million to \$21 million; comprehensive health planning, down from \$13.4 million to \$9.8 million; health manpower education, up from \$5 million to \$6.2 million; mental health research and services, up from \$7.9 million to \$18.1 million.

Housing and urban development—Low-rent public housing, up from \$20.5 million to \$31.8 million; urban renewal, up from \$64 million to \$65.3 million; open space grants, down from \$9.5 million to \$5.7 million; model cities, up from \$258,000 to \$2.5 million; urban planning, up from \$2.1 million to \$2.8 million.

Pollution control—Waste treatment facilities, up from \$10.5 million to \$13.2 million.

Law enforcement—Manpower training, up from \$1.5 million to \$37.6 million.

Unemployment compensation—Up from \$69.2 million to \$72.4 million.

Transportation—Airports, down from \$6.7 million to \$3 million.

#### WE MUST COMPLETE OUR JOB ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

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

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, the House took up without prior notice to the membership, and on a day when no business was scheduled, a con-

ference report on the debt ceiling legislation to which the Senate had attached an amendment increasing social security benefits by 10 percent across the board. The increase is retroactive to the first of the year and includes a 5-percent increase in special payments to noninsured persons aged 72 and over.

I have two regrets, Mr. Speaker. One, that the legislation was brought in without due notice, depriving me of the opportunity to be recorded in favor of this long-delayed increase to help our retired citizens, those who are hardest hit by the insidious backdoor tax of inflation.

The other is that the conference report did only a half-way job. It struck out the proposed increase in allowable income, also referred to as an "increase in earnings test." At the present time social security beneficiaries may only earn up to \$1,680 annually before loss of benefits.

Older people blessed with good health and talent should be encouraged to work, not penalized. We should set our sights on an increase now in the earnings test with a programed elimination over a reasonable period.

The conference report also neglected the very desirable feature of gearing benefits to the cost of living.

The job is only half done after months of promise and delay which has caused much suffering to our older citizens so many of whom face serious economic hardships.

Let us urge our colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to complete the job swiftly.

#### DYNAMIC PROPOSAL BY GOVERNOR REAGAN ON WELFARE

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of welfare is escalating at an alarming rate, and this is certainly demonstrated by the rising welfare rolls. Many proposals and alternatives have been suggested. Most of them have been extremely costly, and offer no tangible or realistic hope for real and constructive reform. However, on the 3d of March 1971, the Honorable Governor Ronald Reagan of California, in an address, offered a sensible and feasible plan for the State of California. The Governor's plan would bring relief to the already overburdened taxpayer, and at the same time, would not penalize those on welfare in real need, or who have a desire to work and a desire to better themselves. His proposal is a dynamic example of State and local leadership taking the initiative to solve America's No. 1 domestic problem. If successful, Governor Reagan's plan can serve as a model for other Governors and other States to follow, as well as this entire Nation.

Governor Reagan's plan and speech of March 3, 1971, is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY GOV. RONALD REAGAN

Mr. Chairman, Members of Town Hall, Ladies and Gentlemen:

First let me thank you of Town Hall for your thoughtful and timely invitation. I suspect that you were aware you were providing a forum through which the people of California could be reached. In doing so, you

have been of great service because the people of California are confronted by a most serious problem.

In the last few days, I have been asked a number of times if the political honeymoon is over. I am not sure it ever started. On the wedding night someone said something about stepping into the next room to slip into something comfortable—and they never came back.

On January 4, in my inaugural remarks I said that unless we who had been elected to office were willing to completely reform our programs of social welfare, we would have to ask you for a tax increase this and every succeeding year as far as we could see into the future.

What we call California's welfare and health care system is in reality nothing more than a state implementation of federal mandates approaching \$3½ billion in cost and leading us into sure bankruptcy unless we have the courage to choose another course before it is too late.

If misery loves company the theme music for the National Governors Conference in Washington last week must have been "Hearts and Flowers." Those states which have breezed along without having to tap all the potential tax sources such as the sales or statewide income tax are now adopting one or the other, or both. In an unprecedented crisis Pennsylvania ran totally out of state funds four days ago.

There was no partisanship at this conference nor in the unanimous endorsement of federal revenue sharing. But the topic dominating all others was welfare and how long government at any level could keep pace with its ever increasing cost. I might add there was great interest in California because we were the only state readying a concrete proposal for welfare reform. Surprising was the general acceptance that added revenues were only temporary expedients and not a permanent answer to the problem.

Certainly this is true in California. The biggest of our welfare programs, Aid to Dependent Children, increased its case load 39 percent last year and its cost 42 percent. Medi-Cal is increasing more than twice as fast as our normal increase in revenues. One out of nine Californians is drawing some form of welfare now and by the end of the next fiscal year, if welfare goes on increasing at the present rate, it will be one out of seven.

Even cutting back legitimate government services and postponing important and needed projects, we face the fact that to continue the present welfare and Medi-Cal programs without change will require \$220 million more than we have. To save the state \$220 million in welfare means reducing the total costs more than \$600 million. We cannot reduce our share without reducing costs at the county and the federal level. Or put another way, if we have to ask the taxpayers for an additional \$220 million in state revenue, we force the counties to raise property taxes another hundred million and add roughly \$300 million to federal costs. And of course the same citizen pays it all—county, state and federal. Right now, Californians are paying \$32 billion in taxes of which more than \$20 billion goes to Uncle Sam. That is a tax burden that pro-rates out at \$4,152 for every average family of four in California. A choice has to be made. Either we tighten government's belt or we loosen your purse strings and extract even more money than we are now taking. I am unalterably opposed to that latter choice.

Last month I submitted to the legislature a budget which can be balanced without increased taxes if we undertake a total reform of welfare and Medi-Cal. About two hours ago a message outlining this reform was delivered to both chambers of the legislature. I had planned a more personalized delivery of this message but a funny thing happened to me on the way upstairs.

Perhaps it is just as well, for the message is probably the most comprehensive and detailed ever submitted by any governor of this state. It calls for a sweeping 70 point reform of the entire welfare system. Legislation by the Senate and Assembly will be required in some of the proposed changes. Others can be made administratively and we will need the cooperation of the federal government to complete the package. The Social Security Act says that states should be encouraged to experiment with demonstration projects. On this basis, we are requesting the necessary waivers.

If there were no fiscal crisis, we would still have to urge welfare reform on the grounds of common sense. Present regulations are so ambiguous that court decisions have added \$441 million to the cost of California welfare since 1967 and if we lose the cases still pending, another \$1.8 billion will be added. But an even more compelling reason for reform is one of moral responsibility.

We had a task force of volunteer citizens and our own appointees and staff working on this problem last summer. The counties were doing the same and some of our reform proposals, incidentally, reflect their findings.

Reform is needed not only because welfare is an administrative disaster leading us to bankruptcy, but because it is a tragic failure for those who are destitute and who have nowhere else to turn for the most basic requirements of living. Let me emphasize this latter point because any time changes are proposed in welfare there are those who will raise a cry that we are lacking in compassion for the poor. The very opposite is true. Welfare today is spread so thin it is incapable of properly caring for the truly needy and destitute. It is spread thin in attempting to provide for too many who are not needy but who through loopholes are legally eligible to claim welfare benefits, and too many who are receiving aid illegally because there is just no way to prevent their cheating and because there is a gigantic extravagant administrative overhead bound in endless miles of red tape and born of overlapping and duplicating agencies.

I have heard the repeated statements that welfare fraud is only one or two percent and not really an item of concern—or even something you can do much about. The truth is no one knows. No one in the United States knows how many people are receiving welfare. We all know how many checks are being mailed out but we have no way of knowing how many individuals are getting several checks under different names. We do not know because regulations keep us from checking on an applicant's declaration—we must accept his word as to his need.

Recently in the San Francisco bay area, a group of citizens set out to show how easy it is to get on welfare. Some of them managed to get on as many as four times in one day in a single office. In our neighbor state of Nevada, the governor (who declared himself to me as a liberal Democrat), ordered a house to house canvas of welfare recipients. (They have a limited enough population to be able to do this.) This actual head count revealed 22 percent of their welfare recipients are receiving welfare dishonestly. Some time ago a welfare conducted investigation in the District of Columbia turned up less than two percent of fraud—a congressional investigation then found it was 57 percent. Even so, I have to question whether fraud costs as much as the legal kind of cheating we have created by our own well intentioned effort to provide work incentives. This idea (spawned in Washington) has created a whole new class of affluent poor.

An answer was needed for the individual who sees no reason to work if the dollars for working only replace the dollars he or she can get from welfare. It was decided that a proper incentive would be to supplement earnings by continuing to pay at least a part

of the welfare grant. By the time they had finished "thinking of everything", the intended incentive had become a windfall known in the welfare trade as the 30 and a third formula. It goes to work when the recipient gets a job. How much of the welfare grant he keeps is determined by not counting \$30 of his earnings as eligible income, nor do you count one-third of the remainder, nor deduction for income tax, union dues, or pension plan. Additional allowance is made for clothing, child care, transportation (and this includes car payments) and finally \$25 miscellaneous. There is virtually no ceiling on earnings above which you become ineligible for welfare although we have found it usually does not go much above \$1,200 a month. At least one man in California, however, managed to keep his welfare grant plus \$16,800 a year in salary. More typical is the case I described in the current issue of "U.S. News and World Report". I gave an example of a California recipient receiving a grant of \$339 a month who took a job paying \$582 a month. The formula reduced the \$582 to \$42 countable income and thus the \$339 grant was only cut by \$29. This individual now has an income of \$892 a month—a good portion of it tax free—and is eligible for Medi-Cal and food stamps.

