

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 2

FEBRUARY 2, 1971, TO FEBRUARY 11, 1971  
(PAGES 1339 TO 2740)

## 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 13 in 1932 to over 500 in 1970, involving \$24 billion. The maze of these programs is so perplexing that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROHN) 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 formulae 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. Roosa. 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