

engineers annually from 1972 to 1976 than present higher education institutions will produce. Projecting these figures across all of the environmental sciences can only lead to the conclusion that there is a severe need for technically trained persons, and, the logical source of supply would be the displaced aerospace and defense engineers, scientists, and technicians.

Consequently, I have worked with local educational institutions and officials to create a Center for Regional, Environmental Training and Research—Retro—in central Florida which will coordinate retraining programs in the environmental and also conduct research and development projects for Federal, State, and local agencies. This R. & D. project would provide on-the-job training while, at the same time, provide solutions to pressing environmental problems. Because it is an ideal natural laboratory and possesses the manpower and economic resources, I am hopeful that this Center will become a national stimulus for utilizing the displaced professionals in a mushrooming area of national priority.

THE INVASION OF LAOS

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

Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. Speaker, in approving a major invasion of Laos, actively supported by American airpower and firepower, and apparently directed by American officers in Saigon, the President has struck yet another devastating blow at the central pillar of our American form of government, the separation of powers. Once again the constitutional authority of the Congress over questions of war and peace has been bypassed. The President has played games with congressional declarations of policy embodied in the law. The Congress itself has been tricked and demeaned.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon those Members of the House who so often in the past have been quick to rise in protest against any slight to the authority of the Congress in respect to other Government activities to speak out against Presidential authoritarianism in this case, and to act against it.

Mr. Speaker, in 1969 and again in 1970 the Congress wrote into law that no defense appropriation should be used for ground combat operations in Laos. Did anyone suppose at the time that the President, sworn to uphold the Constitution and the law, would send in American-operated helicopters to land allied ground troops, to give them air combat and artillery support, and to take the American casualties inevitable in such an operation?

Does anyone suppose that if the President had asked the Congress to approve such an American operation in advance he would have obtained such approval?

No one would have the gall so to contend.

What can the Congress then do about it?

As the first step, the Congress should quickly require an end to the Laotian operation, and a bill to that end, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, has been introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON), H.R. 3633.

Second, the Congress should enact legislation effectively to protect its constitutional authority over questions of war and peace. Since both Houses must concur in a declaration of war, the President should not be able to carry out undeclared wars unless both Houses concur, at least tacitly. This result can be assured by giving to either House the power to require the termination of undeclared hostilities. I plan to reintroduce legislation to this effect tomorrow.

THE INVASION OF LAOS

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. Speaker, today I join the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY) and others in cosponsoring legislation to prohibit any U.S. military involvement in or connected with the nation of Laos. This legislation, which is in the form of an amendment to the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, Public Law 91-652, would prohibit the use of Federal taxpayers' funds, in any form, from supporting any kind of military operations in Laos—including U.S. ground combat troops, U.S. advisers to or for Laotian military forces, U.S. air or sea support for any military operations in Laos, or any other kind of U.S. support for military operations of any nation in Laos.

In the last few days the American people have been subjected to an object lesson in what Senator FULBRIGHT once described as "arrogance of power."

We have witnessed the incredible spectacle of the Nixon administration blithely embarking on a second invasions expedition into countries neighboring on South Vietnam, in violation of the neutrality and the sovereignty of Laos, in violation of the Geneva Accords of 1962, and in violation of the intent, if not of the letter, of legislation—the Church-Cooper amendment—passed by the Congress last year. This was done in secrecy from the press and from the Congress of the United States. But the secrecy with which this illicit mission was undertaken is not the real or the principal issue. Nor is the protection of American troops still in Vietnam the real issue. The best way to protect American lives would be to get American troops out of Vietnam, as every American knows, and the sooner the better. The real issue is the fact that President Nixon is fully engaged on a theater-wide conflict throughout all of Southeast Asia and is following a program that was mapped out by the Pentagon long before the President took office.

Today we are fighting a general's war in Asia. This is not a war of the American people. The American people elected President Nixon to get them out of the

war, and 73 percent, according to the recent Gallup poll, are for complete withdrawal. This is not a war of the Vietnamese people. The corrupt and undemocratic Thieu-Ky regime, which we bolster, does not represent the Vietnamese people. This is a war of the ruling military groups of South Vietnam and the United States, and President Nixon is riding this tragic whirlwind through the jungles of Asia. Indeed, he is responsible and will ultimately be held to account by history for his mistaken policy in Asia, providing the recklessness of that policy does not bring about another world war and render us bankrupt economically.

The Vietnamization policy has been successful if one measures it by the fact that we seek to transform the South Vietnamese Army into the invading champion of Southeast Asia, and now give them Laos to test their strength. We were told that the purpose of our involvement in South Vietnam was to enable the South Vietnamese to become strong enough to defend themselves and assure self-determination. Yet today we see that Vietnamization as President Nixon means it is the conquest of Southeast Asia by the South Vietnamese Army and the indefinite presence of U.S. troops there to help them. They have invaded two countries in the last year, once with our overt support in Cambodia and this time with everything except U.S. troops on the ground.

Where do we go next, Mr. President? Thailand, Burma, or North Vietnam? And as we invade the freedom of others we do so at the cost of continued imprisonment of 300,000 of our own American soldiers in Vietnam.

I hope that other Members will join in cosponsoring the Harrington-McCloskey amendment and that we will bring this measure to the floor for a favorable vote. I believe it is time that the House took decisive action to spell out for the administration the plain fact that the American people want an end to this idiocy in Southeast Asia; that they want our soldiers home again before another year passes; and that invasions in the name of peace will serve only to prolong this bitter war.

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

LAOTIAN INVASION

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, a headline in Monday morning's paper says that war critics are resigned to the Laotian invasion. I am sure it is true that some of the most outspoken critics of the war are resigned to the fact that the President arbitrarily and without consulting or even informing the Congress has invaded another country just as he did a year ago.

Of course I am pleased that no American ground combat forces were used. I am sure that had we not passed the Cooper-Church amendment, they would

February 9, 1971

inner-city groups as Shaw People for Urban Renewal (SPUR), Congress Heights Association for Services and Education (CHASE), Congress Heights Committee for Health Facilities and Medical Services and the Washington Metropolitan Planning and Housing Association.

Through these and other academic offerings, GW seeks to provide future leaders with the knowledge, experience, and motivation to devote a lifetime to coping with the problems which the nation is, and will be, facing.

The Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade paid tribute to the University on January 19, 1971, at a special Sesquicentennial Luncheon. Almost 500 government, business and industrial leaders honored The George Washington University for its 150 year contribution to our nation and the Metropolitan Washington Area. Congratulatory messages were read during the festivities including:

"Throughout its eventful history the George Washington University has responded with strength and imagination to the changing academic needs of our growing society." President Richard M. Nixon—The White House.

"George Washington University's 150 years of growth and steady progress, and its significant future plans, combine to constitute an exemplary source of great inspiration to the City of Washington and to the entire metropolitan community. Even beyond the academic contributions, we are aware of the significant economic impact that is made by the University to the general welfare of our citizens." Commissioner Walter E. Washington—District of Columbia.

"Marylanders—as well as the people of all the 50 states and many foreign nations—can take great pride in the outstanding educational and cultural opportunities offered by The George Washington University." Gov. Marvin Mandel—State of Maryland.

"For 150 years George Washington University has made a continuing contribution to higher education throughout the world. We in Virginia feel a particular bond to an institution whose alumni can be found throughout the Commonwealth." Gov. Linwood Holton—Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues in the House would want to join in extending congratulations to the George Washington University on the occasion of its sesquicentennial 1821-1971.

PRESIDENT CAN ACHIEVE A STABLE ECONOMY

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, in his economic report to the Congress, President Nixon has wisely rejected the gratuitous advice from some quarters that the Government should intervene more heavily in our free enterprise market.

The President has recognized that strong action must be taken to hold back the spiraling wage and price increases but he is also well aware of the dangers in instituting wage and price controls. Using, as he says he will, all the effective and legitimate powers of Government to strengthen the free market forces that hold prices down, the President can achieve a stable economy without resorting to the crippling effect of Government controls.

We can be thankful that this administration has a healthy respect for the free marketplace and cannot be panicked into

extreme Government actions. As the President said, he has a policy of action: but not a policy of merely action for action's sake.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1821, President James Monroe signed a congressionally approved charger establishing the George Washington University. This year the university is celebrating its 150th anniversary. For the past 150 years George Washington University has been a well-known and respected institution of learning, and it is my belief, and the belief of many others, that it will continue as such for the next 150 years.

I am proud to say that I am an alumnus of this great institution. In 1939 I graduated from the George Washington National Law Center. As an alumnus, I am also proud of the distinguished record of service of so many of my fellow graduates. The George Washington University has produced more graduates in the foreign service and in top Federal positions than any other college or university in the Nation. In the 92d Congress there are five Senators and 12 Congressmen who graduated from G.W. J. Edgar Hoover, George Romney, and David Kennedy are also graduates. It is no accident that G.W. has been called the alma mater of Federal decisionmakers.

Of course many things have changed in the last 150 years. And an institution which rigidly rejected change could certainly not have survived all these years. It is to the credit of the university and its administration over the years that it has met the demands of the increasingly complex world and adapted itself to the times. Without this willingness to change the university could never have earned its reputation as an institution which provides future leaders with the knowledge and experience to deal with the problems of today and tomorrow.

I would like to join with my fellow George Washington University graduates in wishing our alma mater another 150 years of service.

CONVERSION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1970 which is being reintroduced today. Since my district includes the Kennedy Space Center, I am well aware of the serious dislocations caused by changes in national priorities and the lack of a national policy to deal with such dislocations.

Periodically, the Federal Government urgently seeks professional talent to meet what are thought important na-

tional needs, and a few years later these highly trained people are callously dumped into a depressed job market. This lack of planning or anticipating changes in national priorities is tragic. It is tragic not only because it evidences poor management and a waste of valuable national resources, but also because it shows a lack of concern by us in the Federal Government for the individuals involved.

The space program is a perfect example. In order to realize the goal of placing a man on the moon by 1970, the Congress appropriated massive funds and put maximum emphasis on the space program. Brevard County in which the Kennedy Space Center is located became the fastest growing county in the Nation. Approximately 40 percent of the total work force were in professional and managerial occupations reflecting the fact that service and support was the main requirement, rather than manufacturing of aerospace equipment.

During 1970, the economy of the area changed dramatically. Significant reduction in both NASA and Department of Defense budgets brought about a total reduction of 16,000 jobs at the Kennedy Space Center and the Air Force Eastern Test Range. The unemployment rate in the area has risen from 1.9 percent in 1966 to almost 8 percent. A large percentage of those unemployed are well-educated with considerable technical expertise, are in the middle age bracket, and have large family and financial obligations.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral obligation to those displaced professionals and their families. It was the Congress who made it a national policy to lure well-qualified professionals away from other areas to be retrained in aerospace and defense science and engineering. Thus, we in the Congress are obliged to fund conversion research and the retraining of these highly skilled people to work in other emerging areas of national importance.

The bill we are introducing today authorizes funds needed to effectively meet the challenges of a nation in transition and, at the same time, sets forth a national policy which, hopefully, will anticipate and prepare for future changes in national priorities. The combination of retraining programs and research, aid to small businesses, and the establishment of nonprofit community conversion corporations will go a long way toward meeting the immediate problem. On the other hand, the establishment of an Advisory Commission on Research and Development Conversion together with a research program for the National Science Foundation will result in the anticipation and identification of changing priorities.

An area of great potential, especially for those in the aerospace field, for utilizing the skills of the professional unemployed is the environmental sciences. With public interest in improving the environment so high and the shortfall in expertise, this area is a natural. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has estimated that the water pollution control field alone will require 2,400 more water quality management

have been used, and I am very grateful that this action and act of responsibility on the part of Congress saved a great many American lives. But American air power has made this invasion by the South Vietnamese possible. Therefore, it is as much our invasion as was the Cambodian invasion of 1970, and yet there is no hue and cry over this invasion.

Perhaps we are resigned to it. But I refuse to let this happen in total silence.

There can be no doubt about this latest action on the part of the administration. We have opened another front in the war. We have invaded another sovereign country. We have expanded an ever widening war that is supposedly winding down.

The promises of the 1970 campaign have been broken already, and once again we see that the administration considers the executive branch of Government the only branch responsible for military actions. President Nixon has been President for more than 2 full years, and now instead of just having a war in Vietnam, we have a war in Cambodia and now a war in Laos.

Last May, our objections were met with flat statements from the administration that the invasion of Cambodia was a single and final act that would end enemy infiltration of Cambodia and secure that country for the free world.

Today, the North Vietnamese control more of Cambodia than they ever did, and it is reasonably estimated that they could seize the capital and the rest of the country at will if they so desire.

Our invasion of that country, the divisions we created, and the atrocities perpetrated in our name have probably lost Cambodia to us more than has any action, either militarily or politically, on the part of the North Vietnamese.

Are we doing this once more in a third country—Laos?

It appears so.

Once again, we are promised that this is a single and final action. That it is done to interdict the delivery of supplies and to prevent buildups before the rainy season. Yet our experience in Cambodia should teach us otherwise.

The Kingdom of Laos is sorely divided, and I doubt that our sponsorship of a foreign invasion will strengthen the forces of the Royal Lao. I think this invasion, like the Cambodian invasion, is a grave error, for it aggravates tension within those countries, it accomplishes little militarily, and it is an affront to all those that believe in international law and the sovereignty of borders.

Last May, we were told that President Nixon had ordered the invasion of Cambodia to break up Viet Cong supply lines, save American lives, and protect South Vietnam. We are now told that there has been an invasion of Laos to stop Communist supply lines, save American lives, and protect Cambodia. Whom will we invade to protect Laos?

There are those that say the President is making a big splash to cover the retreat of American forces. If this is to appease the hawks, I am appalled. If this is to show the South Vietnamese that we support them, I am dismayed.

I do not understand why it is apparent

only to critics of the war that it is expanding. The administration does not see it that way. They see the invasion of Cambodia and the invasion of Laos as a narrowing of the war. Yet, the fact that we have been fighting increasingly and spending 200 times as much money in Cambodia as we was originally planned does not seem to be an extension of our involvement or an extension of the war in the eyes of the administration.

It does seem that way to me.

I have no doubt that the administration will claim a success in the invasion of Laos, just as there was a "successful" invasion of Cambodia.

But if last May's experience teaches us anything, "success" means Communist forces growing in strength and popularity—with the Pathet Lao controlling more and more of the country as their counterparts now do in Cambodia.

Our intervention, designed to stop the growth of Communist forces, has had an opposite effect.

As the editorial in the Boston Sunday Globe yesterday pointed out, it appears that the administration has forgotten that Laos borders on Communist China. It has forgotten what happened at the Yalu River during the Korean war, and that there are limits to intervention.

I would like to quote from that editorial, for it is succinct and to the point:

The Nation has been told repeatedly that we seek no wider war, and always the war widens. It is always done in the name of assuring the safety of our troops, and what we wind up supporting in their name is one weak, corrupt foreign government after another. And all this is done to oppose communism, which is a word that simply has no meaning to Asians.

By May, when the rainy season begins again, we shall still have 284,000 troops in Vietnam and be supporting in one way or another who knows how many invasions of nearby countries. We cannot begin to emerge from this morass until President Nixon sets a firm date for our total withdrawal, as Hanoi has demanded and as 73 percent of the American people, according to a recent Gallup Poll, now believe he should do.

