UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 31

DECEMBER 11, 1970, TO DECEMBER 17, 1970

(PAGES 41105 TO 42328)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1970

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1970—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1141 THROUGH 1143

Mr. MONDALE submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 17550) to amend the Social Security Act to provide increases in benefits, to improve computation methods, and to raise the earnings base under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to make improvements in the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs with emphasis upon improvements in the operating effectiveness of such programs, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1144

SOCIAL SECURITY COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE MONTHLY WAGE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, under the present social security laws, many workers lose significant retirement cash benefits because of changes in the conditions of their employment over which they have no control. Under present law, benefits are based on average earnings in all years, minus the 5 lowest years. On this basis, benefits are reduced in cases of declining earnings in later years, or in cases of reduced wages or unemployment in a changing industry. If a laborer is unable to continue heavy manual work and must take a lower paying job in the last years before he retires, he will receive a lower monthly social security benefit after retirement. Any losses in annual income due to mergers, plant closings, or recession are reflected in retirement benefits, if an employee has 5 lower earning years at the beginning of his career.

My amendment would protect retirement earnings by basing benefits on an individual's 10 highest earning years. This bases the computation on the positive side of the employment record, over which an individual has control. The estimated cost of this change would be 0.66 percent of taxable payroll.

To illustrate the workings of this provision: In Minnesota, where we have had rises and declines in the iron ore and lumber industries, a laborer at the median wage level would have $168 monthly social security benefits at best. If he had suffered 5 years of reduced pay or a year of unemployment late in his career because of changes in his industry, he would get only $161, or a 4-percent reduction. Under my amendment, his benefit would be based only on his 10 highest years of earnings, and he would pay no penalty for wage conditions beyond his control. He would earn $179 per month, or 12 percent more than under present law.

In many States, rapid shifts in new technologies cause frequent layoffs in many industries. The high current rate of general unemployment is also causing losses in the computation of average monthly wages for most of the almost 5 million unemployed who are covered by social security.

If we consider that half of all persons over 65 have less than $1,500 annual income, it is obvious that we ought to design methods of computing benefits which would protect social security beneficiaries from erosions of their benefit base over which they have no control. This kind of policy is now applicable to Federal civil service employees; the Congress recently established their retirement benefits based on their highest 3 years of wages. For many years the military has based retirement income on the highest permanent pay grade attained. These positive definitions result in pension levels which are in sharp contrast with the average social security payment, which the Bureau of Labor Statistics says constitutes only one-third of a reasonable budget for retired persons.

When the Social Security Act became law in 1935, President Franklin Roosevelt said that he considered it the beginning of a "supreme achievement" in national legislation. While we consider amendments to that act 35 years later, I question the supremacy of our legislative achievements for our older citizens.

Older citizens are being cruelly squeezed between stationary pensions and the worst price rises in a decade. Shriveling pensions strip away the only hope most retirees hold for independence and dignity.

Thirty percent of all Americans over 65 live in poverty, as opposed to 12 percent of all other citizens. It is difficult for those of us who are relatively affluent to realize that these millions of retired citizens are thus condemned to lose their share of our affluence and the dignified retirement they have earned.

I urge consideration of the amendment which I submit as part of the effort to preserve a decent life for our older citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 1145—EARNINGS LIMITATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to commend the committee for its recommendations of a 10-percent cash benefit increase and establishment of a $100 monthly minimum benefit. These changes will do much to alleviate deprivation among the elderly. I also support a number of the other improvements in cash benefits suggested by my other colleagues, some of which amendments I have cosponsored.

I would like to briefly discuss my amendment which I submit related to the earnings limitation on social security benefit entitlement.

Many retirees wish to remain active by working parttime. This often contributes to good physical and mental health, and obviously many retirees need income supplements. At the present time, however, social security policy dictates that a retiree may earn only $1,680 annually without losing some of his social security benefits; the bill now before us sets the limit at $2,000. Along with many of my colleagues, I believe that the limit ought to be raised to $2,400, to encourage beneficial activity and to give retirees more opportunity to remain materially independent. The cost of this change, $280 million dollars more per year then in the committee bill, is not excessive when we consider that in recent years we have willingly spent such sums as $1 billion dollars, or four times as much as this amendment would cost, for the B–70 bomber, which is now obsolete and never went into production.