Our task force surveyed those counties which together carry 40 percent of the welfare case load. We learned that working welfare recipients have average earnings of \$346 a month. Their grants in aid not counting Medi-Cal (for which they remain eligible) averaged \$186. The grants for those with no outside earnings or income are only \$21 more or \$207 a month. Simple decency suggests reducing the supplemental grant and increasing the \$207 so as to provide a more decent living for the totally destitute. Our reform proposes doing this. We will first of all provide better for the truly needy. Admittedly our first requirement in these stringent times must be balancing the budget but even so we can also improve the lot of the poor and as we put our financial house in order do so even more substantially.

Some will accuse me of citing horror stories which they claim are only isolated cases. But they are wrong. Contra Costa County estimates it has 2500 people fully employed and on welfare; 148 of them earn more than \$600 a month. Alameda County puts its figure at almost 4000 with 198 earning more than \$600.

We can have realistic eligibility procedures to eliminate or at least curtail fraud, a ceiling on earnings above which no welfare payments will be made and a reduction in the grants to those who have outside income. Able-bodied and employable recipients will be required to work or take job training and we will go after those fathers who have deserted their families, contributing nothing to their support. In California they number 250,000. We intend to provide the counties with the financial incentive to solve this problem. Properly pursued it could be used to help the counties offset their welfare expenses.

Strengthening the role of the family is basic to our proposal. It is called: "Meeting the Challenge: a responsible plan for welfare and Medi-Cal reform." Obviously time will not permit the details of the 70 point proposal we have made, but let me summarize the more important changes. First, we think the unemployables who are in fact pensioners, the aged, the disabled and blind should be removed from the welfare structure. The state will assume all administrative and grant payments for these citizens numbering about 600,000. Their payments will be automated similar to the method used in paying Social Security. There is no need for a costly bureaucracy checking to see if the elderly are continuing to get older. With the administrative savings we should eventually be able to increase their pensions so as to give life a little more dignity, pleasure and meaning.

The state would be taking over about \$92 million in present county expenses but in another area—"Aid to Families with Dependent Children"—the counties would assume an additional \$84 million of cost. So the net effect of these statistics is \$8 million in savings to the counties in 1971-72.

Let me say here and now to those who have charged we intend to balance state spending by dumping the load on the counties . . . they are, as usual, talking through their hats. One of the absolute musts in this reform program is that there be no net cost shift to the counties. As a matter of fact, let me repeat what I said earlier, if there is no reform, county costs will go up \$100 million. With reform this will, of course, be eliminated. The \$8 million projected savings next year will grow in future years and could be as much as \$47 million in savings to the counties during 1972-73.

With the change of the elderly and disabled to a pension status, welfare will then be dealing with the potentially employable. As of now welfare is as I have described it "at sea without rudder or compass." Just putting ever increasing numbers of people on a dole and providing food and shelter is not a worthwhile goal. These people are not a faceless mass—they are individuals with individual and unique reasons why many have been unable to get into the competitive labor market. Finding and treating with that unique and personal reason will give welfare a purpose and a goal. The goal must be to eliminate, if possible, the need for itself. We must begin to measure our success by how many people we have removed from the rolls each year, not how many we have added. We intend to place the employable welfare recipient under the jurisdiction of the Department of Human Resources Development. This department's total effort is devoted to job hunting and job training. Social workers assigned to this new jurisdiction will be judged not on the basis of how many people they place on welfare, but how many they place in jobs. This entire concept was born of recommendations made by the County Supervisors Association.

California has not been hesitant about job training programs, quite the contrary. The only major government funded program now dealing with welfare job training is "WIN"—work incentive program. Almost a third of all those who have obtained jobs through "WIN" in the entire nation, have done so in California.

Now we propose going further. The able-bodied employables will be expected to work in a public work force if they are not engaged in a job training program. They will receive the same benefits they are getting now, but will in return work at public assistance jobs which will benefit the community and the state. These will not be boondoggles or meaningless tasks for some punitive reason of "work for the sake of working." Every department of the state has been told to list those things it would do if it had the manpower and the funds. In addition, local government will be asked to provide work which can range from supervising school playgrounds and helping in child care centers, to working in the field of environment. Los Angeles County has already proposed using recipients as school watchmen to prevent vandalism. The program will be permanent but the individuals will be as temporary as we can make them. Every effort will be made to move them from this public work force into jobs in the private sector.

If an individual refuses to take a job when it is available, participate in a job training program or in this interim public work force, he or she will be denied further welfare assistance.

This, very much briefed down, is the direction our welfare reform takes. There are, in addition, changes in eligibility standards, elimination of unnecessary red tape and paperwork, increased auditing of abuses, flat grant computations and prior month budgeting to determine the size of welfare grants.

The goals are simple and straight forward: to increase our assistance to the truly needy; to require those who are able to work to seek work, train for a job or serve their community if asked as a reasonable condition for receiving welfare; and to strengthen family responsibility as the basic element in our society.

Then we propose to reform our health care program, known as Medi-Cal. This program went into operation in the spring of 1966. By spring of 1967 it was in financial trouble and was bogged down administratively with providers of service waiting six months or more for payment. Some of the management snarls have been taken care of but not the problems created by its unlimited benefits plus the case load explosion in welfare.

The working men and women in California who pay for this program are providing a level of health care for the others, that they can't possibly afford for themselves. Most health care plans or industrial and union programs offer no more than eight services with the individual paying part of the cost for each of those. Medi-Cal offers 20 totally free services with no restriction whatsoever on utilization.

In 1967 there were 97 claims of Medi-Cal for every one hundred participants—today there are 141 claims per 100 enrollees. The per capita health care cost per year for the average citizen is \$312. The average cost per Medi-Cal recipient was \$517 last year. We are proposing legislation to bring Medi-Cal benefits in line with those which the tax-paying citizens can afford.

Instead of a no-limit credit card Medi-Cal will provide a card good for the same amount of health care services the average citizen uses each year. Provision will, of course, be made for the cases of catastrophic illness or accident or emergency. To control over-utilization we propose a partial or token payment by every Medi-Cal patient for the services he receives—a dollar for each visit to the doctor or for each drug prescription, etc. The provider would collect this and bill Medi-Cal for the balance.

In North Carolina a test was run on drug prescriptions alone and utilization was reduced by 25 per cent. In England socialized medical program token payment resulted in almost 10 percent reduction when tried.

I know that many will see our proposed welfare reform only as a device to balance the budget and this will lead to charges that we are placing dollars above human beings. To do so is at best the cheapest kind of demagoguery and at worst selfish, irresponsible protection of self interest.

Of course, we seek to balance the budget; the Constitution and common sense require that we do so. What is the alternative? An increase in state taxes which must be accompanied by a corresponding increase in county taxes and further deficit spending at the federal level. And if all of that is done, it must be repeated again and again until the very system collapses.

In the meantime, welfare goes on falling those who need it most, destroying our most precious resource, our people. Finally faced with economic crisis, we will find ourselves no longer able to help those who turn to us because they have no other refuge. Our present fiscal plight is not the reason for welfare reform; it is the excuse. It prompts us to do at last that which has needed doing for a long, long time.

Thirty-six years ago, in the dark days of

the Depression, a president of the United States who called on our people to be compassionate warned us at the same time to temper compassion with wisdom. Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The lessons of history show conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit." Was he right? Is there a sickness of spirit spreading over our land?

Last week in Washington, D.C., the "National Welfare Rights Organization," ostensibly formed to protect the interests of the needy, picketed the governor of Nevada for daring to expose those who fraudulently posed as needy in order to rob their fellow citizens. In one of our cities a man with no dependents and earning \$800 a month sued to prevent a county from making him contribute \$20 a month to the support of his aged mother. In St. Louis an industrial firm ran blockbuster ads in six papers offering the unskilled, jobs at \$100 to \$150 a week. One hundred forty-one applied, but most weren't seriously looking for work or they didn't like the money. Of the thirty-eight who finally went on the payroll, 27 didn't show up or if they did, quit in the first two days. The company is still advertising.

An unemployed young father in California, finally forced to accept welfare, is urged by the social worker to free himself of debts by declaring personal bankruptcy. His only assets, his household furnishings, are taken to pay his creditors a few cents on the dollar. But this, he is cheerfully told by the welfare worker, makes him eligible for a house full of brand new furniture courtesy of the taxpayers.

Perhaps you saw the Negro mother on the TV news telling of how she was forced into welfare. She had never been on welfare before. She worked from late afternoon until 11 or 12 at night to support her children. Each evening she left the children at home in charge of the oldest. She arrived home from work one night to find a social worker waiting for her. She was told her children were to be taken from her unless she stayed home to care for them. When she asked how she could support them if she didn't go to work, she was told to quit work and go on welfare. Wouldn't it make more sense to provide a baby sitter?

To those who say reform of welfare is impossible or unworkable, I can only say, "not to Californians." Last week we talked to Secretary Elliot Richardson of HEW and were assured of his very real interest and cooperation. We talked to the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate and obtained their enthusiastic pledge of support in our efforts to make California welfare a pilot program. They asked how many governors would favor what we were trying to do. It was the last day of the conference and we could only contact 27. Twenty-four of them, Democrats and Republicans, signed a letter supporting our major proposals, three took the letter to consult with their congressional delegations, all of them asked for our detailed reform proposals. We are writing the other 23 and have every reason to expect most or all will sign the letter based on their views as expressed at the conference.