The war widens. Americans are killed, our economy flounders. There are almost six million Americans out of work because our resources are being wasted in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. These great events affecting the very quality of American life occur in silence and in ignorance.

The news embargo has been successful in that Americans know less about this invasion than do the rest of the people of the world.

With insufficient information and with no direct reports either from our Government or the press, it is not easy to comment in depth. But with the scarce information we have, I feel it is incumbent upon me as the representative of the Eighth District of Massachusetts to protest this widening of the war, this circumvention of the Cooper-Church amendment.

I cannot sit by and allow the administration to commit American men and the future of our Nation to another war without speaking out. I protest this action, and I protest the President ignoring American public opinion, the expressed desires of the Congress and re-

fusing to consult with the elected representatives of the people.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Have we now disposed of all special orders?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the Chair intends to enforce the 1-minute rule on all occasions when we have business, but the Chair has been lenient today because there is no legislative business scheduled for today.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR THE CONDUCT OF THAT COMMITTEE

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include a copy of the rules adopted by the Rules Committee for the conduct of that committee during this session of Congress as required by statute.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the new rules of the House require standing committees to adopt their own written rules of procedure. Also, the written rules of the Committee on Rules, which were adopted 4 years ago provide that the chairman may have its rules of procedure printed in an early issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, I arise at this time to place the written rules of the Committee on Rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On last Thursday, February 4, 1971, the House of Representatives reconstituted the Committee on Rules. That same afternoon it met and adopted its new committee rules for the 92d Congress which consists of its old rules with certain additions which basically were necessitated by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the following rules were adopted unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

THE 92D CONGRESS—RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 4, 1971

RULE I—MEETINGS

(a) The Committee on Rules shall meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday of each week while the Congress is in session. Meetings shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman, or in the absence of the Chairman, by the Ranking Majority Member of the Committee present as Acting Chairman.

(b) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public except when a majority of the Committee determine that testimony received may bear upon matters affecting the national security. Executive sessions of the Committee shall be closed.

(c) For the purpose of hearing testimony, a majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(d) A printed transcript of any hearing or public meeting of the Committee may be had if the Chairman decides it is necessary, or if a majority of the Members request it.

(e) A Tuesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need

therefor, and additional meetings may be called by the Chairman, or by written request of a majority of the Committee duly filed with the Counsel of the Committee.

(f) The Committee may permit, by a majority vote on each separate occasion, the coverage of any open meeting, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography under such requirements and limitations as are set forth in the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(g) The five-minute rule in the interrogation of witnesses, until such time as each Member of the Committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness, shall be followed.

RULE 2—VOTING

(a) No measure or recommendation shall be reported, deferred, or tabled by the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(b) A roll call vote of the Members of the Committee may be had upon the request of any Member.

(c) The result of each roll call vote, including the names of Committee Members and how they voted on specific issues, shall be available for public inspection at the office of the Committee.

RULE 3—REPORTING

(a) Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee, the Chairman or Acting Chairman shall report the same or designate some member of the Committee to report the same to the House, such report to include the totals of any record vote thereon.

RULE 4—COMMITTEE STAFFING

(a) The professional and clerical staffs of the Committee shall serve under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of the members of the staffs and delegate such authority as the Chairman deems appropriate, with the exception of the Minority staff, who shall serve under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE 5—MISCELLANEOUS

(a) The Committee shall prepare, maintain, and publish for the Members of the Committee, so far as practicable, a calendar listing all matters formally before it. Information on the calendar shall include the numbers of the bills or resolutions, a brief description of the bill's contents, including the legislative committee reporting it and the name of the principal sponsoring Member.

(b) For purposes of this rule, matters formally before the Committee include: bills or resolutions over which the Committee has original jurisdiction, and bills or resolutions from other committees concerning which the chairman or designated member of such committee has requested a hearing in writing and forwarded to the Committee on Rules a copy of such bill or resolution as reported, together with the final printed committee report.

(c) Executive session minutes shall be available to Committee members but may not be released to any other person without the consent of the Committee, in compliance with Rule XI, clause 27(o).

(d) Upon adoption of the rules and procedures of the Committee at the opening of each Congress, the Chairman may have these rules and procedures printed in an early issue of the Congressional Record.

THE PRESIDENT'S ENVIRONMENT MESSAGE

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it is especially appropriate and significant that the President's second major message on the environment has come to us this week, for it was a year ago tomorrow, February 10, 1970, that his first eloquent message on the environment was sent to the Congress. You will recall that in that message the President said:

The time has come when we can wait no longer to repair the damage already done, and to establish new criteria to guide us in the future.

He went on to say that the "urgent common goal of all Americans was the rescue of our natural habitat as a place both habitable and hospitable to man," that, "the task of cleaning up our environment calls for a total mobilization by all of us," and that, "it summons our energy, our ingenuity and our conscience in a cause as fundamental as life itself." In that message the President outlined a comprehensive, 37-point program for the environment, including 23 major legislative proposals and 14 new administrative actions.

While the overall legislative record of the 91st Congress was far from impressive, I do think we made a noteworthy beginning in laying the groundwork for the environment decade. We passed the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 which, among other things, established the President's Council on Environmental Quality; we passed the Clean Air Act Amendments which set national air quality standards; we approved the Resource Recovery Act which deals with solid waste disposal and recycling programs; we passed tough new oil spill legislation; and we approved an executive reorganization plan creating the Environmental Protection Agency.

In his environment message yesterday, President Nixon took note of these accomplishments, but also underscored those pieces of unfinished business carried over from last year's agenda.

Near the top of that list are the administration's bills dealing with water pollution control, waste treatment facilities, and environmental financing authority. These should all be top priority items in this 92d Congress. The President has proposed a \$12 billion, 3-year program to construct municipal waste treatment facilities, with half those funds coming from the Federal Government. And the President has again proposed the creation of an Environmental Financing Authority to insure that every municipality has an opportunity to sell its waste treatment plant construction bonds. And the administration is again sending up its water pollution control legislation which would strengthen water pollution standard-setting and enforcement powers, vesting many of these in the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Unfortunately, none of the above-mentioned bills even got out of committee in the last Congress.

I do not want to deal at great length here with all of the other excellent legislative recommendations contained in the administration's environmental program,

but I do want to single out a few which I feel are worthy of special mention at this time. I welcome the President's call for the adoption of a national land use policy "which will encourage the States, in cooperation with local government, to plan for and regulate major developments affecting growth and the use of critical land areas."

As the President points out:

This should be done by establishing methods for protecting lands of critical environmental concern, methods for controlling large-scale development, and improving use of lands around key facilities and new communities.

To assist States in this effort, the President is proposing a 5-year, \$100 million authorization, with priority given to States of the coastal zone which, in his words, "is especially sensitive to development pressures."

In conjunction with this, the President is calling upon the Congress to review our Federal public land policy. Federal public lands comprise nearly one-third of our Nation's land area. As the President put it:

The public lands belong to all Americans. They are part of the heritage and the birthright of every citizen. It is important, therefore, that these lands be managed wisely, that their environmental values be carefully safeguarded, and that we deal with these lands as trustees for the future.

The Public Land Law Review Commission, in its recent report, one-third of the Nation's land, has provided an excellent springboard for public debate and review of our Federal land use policy. I look forward to working closely with the administration in reviewing that report and that policy, with a view to improving public land management, both legislatively and administratively.

I also welcome the President's "legacy of parks" proposal to bring "parks to the people," especially close to our stifling and overcrowded urban areas. In this latter regard, the President is requesting \$200 million in this fiscal year for the purpose of acquiring and developing additional park lands in urban areas.

I wish to applaud the President on his efforts to press for greater international environmental cooperation. It has already become trite to refer to this as "spaceship earth," yet the fact remains that it is a very appropriate metaphor. We are all on this tiny global capsule together, and our air, water, mineral, and food supplies are dwindling. It will take teamwork of the caliber demonstrated on the Apollo 14 mission to avert disaster and insure the survival of mankind.

Pollution is an international interloper which can only be arrested through the closest cooperation between nations. One need only consider the far-reaching effects of ocean dumping, oil spills, pesticide use, nuclear testing and the discharge of effluents into rivers and lakes, to begin to appreciate the truth in that statement. I am therefore pleased with the President's announcement that—

The United States stands ready to work and cooperate with all nations, individually or through international institutions, in the great task of building a better environment for man.

February 8, 1971

out gag, without rule, without limit; some place where every public act must come under the surveillance of men who have complete freedom of speech, so that the good that is in it may be properly exemplified and the evil that exists may be properly exposed?

Mr. President, when one is attempting to chart a path to follow in the future, it is always helpful to look into the past, to see how the path led us to where we are today.

We have looked back at the views of our predecessors of some 50 years ago. They are revealing and persuasive. They show us that then, as now, the principle of freedom of debate stood out like a beacon showing the way—the way toward wisdom and justice in legislation, and sound and mature thinking reflected in policy.

Then, as now, there were efforts to turn the path toward restricting debate, in the name of progress, or more accurately, expediency. Those efforts were strenuously resisted by wise and farseeing men from all parts of our country. Mr. President, again the Senate must reaffirm today and tomorrow what was recognized in the past, and reject modification of rule XXII. The future will again show, as it has shown in the past, that we were wise in protecting freedom of debate—not unlimited debate, but a reasonable restriction of debate in the Senate.

LAOTIAN STRATEGY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the critics of the President, as usual, have been unable to wait for the facts or the results before taking to television, radio, and the press to denounce the South Vietnamese sweep into Laos.

Unfortunately, the media have again given them credibility they do not deserve.

For instance, even though no American ground troops or advisers are participating in the Laotian operations, we hear charges of a widened war.

Even though North Vietnam invaded Laos years ago, and even though Laos is a vital part of their supply line, we hear demands for an immediate pullout.

Mr. President, in the last 6 years the North Vietnamese have used the Ho Chi Minh trail to move into South Vietnam the fantastic total of 630,000 men; 100,000 tons of food; 400,000 weapons; and 50,000 tons of ammunition.

Can anyone say why this should be allowed to continue? Can anyone say why the North Vietnamese should always be allowed to pick the time and place and size of the attack?

Mr. President, there is no doubt but that this South Vietnamese offensive will knock the North Vietnamese off balance—in fact, it may well make it impossible for them to launch any sort of major attack within the next year.

It is not a generally known fact, but the North Vietnamese usually take from 3 to 6 months to plan a major offensive. This South Vietnamese offensive can easily throw any North Vietnamese timetable for future attacks completely out of kilter.

Mr. President, with a full understanding of the circumstances in mind, can

anyone deny the worth of this operation? Can anyone deny that it will not hasten the progress of the Vietnamization program and thereby hasten the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam?

To sum up, there are no American ground forces involved in this action. It is limited in time and in scope. It will strengthen the security of South Vietnam and hasten American withdrawal.

Those—who have demanded immediate withdrawal from Laos and who have again sought to divide and polarize our Nation on an issue that affects all Americans—should think again.

The President is withdrawing our Nation—with courage and with honor—from the morass of Southeast Asia, into which the McNamaras and Cliffords and O'Briens of another administration led us.

Those who supported them and the policies of that administration then should exercise some restraint and some understanding now.

Mr. President, let me repeat that as of May 1, under the leadership and direction of President Nixon, some 265,000 Americans will have been withdrawn from Southeast Asia. I suggest, as I have many times on this floor, that this is a change in direction. This is a change for the better. This is a deescalation of the war.

I certainly recognize the right of Americans to differ and question the motives of no one in this body who may have a different view. But from time to time I question the judgment of those who feel that before any military move is made in Southeast Asia it should be cleared by this or that Senator or this or that committee.

This is a military operation. The operation is in accord with the so-called Church-Cooper resolution adopted by this Congress late last session. It is in accordance with a previous directive of the President himself that there shall be no American ground forces in Cambodia or in Laos. And I need not remind those present that the President has announced six troop withdrawals, and has kept his word on each of the six. In fact, he is ahead of schedule insofar as withdrawing Americans from South Vietnam is concerned. He has said he would, and he will, in April of this year announce further troop withdrawals. As I indicated, on May 1 some 265,000 Americans out of a high of more than 540,000 will have been withdrawn from South Vietnam. This will include, for the most part, a great majority of the combat troops.

There are those who criticize this action into Laos involving only South Vietnamese ground troops, and there were those who criticized and second-guessed the action into Cambodia last year. There in Cambodia, President Nixon kept his word, and as a result of that action in Cambodia, American casualties have been reduced, not by 10 percent and not by 20 percent, but by between 60 and 70 percent, because the sanctuaries in that area were cleaned out.

I know of no one in this body who wants the war to continue for 1 day or 1 hour longer than necessary, and I would hope everyone in this Chamber wants

the war to end, if possible, at an earlier date than anyone may anticipate. But I can foresee the resumption, particularly in the Senate, of the debate on whether or not the President should have this power and Congress that power, who has this power and who has that power, and how we can circumscribe the powers of the President.

We have a grave responsibility in Congress. We have a grave constitutional responsibility as Members of Congress and as Members of this body in the conduct of foreign affairs. The President also has a grave responsibility as Commander in Chief and as the Chief Executive of this Nation. He has grave responsibilities, including the overwhelming and probably the sole responsibility for the protection of American lives and property, whether in uniform or civilian, anywhere in the world. It is a responsibility and a power that no President can exercise lightly.

I would only suggest, Mr. President, that before we rise in quick condemnation of this administration for this President, we should look at the record: I would suggest that the President is entitled to this much and would also suggest that those who criticize the President today should look at the record.

Yes, look at the record in Cambodia. Look at the record of troop withdrawals. Look at the record of the scaling down of American bombing in Southeast Asia. And then look at the record in the 1960's—in 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968—when we had a real escalation of the war in Southeast Asia, not by President Nixon but by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

As a Member of the House of Representatives at that time, I supported those Presidents, as I support this President. The junior Senator from Kansas also recognizes that we are on the threshold of a 1972 political campaign. I recognize that there are those who seek the office of President who feel it necessary to take issue with President Nixon, whether it be on the war or the domestic front. But I do suggest to those who are so quick to condemn that they review their own records and review their own votes, and then look at the facts and make a judgment. But, let me repeat, there are no American ground combat forces or advisers in Laos now, and none will be in Laos. The operation will be a limited one, both as to time and area.

The operation will promote the security and safety of American and allied forces in South Vietnam and is consistent with all statutory requirements. The ground operation by the South Vietnamese forces will aid our Vietnamization program, and American troop withdrawals will continue.

So far as the Senator from Kansas knows, that is what everyone seems to want. No one has suggested that we send more American forces to Southeast Asia, and I have not heard many suggest that we have a unilateral withdrawal or some fixed timetable determined by Congress. There are some who may suggest that approach; but, as I recall the debate on the so-called amendment to end the war, from the time the original amendment was offered until it was finally defeated

February 8, 1971

by this body, the date of withdrawal was changed five times. As I said then to the sponsors of that amendment, if the Senators themselves cannot make up their minds on a day for withdrawing troops from Southeast Asia, if the sponsors of the amendment find it necessary to change that date four or five times, why should we rob the President—any President, Democrat or Republican—of that option, of the right to change his mind, of the right to make the determination?