I believe that our public policies have not been adequate to maintain certain basic benefits of American citizenship for older Americans, and many senior citizens have lost their independence and individual dignity. Every person has a right to maintain his autonomy, his individuality as a citizen, to the end of his life.

But that is becoming more and more difficult in the United States. In the last 30 years, the average life expectancy in the United States has risen from 63 years to 70. At the same time the mandatory retirement ages in many occupations have been lowered. This has brought enforced idleness and feelings of uselessness to millions of our citizens. In the past 15 years, the percentage of those between 65 and 70 who were employed dropped from 58 to 34 percent.

At the same time, as our society has become more mobile, our traditions of mutual support between children and aging parents have fallen away.

Idleness and isolation are often accompanied by severe income losses. Older citizens are being cruelly squeezed between stationary pensions and the worst price rises in a decade.

The incidence of poverty among persons over 65 is almost three times the rate among the population under 65. Most importantly, only 17 percent of social security recipients have any outside source of income.

This amendment addresses itself to the problem of enforced idleness and low levels of income. It would do much to encourage part-time employment among retired persons. This provision would also help prevent the complete loss of the valuable talent and experience which senior citizens add to the Nation's productivity.

I urge the Senate's approval for increasing the earnings limitation to $2,400 per year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 1146

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR FARMWORKERS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, for all practical purposes, migrant and seasonal farmworkers are excluded from coverage under the Social Security Act, although it is one of the few major areas of conventional Federal employee benefit programs in which farmworkers may receive even the slightest theoretical benefit.

Since 1956 farm employment has been covered for social security purposes if the worker received cash wages amounting to at least $150 from one employer during the year, or if a worker worked for one employer 20 days or more during the year. A significant provision of the present law treats the crew leader as an employee of the farmer unless there is a written contract between the two that provides otherwise.

The restrictions in the law effectively serve to deny coverage for the farm-

worker. First, the low rate of compensation and short periods of employment that characterize migrant and seasonal farmwork often prohibit him from meeting even the meager qualifying requirements set forth above. A further catch is that the 20-day requirement must be for cash remuneration computed on a time basis rather than on a piece rate basis. As many farmworkers are paid on a piece rate basis the 20-day provision has had limited practical effect.

The provision allowing treatment of the crew leader as an employer raises serious problems for the farmworker, the farmer, and the crew leader. The initial rationale for this provision was to give the employee working on several farms under a single crew leader a better chance to meet the annual requirement of $150 or 20 days under one employer. Additionally, the crew leader language was initially inserted in 1956 to relieve the farmer of alleged bookkeeping inconvenience.

However, because of the nebulous and changing work relationships between farmers and crew leaders, the amendment has become a screen for tax evasion by endless shifting of responsibility between the farmer and a sometimes difficult to find crew leader. And, although some provisions of the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act would hopefully have aided in keeping track of some crew leaders, permitting at least a chance for eliminating abuse, that act for all practical purposes is unenforced.

Two amendments to the Social Security Act would eliminate the discriminatory treatment of the farmworker.

First, by eliminating the restrictive wage and work period qualifications, a greater number of farmworkers would be covered.

Second, by eliminating a law which makes the crew leader an employer for social security purposes, there would be less chance for abuse.

The first amendment, in addition to covering more farmworkers under the Social Security Act, would also provide major relief to the farmer who is permitted to withhold a portion of a farmworker's pay although he may not know if the farmworker is, or will be, covered. Often this portion is not refunded when all qualifications for coverage are not met by the farmworker.

By passing this amendment, the farmer would be relieved from the guessing game as to which farmworkers are covered, and whether he might be liable for funds illegally appropriated through an unscrupulous crew leader.