I asked for the opportunity to address the joint session of our legislature precisely because of the news coverage that would follow. It is absolutely imperative that the people of California understand what we are trying to accomplish.

Right now the propaganda fires are being stoked by special interest groups determined to resist and kill any effort to change welfare. In the days ahead the legislative committee hearings will be the target for demonstrations and pressure of every kind.

We have had great cooperation from some in the social welfare field who are true professionals and who want order brought out of the present mess. But others, feeling their bureaucratic empires threatened, will challenge every proposal and predict dire results if any part of our plan is adopted. Others will urge total federal takeover as the only solution. This would mean surrendering to those who caused the problem in the first place, and few in federal government want this.

Today we stand at a crossroad. We can continue to talk about welfare, complain about it and watch it grow unchecked while we raise taxes this year and every year thereafter to feed its cancerous growth. Or we can take the steps necessary to control it and reform it so that it will at last have the proud purpose of maximizing human dignity and salvaging the destitute.

This is not a jerry-built, hasty answer to a crisis. It is the result of months of work and study. It is perhaps our last chance. Neither Democratic or Republican, it is humanitarian—and it is ready to be tried.

I have addressed this message to the people of California because we need you.

#### NATIONAL PARKINSON FOUNDATION

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 of this year, the National Parkinson Foundation held its 12th annual Bob Hope Dinner. Bob Hope is Honorary National Chairman of the National Parkinson Foundation. He for 12 years has attended this great fund-raising dinner for research in respect to Parkinson's disease and for rehabilitation programs for the victims of Parkinson's. Bob Hope provides a thrilling evening of entertainment by having many personalities of distinguished national reputation to perform and acting as master of ceremonies himself. In addition, Bob Hope makes annually a generous contribution to the fight against Parkinson's disease which has been carried on very magnificently by the National Parkinson Foundation and the National Parkinson Institute, under the dedicated direction of a great and wonderful lady, Mrs. Jeanne Levey, who with her husband, a victim of Parkinson's disease, founded the National Parkinson Foundation.

My wife was chairman of the dinner this year as she has been for many years previously and she is national chairman of the women's division of the National Parkinson Foundation in which I have also taken an active part.

The National Parkinson Foundation was very fortunate to have as the principal speaker at this year's dinner the Honorable Robert H. Finch, Counsellor to the President. Mr. Finch, out of his great knowledge of the subject from his experience as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and his warmhearted compassion for the victims of this killing and crippling disease, delivered a magnificent address which gave new heart and encouragement to both the victims of Parkinson's

disease and those who have struggled to conquer it with such dynamic leadership.

All honor to a great lady like Mrs. Jeanne Levey and my wife and others who worked devotedly with them and to such great men as Robert H. Finch and Bob Hope for what they have done and will do to find the cause and cure of Parkinson's disease and afford relief to the 1 million people in the United States who are Parkinson's victims.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the able address of Mr. Finch on this moving occasion in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

#### REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. FINCH

Sitting next to me tonight is one of the most lively, most energetic, and most dedicated women I have ever had the pleasure of knowing . . . Mrs. Jeanne Levey. She is vital proof that charming ladies can indeed lead in the betterment of their community and Nation.

As the motivating force behind this tremendous endeavor, Mrs. Levey has built the Parkinson Foundation into a medical facility of the highest caliber.

Now I know that Mrs. Levey couldn't have accomplished all that she has without the generous support of all of you present. So my tribute to her is a tribute to you as well—for sharing her dream.

I couldn't begin to give the deserved recognition to all those who have given special help to Mrs. Levey over the years, but I would like to pay my compliments to Congressman and Mrs. Claude Pepper. Claude, your vice chairman, has long been recognized across the Nation for his valuable contributions to the betterment of health for all our citizens, and he has a long list of impressive awards and tributes which salute his valuable efforts.

But particularly I want to honor the man we all salute tonight, Bob Hope.

No one in this room would disagree with the statement that he is literally one of the great humanitarians of our time.

Nothing could be more appropriate than to have this new Parkinson's Research Institute named in his honor.

When you consider the millions he has raised for charitable causes—the worthwhile endeavors he has been identified with—I guess you'd have to say he's sort of a one-man ambulatory HEW.

Gosh, come to think of it, if you put Bob's generous impulses and fund raising prowess together with the assets of Howard Hughes you could probably do away with the Federal Government entirely.

I will have to talk to the President about that—now that would be real Government reorganization.

The last two years when he did his annual Christmas show for the troops abroad, I worked with Bob so the boys would be actually signing up and preparing to return to college. We called it Project "Hope." It was a great success. Over 50,000 men signed up in 1969 alone.

The President's Message to Congress three days ago is a landmark in our pursuit of health. Here is a national strategy which has been two years in the preparation, and which will marshal and coordinate a variety of health forces, both private and public, to meet the major needs of our people. The proposals cap a long self-examination.

In 1969 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare launched a program to determine how America's health capabilities could best be used to meet our health needs.

Early in the inventory, we saw the unevenness in the distribution of our health efforts.

There was an overabundance of funding and manpower in one area—a shortage in another. Some needs were overstressed, and others disregarded. And through it all—the most advanced nation in the world, in health research, capabilities, and expenditures—the United States, continued to receive poor marks in health statistics. You know them well.

This shortcoming required immediate attention from the new Administration in 1969—and as Secretary of the Department, I was pleased to see the health services turn to, and verify the need for, a new strategy.

The efforts have continued under Secretary Richardson and in our Domestic Council. The result is the President's plan.

It is a new template for making certain that when we invest more of our Nation's resources in the health of our people, we will get a full return on our investment—and we will avoid and overcome the ills that have so long and so often befallen us.

President Nixon has asked Congress to build this new strategy on these basic principles. First we must build on the strengths we have established—one of those strengths is the diversity of our system. We must take advantage of the range of choices our health structure offers to doctors and patients alike, so that from this spectrum of services and achievements, we can select and maximize the care and the cure that will do best.

Second, we must increase our health capabilities by increasing our health manpower. There is need for more doctors and more paramedical personnel. By expanding our medical training facilities, and accelerating their programs, our private health personnel will be increased, and health care will be more widely available and accessible to all.

Third, we must organize for efficiency. So many of our philosophers say, "Money isn't everything." (Even Bob Hope says it, but not out loud.)

In health care this is clearly the problem of the day. But we have one immediate solution. Preventive medicine is a lot less expensive.

We can usually be sure that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We can always be sure that it costs a lot less in money, time, and especially in pain.

Certainly curative medicine is the last resort in defense against disease. Preventive medicine is the first. And it is the only truly satisfactory way to insure personal health.

The best patient care, the most effective care, comes before any illness—not after.

Here is the thrust of our national health strategy. We seek improvements in quality—based on research and discovery. We seek improvements in availability—based on increased numbers of better trained physicians and health personnel. We seek improvements in efficiency—resulting from a broadened practice of preventive medicine.

#### THE FIGHT AGAINST PARKINSON'S DISEASE

The pitched battle which all of us here wage against Parkinson's disease is one whose success will be near and dear to me. It is near, because relatives, friends and clients of mine suffered it. And it is dear, because those I have seen in its throes suffered such untold anguish.

It is an unexpected invader, stealing in and striking almost without warning—taking its toll really before a defense can be made against its dread progress. Those who have watched know best.

But tonight, we can say that our concerted struggle has brought a promise of victory.

We could be on the verge of solving the riddle of Parkinson's disease—how it is caused, how it can be cured or arrested, and how it can be prevented. I can dare to make

this bold statement because of the vital work you are doing here in Miami, for example, and because that work is backed up by substantial efforts in research that will answer these questions.

These earnest efforts have brought us L-Dopa, and enabled us to wisely use this first really effective anti-Parkinson drug to arrest the effects of the disease. Now, however, neurologists predict even greater potential.

L-Dopa will be the new research tool whose usefulness in further discoveries about the disease will prove at least as important as its immediate effectiveness in counteracting Parkinsonism.

As Secretary of HEW I soon got excited about L-Dopa. Let me tell you why.

The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke was a source of that excitement (Dr. MacNichol) because preliminary findings were being positively corroborated. Large-scale trials by other research projects confirmed earlier conclusions so that we could give the green light to widespread use of the drug. In June of 1970, while I was still Secretary of HEW, the Food and Drug Administration was able to license L-Dopa for prescription sale.

In the Domestic Council we have continued to receive favorable reports on research with the drug—in Brookhaven National Laboratory, where Dr. George Cotzias (COT'-SEE-US) continues his broadened work of discovery—and in Miami. Here, the National Parkinson Institute was one of the first organizations in the world to have the vision and courage to go ahead with L-Dopa while it was still considered highly experimental.

The hundreds of patients you have treated can testify to your strikingly successful results.

Some additional, advanced work you are doing is even more current.

An important question now is whether L-Dopa really changes the progress of Parkinson's disease. Does it actually arrest it? Or is it merely symptomatic treatment?

There is a cooperative project on this, which promises to give us an answer to the question.

Together with the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, the National Parkinson Foundation is collecting data on patients who were here—at the Institute—between 1962 and 1964. This information is being matched against identical information for post-L-Dopa patients. The results of the work are beginning to come in, and they will be examined carefully.