I would say again that there comes a time when we cannot and should not give the enemy license to determine where the attack will be made, when it will be made, and what the response will be from the other side.

The Senator from Kansas believes that when the facts are in, this operation will have been successful, and the success of this operation will mean an earlier withdrawal of American forces.

It has been suggested that some would like President Nixon to accept defeat in Vietnam. Perhaps this generates some of the criticism. The Senator from Kansas believes that the President has a positive program; that the President has been successful; that the President has kept his word to the American people and to Congress; that the President has followed the dictates of the so-called Cooper-Church resolution and, more important, his own directive, which preceded the Cooper-Church resolution by several months, and that the President will continue to do so.

So I support the incursion or the invasion or the action or the sweep into Laos by the South Vietnamese forces. I support the American air participation, perhaps for the same reasons some oppose it, for the same reasons some criticize it, but, I believe, I support it with more validity, because I happen to believe that this will bring about a quicker end to the war in Southeast Asia and that it will bring about a quicker withdrawal.

To those who seem concerned about the plight of North Vietnam, I would only ask, "What has North Vietnam ever done to indicate a willingness to negotiate?" It was hinted, first, that if we would announce a troop withdrawal, they would go to the table. We have been at the table now for a long, long time. It has been suggested that perhaps if we would withdraw a larger number of troops, they might discuss the prisoners of war and the Americans missing in action in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. This they have failed to do. They have failed to give our American prisoners humane treatment in accordance with the Geneva accords. Frankly, I can think of nothing they have done to help reach a negotiated settlement of the war.

Last October 7, the President, in speaking to the American people, suggested a cease-fire. In that proposal, and as a part of that proposal, the President suggested the return of American prisoners of war and Americans missing in action. The President also endorsed the concept of total withdrawal, withdrawal of all American forces—ground forces, support forces, all American forces—as part of an overall settlement.

The President did the same in September of 1969, in New York, when he spoke before the United Nations. Again he endorsed the concept of total withdrawal of ground forces and of support forces.

Perhaps it is time for the President to ask—or for someone on the President's behalf to ask—the critics of the President: "What do you propose to do? How do you propose to disengage from Southeast Asia?"

It is easy, of course, to criticize the President's policy, but the Senator from Kansas is convinced that, while there has been a deescalation of the war, there has been an escalation of the criticism and an escalation of the rhetoric. It also seems to the Senator from Kansas that those who criticize the President's policy are given much more credibility than they deserve by the media.

Is it wrong to support the President, whether he be Democrat or Republican—Kennedy, Johnson, or Nixon? Is it wrong to support President Nixon when he is disengaging in Southeast Asia? Or is it only right to criticize the President? Are the American people entitled to hear both views or only the criticism and only the escalated rhetoric? The facts are on the side of the President, and the facts will remain on the side of the President, because he is committed to peace in Southeast Asia. There will be further troop withdrawals.

I regret not being here earlier, when statements were made by the junior Senator from California, and when he said that Laos has now become the latest burying ground for both American troops and President Nixon's Vietnamization plan.

I would only suggest that the record be reviewed, that President Nixon's record be reviewed, compared, contrasted with the record of previous Presidents in Southeast Asia.

Let there be no mistake about it: Every Senator, every Member of the other body, wants peace. No one party or no one Senator has a corner on that market.

Perhaps it might be well if hearings on the Southeast Asia policy were held in South Vietnam, where a firsthand review of some of the problems in South Vietnam and some of the difficulties faced by American troops could be obtained.

Mr. President, in closing, let me again say that if this sweep into Laos is successful, perhaps those who today so roundly criticize the President will stand to applaud him at the appropriate time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY MESSAGE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in transmitting to Congress today a second en-

vironmental message the President has established an historic pattern of great importance. The submission of a Presidential environmental quality message containing so many innovative legislative proposals for congressional action represents clearly, not only the commitment of this administration to the protection and enhancement of the environment, but a response to the public concern we have all seen expressed so strongly in the past several years. The President's actions will be recorded in history as initiating the substantive redirection of our country toward the salvation of our natural environment. This may be recorded as the most significant historical fact of the 1970's.

The proposals taken together represent the broadest sweep of environmental legislation ever submitted to Congress from any source. They are innovative and, if enacted, will have tremendous consequences for good. The list alone is evidence of the comprehensiveness and innovative thinking supporting these proposals:

- First. National land use policy act;
- Second. Powerplant Siting Act of 1971;
- Third. Mined Areas Protection Act of 1971;
- Fourth. Land and water conservation fund amendments;
- Fifth. National Housing Act amendments;
- Sixth. Amendments to Surplus Property Act of 1944;
- Seventh. Tax reforms for better land use;
- Eighth. Water quality control—four bills;
- Ninth. Federal Environmental Pesticides Control Act of 1971;
- Tenth. Noise Control Act of 1971;
- Eleventh. Environmental financing authority;
- Twelfth. Sulfur oxides charge;
- Thirteenth. Tax on lead and gasoline;
- Fourteenth. Marine Protection Act of 1971; and
- Fifteenth. Toxic Substance Control Act of 1971.

In the reception of this message the Congress undertakes its large responsibility which will be met.

I am sure that the Committee on Public Works, on which I serve as ranking minority member, will give those elements of the President's proposals before the committee the fullest consideration and expeditious attention. Historically, our committee, under the chairmanship of Senator RANDOLPH and Senator MUSKIE, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, has taken the lead in efforts to control the pollution of our environment. I am sure that the committee will give the public full opportunity to comment in hearings on all proposals and the committee will bring back to the Senate legislation of great significance.

As recently organized, the committee has added five new members; Senator BEALL, of Maryland, Senator BUCKLEY, of New York, and Senator WEICKER, of Connecticut, have been added to the minority. Senator TUNNEY, of California, and Senator BENTSEN, of Texas, have been added to the majority. These new mem-

of a hat will not necessarily make it come true. Such a hothouse figure is the outgrowth of some pretty unbelievable vitamin-like assumptions, such as: A 22-percent hike in corporate income taxes to \$37 billion; 17.5-percent rise in payroll taxes to \$58 billion; 6-percent increase in individual income taxes to \$94 billion; 4-percent growth in excise taxes to \$17.5 billion; 43-percent increment in estate and gift taxes to \$5 billion; and 8-percent addition to miscellaneous Government income to \$7 billion. As a matter of fact, outside opinion seems to hover around a deficit prediction of from \$18 to \$19 billion. Since when has this country enjoyed a 9-percent growth in its GNP? Does the President think he is in Japan?

When challenged on these figures in recent days administration spokesmen skilled in the art of self defense, are quick to retort that outside economists have no monopoly on wisdom. I think it is clear from past performance that there is more wisdom outside than inside the present administration. Remarks like this and figures like these are difficult to accept from an administration which by its own admission has been proven horribly wrong in the past. These figures are being produced by the same men who produced last year's figures, do not forget. Whatever happened to the \$13 billion surplus that was planned for the coming fiscal year?

Now ordinarily none of this, serious as it is, would lead me to get up and make a speech on the subject of the budget were it not for the fact that all this gimmickry is serving as the basis for an even greater hoax, if possible, the concept of revenue sharing as preached by the present administration. This budget is supposed to contain within its entrails some \$16 billion worth of funds which loosely—very loosely—are referred to as revenue sharing by the administration.

When this magical figure is broken out and we find that \$10 billion of it is really old programs made more liberal and partly funded by funds appropriated last year by Congress and never spent by an administration dedicated to balancing its budget, we are still left with some \$6 billion of new funds, \$5 billion of which will be distributed to the States in an as yet unexplained manner, with no strings attached. Every time the question is asked about where the \$5 billion is coming from, the answer invariably is "the expansionary budget." So, this budget that was presented last week becomes a very important prop behind a very controversial concept. In questioning the administration figures and projections contained in that budget, I am questioning whether there is, in fact, going to be enough money to fund this redistribution, this bonus blank check to States and cities and towns next year in a manner far from clear. It takes no courage for anybody to promise the earth, especially when those that it is promised to are in desperate need of help. The problem comes when it is realized that all we have done is promise them something we cannot deliver—not at least without adding to the national debt and accepting an increased financing cost.

The American people are being asked to buy a concept, swear allegiance to an idea, which is vague to say the least. I have yet to hear a spokesman for either the administration or the various Governors and mayors get down to details and specifics about just what revenue sharing will entail. If it is going to add to the debt, then the American people ought to know. If it is going to ultimately require increased taxes, then the American people ought to be told. Right now they are being lulled into thinking there is behind the budget income sufficient to cover this largesse.

At the very heart of the controversy over revenue sharing is the sad fact that it separates the tax raising function from the tax-spending privilege. If all that was being proposed was a redistribution of income through a sharing plan, then that would be one thing. For the fact is, I am not opposed to responsible revenue sharing. The Federal Government in recent years has been sharing quite a bit of its revenue with the States, cities, and towns around the country. Every time the Government votes an increase in social security benefits, this relieves the burden on the States, cities, and towns old-age assistance program. If the Federal Government tackles the crucial issue of welfare reform and takes it over lock, stock, and barrel, it will relieve a tremendous burden from the shoulders of the States, cities, and towns around the country. I am for this kind of responsible revenue sharing. What I am opposed to is irresponsible revenue-sharing schemes. If what is being proposed is the distribution of funds we do not have—and this means either borrowing or raising the money through taxes—then the concept becomes unpalatable and hard to take. What I would like is some honest truth from the administration, not pie in the sky, not a budget which is more appropriately described as "wish-fulfillment" than "self-fulfillment." The administration is trying to finance revenue sharing through a hoped-for tax windfall when all it has to show for its efforts to date is a tax shortfall of historic proportions.

I am convinced that if the American people could cut through this verblage, these promises, these slogans, they would see exposed a carefully hidden built-in tax increase. As I have said many times before, what will it profit a man to save \$100 on his real estate taxes if in the end he has to pay \$300 extra in the near future in his Federal income taxes? What I am refusing to agree to today is it is not the sharing of Federal funds, but the sharing of Federal funds that do not exist. Those of us who dare to question the administration's motives in all of this, those of us who insist on boring into and through the web of mystery which completely envelops the hazy concept of revenue sharing, are inevitably going to be subjected to one of the most well-organized, well-financed, and concerted publicity and promotional drives of recent memory. But I think the public will see through the campaign of Madison Avenue, circus hucksters, and carnival barkers and the campaign will backfire. At least I will have good company

on the firing line. The leaders of organized labor and various minority groups around the country have joined together to ward off any attempt to water down adherence across the country to minimum national standards which have only been instituted after decades of hard work. Already, too many mayors and local officials around the country are expressing doubt about the program as some of the details are being leaked out and it appears that some of the existing grants-in-aid may be cut back to fund the new program.

There is not a Member of Congress here today who is not a taxpayer in some other town, some other place, some other State, and who has not got the same aspirations and desires as countless citizens across the land to do something to solve the crisis which confronts local government at every level. If it could be done without any pain and without any sacrifice by simply wishing it away, I would be the first to go along. But it will take more than sleight-of-hand tricks. It will take more than false promises to solve the problems facing the cities and States. It is time we stopped living in a dream world, woke up from illusions and accepted reality for what it is. Magic formulas are always dangerous and should be highly suspect when trooped out by an administration of tired magicians who have mismanaged the economy to date badly. This is no time for hat tricks or stories of the goose that laid the golden egg.

LAOTIAN OPERATIONS MAKE SENSE

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, from a purely military standpoint, the movement of units of the South Vietnamese Army into Laos to disrupt the supply and infiltration network of North Vietnam should be viewed as a very wise tactic.

This ploy, which most assuredly will keep the enemy off balance, will be of immense benefit in saving American lives as we continue to decrease the level of American involvement in South Vietnam.

The Cambodian sanctuary operations 7 months ago, plus the closing of the Port of Kompong Som—Sihanoukville—by the Lon Nol government, virtually eliminated all the supplies the enemy needed to mount any type of offensive operation in the III and IV Corps areas of South Vietnam. About 90 percent of the Communist supplies now reaching South Vietnam must come down the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The supplies are then routed from sanctuary areas in Laos to South Vietnam, as well as Cambodia. For this reason, these staging areas in Laos are very important to the current and future operations of the North Vietnamese.

I do not really expect the current operations by the South Vietnamese to result in the destruction of much North Vietnamese equipment being stored in

Laos. The important point is for these operations to dominate the North Vietnamese staging areas and prevent new supplies from moving down the Ho Chi Minh Trail. If this can be accomplished, then we will have more breathing room to withdraw our combat troops in safety and provide the South Vietnamese with more time to prepare for the day they must defend their country by themselves.

There is no doubt that the operations in Laos will be hard on the South Vietnamese ground troops, as well as those Americans providing air support. We could expect nothing less under conditions of military conflict. But I still go back to my original point that the Laotian operations do make sense.

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CEMETERY AT VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the shortage of national cemetery facilities. Statistics made available to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reveal that the Department of the Army now operates 46 national cemeteries that are still open and available for the interment of deceased veterans. Additionally, there are six open national cemeteries operated by the Department of the Interior. In the next 10 years 14 of these 52 national cemeteries will be closed. In the next 30 years, 36 of these 60 national cemeteries will be closed. On the other hand, approximately 750,000 servicemen are being separated annually from the Armed Forces. All of these veterans are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Despite these rather alarming statistics, there has been no expansion of the national cemetery system for many years.

The situation is even more acute in the State of California than it is across the Nation generally. There are more than 2,900,000 veterans residing in the State of California, all eligible for burial in a national cemetery. The three national cemeteries located in California, Fort Rosecrans, San Diego; Golden Gate National Cemetery at San Bruno; and San Francisco National Cemetery at the Presidio in San Francisco, are all closed to future veteran burials because of the unavailability of space.

On the entire west coast of the United States there is only one national cemetery with space available for future burials. This is the Willamette National Cemetery at Portland, Oreg. In an effort to alleviate the problem as it relates to veterans in my own State of California, I have introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.

The proposed site is located between San Francisco and Los Angeles and is readily accessible to both northern and southern California residents. I am informed that there are three areas of

Vandenberg Air Force Base controlled land that could be utilized for this worthy purpose with no acquisition cost to the Government. The land is unencumbered and has natural features that would eliminate the need for excessive development costs. This Government-owned land meets all the established criteria for national cemeteries as set forth by the Chief of Support Services, Department of the Army. I am hopeful that the committee will act promptly upon this legislation so that veterans in the State of California may be entitled to burial in a national cemetery within reasonable proximity of their hometown.

CONCERNING REVENUE SHARING

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing with increasing frequency the suggestion that the Federal Government assume the entire cost of the Nation's welfare programs as an alternative to the President's Federal revenue-sharing plan. I suppose we New Yorkers should be grateful for this suggestion since our State and California expend almost 40 percent of the Nation's annual \$11.5 billion welfare budget.

Unfortunately, I can not bring myself to feel that the proponents of this alternative really want to be so generous to New York and California, or really want to nationalize our welfare programs. Instead I must view this welfare proposal as a political diversion to counter the tremendous appeal and basic fairness of the President's revenue-sharing proposal.