By eliminating the presumption that the crew leader is the employer, the second amendment would relieve the farmworkers of the determination of who may have illegally appropriated his withholding, either the farmer or the crew leader. Many farmworkers are paid by the day and neither records of their earnings nor receipts for deductions are provided. Presently, although the law requires that a receipt of social security withholding must be given to any employee who earns $600 or more, this is usually not applicable to the migrant who is a short term worker usually not earning $600 for any one employer, and usually not easily contacted following termination of employment because of his mobility. By placing full responsibility for social security coverage on the farmer, the farmworker will better know who to approach in terms of the extent and nature of his coverage.

The financial cost of making some minimal provision for our farmworking citizens when they become too old to follow farmwork or other gainful employment, has been unfairly thrust upon the general public. In other words, the limitations on coverage of these workers during their periods of gainful employment in farmwork, although amounting to a minor benefit or convenience to the employer, will in the long run constitute a substantial detriment to the taxpaying public as well as the farmer himself. Every dollar that these citizens are allowed to pay for their own social security entitlement will lessen the financial burden on the taxpaying public during the worker's nonproductive years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment which I submit to the Social Security Act (H.R. 17550) now on the floor, be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with a section-by-section analysis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 1146) is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1146

On page 123, line 24, insert the following:

COVERAGE OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR

SEC. 134. (a) Section 209(h) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(h) Remuneration paid in any medium other than cash for agricultural labor;".

(b) Section 210(n) of such Act is repealed.

(c)(1). Section 213(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "(except wages for agricultural labor paid after 1954)".

(2). Section 213 of such Act is further amended by repealing paragraph (2)(iv) thereof.

(d)(1). Section 3121(a)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages for purposes of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) remuneration paid in any medium other than cash for agricultural labor;".

(2). Section 3121(o) of such Code (relating to definition of crew leader) is repealed.

(e) The amendments made herein shall be applicable only with respect to remuneration paid after 1970.

The analysis, presented by Mr. MONDALE, is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENTS TO COVER FARMWORKERS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Section 134. (a) Under the "Definition of Wages" provisions of the present Social Security Act, the farmworker must receive cash wages amounting to at least $150 from one employer during the year, or alternatively, the farmworker must work for one employer twenty days or more during the year, before any wages that he earns are counted. The proposed amendment eliminates these special requirements for farmworkers, thus putting him on an equal footing with all other covered employees. The limitation that only cash wages can be counted, rather than any other form of remuneration (such as housing or food), remains intact.

Section 134.(b) This repeals the definition of Crew Leader appearing in Section 210(n). The present Act establishes the crew leader, rather than the farmer, as the person primarily responsible for deducting social security. There presently is a legal presumption created that farmworkers paid by a crew leader are employees of the crew leader, rather than the farmer; also, under no circumstances is a crew leader considered as an employee of the farmer. These provisions are subject to substantial abuse that adversely affects farmers, farmworkers, and crew leaders.

Section 134.(c) The language in c(1) places farmworkers on the same footing as all other workers regarding the definition of quarter of coverage under Section 213 of the Social Security Act; and Section c(2) removes special limitations for agricultural workers requiring that certain minimum amounts must be made each quarter for coverage in the next quarter, and permitted some overlapping of quarters under limited circumstances.

Section 134.(d) To accomplish coverage of agricultural laborers under the Social Security Act, this section makes necessary changes in the related Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, regarding the definition of wages for purposes of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. Thus, section (d)(1) amends Section 3121(a)(8) of such Act to remove the discriminatory wages and days worked provisions of the present law; and section (d)(2) repeals language which defines the crew leader.

Section 134.(e) The amendments made by the preceding sections shall be applicable only with respect to remuneration paid after 1970.

AMENDMENT NO. 1147

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. SAXBE, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. HART, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MONDALE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 17550, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1148

Mr. PROUTY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17550, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1149

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 17550 and ask that it be printed.