To put it all together, now—

Everyone I know, who is aware of the work of this organization, has been impressed and indeed inspired.

The dedication and the courage shown by Mrs. Levey—and by the other leaders in the organization.

The volunteers—the contributors—all of these are dedicated as well—and all have exceeded the call of duty and certainly of charity.

But the most impressive test of any institution of this kind is what you have done for the patients. There is the final proof of success. And now, there is a vision of even greater success.

Only a few years ago the only thought for Parkinson patients was that the disease process could be slowed so that they might enjoy a few more active years.

Today, there is a new expectation that in a short while the process can be completely controlled or arrested.

Then over a million Americans will be freed from the virtual slavery of this tortuouscrippler.

And here—your deeds are father to more than just a wish.

So tonight we are one step closer to that

day when we will be able to say with Bob Hope, *Thanks for Making Parkinson's a Memory.*

#### NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) and more than 100 other Members in both Houses of Congress in introducing this bill to establish a National Legal Services Corporation. Identical legislation is to be introduced in the other body when the Senate meets tomorrow. Its chief sponsors there are Senators MONDALE and TAFT.

The Legal Services program giving people who cannot afford a lawyer full access to the American system of law has proven itself a very effective tool in redressing the problems of poverty. It is developing in many parts of this Nation a confidence in the ability of the law to be a force for good among people who have always thought of the law as the loan shark, the Welfare Department, or an adversary. It is offering hope to people who heretofore have had to face the legal system without education or sophistication.

Despite the program's success, legal services attorneys regularly confront conflict-of-interest problems and political pressures because of its location in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

In the early days of Legal Services, the Office of Economic Opportunity provided a natural location for the initiation and maturing of the legal assistance program. Nevertheless, experience has taught us the difficulties that are inherent in this structure. Throughout the past 5 years—regardless of which administration governed—the integrity of legal help for the poor has been challenged by politics and conflicts. Under the present structure, special attorney-client problems necessarily arise when suits are brought against agencies of the Federal Government, or against State and municipal governments.

The National Legal Services Corporation will encompass the full range of legal assistance presently offered through OEO. The Corporation approach is designed simply to meet three serious needs of the legal services effort—independence, security, and viability to the poor.

The problems of the OEO legal services program have been the subject of considerable study this past year by the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization—known as the Ash Commission—and by the American Bar Association Committee on Right to Legal Services. Both the ABA Committee and the Ash Commission have reached the conclusion that the objective of legal services—assuring that the Nation's poor have full access to our legal sys-

tem—will stand the greatest chance of success by making the program an independent corporation. By the legislation we introduce today, we hope to implement that recommendation.

The ABA consultant's report, written by Charles L. Edson, followed a review of all pertinent Federal statutes as well as more than 70 interviews with leaders in the Departments of Justice, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, and throughout the U.S. Government. The final report contains an appendix written by the Washington law firm of Covington and Burling asserting that the Corporation proposal has been found to be legal and constitutional in all respects.

The National Legal Services Corporation will be established as a separate title under the Economic Opportunity Act. It is patterned after the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The Corporation will be funded by yearly appropriations from Congress. The first fiscal year authorization is \$140 million, about twice the amount spent for the present program. OEO officials estimate that present funding provides legal assistance to less than 20 percent of eligible low-income Americans.

The Corporation will be administered by a 19-member Board of Directors. Five members of the Board will be chosen by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. One member will be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, upon the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Six members serve by virtue of their office, including the president and president-elect of the American Bar Association, president of the American Trial Lawyers Association, president of the National Bar Association, president of the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association, and the president of the American Association of Law Schools. Three Board members will be chosen by a Clients Advisory Council and three will be chosen by a Project Attorney's Advisory Council—each council to be established by the act. The Executive Director of the Corporation, selected by the Board, will also be a voting member of the Board of Directors.

Six months after the date of enactment of this legislation, the Corporation will become fully operative. During the transition period, the Board of Directors will be selected and the Corporation will take necessary organizational steps. OEO will continue to administer the legal services program throughout this transitional period.

I want to stress the fact this legislation has broad bipartisan support. The delivery of legal help to an individual who cannot afford it is critical to each of us, regardless of political or philosophical persuasion.

In drafting this legislation we have sought the advice of many persons in and out of Government, and over a period of many months. We believe it is the best possible way to assure equal justice for all Americans. We strongly urge our colleagues in both Houses of Congress to

act swiftly to establish the independence of legal services.

Mr. Speaker, as supplementary information for my colleagues, I want to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from two lengthy studies on the legal services program. The first excerpt comes from the Ash Council Memorandum to the President, released February 6, 1971; the second is from the consultant's report of the Committee on the Right to Legal Services of the American Bar Association. Following the excerpts, I will include a section-by-section analysis of the National Legal Services Corporation Act.

EXCERPTED FROM: THE CORPORATION FOR LEGAL SERVICES, A CONSULTANT'S REPORT, APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RIGHT TO LEGAL SERVICES, SECTION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

#### SUMMARY

The five years of the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity have been marked by singular achievement. Legal Services lawyers now handle a million matters a year for those who otherwise would see justice denied. Some cases have resulted in landmark judicial decisions significantly altering the law as it affects the poor. Impulses generated by the program have affirmatively affected the law schools, the law firms and other legal institutions.

The program's success dictates that serious thought be given to its permanent structuring. \* \* \* The Departments of Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development, and Justice each have some logical claim to the program, and long term security might be gained if legal services were submerged within a large department. However, legal services lawyers have brought numerous suits against both HEW and HUD funded agencies and those departments as well. Justice represents these departments when they face court challenges. Placing legal services within any of them would create serious conflicts. Further, legal services within either HEW or HUD could mean a replay of the destructive administrative conflicts that have plagued it at OEO. The possibility of placing the program within the Administrative Office of the Courts or the Judiciary itself was rejected on conceptual, administrative and financial grounds.

The study of independent entities focuses on one model of compelling attractiveness, the federally-funded private non-profit corporation as exemplified by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Congress established this corporation in 1967 as a vehicle to channel federal funds to the producers and distributors of educational television programming. The First Amendment concerns of communications freedom that impelled this entity have equal cogency with respect to Legal Services' need for independence. \* \* \*

Legal Services could enjoy similar success if administered by such a private non-profit federally-funded corporation. It is recommended as the permanent funding vehicle for the program. \* \* \*

#### Law Reform and the Legal Ethic

The OEO Legal Services Guidelines issued in early 1966 stressed the necessity for law reform—a position reemphasized not only by all Directors of the Legal Services program but by OEO Directors as well. President Nixon recognized the need for such activity when he stated in his Message of August 11, 1969:

"The sluggishness of many institutions—at all levels of society—in responding to the needs of individual citizens, is one of the central problems of our time. Disadvantaged

persons in particular must be assisted so that they full understand the lawful means of making their needs known and having their needs met."

In addition, the ethics of the legal profession require a lawyer to serve his client by any permissible legal remedy to secure his object. Canon 7 of the Code of Professional Responsibility commands, "A lawyer should represent a client zealously within the bounds of the law." Ethical Consideration 7-1 elaborates:

"The duty of a lawyer, both to his client and to the legal system, is to represent his client zealously within the bounds of the law, which includes Disciplinary Rules and enforceable professional regulations. The professional responsibility of a lawyer derives from his membership in a profession which has the duty of assisting members of the public to secure and protect available legal rights and benefits. In our government of laws and not of men, each member of our society is entitled to have his conduct judged and regulated in accordance with the law; to seek any lawful objective through legally permissible means; and to present for adjudication any lawful claim, issue or defense."

This explicit command makes no exception to a lawyer who feels that his clients' rights can only be redressed by challenging a law or practice that impinges on those rights. In the final analysis, law reform is no more than a lawyer performing his ethical and professional duty for his client.

#### Basis of Judgment

Quickly summarized, to perform its mission, a permanent legal services structure must couple *independence* for the program with the *security* needed to assure its continuation.

Independence connotes: Freedom of a lawyer to represent his client to the limits of his ability within the bounds of professional discretion, including a challenge to established or favored institutions, laws or practices.

Freedom from any political intimidation or retaliation for such representation whatsoever, including efforts to bar action against public agencies.

Freedom for a legal services lawyer to represent his client pursuant to the Code of Professional Responsibility and the highest practices of the profession without interference by any outside source, lay or legal. As Disciplinary Rule 5-107(b) states:

"A lawyer shall not permit a person who recommends, employs or pays him to render legal services for another to direct his professional judgment in rendering such legal services."

As Ethical Consideration EC5-23 amplifies the issue:

"Since a lawyer must always be free to exercise his professional judgment without regard to the interest or motives of a third person, the lawyer who is employed by one to represent another must constantly guard against erosion of his professional freedom."

By security is meant the establishment of a permanent legal services structure with the capacity to achieve governmental, public, client and bar understanding of and support for the provocative and controversial role of legal services in a free society.

#### Private, nonprofit federally aided corporations

Perhaps the least known of all government-affiliated entities, the federally-supported non-profit corporation enjoys a long history. Since 1867, the federal government has been the principal source of funds for Howard University, a comprehensive university organization located in the District of

Columbia. Howard is governed by its own trustees, selected independently from any federal government source. The federal government has a similar relationship with another private institution in the nation's capital—Gallaudet College, a higher institution for deaf persons. Since 1879, Congress has been making funds available to the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville, a non-profit corporation, to assist in the education of the blind by distributing braille books and other equipment.