Welfare reform is one thing, and I support it; revenue sharing is another matter, however, and the two should not be confused. It is a cruel hoax on the people of New York and California to imply that nationalization of their welfare burdens will be seriously considered as an alternative to revenue sharing. I urge that those who recognize the serious need for new financial aid to our State and local governments not be misled by this diversionary tactic. Revenue sharing is what is needed, and I invite all my colleagues to join in sponsoring this legislation when it is introduced tomorrow.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the decline of rural America is not only an historical fact, it is a national tragedy. The present, and growing, imbalance between our urban concentrations and the countryside has diminished the quality of life in both and caused undue stress on the environment. A policy of balanced development is clearly required.

The first step toward redressing the present imbalance is to revitalize our rural areas, making it possible for more of our citizens to live there. This means

more jobs, more housing, better community services. But the key element among these, the one that can do more than any other to turn around the declining rural economy, is the creation of more new jobs.

Today, I am introducing the Rural Job Development Act of 1971 to provide tax incentives to businesses locating or expanding their employment opportunities in declining rural areas. Rural areas that are "making it" economically would not qualify. The bill would direct development to those counties and Indian reservations where population has been in steady decline and where more than 15 percent of the families earn less than \$3,000 annually. Thus, this bill will be a true aid to needy areas and restore vitality to underdeveloped regions making them attractive alternatives to congested urban living.

A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 236 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, TO REQUIRE LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL APPROVAL OF ANY PROJECT AS A CONDITION OF INTEREST REDUCTION PAYMENTS—OR MORTGAGE INSURANCE—WITH RESPECT TO SUCH PROJECT

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would amend the National Housing Act, section 236, thereby eliminating a deficiency now existing in the law. This amendment will require local government approval of the location of any federally subsidized public housing projects under section 236. As it now stands, sites are subject to the approval of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Local officials do not have to be consulted.

It seems to me that the location of these project sites could best be determined by the locality, not by Washington. Projects of large size clearly have a significant impact on a city's growth. For this reason, local participation in these important decisions is essential for proper planning of the city's development and expansion. It is important as well for harmonious achievement of our goals of better housing and a higher quality of life for all. These projects have a serious impact on the city of Houston where we have the largest city in America without zoning.

I strongly support President Nixon's policy which calls for returning to the local level power which has been flowing far too long toward Washington. My bill, which is cosponsored by nine other Members of the House, will place final say concerning the sites of section 236 projects where it belongs—in the hands of the people.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

(Mr. ERLÉNORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend

are in a position to help Kansas. This should remind Oklahomans of another Senator who was so fond of saying and proving "I'm against any combine Oklahoma ain't in on."

Dole is on the Senate Public Works Committee and has evidenced considerable interest in the development of the Arkansas River.

At one time the late Senator Robert S. Kerr and the late Senator Andrew Schoepel of Kansas were working together to take navigation to Wichita, Kansas. If this could be done it would increase the water freight traffic and Oklahoma would benefit accordingly.

We are hopeful that Senator Dole can convince the Corps of Engineers of the feasibility of this project. He has shown he is against any combine Kansas "ain't in on."

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN LAOS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the South Vietnamese Government has sent troops, supported by U.S. air personnel, into Laos.

As this is being written, I have no information to indicate the extent of this newest incursion.

Whether or not the "incursion" becomes an "invasion," only those who grasp at fine lines of distinction will argue that because no American foot soldiers crossed the border the U.S. is not involved in the effort.

Whether or not the incursion is severely limited in time and scope, the expansion of the war at a time we are reportedly attempting to withdraw from the conflict is both appalling and depressing.

It is appalling because in the name of deescalation we are increasing the violence. It is depressing because it appears that we have learned little from past history.

The problem goes beyond the stepped-up bombing in Cambodia and Laos to the basic concept of Vietnamization of the war.

That concept is based on equipping the South Vietnamese for war rather than pressing for a negotiated peace.

Under such a policy, there should be little surprise that efforts to negotiate an end to the fighting and a return of our men held prisoners have met with no apparent success.

Under such a policy we can withdraw "with honor" only if our assigned agents are able to continue the war after our departure.

More disturbing, under such a policy it apparently is justifiable to spread the war in order to buy time for what can only be an apparent "honorable withdrawal."

Perhaps that is too harsh an implication to direct toward the policy of Vietnamization, but pushing the war from South Vietnam into Cambodia and Laos will not end the conflict, but only move it from one area of action to another.

While such a move may buy time to permit the appearance of a withdrawal which allows the Thieu-Ky government to continue in power, it does not insure a permanent "honorable" solution.

And if honor is a part of the goal, I suspect world opinion, however one may define that elusive concept, will not be

fooled by a strategy which spreads the pain of war in return for a withdrawal which is "honorable" only in appearance.

World opinion will not be fooled by a strategy which buys time for the sake of appearance but in reality threatens the future of Cambodia and Laos. And, for the very same reason, as pointed out in a column by Stanley Karnow in today's Washington Post, our responsibility in widening the war increases pressure for a continued U.S. presence in Southeast Asia.

If we are so concerned about honor, we might better ask ourselves what honor there is for an affluent Nation which cannot feed all its people?

What honor is there in having a large number of persons unemployed?

Where is the honor in a nation of decaying cities?

What honor will the world give a nation which has been warned but does nothing to reverse the trend toward a divided society, toward a future of armed suburbs and a no-man's land in the city?

We may all be honorable men, but honor is in the eye of the beholder, whether the person be a refugee from a bombed Cambodian town, a resident of a U.S. ghetto or a hungry child.

In my eye, honor demands we set a date certain for withdrawal of all troops from Southeast Asia, negotiate return of our POW's and get about correcting those inequities at home with which no affluent Nation can exist—with or without honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Karnow's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MAN IN THE MIDDLE

(By Stanley Karnow)

One of the major casualties of the expanding Indochina War may well be Prince Souvanna Phouma, the tenacious Prime Minister of Laos. And his downfall, like the collapse of Cambodia's Prince Sihanouk last year, could have significant consequences for all of Southeast Asia.

The current expansion of the Indochina conflict into Laos has put Souvanna Phouma on the spot. For it is serving to reinforce the right wing Laotian army officers who, with the encouragement of their counterparts in Saigon and Bangkok have been striving for years to oust him in order to set themselves up as direct clients of the United States.

The potential rise of these officers not only jeopardizes the fragile equilibrium that has thus far kept the war inside Laos relatively limited. But their takeover would torpedo the 1962 Geneva agreement that established the convenient fiction of Laotian neutrality and, as a result, it could conceivably touch off a whole new chain of reactions in the area.

In the first place, the creation of a right wing regime in Vientiane is bound to tempt the Chinese Communists to strengthen the forces they already deploy in northwestern Laos. Peking is estimated to have more than 14,000 men engaged in building roads in that corner of the country at present.

The breakdown of the Geneva accords might also prompt the Russians, who have been trying to walk a tight rope in Laos, to adopt a tougher line as a way of competing with their Chinese adversaries.

More important, an end to the myth of Laotian neutrality would be a signal for the North Vietnamese, who currently have about

100,000 troops in Laos, to drop the pretense of observing the cease-fire line they have generally honored until now and push on towards the Mekong River Valley.

Such a move on Hanoi's part would pose an obvious threat to the American air bases on or near the Thai border. Moreover, it would spur the ties to deepen their involvement in Laos, presumably with U.S. assistance.

To a large extent, therefore, the fate of Laos at the moment may be the key to whether the war is going to spread beyond the Indochinese peninsula to other parts of Southeast Asia—and whether, in that event, President Nixon can effectively stick to his promise to reduce the American commitment to the region.

So, as it has periodically in the past, the quaint and charming little kingdom of Laos is again playing a decisive role in international affairs as a result of its unfortunate geographical location.

It was precisely to transform Laos into a neutral buffer rather than let it become a battlefield that the 14 Geneva signatories, among them the United States, the Soviet Union, Red China and North Vietnam, agreed to a Laotian coalition government with Souvanna Phouma as the man in the middle of the muddle.

The coalition was never much more than an ambiguous contrivance that mainly existed on paper. Yet it was respected by the world powers because, as an alternative, a polarization of the rival factions inside Laos, would have ignited a more explosive situation.

Consequently, both the North Vietnamese and their indigenous Pathet Lao satellites have been careful to avoid breaking relations with Souvanna Phouma and even go through the motions of negotiating with him, thereby indicating that they at least recognize his government.

By the same token, both the United States and the Soviet Union have acted jointly to discourage the right wing Laotian army officers from toppling Souvanna Phouma. In April 1964, the American and Russian ambassadors in Vientiane even restored the Prince to office after his ouster by Gen. Kouprasith Adhay, the local army commander.

But Kouprasith and his associates, who dream of receiving massive doses of American aid like the generals in Saigon and Bangkok, have never ceased planning for Souvanna Phouma. Only international support for the prince has prevented them from achieving their objective.

Now, according to reliable reports, the Laotian officers are delighted by the South Vietnamese thrust into Laos in the hope that it will wreck the Geneva Accords, undermine Souvanna Phouma and lift them into power.

Since the South Vietnamese foray is being made with U.S. backing, President Nixon is ultimately responsible for tilting the balance in Laos and extending the war further than it has already gone—which is much too far.

THE CURIOUS LIBERAL VIEW OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star of February 7 contains a most perceptive column by Crosby S. Noyes. His analysis of the current debate on the Southeast Asia operations should be required reading for those who wish a true perspective of the viewpoints. I ask unanimous consent that the column, entitled "The Curious Liberal View of Southeast Asia," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CURIOUS LIBERAL VIEW OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

The anger of the liberals over recent developments in Southeast Asia defies rational analysis.

What is it that they want? What do they really feel? What would they do if they were making the decisions about our policy in Asia?

The answers, I submit, are not nearly as simple as they seem. The fatal weakness of the liberal position at this point is that it is inherently a minority position, not because the government or the majority of the country is reactionary and varlike, but because what the liberals recommend could not be adopted by any American government.

The one consistent characteristic of liberal thinking today is that of dissent—not from any particular policy, but from any policy that has the slightest chance of success. When it comes to Southeast Asia, the failure of American policy has become a primary article of faith to practicing liberals.

The anger at the present course of events is real enough. There is little that happens in this country or abroad that does not fuel their sense of exasperation and dismay. Their capacity for dire prediction is limitless.

The liberals are even angry at each other. The peace movement, they complain, is dead, killed off by the machinations of a devious administration. Even the peace bloc in the Senate seems to be showing new signs of indecision and impotence.

And meanwhile, of course, everything is going to hell in a handbasket.

The Cambodians, despite all the predictions, are showing signs of determination in resisting the invasion of their country by North Vietnam. The South Vietnamese are said to be invading Laos with the object—just imagine it—of breaking up Communist supply lines into their country. And worst of all, the Americans are helping them, even while claiming that they intend to withdraw the bulk of their forces in Vietnam as quickly as possible.

Small wonder the liberals feel betrayed. This is hardly the scenario they had in mind when the Senate doves pushed through the Cooper-Church amendment last summer. And if, in the end, they were unable to limit the use of American air power in supporting actions in Laos and Cambodia, why surely the administration should have understood what they meant to do.

But what is it exactly that they did intend? The liberal lexicon is a bit murky when it comes to practical policy, but a few solid points show through the rhetoric.

They would, presumably, prohibit all help for Cambodia and Laos and for the South Vietnamese operating in these countries. They also would set a firm date for the end of the American involvement in Vietnam—including the withdrawal of all American troops and support for the Vietnamese army. And finally, they would pull the rug out from under the "unrepresentative and repressive" government in Saigon and set up in its place a coalition willing to come to terms with Hanoi.

Or would they?

The curious thing about the Senate liberals is that while they readily make ruinous suggestions about what others might do, they show little zest for putting such suggestions into effect. The chances, for instance, of extending the Cooper-Church amendment to cover the use of American air power in Cambodia and Laos are rated at practically zero.

If you ask them, furthermore, whether they really would prefer to see a Communist government in control in Cambodia or

Laos, they will say of course not. If you ask them who would be served by a public timetable for an American departure from Vietnam, they change the subject. If you ask them whether they consider the government in Hanoi more representative and less repressive than the one in Saigon, they say it is beside the point.

More than anything else, one feels, there is an apprehension that it may all work out—that the disaster they have been predicting so relentlessly over the years may not actually come about. It is, quite obviously, a luxury which only the opposition can afford. And the liberals at this point seem devoutly attached to their opposition role.

NEWS BLACKOUT ON SOUTHEAST ASIA MILITARY ACTIVITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have been deeply disturbed, as have many other Senators, over the prolonged news blackout imposed by the administration on our major military activities in Southeast Asia.

Indeed, the distinguished assistant majority leader, the junior Senator from West Virginia, expressed the concern of many when he raised questions here in the Senate last week regarding the news blackout.

Neither I nor any other American, I am sure, would ask that any information be made public that would in any way endanger the lives of our servicemen in Southeast Asia. In fact, concern for the safety of our servicemen has been cited by the Department of Defense as the reason for the extraordinary news blackout.

I cannot but remark, however, on the contrast between the administration's news policy during the Cambodian incursion of April 30, last year, and during the current military campaigns. Senators will recall that on April 30 last year, the President on national television informed the American people that even as he spoke United States and South Vietnamese forces were moving across the international boundary into the territory of Cambodia. He subsequently announced on national television, to the American people and the world, precisely how far into Cambodia those troops would penetrate and the deadline for their complete withdrawal.

Did those early, open announcements of U.S. military activities last year pose any threat to the safety and security of our servicemen? To the contrary, the administration has proclaimed the entire operation to have been a complete and unmitigated success.

I find it difficult indeed to understand why it was possible in 1970 to give the American people full and timely information on a major military operation, while in 1971 such full and timely information is considered a threat to the security of our servicemen.

Perhaps there are reasons for the difference; there may well be circumstances that fully justify such a dramatic change in information policy. If there are, those reasons should be presented without further delay to the American people, whose sons are fighting this war and whose dollars are paying for it.

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD A. SYMES BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Friday, February 5, 1971, Harold A. Symes, professional staff member of the Committee on Public Works, retired. This one-sentence statement really expresses much. Hal, as we know him, has spent 18 years as a printer with the Government Printing Office, 6 years with other congressional committees, and has served the Public Works Committee as its printing editor for the past 7 years.

During his years with the committee, he has assisted the Members and his professional staff colleagues in the handling of the Air Quality Act of 1963, the Motor Vehicle Air Pollution Control Act of 1965, the Air Quality Act of 1967, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, the Resource Recovery Act of 1970, all of the biennial authorizations for rivers and harbors-flood control, and the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1964, 1966, 1968 and 1970, the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, the Highway Safety Act of 1966, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and the Public Works and Economic Act of 1965 and their 1967 and 1969 amendments.

There is no way of accurately determining the number of volumes, pages, and words which it has been his duty to shepherd through the legislative process. Without him, the committee would have functioned, but with him, it functioned so much better. His ability and diligence, his dedication to his assigned tasks facilitated the important work of the Committee on Public Works. But more than his commitment to his assigned job, he shall be most remembered for the manner in which he carried out his responsibility, always with pleasantness, with kind words, and with great understanding for the needs of others. No matter how complex the particular job, no matter how short the time limit and how impossible the working conditions, he always delivered and with a smile.

While it is true that no man is indispensable, he will be missed by the members of the committee and his colleagues. We wish him a happy, healthy, and rewarding retirement. I know from having worked with this man that this will not be a period of unproductiveness and idleness. He is too active and too involved to sit. Following a brief vacation, we will again see Hal Symes doing something for people because that is the way he lives.