Two well-known variations of the federally-assisted non-profit corporation are the American Red Cross and the Smithsonian Institution. Congress chartered the Red Cross to fulfill United States obligations under the Geneva Convention and the President appoints the chairman and seven members of the board of governors; however, the Red Cross receives no direct federal funding for its activities and thus provides an undesirable model for the Legal Services program. The Smithsonian Institution, a charitable non-profit corporation, has a dual status—private and governmental. It administers a number of federally-funded programs and, in its private capacity, receives and administers contracts and grants and accepts gifts and bequests from non-federal sources. Its governing body, the Board of Regents, includes the Vice President, the Chief Justice, three members of the Senate, three members of the House, and six citizen members. All in all, the Smithsonian presents an interesting blending of both public and private funding to carry out activities in the public interest.

#### The Corporation for Public Broadcasting

In January 1967, after a year of study, the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television concluded an exhaustive report on public interest broadcasting. Significantly, the Commission recommended extensive federal funding for television program production, although recognizing the free speech danger implicit in government participation in the communications media.

"Because we contemplate federal assistance to Public Television on a far larger scale than at present, the pressing need arises to identify the manner in which federal funds will flow to the system. There is at once involved in the relation between freedom of expression, intimately and necessarily a concern of Public Television, and federal support. (Carnegie Commission, *Public Television—A Program for Action*, at pp. 36-37.)"

The Commission proposed the establishment of a federally-chartered non-profit corporation which would neither be an agency nor an establishment of the United States Government. The considerations of broadcasting integrity that impelled the Carnegie Commission to suggest such an entity are equally relevant to the question of Legal Services freedom.

Legislation embodying the Commission's report was introduced shortly after its issuance. The following excerpts from the hearings show that Congress was appraised of and sensitive to the free speech problems involved.

Fred Friendly, a television consultant to the Ford Foundation posed the issue at the Senate hearings:

"Of one thing we can be certain: Public Television will rock the boat. There will be—there should be—times when every man in politics—including you—will wish that it had never been created. But Public Television should not have to stand the test of political popularity at any given point in time. *Its most precious right will be the right to rock the boat.* (Hearings before Communications Subcommittee of Commerce Committee, U.S.

Senate, April 11, 1967, 90th Congress, 1st Session, S. 1190, at p. 173.) (Emphasis added.)"

At the hearings Senator Hugh Scott (Pa.) recognized the necessity for

"... total freedom, if that could be obtained, in programming and in the presentation of ideas and in the protection of thought we hate, protection of the unpleasant, the protection of the Lar Dallys of this country, for example, who like to get out in uniforms and run for office, the protection of the oddball, beatnik, crackpot, jackass, fool, the protection of anybody. (Hearings, at p. 151.) (Emphasis added.)"

Better credos could not be stated for the Legal Services program.

Both the House and Senate Committees recognized in their reports the compelling need for the government to keep its hands off the operations of the corporation. As stated in the House report:

"How can the Federal Government provide a source of funds to pay part of the cost of educational broadcasting and not control the final product? That question is answered in the bill by the creation of a non-profit educational broadcasting corporation.

"Every witness who discussed the operation of the Corporation agreed that funds for programs should not be provided directly by the Federal Government. It was generally agreed that a non-profit Corporation, directed by a Board of Directors, none of whom will be Government employees, will provide the most effective insulation from Government control or influence over the expenditure of funds. (H.R. 90-794, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, August 21, 1967, 90th Congress, 1st Session, at p. 15.)"

#### CONCLUSION

Judge Learned Hand taught that unless the spirit of liberty dwells within the hearts and minds of men, no court can be its ultimate protector. Similarly, unless legal services has wide-spread public and official support and understanding, no entity will withstand adverse pressures. However, within the ambit of this overriding warning, the proposed Corporation for Legal Services affords the greatest promise of independence coupled with permanence. It presents an opportunity to the nation to make a lasting unequivocal commitment to the concept of justice for all. The capacity of this society to ventilate internal pressures through traditional modes rests in part on this choice.

#### ASH COUNCIL MEMO ON THE LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

##### BACKGROUND

The Legal Services Program is administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity under the specific authority of the Economic Opportunity Act. Its purpose is "... to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty" by providing advice, representation, counseling, education and other appropriate legal services for the poor.

The program operates through grants to local, nonprofit legal services corporations which have on their boards of directors representatives of both the legal profession and the clientele served by the program. A recent report showed 268 neighborhood offices staffed by 2,000 lawyers. Appropriations for 1970 are \$54 million.

The Legal Services Program is an attempt to extend the benefits of the traditional adversary process to those who otherwise would not have the ability to seek redress of their grievances within the framework of our legal system. As such, the program has strong and continuing support of its clients and of the American Bar Association which has frequently testified before Congress in behalf of the program.

Both the Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and the Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence supported expansion of the program to help make the legal system a more effective avenue through which the poor might have their complaints adjudicated.

The President's message on the reorganization of the Office of Economic Opportunity of August 11, 1969, stated that:

The sluggishness of many institutions—at all levels of society—in responding to the needs of individual citizens is one of the central problems of our time. Disadvantaged persons in particular must be assisted so that they fully understand the lawful means of making their needs known and having those needs met. This goal will be better served by a separate Legal Services Program, one which can test new approaches to this important challenge.

The nature of some actions, particularly those which involve challenges to administrative procedures or statutes often involves a confrontation with established authority. Thus the program is not free of controversy.

With this in mind, it is our view that the continued development of the Legal Services Program will depend to a large degree on the organizational arrangement under which this activity will be conducted.

*The Office of Economic Opportunity as an organizational location for legal services*

The Office of Economic Opportunity provided an excellent location for the initiation and maturing of the Legal Services Program. As part of the Community Action Program, it was assured funding as it developed a broad base of support and experimented with a variety of operating techniques.

While the bulk of Legal Services cases concern domestic relations, garnishment and landlord-tenant relations, the important class action cases or actions in behalf of clients against Federal, State or local government agencies have aroused public attention. These cases have raised a difficult issue: should an agency whose program is sponsored and funded by the Federal Government be permitted to undertake suits against other units of government? Despite the program's success in forestalling Congressional attempts to limit its freedom of action, this issue will remain a subject of political controversy so long as the Legal Services Program remains in the Executive Branch.

A second problem concerns the retention of the Legal Services Program in the Executive Office of the President. In our Memorandum for the President of October 26, 1970, we recommended that operating programs of the Executive Office of the President be transferred to appropriate operating agencies of the Executive Branch. In this Memorandum, we recommend placing all other operating programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity within either the proposed Departments of Human Resources or Community Development. The proposed transfer of these programs breaks the organizational tie between the Legal Services Program and other programs offering specialized services to the poor.

Retention of this one operating program within the Executive Office of the President would be inconsistent with the concepts discussed in our Memorandum of October 26, 1970, on the Executive Office of the President. As important, it would leave in the President's hands the need to resolve those controversies which the Legal Services Program may generate and which, by the nature of how they arose, are better left to the courts.

##### *Other organizational alternatives*

In examining alternative organizational locations for the Legal Services Program, we

considered how well each would meet the criteria that we believe are necessary for the continued success of the program. These criteria are:

Maintenance of high professional standards;

Broad participation and support of the legal profession;

Responsiveness to the client group;

Ability to attract competent lawyers;

Maintenance of high professional standards;

Avoidance of conflict of interest by separating the roles of the parties in the adversary process; and

Visibility, to assist in reducing levels of social tension in society.

One alternative considered was the transfer of the Legal Services Program to either the proposed Department of Human Resources or the Department of Community Development. Such a transfer would parallel our recommendations for transfer of other Office of Economic Opportunity operating programs.

We believe, however, that subordination of this program within a line department, would reduce its visibility and hence its symbolic importance. Furthermore, it would place within the Departments, a program funding lawyers whose caseload would at times involve suits against agencies within the same department. This we view as a conflict of interest that would inhibit the proper functioning of the program. Also, within either department, the objectives of the Legal Services Program could become subordinated to the mission of that department.

A second alternative considered was the transfer of the program to the Department of Justice. This location would place the program within a larger legal context and might encourage increased involvement of the legal profession in the program. However, the conflict of interest problems arising in cases between Federal agencies and clients of attorneys in the program would be substantial. The Department of Justice is Counsel to the Executive Branch and would in most instances represent the Federal agency in such cases. To have the attorneys for both sides funded by the same department and ultimately reporting to the same Cabinet member would create real or apparent conflicts of interest that could severely impair the effectiveness of the program and raise serious questions as to the fairness of the system.

Another alternative considered was the creation of an Office of Public Advocate within the Federal Judiciary. This alternative was rejected for two reasons. First, such an arrangement would create at least the appearance of a special relationship between the courts and a particular client group, thus giving rise to questions of partiality by the courts. Secondly, an important distinction should be made between a system which provides for representation of clients in cases before the courts such as the Public Defender system and the more active assistance provided by Legal Services attorneys on a broad range of social issues. This latter role, in our view, is incompatible with the passive responsibilities of the judiciary.

##### *The council's view*

We have concluded that achievement of the objectives of the Legal Services Program will be served best by granting the program independent status.