All of us who have been involved in the life of the Congress, are aware of the professional camaraderie of the printers on the Hill, and Hal Symes has been a printer's printer.

ANALYSIS OF AIRPORT USE PROBLEMS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an article entitled, "Will You Lose Your Right To Fly?" which was published in the October 1970 issue of Popular Mechanics magazine. I found it to be a very inter-

Text of the U.S. Statement on Laos

WASHINGTON, Feb. 8 (AP) —Following is the text of a statement made today by the State Department on the South Vietnamese incursion into Laos:

Last evening the Government of the Republic of Vietnam announced in Saigon that elements of its armed forces have crossed into enemy-occupied territory of Laos to attack North Vietnamese forces and military supplies which have been assembled in sanctuaries close to the border of South Vietnam.

These sanctuaries lie between the 16th and 17th parallels and comprise concentrations which are an important part of the Ho Chi Minh Trail system. Our military command in Vietnam has announced the limit of the U. S. military participation.

The decision of the United States to assist is based on the following policy considerations:

[1]

No American ground combat forces or advisers will cross into Laos.

[2]

The operation will be a limited one both as to time and area. The Vietnamese government has made it clear that its objective will be to disrupt those forces which have been concentrated in this region for use against South Vietnamese and U. S. forces located in the northern military regions of South Vietnam, and to intercept or choke off the flow of supplies

and men during the dry season which are designed for use further south on the Ho Chi Minh Trail in South Vietnam and Cambodia.

[3]

The operation will promote the security and safety of American and allied forces in South Vietnam and is consistent with statutory requirements. It will make the enemy less able to mount offensives and strengthen South Vietnam's ability to defend itself as U. S. forces are withdrawn from South Vietnam. It will protect American lives.

[4]

This ground operation by the South Vietnamese against the sanctuaries thus will aid in the Vietnamization program. The withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam will continue. During the month of April President Nixon will announce further withdrawals.

[5]

The measures of self-defense being taken by the Republic of Vietnam are fully consistent with international law. A report to this effect is being made by the Republic of Vietnam to the President of the Security Council of the United Nations, to the Geneva co-chairmen, and to the Governments which comprise the International Control Commissions.

[6]

This limited operation is not an enlargement of the war. The territory involved has been the scene of com-

bat since 1965. The principal new factor is that South Vietnam forces will move against the enemy on the ground to deny him the sanctuaries and disrupt the main artery of supplies which he has been able to use so effectively against American and South Vietnamese forces in the past.

[7]

The United States has consistently sought to end the conflict in Indochina through negotiations. President Nixon specifically proposed last October that there be (a) cease-fire throughout Indochina; (b) a negotiated timetable for the withdrawal of all forces; (c) the immediate release of all prisoners of war; (d) an international peace conference for all of Indochina, and (e) a political settlement. This continues to be the policy of the United States.

[8]

The Royal Lao Government has issued a statement, which, while critical of the current military action, points out that the "primary responsibility for this development rests on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, which has violated and is continuing to violate the neutrality and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Laos."

The United States Government continues to favor the neutrality of Laos and the restoration of the situation contemplated by the 1962 Geneva accords, in which all foreign forces would be withdrawn from Lao territory. A new Indochina conference as proposed by President Nixon could accomplish this goal.

our local community over General Graf's accomplishments and join me in extending our gratitude and best wishes.

LINCOLN AND THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the campaign to abolish the electoral college method of choosing the President will undoubtedly be renewed in the near future. Joint resolutions providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment for consideration by the States have been reintroduced in the present Congress.

Both proponents and opponents will be interested in what Abraham Lincoln had to say on the subject. While a member of this great body from Illinois, he became acquainted with Patrick W. Tompkins, a fellow-Whig from Mississippi. Tompkins showed Lincoln a letter from Josephus Hewett, a Natchez lawyer who had formerly practiced in Springfield.

In a communication to his former fellow-townsmen dated February 3, 1848, from Washington, Congressman Lincoln put the case for retention of the electoral college tersely but adequately. The pertinent paragraph from his letter follows:

Your whig representative from Mississippi, P. W. Tompkins, has just shown me a letter of yours to him. . . . I was once of your opinion, expressed in your letter, that presidential electors should be dispensed with; but a more thorough knowledge of the causes that first introduced them, has made me doubt. Those causes were briefly these. The convention that framed the constitution had this difficulty: the small states wished to so frame the new government as that they might be equal to the large ones regardless of the inequality of population; the large ones insisted on equality in proportion to population. They compromised it, by basing the House of Representatives on population, and the Senate on states regardless of population; and the executive on both principles, by electors in each state, equal in numbers to her senators and representatives. Now, throw away the machinery of electors, and the compromise is broken up, and the whole yielded to the principle of the large states.

THE CURRENT OPERATION IN LAOS

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the current operation in Laos, which is being carried out by ARVN forces.

This long overdue operation is designed to cut the Communists' last major remaining supply line—the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The successful Cambodian operation, which closed the port of Sihanoukville to the Communists, has forced North Vietnam to become almost completely dependent on the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Disruption of this supply line will protect the continued withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. To not have acted at this time, when the movement of supplies along the Ho Chi Minh

Trail is reaching a peak, would have enabled the enemy to inflict heavier casualties on our forces and would have slowed the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. Our failure to act would have permitted the North Vietnamese to continue with impunity to use Laos as a staging grounds for aggressive action in South Vietnam.

Finally, as the North Vietnamese aggressors come face to face with the improved fighting capability of the South Vietnamese forces, this may well have a sobering effect on the Communists. It may well cause Hanoi to see that they cannot succeed in their aggression and meaningful negotiations could commence to bring a lasting peace to Southeast Asia.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. In 1916 Einstein predicted the existence of gravity waves in his general theory of relativity. It was not until June 1969 that his theory was confirmed by Dr. Joseph Weber of the University of Maryland. Weber's resourcefulness and years of hard work and dedication led to the perfection of a system of gravity wave detectors which confirmed that signals he detected originating from the Milky Way Galaxy were gravitational waves. Just as the confirmation of the existence of electromagnetic waves over 80 years ago led to a scientific revolution so may the work of Joseph Weber open up the mysteries of our universe.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Senate Public Works Committee has been conducting hearings this week on the authorization of funds for the Appalachian development program. In that 12 of the 13 counties in Ohio's 10th Congressional District are in the Appalachia region. I would like to share with my colleagues of the House the remarks I have offered the subcommittee outlining our experience with the Appalachia program. This brick-and-mortar type program has been most effective and important to Appalachia Ohio in solving the problems unique to our area and providing us with a Federal-State commitment which is necessary for the continued economic development of the area.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely grateful for this opportunity to express my views to this Subcommittee on the Appalachian Regional Development Program, a program which has

had a profound impact in the Tenth Congressional District of Ohio which I am privileged to represent.

I have noted that while many Senators on the Committee are familiar first hand with the results of this program in their own states, neither of the Senators from Ohio are on the Committee.

I want to take this opportunity to reinforce the evidence that the Appalachian Program has been successful by describing for you some of the results in Ohio's Tenth Congressional District.

There is no disputing the fact that in all too many instances the mountain counties in many of our Appalachian States have been orphans. For too long our Hill counties were ignored by the State Capitol and the Federal Government. The one great virtue of the Appalachian Regional Development Program has been that through the unique political partnership of the Federal Government, the states, and the localities, these grievances of the past have been remedied and we are now making good headway in meeting our needs and solving our problems.

Certainly in our district, we can point to a substantial turnaround in emphasis and attention from our State Capitol as well as the Federal Government.

But the great virtue of this program has been that it does not attempt to dictate to us from the top. Instead, we make our own plans and devise our own solutions at the local level and through the Appalachian Regional Commission, the State Government and the Federal Government join forces to help us get the job done.

Equally important from the point of view of Congress, the dollars under this program are not wasted but are spent in a very orderly and systematic way.

Much of the Tenth District has been isolated from the economic activity occurring in other parts of Ohio and nearby areas. Appalachian Development Highway Corridor "D" is being built through the heart of our district to eliminate that isolation. When the highway is finished, we will be on one of the main arteries linking the St. Louis and Cincinnati areas to Washington and Baltimore, and we expect to reap many economic benefits as a result.

We are getting ready for the expected impact which that highway will have by attempting to upgrade the abilities of our work force through improved health and education.

It would be impossible to adequately describe in the short time available the dramatic improvement in vocational education in our district which has been made possible under the Appalachian Program.

Fortunately, since the Appalachian Act was passed in 1965, Ohio has adopted a new state vocational education program. So our progress in vocational education has accelerated even more and no small share of the credit goes to the Appalachian Program.

We have built two major area vocational and technical centers in Southern Ohio with Appalachian funds. The new Tri-County Joint Vocational High School and Technical Institute at Nelsonville, Ohio, has been in operation for two years. Student response has been so enthusiastic that we now find that the facility is not large enough. The school was planned for 300 11th and 12th grade students. The first year 150 were enrolled and the second year, 600 Applicants have come from all parts of Appalachian Ohio and neighboring West Virginia.

The demand for entrance to the post-high school Technical Institute has been just as great. Instead of the expected 100 applicants in the first year we had 285 full-time and 150 part-time students enrolled. And this year there are 541 full-time students.

Perhaps we can appreciate the enormous success of this new center when I point out that it was the first facility of its kind in the entire state.

Of the 225 students from outside the tri-county school district, we have students from 68 of Ohio's 88 counties and four West Virginia counties.

We have a big program for adults during the evenings. Over 950 adults have taken advantage of the courses during the two years the center has been open. Because of the demands of the students, the curriculum has been steadily expanded so that we now have courses in practical nursing, forestry, and business and management, in addition to all the other courses originally planned for the center.

At the Technical Institute, associate degrees are offered in electrical engineering data processing and computer technology, secretarial occupations, industrial engineering, mechanical engineering, accounting, environmental health, and retail hotel-motel management. The forestry course is the first such two-year course in the State of Ohio. Students in the school are prepared to build a motel-restaurant complex for training people in motel and hotel management. I might add that the school has just been named one of the nation's ten outstanding vocational and technical educational institutions by the U. S. Office of Education.

As I pointed out, the Nelsonville vocational education center was the first to open in our area and has served as a model for others in the State. Since then, a second one has opened in our district, the Muskingum Vocational Technical School in Zanesville. That facility will train students from 11 school districts and technical training will be available for students from five counties.

These centers are playing a key role in our development plans for the area.

For example, the Appalachian Regional Commission has just funded at the Nelsonville School, a new Human Resources Development Center which will assist the area in designing a comprehensive program for correcting many of its manpower problems.

So far, we have identified 15 separate manpower needs in the area and soon we hope to be undertaking programs in those fields. These include programs to improve the educational skills of adults; upgrade job capabilities of many of our unemployed people; education and training programs for employed workers in order to enable them to advance in their jobs; a new approach to pre-professional education for high school youth; new services for pre-school children so that they can compete on an equal footing when they enter the school system; new health and nutrition services for students in our schools; new health manpower training programs; and a new program for the mentally handicapped.

Emphasis on improving health conditions has been just as great. There are many communities in our area where there are no doctors younger than 55. We are facing a very real and serious problem with the shortage of medical manpower. The only doctor in one of our counties has made plans to relocate. It has been difficult to recruit physicians into many of our communities because of the lack of adequate facilities.

However, in seven counties of Southeastern Ohio with a population of nearly 213,000 people, local leadership united in an Ohio Valley Health Foundation supported with Appalachian funds over the last three years has been demonstrating a new approach to making available adequate health services to the people of the area. With a large measure of help under the Appalachian Program, eight hospitals have been constructed or are nearing completion along with facilities for extended care and outreach. Thus, with Appalachian assistance, modern facilities are being provided not only to serve the people in our section of the State, but also to provide modern medical services to those across the river in West Virginia. These are truly region-serving facilities. With ARC assist-

ance we are providing the type of facilities and service so necessary and vital to attract physicians.

Great strides have been made in providing speech, hearing, and visual screening programs for children. With help from the Appalachian Program, a mental retardation program is underway. Both the retardation and the screening programs are designed to detect incapacities among children before they reach the stage where costlier remedial treatment is necessary or, unfortunately, where even such protracted care comes too late.

Since 1968—less than three years ago—the Appalachian Program has provided approximately \$8.6 million for improving health conditions in our area.

There are many other ways this program has brought new hope to Appalachia Ohio.

I understand Governor Moore of West Virginia has already described to you the outstanding leadership of the Appalachian Regional Commission in constructing a new bridge across the Ohio River after the tragic collapse of the Silver Bridge a few years ago; a terrible incident which caused tremendous loss of life and serious disruption of commerce.

The Commission actually advanced \$2 million to get the bridge under construction as soon as possible. And today people in the Point Pleasant, West Virginia-Gallipolis, Ohio, area can once again move back and forth across the river between West Virginia and Ohio, thanks to that effort.

Appalachian investments have been used to promote industrial development in the area. We have also used Appalachian help to develop some of our superb recreational potential. A brand new park facility with modern accommodations and a lodge has opened in my district, and the Commission has provided assistance in constructing an access road to the lodge.

Under Section 205 of the Act, the Commission has helped us reclaim several abandoned stripe mine areas so that they could be used for recreation.

These experiences in our district have persuaded me that, under the Appalachian Act, we have found a way to unite the different levels of government in a new kind of partnership under which we can develop coordinated approaches to local problems.

It would be tragic to stop these efforts just as they are getting started; if anything they should be encouraged and expanded.

I am in favor of increased flexibility to enable the Appalachian Regional Commission to do more in the field of educational improvement.

If the Commission can accomplish the same kind of results in improving primary and secondary education and higher education as it has vocational education, our Region and the Nation will greatly benefit. I earnestly recommend that this Committee consider giving the Commission some additional flexibility in coping with other educational problems in the Appalachian Region.

I would also urge this Committee to seriously consider improving the flexibility of the Commission to deal with the many environmental problems which plague our Region. We are an area which in the past has suffered great damage from coal mining and mine acid drainage, from logging, from industrial and municipal pollution of our waterways, and from air pollution.

I believe the Commission has demonstrated an unusual capability and commitment to work with the States and localities in developing comprehensive approaches to such problems without being confined by the narrow requirements of categorical grants-in-aid.

This Committee has frequently described the Appalachian Program as an experiment

and the Appalachian Region as a national laboratory. I fully agree.

And it would seem to me to be in the best national interest to carry the experiment forward and to grant the Commission broader authority to deal with the problems of our Region and, thereby, develop improved techniques for dealing with these many complex social, economic, and physical problems—techniques which could well be applied to other sections of the country.

We would win a double bonus:

A more productive Region adding still greater contributions to the national economy.

Well-tested approaches that could be applied in other sections of the United States.

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF NAMES BY EAST-WEST TRADE MISSION

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recently a private organization, the East-West Trade Mission located in San Francisco, conducted a mailing to a great many people throughout the country. The purpose of this mailing was to solicit participants for an alleged trip to Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and into Communist China.

My name was listed on the letterhead of this solicitation as a member of the organization's advisory board. Three other Members of Congress, Congressman ROBERT LEGGETT, Senator WALTER MONDALE, and Senator CHARLES PERCY were similarly listed on the letterhead.

Mr. Speaker, in fact none of us had ever authorized the use of our names in connection with this enterprise. We were neither advisers to this group nor sponsors of the proposed trip.

Naturally, we were all extremely concerned about this misuse of our names. I have sent the following letter to Mr. Paul Sjeklocha of the East-West Trade Mission:

Mr. PAUL SJEKLOCHA,
East-West Trade Mission,
World Trade Center,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. SJEKLOCHA: As you know, the use of my name in connection with your recent mailing to solicit members for a trip to China, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia was completely unauthorized.

I have never in any way associated myself with your mission as an advisor or sponsor and consider it imperative that immediate steps be taken to inform all of the people you contacted about the unauthorized use of my name.

This position, as you are aware, is shared by my colleagues in Congress, Senator Walter Mondale, Senator Charles Percy and Congressman Robert Leggett, all of whose names were also used without any authorization.

It is my intention to work closely with Senators Mondale and Percy and Congressman Leggett to see that all possible steps are taken to correct this situation.

Very truly yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Congressmen LEGGETT, Senator MONDALE, and Senator PERCY have also expressed their concern to Mr. Sjeklocha and we are presently taking all possible steps to contact everyone who received this sollicita-

unlimited debate and the actual or threatened use of the filibuster.

I would remind my liberal colleagues that the filibuster, and threat of filibuster, are no longer the instruments of a conservative minority intent on maintaining special privilege.

The outstanding filibusters during the 91st Congress as listed in the newly published committee print, Senate cloture rule, prepared by the Committee on Rules and Administration, bear this out.

During that Congress, lengthy debate, although not necessarily labeled a filibuster, was led by opponents to the ABM authorization, the Haynesworth nomination, the Carswell nomination, the Cooper-Church amendment, direct election of the President and Vice President, the family assistance plan, the shoe-textile imports quotas bill, and the appropriations for the SST.

I participated in a number of these filibusters or threats of filibuster. I see nothing inconsistent in the use of unlimited debate as a means of preventing action or convincing the unconvinced. I believe most of the cases of extended debate in the 91st Congress were of benefit to the Nation and a credit to this body. Most also resulted in victories for the liberals or the so-called liberal position.

I participated in opposing Haynesworth and Carswell, in opposing the ABM, which we lost, and the import quotas bill, which we won.

Opponents of these measures cannot brag of their success in halting the SST, or import quotas, or the nomination of a Carswell, and curse the filibuster as a parliamentary technique.

Cloture has been successfully invoked eight times since the present rule XXII was adopted in 1917. It has been invoked three out of those eight times on civil rights matter. We have demonstrated that we can bring an end to debate under the current rules when public opinion is sufficiently mobilized.

I believe, however, that much as I justify limits on a tyrannical majority recent experiences have demonstrated the need for modification in rule XXII if we are to meet the demands made upon this body.

From 1806 to 1845 we had no device for limiting debate in the U.S. Senate. We could not countenance such a situation today.

I think we have demonstrated that even a two-thirds majority is excessively restrictive to meet today's demands upon this body. I do oppose, however, any move to permit an end to debate in this body upon the vote of a simple majority. I shall continue to oppose such a rule with all the vigor at my command.

I believe that the time has now come for modification. A three-fifths vote to limit debate strikes a reasonable balance between the need for action and provision for restraint.

The question is not shall a majority decide; it is rather one of whether a mere majority shall silence debate.

The Senate provides the only forum where reflection may be demanded—even of the majority. I believe a change to a three-fifths majority requirement will

preserve this institution, reasonably meet the needs and demands for action, while preserving the rights of minorities and their spokesmen to be heard and properly considered in the legislative process. There is further reason to believe that such change may soften demands for more radical change which may endanger this body and every man who finds himself in a minority position on an important issue. I therefore urge adoption of a three-fifths rule.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume its consideration of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, and that the period for the transaction of routine morning business extend to the time when the majority leader is recognized prior to the vote on the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 18— DEPLOYMENT OF THE ARMED FORCES AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES—STAR PRINT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 18 be titled: "To define the principles which shall govern the deployment of the Armed Forces of the United States by the President, to express United States foreign policy objectives in Southeast Asia." and that this joint resolution be star printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAMBRELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ROLLS ROYCE BANKRUPTCY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes of the Senate's time today to discuss a subject that has received considerable attention in the newspapers in the last few days: the very sad financial condition in which the Rolls Royce Co. in Great Britain has found itself, and its possible effect upon the production of airliners in the United States by Lockheed Corp. A number of the airlines have an interest and have already put out substantial advances against orders that they have taken for such aircraft.

I have long been familiar with this problem. Indeed, from the very outset there was substantial question in my mind as to whether or not the Rolls Royce Co. could actually perform the required job of producing engines of this type for this American airframe.

I raised these questions in the House of Representatives when the matter first came up, and the colloquies which we had there at that time assured that there was in effect competitive bidding, and that U.S. corporations, specifically the General Electric Corp., with its major engines plant in southwestern Ohio, had a shot at and won on a competitive bidding basis the contract for the engines for the competitive DC-10 airplane.

I am not at this time going to take any position with regard to what the United States should or should not do, or with regard to what individual companies in the United States ought to do in this very difficult dilemma. I understand that time is being sought, and perhaps has been agreed to, to try to ascertain whether or not the Rolls Royce Co., backed up by the British Government, might be able to perform under the contract; and I am certainly not trying to close in on that time in any way.

Mr. President, what I do feel and what I want to express to the Senate is a very strong opinion that anything that is done with regard to this matter by the U.S. Government should be disclosed fully and stand in the daylight, on its own feet, for consideration on a policy basis by the Members of Congress on both sides of the Capitol and by the public generally. I do not think that anything should be done behind the scenes in the way of putting the backing of the U.S. Government behind the financing of this matter, without the fullest public disclosure and public discussion of the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

LAOS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I discussed briefly the South Vietnamese incursion into Laos, and again I would only say briefly that there will be no U.S. combat ground forces introduced into Laos. I would again remind the Senate that President Nixon is winding down the war in Southeast Asia. I said then and say again that perhaps there has been an escalation of the rhetoric, perhaps there has been an escalation of the criticism, but there has been no escalation or widening of the war in Southeast Asia.

The President has as he has announced on several occasions, six different times withdrawn American troops. The total number of Americans withdrawn now exceeds 200,000. By May 1 of this year, the total number will be around 265,000. That will leave in South Vietnam between 40,000 and 50,000 ground combat troops.

I would point out, as I have many times on the Senate floor, that when President Nixon assumed the Presidency on January 20, 1969, the troop level in South Vietnam was more than 540,000. I recognize that we are probably on the threshold of the 1972 presidential campaign. I recognize, therefore, the temptation, as one engaged in politics from time to time, to find fault with any President, his policies at home and his policies abroad.

But, Mr. President, let me emphasize again that President Nixon has kept his word in Southeast Asia, that there will be no American ground troops introduced into Laos, that this is an important military move, and that if successful this move could facilitate further troop withdrawals, could expedite the Vietnamization program, and could therefore result in an earlier return of all American forces from Southeast Asia. The President is committed to that end, and I am

assured and believe very deeply that the President will achieve that goal.

I would also suggest that it would be easier for the President to achieve the goal if some of those who have been escalating the rhetoric and escalating the criticism might find it in their hearts to obtain the facts and to support the President at this critical time.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE SUGAR BEET INDUSTRY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from time to time I have been very critical of our farm program, but I believe that, consistently, the one piece of agricultural legislation which has done a relatively good job has been the Sugar Act. The sugar beet industry is a very important economic factor in the State of Montana. The act will be expiring at the end of 1971, and I hope that Congress will be able to expedite the extension and improvement of this program.

Experience has shown that, through the administration of the Sugar Act, consumers of this country have had the benefit of adequate supplies at reasonable prices. Farm workers under the sugar program have had and will continue to receive rates in excess of the minimum established by the Congress for agriculture. In general, I think it is correct to say that the farmers, the processors and the refiners of both sugar beets and cane have been able to achieve a satisfactory level of return. Developments in the past several years do give me some cause for concern. Costs are rising at a more rapid rate than the return to the growers and processors. Statistics indicate that the returns to the industrial users of sugar far exceed that available to the growers and processors.

This developing situation was graphically brought home to the people of Montana when the Holly Sugar Corp. announced that it would close the factory at Hardin, Mont. Earlier in the year, a sugar plant was closed in Utah, and the American Crystal Sugar Co. has announced that they will be closing their factory in Chaska, Minn. According to information available, these decisions were based on economic factors. If this is an accurate appraisal, it would seem that there will have to be some adjustment in the Sugar Act to preserve a healthy sugar beet industry in the West. The closing of these factories will have a very detrimental effect on the economy of these rural areas which have become dependent upon this one crop. When Congress schedules the consideration of the renewal of the Sugar Act, it is imperative that we consider what is happening with respect to domestic sugar. We do not want to be faced with another vanishing industry.

I am convinced that we can have a strong sugar beet industry through the combined efforts of an imaginative and aggressive management along with a working Sugar Act administered by a responsible Department of Agriculture. I look forward to receiving specific recommendations from the producers and processors on how the act might be improved.

It is my hope that discussions now underway will bring about a solution to the problem we face at Hardin, Mont., and that the plant will not be closed. The announcement, coming as it did in late January, places the growers of eastern Montana in a very difficult position. My intention in addressing myself to this problem today is to place the Senate on notice that what has been a very fine program may now be in need of some adjustments in order to meet economic situations. Let us not wait until it is too late.

THE WISDOM OF LAOS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today I should like to take a small amount of the Senate's time to express my admiration for the courage and determination of President Nixon in assisting the South Vietnamese invasion of Laos.

If this proves to be a difficult operation from a military standpoint the blame will be easy to place—it will be the undisputed property of civilian leaders such as Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and Defense Secretaries McNamara and Clifford who failed to take this action when it was first indicated.

Mr. President, military men who are closely informed about the war in Indochina know that the invasion of Laos to cut Communist supply lines along the Ho Chi Minh Trail should have been carried out several years ago. The fact that this necessary military operation has been put off for so long is bound to make it more difficult. And the fact that it was delayed so long qualifies the war in Vietnam for the distinction of being labeled one of the stupidest wars ever fought. Again I wish to place the blame for the mess in Vietnam right where it belongs—with the above mentioned civilian leaders who for years thwarted the conduct of an efficient and effective military operation in Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, the Laos operation has become imperative to the success of American plans to withdraw the majority of its combat troops from that area. I for one am becoming very sick and tired of hearing Members of this Senate and other spokesmen of liberal persuasions find fault with every step taken in Indochina to protect American lives.

I am inclined to wonder, along with trained observers such as Washington Star columnist Crosby S. Noyes, just what it is the liberals really want. When I listen to the critics of Mr. Nixon's moves in Cambodia and Laos, and realize that they have a true account of the reasons for these moves, I am persuaded that the last thing some of our prominent "doves" want in Vietnam is an American success. Mr. President, I find myself asking if the partisanship being displayed over events in Vietnam can possibly be so bitter that some parties to it are hopeful that America will be defeated merely to justify their own predictions of disaster.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Mr. Herbert G. Klein, the Nixon administration Director of Communications, for bringing about a wide distribution of the very expert views on this subject recently outlined by Washington Post Columnist

Joseph Alsop. I for one can see nothing wrong with an administration spokesman circulating widely a newspaper column which defends his boss and our President even if it has some disparaging comments to make about some of his critics.

I believe it should be noted here that the outcry over America's air support for the Laos invasion was something less than the protest generated by the doves and peaceniks in the wake of the Cambodia operation last year. It says something for the administration's efforts to recognize that most critics are sensitive to the fact that the operation they complained about last year turned out to be one of the most successful of the entire Vietnam war.

I suspect there is some apprehension in the liberal ranks that Laos might prove to be just as successful. And let me emphasize that this is entirely possible, as the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator STENNIS, has remarked this operation "could be the one that cuts the jugular vein."

By the same token, the long delay in coming to grips with the situation will make it extremely difficult. This could be one of the roughest operations of the entire Southeast Asia campaign. It is fraught with difficulty and with danger. For this reason I commend the President on his courage and urge every sincere, right-thinking American to support the administration in every way possible. It cannot be done, I might add, by a lot of quibbling and nitpicking over such things as the news blackout which preceded the invasion and the exact number and disposition of Americans who might be engaged in this effort on behalf of freedom in Asia.

MORE COAL RESEARCH NEEDED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, power and fuel shortages are being experienced in various parts of the United States. Because of these shortages, a much more vigorous program of coal research is needed.

Such a program should have two major objectives. First, it should seek to solve the problem of air pollution caused by the sulfur oxides which result from the burning of coal; and second, it should be aimed at speeding up the efforts to produce liquid and gaseous fuels from coal.

Our Nation must clean up its atmosphere; but America must also continue to have the abundant fuel supply it needs. Our industrial employment and our prosperity depend upon that.

The key to this situation is a stepped-up program of coal research, which I shall urge the Federal Government to undertake.

RECESSION DEMANDS FEDERAL FINANCING OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about the new federalism and about the need for returning power to the States. There is one area of responsibility, however, in which there is no disagreement as to

February 10, 1971

REVENUE SHARING

Mr. TAFT, Mr. President, the concept of revenue sharing is older than our Constitution. The Basic Land Ordinance of 1785 provided that one 640-acre plot in each township was to be set aside for the maintenance of public schools.

In 1836, the Surplus Distribution Act made provision for the distribution of a \$37 million Federal surplus to the States, in four installments. The State of Maine, with typical Yankee frugality, made a per capita distribution to its citizens of the Federal funds. The fourth installment, however, was canceled because of a financial crisis.

More recently, we have witnessed the proliferation of categorical grants in aid. Grant in aid programs, with direction and ultimate control remaining with the Federal Government, increased from 18 in 1932 to over 500 in 1970, involving \$24 billion. The maze of these programs is so perplexing that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) has had a fine bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs where they can at least be found in one list.

Fundamental to our governmental structure is the premise that many problems can be most appropriately solved at the State and local level. Housing programs and standards designed for Brooklyn, N.Y., may not be responsive to the housing requirements of a small town in Ohio.

The States and local communities should be responsive and creative laboratories for the solution of their own problems. But they have not had the financial capacity to undertake meaningful solutions.

To make matters worse, the demand for State and local services has shown a disproportionate increase. From 1960 to 1969 civilian employment of the Federal Government increased 22.8 percent. But during that same period, the number of local government employees increased 46.1 percent and the number of State employees increased 73.2 percent. In 1969, we had 2,975,000 Federal employees and 9,716,000 State and local employees, but many of the latter were in federally mandated, directed, and strictured programs.

In his message to Congress on February 4, 1971, President Nixon pointed out that:

In the last quarter century, State and local expenses have increased twelvefold from a mere \$11 billion in 1946 to an estimated \$132 billion in 1970. In that same time, our gross national product, our personal spending, and spending by the Federal Government have not climbed even one-third that rate.

In addition to their economic difficulties, localities have a growing sense that they do not have control over their own development. Regional planning organizations curb local autonomy and the grant in aid programs restrict local creativity. There is a sense that all of our communities are being stamped out by a giant Federal cookie cutter.

We cannot expect creative leadership if State and local governments do not have both responsibility and financial capability.