Accordingly:

*We recommend the transfer of the Legal Services Program to a nonprofit corporation chartered by Congress.*

... Granting corporate status to the Legal Services Program would remove it one

step from the political process, while at the same time, guaranteeing the necessary government support. Equally important, such a move would give the program greater visibility and in so doing, signal recognition of the importance of the concept that all citizens should have the ability to participate within our legal system.

We believe that this recommendation is consistent with the best interests of the program and its clients and with Administration policy.

#### IMPLEMENTATION

The Economic Opportunity Act provides that the authority for delegation does not extend to the Legal Services Program. Therefore, any transfer of the program would require legislation. The legislation to establish a public corporation could be modeled on the amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 which established the Public Broadcasting Corporation and should be considered in connection with the Administration's review of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1971.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT

Section 1, Short Title: Legal Services Corporation Act: authorizing a National Legal Services Corporation by amending the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Section 2, Establishes Title IX to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 entitled "National Legal Services Corporation."

Section 901, Declaration of Policy:

(1) It is in the public interest to encourage and promote resort to attorneys and appropriate institutions for the orderly resolution of grievances and as a means of securing orderly change, responsiveness and reform;

(2) many low income Americans are unable to afford the cost of legal services or of access to appropriate institutions;

(3) access to legal services and appropriate institutions for all citizens of the United States not only is a matter of private and local concern, but also is of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

(4) the integrity of the attorney-client relationship and of the adversary system of justice in the United States require that the performance and provision of legal services be free from political interference;

(5) existing legal services programs have provided economical, effective, and comprehensive legal services to the client community so as to bring about a peaceful resolution of grievances through resort to orderly means of change;

(6) a private nonprofit corporation should be created to encourage the availability of legal services and appropriate institutions to all citizens of the United States, free from extraneous interference and control.

Section 902, Establishment of Corporation: Establishes a non-profit Corporation, under the laws of the District of Columbia, which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government.

Section 903—Process of Incorporation: There is established an incorporating trusteeship made up of the President and President-Elect of the American Bar Association, and the Presidents of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, American Association of Law Schools, American Trial Lawyers Association, and National Bar Association. The incorporating trusteeship shall, within sixty days after enactment, establish an eleven member Clients Advisory Council from among persons recommended by the Boards of Directors of existing Legal Services programs and who are representative of the client community. Similarly, the trustees shall establish a Project Attorneys Advisory Council. Within ninety days of enactment the Clients and Project Attorneys Advisory

Council will select three representatives to serve on the Corporation's Board of Directors.

Section 904—Directors and Officers: The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors made up of nineteen persons, one of whom shall be elected annually by the Board to serve as Chairman. Five members of the Board are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. One member by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States. Six members serve by virtue of their office (Presidents of the ABA, NLADA, American Association of Law Schools, American Trial Lawyers Association, and National Bar Association) and the President-Elect of the American Bar Association. Six members are chosen by the Clients and Project Attorneys Advisory Councils (three members each). The Executive Director of the Corporation is a voting member of the Board of Directors. The term of office for a Director is three years. The initial Board will be so constituted that members will have staggered terms of one, two, and three years. The Executive Director, selected by the Board of Directors, shall be an attorney and no individual can serve in this position for a period which exceeds six years.

Section 905—Advisory Council; Executive Committee: Establishing Clients and Project Attorneys Advisory Councils selected in accordance with procedures promulgated by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall also establish an Executive Committee of five members.

Section 906—Activities and Powers of the Corporation:

(a) (1) Provide financial assistance to programs furnishing legal services to the client community.

(a) (2) Carry out programs, including research, training, technical assistance, and law school clinical assistance, to improve the provision of services to the client community.

(a) (3) Increase opportunity for legal education for individuals who are economically disadvantaged or members of minority groups.

(a) (4) Co-ordinate activities in various parts of the country through information collection and dissemination.

(a) (5) Assist and coordinate all Federal programs for the provision of legal services to the client community by reviewing and making recommendations upon (a) grants and contracts concerning legal services and (b) proposed legislative or executive action.

(a) (6) Assure that attorneys paid in whole or in part by funds from the Corporation owe the same duty to clients and enjoy the same protection from interference as if the attorney was directly employed by the client.

(a) (7) Establish policies which assure the professional quality of the attorneys and adherence to the Canons of Ethics.

(a) (8) Establish eligibility standards for clients with first priority on those who are destitute or extremely poor.

(b) The Corporation is further authorized to make grants, contracts, and enter into cooperative agreements. Promulgate regulations approving grants and contracts using criteria regarding (1) the most economical, effective, and comprehensive delivery of services (2) peaceful and orderly methods of seeking change and (3) maximum utilization of organizations presently delivering legal services. Insure that the Board of Directors of grantees are made of a majority of attorneys and at least one-third representatives of the client community.

Section 907—Non-Profit and Non-Political Nature of the Corporation: The Corporation may not contribute to or support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

Section 908—Access to Records and Documents Related to the Corporation: Full access to records is insured. The Corporation is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act as long as consistent with the Canons of Ethics and the ABA Code of Professional Responsibility.

Section 909, Financing: Authorizes funds to be appropriated for payment to the Corporation as may be necessary for any fiscal year, including funds to assist the Corporation in meeting its organizational expenses. The proposed Act also reserves and makes available not less than \$140 million for the first fiscal year of operation and \$170 million for fiscal year 1973. Funds made available to the Corporation under this Act shall remain available until expended.

Section 910, Records and Audits of the Corporation and the Recipients of Assistance: Authorizes annual audit by the GAO and requires Comptroller General to make an annual audit report to Congress.

Section 911, Reports to Congress: An annual report shall be prepared for the President and the Congress.

Section 912, Definitions: "Client Community" means that group of individuals not able to obtain private legal counsel because of inadequate financial means; in establishing eligibility standards for clients, the Corporation must give first priority to those who are destitute or extremely poor.

"Legal Services" includes legal advice, legal representation, legal research, education concerning legal rights and responsibilities and similar legal activities.

Section 913, Federal Control: Prohibits Federal control over the Corporation or its employees.

Section 3—During the first year of operation the Director of OEO shall take such action as may be necessary to arrange for the orderly continuance by the Corporation of the Legal Services Program.

Section 4—See Financing section in this analysis.

#### BAN SPORTS ON CLOSED CIRCUIT TV

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, March 24, I will be introducing a bill which would ban the production of major sports events on closed circuit television in order to keep professional sports on home TV and radio. This bill would prevent the future showing of championship fights, superbowl, world's series games, and other major sports events on closed circuit TV. The purpose of the ban would be to force promoters to turn to public network television and radio for the broadcast of all major sports. In other words, this bill would keep professional sports in America open to all sports fans, not just a select few.

The exorbitant profits made by a handful of professional promoters from the recent Ali-Frazier fight were, I believe, totally unjustified and were responsible for numerous lawsuits and the illegal counterfeiting and scalping of tickets at incredible prices. I believe the way the Ali-Frazier fight was promoted seriously injured the public's image of professional boxing and of professional sports in general. I believe that the \$20 million or more expected profits from the Ali-Frazier fight will represent an enormous temptation for other sports to follow suit and produce their events on closed circuit TV.

After all, if a championship fight can reap such amazing profits, so could a superbowl, a world's series games, or an NBA championship game. When we reach that point, however, spectator sports would become the province of the rich and the boon of the professional promoter. The only losers would be the vast majority of American sports fans.

I believe my bill would prevent such an absurd situation from arising. It would place closed circuit TV in the same category as pay TV, which is handled by the Broadcast Bureau within the Federal Communications Commission. At present, closed circuit TV comes under the jurisdiction of the FCC's Common Carrier Bureau, which regulates such non-public areas of communications as the telephone industry. Under my bill, promoters of major sports events would be required to accept the highest bid from a television network for the broadcast of a sports event. The only exception to the closed circuit TV ban would apply if the Broadcast Bureau determined that the anticipated profits from a live network broadcast—along with other expected receipts, such as gate receipts) would not be sufficient to justify the holding of the sports event. In that case, which would be extremely rare, I think, the FCC would allow for the production of that event on closed circuit TV.

There is no question that under my bill the profits of, say, future championship fights would be significantly reduced. But the fact that the boxers themselves might only make a half million dollars apiece from a network TV contract, instead of \$2.5 million from a closed circuit production, would hardly be a deterrent to the holding of their matches.

There is a critical need for the passage of this preventive legislation before the lure of these unprecedented profits extends to other major spectator sports. If that occurs, remedial legislation would be terribly difficult to pass in the face of intense opposition from the powerful vested interests who would favor the continuance of closed circuit productions.

This is one instance where the threat to the public good is clear and immediate, and where preventive legislation—taken now by Congress—would be both politically feasible and effective in keeping spectator sports open to the general public. It would be the height of irony if sports fans were further excluded from viewing their teams while, at the same time, their tax money was going for the construction and maintenance of bigger and more modern stadiums for their teams to play in.

Mr. Speaker, I will be working hard in the near future for the passage of this important legislation. I believe that the chances for its passage this session could be surprisingly decent if public support of this bill is as strong as I hope it will be and if we in Congress are sensitive to the people's best interests.

#### WHITHER INDIA AND INDIRA

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, India has voted socialist straight down the line, giving Prime Minister Indira Gandhi complete control of that country's government. Her electoral success is being hailed by the press as one of the extraordinary political achievements of post-independence India. Mrs. Gandhi has outstanding ability, and she is endowed with great appeal to the people of India from the fact that her father was Nehru and because of the name which she bears. What is not being said about her victory is that Mrs. Gandhi won through an emotional appeal to the country's poor. They think she is going to take from the "haves" and give to the "have-nots." Ninety percent of the people of India are extremely poor, and it follows that they would vote for the person who promised them most, particularly if they trust that person. They would also have voted for her as a conservative or a middle-of-the-road candidate, and in fact they did so for years.