As a former member of the Ohio House of Representatives and the Republican floor leader for 2 years, I became directly involved with the problems of State finance. For that reason I was happy, in 1965, to accept the invitation of the Republican National Chairman, Ray Bliss, to head a Republican task force on the functions of Federal, State, and local governments. We conducted studies of State and local government finance for over 3 years and made a comprehensive recommendation for Federal revenue sharing.

During the last Congress, I sponsored H.R. 9973 and cosponsored H.R. 13982, which were revenue-sharing proposals. Unfortunately neither measure was acted upon by Congress.

I am gratified that President Nixon has made revenue sharing one of his top priority items for the 92d Congress. I have joined as a cosponsor of this measure. In doing so, I am not unmindful of various alternative proposals which are worthy of full consideration. These include a proposal for Federal tax credits for State income taxes paid, and proposals to federalize all welfare programs, thereby relieving States of their share of this massive financial burden.

The resident's revenue sharing proposal is in two parts. The first part, which I have cosponsored, will provide \$5 billion of new money for State and local governments. This will be unrestricted money, to be used as State and local governments may deem most appropriate for their particular needs. It will be their choice of priorities, not ours in Washington. Under the proposed formula, approximately 48 percent will be distributed to local governments. However, the bill contains an incentive provision whereby any State may adopt an alternative formula for intrastate distribution. A State adopting such an alternative plan will receive an incentive increment from the Federal Government. I believe that as we consider this measure, we should provide a minimum total pass through formula, whereby local government is assured of its share under any alternate intrastate allocation plan adopted by the State government.

The second part of the revenue-sharing proposal will convert one-third of the existing narrow-purpose aid programs into grants for six broad purposes: urban development, rural development, education, transportation, job training, and law enforcement. This program will involve \$11 billion, including \$1 billion of new money. By broadening the areas of categorical grants, States and local governments will for the first time have the flexibility to tailor their programs to their problems, instead of fitting programs around specific Federal grants limitations and earmarking. In far too many instances, communities have not been able to avail themselves of Federal dollars for the reason that the available grants are not appropriate to their specific problems. By broadening the grant areas, we invite local governments and States to be more creative in designing programs that will solve problems. No longer will there be pressure to accept an unsuitable program for fear that the

Federal dollars will not otherwise come into the community.

While I cosponsor this measure, I will keep an open mind with respect to improvements which we may care to make in the formula for allocation of dollars among States and the formula for direct distribution to local governments. In addition, I shall consider appropriate changes to include autonomous local governmental units, such as school districts in Ohio.

But while we may wish to reflect longer upon the specific formulas in this bill, its basic philosophy is sound. A recent Gallup poll indicates that 77 percent of the American people support the concept of revenue sharing. They know that if we call upon our States and local governments to assume an increasing role in solving the problems of America, it is time that we gave these governments the resources to do the job.

A NEW INVASION OF LAOS

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, we have mounted a new invasion of Laos.

The American people were the last to know. But we have come to expect that.

Again the war is wider. In the name of getting out, we are going back in as deep as ever.

It is typical of our plight that what seemed ridiculous a year ago is now the deadly serious policy of our Government.

On January 19, I warned that we had begun a new involvement in southern Laos. I asked the President about reports that we were secretly supporting several Thai battalions in attacks which were part of a steadily increasing escalation in the area since August.

I was concerned that this could lead to growing American embroilment, and would be another blow to the negotiations, not to mention the chances for a return of our prisoners.

Where does it stop?

The limited assistance to South Vietnam led to American advisers and the bombing of the North.

We know where those so-called limited commitments took us.

A "limited" invasion of Cambodia has led to Laos. If the South Vietnamese sit astride the Ho Chi Minh Trail—in treacherous terrain, perhaps encountering a major enemy force for the first time—they risk disaster. That risk is already drawing our planes into heavy new bombing.

Where will that bombing draw us—to Hanoi, to Haiphong, to the Chinese border?

Behind it all is our refusal to face the truth in South Vietnam. The million-man South Vietnamese Army is the basis of our policy—to withdraw and yet to preserve the Saigon regime at the same time.

In the end, this policy is built on sand. That is why we bomb and invade.

We have seen this logic before. If only we "hurt" the other side, if only we show ourselves manly, or ferocious, or unpredictable, the truth will somehow be postponed or go away.

Congress and the American people have to recognize what this could mean

for the future. The administration is so committed to the Thieu-Ky regime, and so doubtful of its strength, that they refuse a compromise settlement and launch a wider war.

How then can they really continue on withdraw our forces when the Saigon regime could collapse after we are gone? This policy does not "protect" our withdrawal. It will prevent it.

And if we go on and on with the slaughter, when will our prisoners of war see their families again?

The administration has taken us this far down the road because we have let them. But a senseless war tolerated in frustration or misunderstanding is no less senseless.

The Congress must vote immediately on the Vietnam Disengagement Act, to bring our men home by the end of this year. We must extend that legislation to cover all Indochina, to end the bombing, and to bring about an immediate return of our prisoners in exchange for withdrawal.

History has given us words for what we are doing in Indochina. We are making a wilderness of devastation in three countries, a wilderness of our own schools and cities and farms starved by war spending.

We are making a wilderness, and call it peace.

PRIDE IN NEW HAMPSHIRE'S NATIVE SON—ALAN SHEPARD

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I have sent the following wire to Capt. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., at the Space Center in Houston, Tex.:

Heartiest congratulations on a magnificent job well done. I know all Granite Staters join together at this time in their pride in New Hampshire's native son. We are all standing a little taller today.

It is a long way from Derry, N.H., to the Fra Maurs highlands of the moon, but Alan Shepard has made this trip with enormous skill and great dedication.

It has been a hard road beset by many many obstacles. I well remember the time only a few years ago when physical problems seemed to have ended his chance to reach the moon. In the popular parlance: "His chances hardly seemed worth a nickel." But Alan Shepard was never one to let a tough road hold him back. With great perseverance he stands today as the successful leader of our most productive trip to the moon.

I guess none of us can truly comprehend what personal dedication and ability one must have to play the leading role in a moon flight. Years of the most rigorous physical and mental training must go into every flight. A whole new complex of the most involved science must be learned to be called upon when needed to achieve the greatest possible results from such an undertaking.

In reading the millions of words written on the Apollo 14 flight, I have been struck with the many times the reporters have used "flawless," "magnificent," "precise," "looking good," and many other glowing descriptions of the flight. I do not for one moment detract from the great contributions by Alan Shep-

ard's crew, Comdr. Edgar D. Mitchell and Maj. Stuart A. Roca. Nor do I fail, in any way, to realize that without the thousands of dedicated and tireless effort of the ground crews this flight would not have been possible in the first place or achieved its successful conclusion.

But I will have to be pardoned if I give my major praise to Alan Shepard. He captained the flight that brought back the largest and most significant collection of lunar samples. These are going to add immeasurably to our knowledge of our universe. Apollo 14 set up on the moon much more elaborate experiments than any of us believed possible.

And as one who enjoys the chance for an occasional round of golf, I was most pleased by his moment of relaxation when he used the six iron for some shots into the lunar darkness. There was a real twinge of envy when he recorded his one shot as going "miles and miles and miles." If we could just do the same here on earth.

The New York Times, in reporting the "on-the-nose" splashdown this morning, quotes George M. Low, NASA Administrator, as saying:

On that first Mercury flight in 1961, Alan Shepard tested man's reaction to the space environment. On Apollo 14, just 10 years later, Alan Shepard and his crew demonstrated that man belongs in space—that man can achieve objectives well beyond the capabilities of any machine that has yet been devised.

Alan Shepard is no machine. He is a very real person. As a Senator from his native State, I am proud to pay due recognition to what he has done for his Nation. He deserves the pride all New Hampshire has for him.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, February 16 marks the 53d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On that day we will pay tribute to a people whose fight for freedom and liberty has often been difficult, but never has faltered. I welcome this opportunity to join with Senators in saluting the Lithuanian people in their quest for independence from Soviet rule. There are more than 1 million people of Lithuanian descent in America today.

February 16 is the anniversary of Lithuania's first liberation from Russian oppression, in 1918. It is touched with sadness only because the Baltic States are no longer free. The United States has consistently refused to recognize the illegal incorporation of Lithuania and her sister states into the Soviet Union. Let us hope that the self-determination of these people will soon again be realized. Let us reaffirm our support for their struggle and undying efforts to be free.

CONSUMER'S STAKE IN U.S. AIR TRANSPORT INDUSTRY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Aviation Subcommittee heard important testimony from several witnesses who represented the point of view of the flying public.

One witness, Mr. Shelby Southard of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.,

submitted a particularly thoughtful statement, in my judgment, one which I was not able to hear in person but have since considered in some detail. The general thrust of his statement is that the American consumer has an important stake in the U.S. air transport industry, a stake which is sometimes overlooked in the boardrooms of our Nation's airlines.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Southard's statement be printed in the Record.

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

STATEMENT TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF AVIATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SUBMITTED FOR THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.A., FEBRUARY 8, 1971

First of all, Mr. Chairman, may I thank the Subcommittee for giving me the opportunity to testify at these hearings as a representative of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. and of the consumer movement where our League seeks to play a constructive role. The American consumer has an important stake in the U.S. air transport industry, and it goes beyond the reliability of domestic services.

During the past decade, the introduction of the low-cost charter has brought overseas vacations by air within reach of millions of Americans who had never flown before. Demand for overseas charters, both for educational and recreational purposes has grown rapidly, and chartering is now a major feature of many of our cooperatives as well as other organizations. For example, the Greenbelt Consumer Service, a cooperative here on the East Coast, and the Berkeley Cooperative in California utilize charters to provide low-cost overseas vacations for thousands of their members each year.

The importance of chartering is demonstrated by the fact that cooperatives and trade unions have banded together to form their own organization—the American Travel Association. ATA's purpose is to promote purposeful low-cost international travel for large numbers who would not otherwise be able to enjoy it.

Let me emphasize that I am not an expert on air transportation. My purpose today is to present to your subcommittee a consumer's-eyeview of Senate Bill 289, which would amend the Federal Aviation Act, among other things, to simplify the regulations governing group air transportation, and to strengthen the U.S. Government's ability to protect the rights of American citizens who travel abroad on low-cost charter flights. The Cooperative League of the U.S.A. is happy to support this legislation, not only for its potentially beneficial effects on the air transport industry, but also because we believe it will increase the availability of low-cost air travel to the American consumer.

In recent years we have seen more and more important pieces of consumer legislation pass through both Houses of Congress and across the desk of the President. And we have witnessed in them an ever-widening area of consumer protection provided through Federal law and legislative oversight. Gone is the old view of consumer interest as merely a matter of honest food labeling or accurate weights and measures. It has been replaced by a much broader concern for the individual in a fast-changing environment. This is as it should be.

We are most gratified, therefore, to see that this bill follows that pattern by recognizing the basic right of consumers to band together for the purpose of increasing the purchasing power of their combined resources. This, of course, is the basic premise

University Heights-----	\$59,941
Pepper Pike-----	18,833
Total, revenue sharing-----	10,500,000

On the other hand, if the Federal Government were to assume the total cost of the welfare program it would release \$85,056,999 in State and local dollars spent every year in Cuyahoga County. The present grand total cost of welfare in Cuyahoga County totals \$140,925,581, as follows:

Federal-----	\$55,868,582
State-----	74,616,969
Local-----	10,440,030

The reform and federalization of welfare would release \$85 million in State and local expenditures in Cuyahoga County for other purposes including education, safety, and pollution control.

The 1971 welfare expenditures in Cuyahoga County are projected as follows:

Aid for dependent children:	
Federal-----	\$27,588,352
State-----	34,642,726
Local-----	3,849,192
Total-----	66,080,270

Aid for aged:	
Federal-----	4,096,524
State-----	1,736,385
County, local-----	192,932
Total-----	6,025,841

Aid for disabled:	
Federal-----	2,215,250
State-----	1,495,795
County, local-----	166,200
Total-----	3,877,245

General relief:	
State-----	14,962,165
Local-----	4,987,388
Total-----	19,949,553

Vendor maintenance:	
Federal-----	898,954
State-----	734,356
County-----	81,595
Total-----	1,714,905

Medicaid:	
Federal-----	16,698,507
State-----	15,156,714
Total-----	31,855,221

Administration:	
Federal-----	4,192,995
State-----	5,771,246
Local-----	1,149,658
Total-----	11,113,899

Total welfare-----	140,925,581
--------------------	-------------

Mr. Speaker, total Federal cost of welfare in Cuyahoga County is \$55,868,582, total State cost of welfare in Cuyahoga County is \$74,616,969, and total local cost of welfare in Cuyahoga County is \$10,440,030.

The full Federal assumption of welfare programs would release \$85,056,999 for other State and local programs.

The projection of costs and Federal contribution does not include the \$16,800,000 Federal contribution in the food stamp program.

This alternative approach to revenue sharing must be carefully reviewed and

compared. The reform of the welfare program and the development of uniform standards in administration would provide higher standards, more responsible administration and greater efficiency.

FACTS BEHIND RECENT MOVE IN LAOS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the Washington Post yesterday, columnist Joseph Alsop has very clearly detailed the facts behind the recent move in Laos. I commend it to the attention of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. Alsop says President Nixon has demonstrated the courage of his convictions to end this war. The column points out that there were 16 reasons why the operation should not have been attempted, but there were two reasons that outweighed them, thus the courageous decision by President Nixon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

LAOS: NIXON'S REASONS

(By Joseph Alsop)

"There were sixteen good reasons against doing it, and there were only two reasons for doing it. But if you analyzed them, the two reasons for completely outweighed the 16 against—which were mostly domestic political reasons anyway."

Thus President Nixon himself, concerning his second great Southeast Asian gamble, to support the current, critically significant South Vietnamese drive across the border of Laos.

The first reason was the need to force the Hanoi war-planners to take the hardest kind of hard new look at their own situation and future prospects. A new look in Hanoi will hardly be avoidable, if the Laos trails are cut in the area around the little town of Sepone—which is the obvious aim of the big effort now in progress.

The intent, if the operation succeeds, is to keep the trails cut until the full onset of the rainy season in late spring. The big rains always make the Laos trails all but impassable, particularly for serious supply movement, until the dry season begins again. This will be about the beginning of next December.

For 10 months, then, about 130,000 North Vietnamese troops and other personnel in Cambodia and southern Laos, will have their unique existing lifeline severed—if all goes according to plan.

Yet if their unique lifeline is in fact severed as planned, they will get almost no replacements, or ammunition or other military supplies. In South Laos, where virtually no food is locally available, they will also get none of the rations they need from the north.

As to the President's second decisive reason for his gamble, it should also be obvious. It was to leave the South Vietnamese in a solid position to defend their own independence, after the withdrawal of U.S. troops.

There is nothing to prevent the South Vietnamese from cutting the Laos trails next dry season, if they manage to do so this time. In

sum, the President has now moved to finish what he began when he invaded the Cambodian sanctuaries.

The great result of the Cambodian operation was to close off the main lifeline of the North Vietnamese invaders of their neighbor countries. This was the seaborne supply route, running through Sihanoukville and Cambodia.

In the old days, when Hanoi had an easy time of it, the rations for the 70,000 North Vietnamese troops in South Laos were also bought on the Chinese markets in Phnom Penh, and they were trucked north. All that is over now, however, and as already stated, the other remaining lifeline of these same North Vietnamese troops is also likely to be cut.

Another effect of the President's decision, one must add, is to underline the sheer ludicrousness that has so long pervaded most discussion of the Vietnamese war in this country. Take the howl about General Abrams' famous "news embargo," for example.

To begin with no sensible reporter ought ever to wish to describe in detail and in advance any forthcoming military operation. Doing so jeopardizes the lives of every man engaged in that operation. To go on with this supposedly wicked embargo evidently left Hanoi utterly uncertain about where the blow would come. Otherwise there would have been a very nasty welcoming committee for the South Vietnamese the moment they crossed the Laos border.

Yet there is a far better, and far more depressing example of the folly many people have indulged in during these last years. You simply need to calculate what would have happened, if the same changes in the lunatic rules of the war had been made four years ago. There could have been no Tet offensive, to begin with.

For it is now well established, by computing actual bills of lading picked up in Sihanoukville, that the Cambodian lifeline was vital to the Tet plan. Over 2,000 tons of supply—the enemy's essential sinews of war for the whole southern half of South Vietnam—are now known to have come through Sihanoukville in 1967 and up to March 1968.

Then too, the Hanoi government solemnly committed itself by treaty, negotiated on our side by Gov. Averell Harriman and duly signed in 1962, never to use the Laos trails for supply purposes. They broke that promise before the ink was dry on the treaty. But there was no reason to treat the trails as effective sanctuaries, any more than there was a reason to treat Hanoi's Cambodian bases as sanctuaries.

Untold blood and untold treasure have been wasted, in truth, because the courage to do what President Nixon has done was not found long ago.

TAX SAVING INFORMATION FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the 1970 Tax Reform Act, there are new tax savings available to our senior citizens. In this year of rising costs these tax savings are especially welcome by our senior citizens who are struggling on their fixed incomes to meet rising bills.

The Senate Special Committee on the Aging has provided an excellent analysis

tions for building it. However, this one facility will not serve all the research needs on the North American continent, and it is a matter for concern that the inaction of the utilities of this country has created a research gap which is being filled by a neighbor in another country no larger than a number of single companies in the United States. I might add that there are manufacturers in Canada, too, which carry on research, and that U.S. manufacturers bid for Canadian business. Nevertheless, Hydro Quebec is mounting its own research effort, while U.S. power companies sit on the sidelines.

One of the best reasons for direct power industry participation in research is that only in this way can it obtain the services of research scientists qualified to appraise the quality and pace of the research conducted by manufacturers, universities and research institutes. I do not suggest that the power industry should carry out all or most of its research program with its own people and facilities, but it seems to me it cannot effectively determine research priorities or set research goals without at least a nucleus research staff of its own, of the very highest caliber.

The research needs of the industry are as endless as they are urgent. We need to learn to take sulphur out of the coal or the stack gases or both. We need to minimize nitrous oxide pollution in the burning of all fuels. We need to learn what other pollutants in stack gases may be doing harm now, or are likely to do so as fuel volumes grow, and deal with them before and not after a public alarm. We need to develop the technology of closed cycle cooling so that our industry will not remain a major threat to the ecology of surface waters. We need to develop new generating sources, as well as to improve existing ones, in order to make more efficient use of fuels both as a conservation measure, and to bring down costs. We need a great deal of advanced work on metallurgy and on quality control in order to move to higher unit temperatures and pressures and to increase unit reliability. We need to accelerate development work on EHV and DC technology to reduce costs, improve reliability and avoid unnecessary drain on land resources for transmission line rights-of-way. We should be mounting an adequate research program in undergrounding of transmission lines, in response to the demand of the increasing number of people who find overhead lines aesthetically offensive.

It would be Utopian to think that enough money could be found to pursue all of these lines of research with equal vigor, and if the money were available there are probably not enough trained people to carry it on. The question, therefore, is how large a research effort is practical and feasible, and how is it to be financed and carried on. A number of people, myself among them, have advocated a federal tax on energy use in the amount of 1% of gross revenues, which produces something in the order of \$300,000,000 at present levels of use if the tax is limited to the electric power industry, and much more if it is extended to other energy industries. The money would be earmarked for research and would be administered by a joint federal-industry council. Perhaps some of this money could be used to fund the creation of several national energy laboratories. Patterned after Argonne or Brookhaven, such laboratories would be geared to research and development in all areas of energy production and transmission. Such laboratories would complement the research done by private industry.

There is opposition to this plan on the ground, among others, that government participation would somehow distort the research program. I do not see why this should happen if the fund is properly established. Another objection, based on the history of the Highway Trust Fund, is that such funds

tend to be self-perpetuating, even after the justification has disappeared. I cannot believe energy research is likely to be of only short-term importance, but I should see no objection to limiting the life of the fund to a reasonable period of years.

The tax proposal has the merit of providing a response to an urgent problem which has baffled the power industry for many years. It solves the institutional difficulty I have mentioned, that there are so many entities and varieties in the electric power industry, and such a resultant diffusion of responsibility, that the industry has almost totally renounced a research role. A federal tax would raise funds on a scale reasonably commensurate with needs, on the basis of nationwide participation and an equitable distribution of the costs. I do not argue this is the only possible road to research progress or necessarily the best one, but it is better than the present situation of almost total industry default in the research area. I should gladly support, and I believe most of the others who have suggested the tax device would support, any other realistic plan which achieved the same goals, and behind which the industry would unite. It seems to me that the challenge to the leaders of the industry is to come up with an alternative plan on an adequate scale, or to support this one.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, although adults of our Nation are becoming fully aware of the dangers inherent in misuse of the environment, programs to pass this awareness on to our schoolchildren are often still in the formative stages.

For this reason, I was pleased to hear of a reception here last week when it was announced that the National Council of State Garden Clubs, as its 1971-72 civil development project, plans to distribute teachers' guides to conservation education to every school in the United States.

Congress has acted to encourage environmental education and it is gratifying to see citizen initiative in this vital area. The national projects chairman of this activity is a lady from Montana, Mrs. Lyle Johnsrud of Fort Benton.

In a news release Mrs. Johnsrud brought to my office, her organization outlines the goals of this most worthwhile endeavor.

I ask unanimous consent the news release be printed in the RECORD.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION FOR ALL CHILDREN GOAL OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE GARDEN CLUBS

WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 27, 1971

National Council of State Garden Clubs, Inc. announced their Civic Development Project for 1971-1972 at a reception held today in Washington, D.C. The goal of the Project is to provide teachers with the material necessary to make conservation/environmental education an integral part of the educational activities in every classroom in the United States.

In the weeks and months ahead, members of Garden Clubs in communities across the nation will be contacting schools and teach-

ers, neighbors, civic and business leaders for their support of what National Council has termed "one of the most important and far reaching programs ever undertaken by any national organization."

In a statement released at the reception, National Council of State Garden Clubs, Inc., said: "We have committed ourselves to this enormous nation-wide task because we firmly believe the greatest single step to safeguard our environment and to improve the quality of life is to provide the children in our schools with the means to understand and appreciate the world they will inherit.

"Earnestly seeking the support and aid of friends, neighbors, other civic organizations, businessmen and members of industry, our 387,700 members in over 14,600 Garden Clubs across the nation will work to donate the appropriate volume from the Series of Teachers' Curriculum Guides to Conservation Education, People and Their Environment, to teachers in every school in the United States."

People and Their Environment is a program written for teachers by teachers and designed to make conservation/environmental education an integral part of any school system's curriculum. It was edited under the direction of Dr. Matthew J. Brennan, and is published by J. G. Ferguson Publishing Company, a subsidiary of Doubleday & Company, Inc. Each of the eight volumes in the Series was specifically developed for a different grade level and/or subject area. The eight volumes are: Grades 1, 2, 3; Grades 4, 5, 6; Science, 7, 8, 9; Social Studies, 7, 8, 9; Social Studies, 10, 11, 12; Biology; Home Economics; and Outdoor Laboratory, 1-12.

Representing National Council of State Garden Clubs, Inc., at the reception were: 1st Vice-President and Acting President, Mrs. Maxwell W. Steel of Huntingdon, Pennsylvania; Vice Presidents: Mrs. Howard S. Kittel of Fort Worth, Texas and Mrs. Vernon L. Conner of Mount Dora, Florida; Treasurer, Mrs. Robert R. Crosby of New York, N.Y.; National Projects Chairman, Mrs. Lyle Johnsrud of Fort Benton, Montana; and Conservation Chairman, Miss Elizabeth Mason of Atlanta, Georgia.

FEDERALIZATION OF WELFARE AND REVENUE SHARING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate on the advantages to the State and local communities of the President's program of revenue sharing, it is important to compare the community benefit of the Federal assumption of full financial responsibility for welfare compared to President Nixon's plan on revenue sharing.

According to the President's proposal for a \$5 billion "free" distribution of Federal funds to local communities based on a distribution of 1.3 percent of the personal taxable income base, the distribution in Cuyahoga County—Metropolitan Cleveland—would be as follows:

Cuyahoga County	\$3,481,201
Cleveland	5,719,158
East Cleveland	268,079
Euclid	363,739
Shaker Heights	240,544
Highland Heights	11,754
Lyndhurst	52,213
Mayfield Heights	48,057
South Euclid	105,400

CIA Base In N. (Laos) Evacuating

By TAMMY ARBUCKLE

Special to The Star

VIENTIANE, Laos — The United States today began evacuating its base at Long Cheng, 75 miles north of here, as an estimated 5,000 North Vietnamese troops massed around it, well-informed sources said.

The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, which uses Long Cheng as the center of its Laos operations, has dismantled some of the monitoring equipment used to spy on Hanoi's communications with Laos and North Vietnam.

The equipment has been flown to other secret airstrips.

Most of the Americans left in Long Cheng no longer spend the nights there. All American commando leaders in charge of guerrilla teams have moved to Pakkao southeast of Long Cheng.

Long Cheng Hospital, with its American doctors, has been evacuated. Bedridden patients have been flown to Ban Son, 20 miles to the southwest and the staff is expected to follow soon.

Meo Gen. Vang Pao's forces, which are under direct U.S.

See LAOS, Page A-6

command, are reported to be tired and suffering from battle casualties which decimated the Meo force from 11,000 combat troops to just under 4,000 in 26 months of fighting.

"The North Vietnamese are fresh, fit and well-armed and we are tired," a government military man said, referring to the arrival of Hanoi's 312th Division north of Long Cheng.

The 312th is a fresh unit brought to fight alongside Hanoi's 316th Division which already was in the area.

Mortar Barrages

Hanoi troops are firing rocket and mortar barrages into positions north of Long Cheng.

Two nights ago they pulverized one post in four hours of shelling, demonstrating that Hanoi has no ammunition shortages.

The North Vietnamese troops, Sunday, briefly probed along Skyline Ridge, a position overlooking Long Cheng.

Twenty of the North Vietnamese were killed in action and an American installation on Skyline ridge, which guides aircraft, took a direct hit from a rocket.

Civilians Leaving

Meo civilians around Long Cheng already are leaving as the North Vietnamese conduct a terror campaign. In one Meo village, near Long Cheng, North Vietnamese troops reportedly executed all the Meo men Monday night.

This Hanoi military pressure, the weakness of the Meos, and the start of hazy weather preventing adequate U.S. air support, are believed to be the reasons the United States apparently is retreating.

The fall of Long Cheng, however, would likely have important political consequences.

Lao generals have said recently that, if Long Cheng falls, they will make an official alliance with the Thais, South Vietnamese and Cambodians and openly reject the stated Laos policy of neutrality.

16 Feb 71

30 Reported Dead at CIA Base in Laos

By D. E. Ronk

Special to The Washington Post

VIENTIANE, Feb. 15 —

Thirty Meo tribesmen were killed and 60 wounded in Saturday's bombardment of the Central Intelligence Agency's base at Long Cheng, Laotian military sources said.

It was reported here that American F-4 bombers mistakenly bombed Long Cheng in an attempt to break up what is being called a siege of the

base by Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese forces.

[Reuter reported that the Laotian government sent troop reinforcements to Long Cheng, and Defense Minister Sisouk Na Champassak announced that an investigation was under way into the bombing of the camp.]

Initial reports from Long Cheng said the casualties occurred in a North Vietnamese rocket attack. Origins of the bombardment remain unclear.

Meanwhile, Laotian military sources said today that a North Vietnamese soldier captured late last week revealed that the North Vietnamese command west of the Plain of Jars planned to attack Long Cheng today.

American military sources in Vientiane say the situation around Long Cheng remained stable and quiet Sunday night.

Long Cheng, 77 miles north of Vientiane, is a CIA center for intelligence, logistics and

for command of the 6,000 troops of Maj. Gen. Vang Pao in that area. Vang Pao's troops are mixed Meo and Laotian.

Pressures against Long Cheng and Sam Thong, which form a command and logistics complex, have steadily increased in recent weeks. There have been almost daily reports of rocketing and ground probes against the outpost.

See LAOS, A9, Col. 5

LAOS, From A1

A general exodus of tribal residents from the area has begun. Upward of 65,000 tribesmen are moving southwest toward Muong Cha, a refugee center established by the U.S. Agency for International Development, an American official here said. Reliable independent observers confirmed the refugee movement.

Emergency rations are being flown into Muong Cha by Air America planes to meet the demands of a growing refugee population.

Air America pilots estimated that there is a two-week march from Long Cheng to Muong Cha. Edgar Buell, a U.S. aid official in Laos for a decade, says 20 per cent of the people on such marches die en route.

Reports originating at Long Cheng say there has been an increase in Meo army desertions in recent weeks and it is believed soldiers are leaving the base to accompany families on the trek out of the battle zone.

At Ban Son, called site 272 by Americans, observers note an increase in residents and hospital admissions. Ban Son was created as a replacement refugee center for Sam Thong which was abandoned a year ago, then reclaimed, but it remains almost a ghost town, according to recent visitors.

The refugee movements toward Muong Cha rather than Ban Son tends to confirm the belief among observers here that the Meo do not believe Ban Son would offer sufficient refuge.

In a move believed re-

lated to the defensibility of Long Cheng, a new CIA base of operations for guerrilla forces was recently established at Pakkao and a military training center at Phou Koum.

Pakkao is now reportedly surrounded and Air America pilots report receiving enemy fire on approaching the landing strip. An American was reported wounded in a clash there early last week. Nonofficial observers are forbidden entry to Long Cheng, Pakkao and Phou Koum.

Long Cheng, now under siege, is seen by most observers here as the key to Vientiane's northern front.

"If Long Cheng falls, the Meo have fallen, and if the Meo fall there are no northern defenses to the Mekong Plain," one observer said.

"Long Cheng is immensely important psychologically to the Meo," he added. "It's been the only relatively stable place they have known for a decade—they have come to see it as a kind of capital. If it is lost they will be drifting without a home."

Vang Pao's army is called the only viable fighting force allied with the Vientiane government. Nearly all combat operations mounted in the past decade by government forces have involved the Meo. In the past three years they have suffered more than 7,000 killed in action.

Vang Pao himself has frequently told reporters that there are no alternatives to holding the mountains about Long Cheng.

"We must die here," he has been quoted as saying.