America, as a capitalist country, can have some earnest reservations about the course which the Government of India is now expected to follow. Nationalization of more of the country's principal industries is now in prospect. The distressing part of it is that there just are not enough assets in India for universal sharing. When this fact finally dawns on the people, there could be resentment, even violence, and the next step could be communism for that country.

#### NATIONAL WILDFIRE DISASTER FUND

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is an area in forest fire control programs which should have more emphasis and adequate funding. I refer to the fire protection problems known as wildfires.

These are fires of catastrophic proportions which can occur whenever there are adverse combinations of high temperature, low humidity, protracted drought, and gale force winds. At such times any open flame may be fanned into a fire that destroys millions of dollars worth of property and endangers the lives of many people.

Examples of such disasters are the Peshtigo fire of 1871 which burned over more than 1 million acres and killed 1,500 people. A decade later a similar conflagration burned a million acres in Michigan and killed 119 people. The Hinckley fire of 1884 claimed 418 lives in Minnesota. The great Idaho fire of 1910 blackened 3 million acres.

In more recent years, the Bar Harbor fire of 1947 destroyed over 200,000 acres in Maine and killed 16 persons. South Carolina had an emergency situation in 1966. The Idaho fires of 1967 reached disaster proportions because of frequent lightning strikes during extreme burning conditions. Last year severe fires ravaged eastern Washington and southern California.

No part of this country is immune to

fires of disaster proportions. By the same token no single fire control agency, Federal, State, or private, can afford the cost of maintaining sufficient reserve equipment and manpower to combat a fire of disaster proportions.

Needed is a national program for wild-fire control. Such a program should establish national guidelines for organizing all firefighting agencies into a disaster fire network. Every State should have a plan for forecasting, mobilizing, and organizing for emergency fire situations. Funds for emergency use should be available for instant use.

I offer such a program for your consideration. I am introducing a bill which I feel would provide important steps toward the control of disaster from wildfires. I include a copy of the measure in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 6399

A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a national wildfire disaster control fund

*Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of \$10,000,000 to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, until expended, for the purposes described below to supplement the efforts of State and local governments in the prevention, control, and suppression of forest and grass fires on private and public property when, in the discretion of the Secretary, such additional assistance is deemed necessary.

(1) Fire emergency preparation including planning, administrative, supply and other activities designed to increase capabilities for quick and effective action in the event of a fire emergency.

(2) Control and suppression of disaster or potentially disastrous fires on forests, ranges, and intermingled agricultural lands upon request of State or local government officials when regular and emergency fire control resources are considered potentially or actually inadequate or have been exhausted.

Sec. 2. The appropriation of such moneys for the initial establishment of the fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That pending such appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of Agriculture may allot, from existing appropriations, such funds as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of work herein authorized, such appropriation to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made.

Sec. 3. The authority conferred by this Act, and any funds provided hereunder, shall be supplementary to, and not in substitution for, nor in limitation of, any other authority conferred or funds provided under any other law.

#### THE PLEDGE TO SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to an informed and enlightened article on South-West Africa which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. The author, Mr. Ernest A. Gross, has impressive credentials to comment on this subject by virtue of his previous service as Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Delegate to the United Nations. Mr. Gross

presents a logical and cogent argument that South Africa has violated the terms of its mandate over South-West Africa by extending apartheid to the territory and by refusing to account to the United Nations as required by a 1950 opinion of the International Court of Justice. I trust that these points will be given careful consideration by the Court in its current consideration of the Security Council's request for an advisory opinion on the legal consequences for states of South Africa's continued presence in the territory. The text of the article follows:

THE PLEDGE TO SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

(By Ernest A. Gross)

United States policy in regard to South West Africa (Namibia) has been assailed by Mr. Dean Acheson on the ground that "if the United States does intend eventually to try to coerce South Africa out of South West Africa, it is following a path to huge and gratuitous folly" (Washington Post, Jan. 2). Mr. Acheson's strictures, harsh and marred by factual error, omit any reference whatever to the central moral and legal issue: South Africa's persistent violation of its Mandate—a trust assumed on behalf of the international community—to "promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants" of the Territory of South West Africa.

Mr. Acheson, when Secretary of State, characterized the problem as "perplexing," and the dilemma posed for the United States (and the United Nations) has not abated in the two decades since he left office. The source of perplexity is easy to define. The United States, together with all other U.N. members, is pledged to protect the rights of the peoples of an international trust territory, in the face of South Africa's obdurate refusal either to honor those rights or to respect the authority of the Organization upon which the trust is laid.

The *apartheid* policy, which South Africa applies as rigorously in this international territory as in South Africa itself, excludes "non-whites" (the large majority of the population) from any effective participation in political life. It imposes limits upon their economic and social progress and forbids them under criminal sanction, to form of join labor organizations to seek improvement of their condition. It denies educational opportunities essential to qualify for scientific or technical skills and denies them entry into a large number of professions. It prohibits their emigration, while limiting at home their freedom of movement and of residence, by means of an onerous and degrading "pass system."

Needless to say, such a policy has been condemned, officially and universally, as a grave breach of the Mandate.

Moreover, South Africa has refused to account to the United Nations in respect of its administration of the territory, despite a 1950 Opinion of the International Court of Justice that it was under an obligation to do so. The court's decision fully sustained the views of the United States in this regard, submitted to the court in a statement cleared by then Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

At last, on October 28, 1966, the U.N. General Assembly acknowledged the obvious futility of further efforts to persuade South Africa to fulfill its obligations under the Mandate. The Assembly decided that, by reason of its material breach and, indeed, by its own disavowal of the Mandate, South Africa had forfeited all right to continue to administer the Territory. The Assembly decreed that, with the termination of the Mandate, the Territory was to come "under the direct responsibility of the United Nations." An *Ad Hoc* Committee was established to recommend "practical means" for the ad-

ministration of the Territory, until the inhabitants could exercise their right of self-determination and achieve independence.

The territory thus becomes the only area on the surface of the earth over which the United Nations has asserted a direct responsibility of government. The decision, taken with near unanimity and with the full concurrence of the United States, is to be seen as the product of a long-smouldering sense of frustration and moral outrage. There was no illusion concerning the nature of the obstacles for the enforcement of this "sacred trust of civilization," so long betrayed by the power in control and in possession.

The United States representative on the ad hoc committee for South West Africa, in 1967, was William Rogers, the present Secretary of State. In his opening statement to the committee, Mr. Rogers declared that it was the responsibility of the United Nations to provide the people of South West Africa "with the best practical means—and the emphasis must be on the word 'practical'—of exercising their right to self-determination and independence."

To be sure, standards of practicality in matters of essentially moral and human concern are to be measured against a flexible yardstick. Few, if any, responsible persons would advocate the use of outside military force to "coerce South Africa out of South West Africa," in Mr. Acheson's phrase. But how many would counsel supine acquiescence in South Africa's defiance of the confirmed authority of the United Nations to bring relief to the oppressed inhabitants of a territory impressed with an international trust?

As is true of all struggles for human rights and freedoms, regeneration must take place from within the social order, which is the primary architect of its own change. Nevertheless, the international society—rudimentary as it is—cannot passively accept an evil anachronism, without impairing its own integrity and stunting its own growth. It must bring to bear all practicable pressures, short of force, with the hope of inducing, even if it cannot compel, necessary change.

Many such political, economic and moral pressures are available to the United States, as well as to other of South Africa's major trading partners.

The United States government has announced that export-import guarantees would not be available for trade with the territory and that American investments made after the termination of the Mandate would not be protected against claims of a "future lawful government." Tax and trade treaties with South Africa should be regarded as inoperative insofar as they purport to extend to the territory.

The U.N. Council for Namibia, which has superseded the earlier committee, should be strengthened by added personnel and resources. It should assist and train Namibian leaders, both at home and in exile, to shape economic and political institutions requisite for an independent state. The council will gain in stature and effectiveness if the United States agrees to become a member, as it thus far has declined to do. A Namibian government-in-exile should be fostered. All U.N. members should honor Namibian passports, validated by the United Nations.

These measures are merely illustrative of the many open to the international community, if it is determined—as the United States promised at the time of the General Assembly decision in 1966—"to bring practical relief to the people of South West Africa in their time of need."

When the United States sought to conserve foreign exchange it did not hesitate to prohibit all new direct investment in South Africa. Can it be said that measures adopted in order to correct the balance of payment are a "gratuitous folly" if designed to redress the balance of justice?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. Boggs) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VANDER JAGT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARSHA, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RUPPE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of Illinois) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEGGETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND to revise and extend remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HORTON to revise and extend remarks during debate today right after Mr. CONTE and to include extraneous material.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. DUPONT.

Mr. HOGAN in five instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in three instances.

Mr. KEITH in six instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

Mr. WARE.

Mr. WYLIE.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. BROZMAN.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. MIZELL in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of Illinois), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in six instances.

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.  
 Mr. SISK in two instances.  
 Mr. RYAN in three instances.  
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.  
 Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.  
 Mr. ROUSH in two instances.  
 Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.  
 Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas in two instances.  
 Mr. DINGELL in four instances.  
 Mr. MATSUNAGA.  
 Mr. HAWKINS.  
 Mr. CORMAN in two instances.  
 Mr. WOLFF.  
 Mr. GAYDOS in five instances.  
 Mrs. ABZUG.  
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.  
 Mr. FOUNTAIN.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 Mr. RODINO in two instances.  
 Mr. BENNETT in two instances.  
 Mr. PURCELL in two instances.  
 Mr. SCHEUER.  
 Mr. JARMAN in two instances.  
 Mr. HAGAN in two instances.  
 Mr. DENHOLM in three instances.  
 Mr. FOLEY.  
 Mr. LONG of Maryland.  
 Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 22, 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:

438. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, with respect to accountability and responsibility for U.S. property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

439. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of various facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

440. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

441. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to motor vehicle insurance and an accident compensation system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

442. A letter from the Chairman, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commis-

sion, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

443. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to extend the authorizations for titles I through V through fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Public Works.

444. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the provision in the Social Security Act for providing assistance for U.S. citizens returned from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

445. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the acquisition of major weapons systems by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 6357. A bill to support the price of milk at 90 percent of the parity price for the period beginning April 1, 1971, and ending March 31, 1972; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 6358. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. HOSMER) (by request):

H.R. 6359. A bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. BIESTER,

Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ERLÉNBERN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. RALLSBACK, Mr. ABOUZEK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 6360. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for

himself, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 6361. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. McDADE,

Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE,

Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. RUPPE):

H.R. 6362. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENGER, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. Charles H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. ROBINSON of New York):

H.R. 6363. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal service program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 6364. A bill to provide a maximum age for persons to be seated as a Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 6365. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6366. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of foreign tourists into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 6367. A bill to amend the Department of Transportation Act in order to modify the national policy with respect to the protection of lands traversed in developing transportation plans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 6368. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured by executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERLÉNBERN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 6369. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Bureau of Consumer Protection 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. ERLÉNBERN (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 6370. A bill to amend titles X, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act so as to limit, for purposes of determining need of an individual for aid under any State program established pursuant to any of such titles, to specified relatives of such individual the persons whose financial responsibility for such individual may be taken into account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 6371. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BYRON, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DORN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 6372. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6373. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6374. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6375. A bill to provide for the establishment of a system of overtime pay for the U.S. Capitol Police; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 6376. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for more equitable retired pay for members of the military services; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the present limitations on eligibility for, and the amount of, the child-care expense deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6378. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6379. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of obscene materials to persons under the age of 18 years, to restrict the exhibition of movies or other obscene matter to such persons, to prohibit the sale of mailing lists used to disseminate by mail obscene materials to such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation and fishery programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6381. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 6382. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DENT, Mr. FRASER, Mrs.

GRASSO, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6383. 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. ALEXANDER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 6384. A bill to provide for the abatement of air pollution by the control of emissions from motor vehicles; preconstruction certification of stationary sources; more stringent State standards covering vehicular emissions, fuel additives and aircraft fuels; emergency injunctive powers; and public disclosure of pollutants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 6385. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mrs. ABZUG):

H.R. 6386. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. BELL):

H.R. 6387. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 6388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINK:

H.R. 6389. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation of the Dickinson reclamation project in North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 6390. A bill to protect the public from exposure to excessive noise from civil supersonic aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 6391. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6392. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6393. 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. QUIE (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 6394. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 6395. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for

the payment of pension of \$125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 per centum where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 6396. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national catastrophic illness insurance program under which the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with State insurance authorities and the private insurance industry, will reinsure and otherwise encourage the issuance of private health insurance policies which make adequate health protection available to all Americans at a reasonable cost; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 6397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work by automobile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 6398. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6399. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a national wild-fire disaster control fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6400. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States and subdivisions thereof in the enforcement of State and local laws, rules, and regulations within the national forest system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6401. A bill to provide for the arrest and punishment of violators of certain laws and regulations relating to the public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 6402. A bill to provide for the equalization of the retired pay of members of the uniformed services of equal grade and years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6403. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, to increase the authorization for water resources research and institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6404. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6405. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6406. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the continuation of the investment tax credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 6407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax interest on certain deposits in thrift institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6408. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual an income tax deduction for the expenses of traveling to and from work by means of mass transportation facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an employer a deduction for the cost of making changes in his place of business to make it possible to hire or retain handicapped individuals as employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6411. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 6412. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 6413. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act), to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the protection of U.S. vessels on the high seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 6414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6415. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual receiving benefits thereunder to earn outside income without losing any of such benefits and 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. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 6416. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 6417. A bill to reduce the number of class A retailers' licenses issued and outstanding under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, to establish the number of such licenses that may be issued and outstanding under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself, Mr. POFF, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARING, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 6418. A bill to consent to the interstate environment compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.R. 6419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 6420. A bill to amend the Immigra-

tion and Naturalization Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 6421. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus supplies and equipment to political subdivisions within redevelopment areas for public purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6422. A bill to establish the authorized strength of the Naval Reserve in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6423. A bill to provide for the payment of medical or surgical services or hospital treatment for certain disabled former members of the Metropolitan Police Department, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the Executive Protection Service, and the U.S. Secret Service Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 6424. A bill to provide certain essential assistance to the U.S. fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 6425. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6426. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6427. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6428. A bill to require that impact-resistant eyeglasses be issued under the medical program for members of the uniformed services on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6429. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6430. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 6431. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code to increase the jurisdictional amount for the administration of small estates, to increase the family allowance, to provide simplified procedures for the settlement of estates, and to eliminate provisions which discriminate against women in administering estates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 6432. A bill to provide minimum standards in connection with certain Federal financial assistance with respect to correctional institutions and facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.R. 6433. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of \$125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 6434. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of \$125 per month

to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 6435. A bill to restore the investment tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6436. 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. PERKINS:

H.R. 6437. A bill to increase annuities payable under the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6438. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of non-marriage of certain annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6439. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 6440. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6441. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 6442. A bill to amend the act of August 12, 1965, relating to the establishment of Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa (for himself,

Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. WATTS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 6443. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6444. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10-percent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 6445. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to persons in the aerospace industry for the purpose of enabling such persons to transfer the application of aerospace technology to the problems of ground transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 6446. A bill to provide for addition of the Minam River Canyon and other areas to the Eagle Cap Wilderness, Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, to modify the boundaries of the Wallowa National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMANS:

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate by proclamation the third week of May of each year, beginning May 16 through 22, 1971, as "The Week of the Young Child"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.J. Res. 480. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools or other public bodies in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.J. Res. 481. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning on the last Monday in October of each year as "National Magic Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.J. Res. 482. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of June 8 through 14, 1971, as "National Fraternal Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 483. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the 28th day of September of each year as "Teacher's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SISK, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. STRATTON):

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution that the Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed "proportionate repatriation" plan for obtaining the release of American prisoners held in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a study team to observe the election in Vietnam in October 1971; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 214. Concurrent resolution urging the withdrawal now of U.S. forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H. Con. Res. 215. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to paid advertisements broadcast for the Federal or State or local governments or departments or agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution to establish minimum standards on pollution in international waters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Res. 325. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. Res. 326. Resolution that the U.S. Department of Transportation give every consideration, without further delay, to the proposed route of Interstate Highway 75 across Lake Allatoona; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MILLS, Mr. WATTS, Mr. EVINS, of Tennessee, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SISK, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. LANDRUM, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. JONES

of Alabama, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. BAKER):

H. Res. 327. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COTTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DORN, and Mr. DRINAN):

H. Res. 328. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAYS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KASTENMEIR, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MEEDS, and Mr. MELCHER):

H. Res. 329. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 330. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Res. 331. Resolution providing for two additional student congressional interns for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Delegate from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H. Res. 332. Resolution protesting the showing of X-rated motion picture previews at G and GP rated motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. BRADEMAS, and Mr. O'HARA):

H. Res. 333. Resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to the Committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H. Res. 334. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H. Res. 335. A resolution: Mass transporta-

tion—A national priority; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 6447. A bill for the relief of Dionisio Pajimola Almirol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6448. A bill for the relief of Madonna Cudjoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 6449. A bill for the relief of Maria Lourdes Rios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6450. A bill for the relief of Constantin Andreopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6451. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 6452. A bill for the relief of Desanka (nee Rogic) Haen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 6453. A bill for the relief of Francesco and Giuseppa Daniele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6454. A bill for the relief of Luis Elkin Echavarría-Quintero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6455. A bill for the relief of William M. Starrs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6456. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng Tsuau Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6457. A bill for the relief of ToppSav, Inc., formerly known as the Topp-Cola Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6458. A bill for the relief of Bak Hon Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6459. A bill for the relief of Rosario Anzalone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6460. A bill for the relief of Angelo Carusotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6461. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Gugliotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6462. A bill for the relief of Vitantonio Presidio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caterina Scafuro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 6464. A bill for the relief of Edith C. H. Yang and three children, Julia Chen, Dorothy Chen, and Samuel Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6465. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elba Engracia Davila-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6466. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pilar Sartilaguda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 6467. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Seaborg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 6468. A bill for the relief of Angela Buono Gallodoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6469. A bill for the relief of Pietro Gallodoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 6470. A bill for the relief of Sullivan I. Kite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLNBORN:

H. Res. 336. Resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of Elmhurst College of Elmhurst, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.