This amendment which I plan to offer to H.R. 17550 would eliminate the present tariff on petroleum products imported into the United States

The President pointed out in his latest inflation alert that oil prices play a part in our rising cost of living. The amendment seeks to relieve the consumer of a tariff on oil products that are imported into this country under a quota system which is already creating artificially high prices for petroleum products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). The amendment will be received and printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1150

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to comment briefly on that portion of H.R. 17550, the Social Security Amendments of 1970, which deals with the old age, survivors, and disability insurance system.

The importance of this bill, which pro-

vides benefits to over 26 million aged Americans, cannot be overstated. A major portion of these 26 million Americans depend completely upon monthly social security checks for a living, and fully one-third of these people live at or near the poverty level.

Thus, the most well-known provision of H.R. 17550, which raises the current benefits by 10 percent, is of vital importance. There are, however, a number of other provisions in the bill which have received less attention, but which are nonetheless equally important.

I am pleased to say that these other important provisions include two proposals which I submitted to Congress well over a year ago, and testified on this year before the Finance Committee; namely, my proposal to provide full benefits for widows; and to grant automatic benefit increases to correspond with rises in the cost of living.

FULL BENEFITS FOR WIDOWS

Under existing law, a man can draw 150 percent of his monthly benefits if he is married. If he is a widower, he receives his full benefits—or 100 percent. But if he leaves a widow, she can receive only 82½ percent of his total allotment. This is a serious injustice, as there is no reason to think that a single widow living alone needs less than the worker himself living alone. The widow's landlord certainly does not lower the rent by 17.5 percent—100 percent–82½ percent; nor does her grocer lower the price of food items by that amount.

H.R. 17550 corrects this inequity by accepting my proposal of last year; namely, to give widows 100 percent, rather than just 82½ percent, of her deceased husband's primary insurance amount when she reaches age 65.

AUTOMATIC BENEFIT INCREASES TO CORRESPOND WITH THE COST OF LIVING

My other proposal that I first made as a pledge in the campaign of 1966, a proposal also made by President Nixon, to grant automatic benefit increases to correspond with rises in the cost of living, was also accepted by the House and Finance Committee. This proposal assures some protection against inflation to the people who must worry about the 5-cent hike in bus rate fares and the 3-cent increase in the price of bread.

In opposition to this proposal, some people have made the point that Congress has generally acted to provide increases commensurate with the cost of living, and that Congress should retain its authority over these increases. These people do have a point, in that Congress generally—sooner or later—does provide the necessary increases to meet the cost of living. Unfortunately, however, this sometimes occurs later rather than sooner.

For example, from 1959 to 1965 there was no change in the benefit level, although the purchasing power of the dollar declined by 8 percent. And earlier, between 1940 and 1950 there was no change in the benefit level, even though the purchasing power of benefits declined by about 37 percent. There is no way that we can compensate for the hardships endured during these periods when benefits lag behind the cost of living. Those people dependent upon social security during these periods suffer unduly, and this cannot be undone by a belated benefit increase.

This is why I feel my proposal to incorporate automatic benefit increases is so important, and why I am so pleased with the Finance Committee's action in retaining this House-passed provision. In addition, the Finance Committee wisely added its own provision that Congress should initiate action on the increases, and thereby retain some authority over them.

THE RETIREMENT TEST

A third proposal of mine, to increase the current earnings limitation of $1,680 to $2,400 immediately, was partially accepted by both the House of Representatives and the Senate Finance Committee. By raising the earnings limitation to $2,000, with a $1 for $2 reduction in earnings above $2,000, and by eliminating the former $1 for $1 reduction in earnings once a person begins making $2,880, the House and Senate Committees moved in the right direction, and I commend them. I feel we can and should go further, however, by raising the limitation to $2,400.

The social security program was originally devised to provide a floor of protection against the loss of earnings caused by a worker's retirement, death, or disability, and the so-called retirement test was established to assure that a worker had, in fact, retired. Since social security was also never intended to provide much more than a modest standard of living, an individual was expected to supplement social security with individual savings or a private pension plan. A person is allowed to keep full social security benefits no matter how much he gets in dividends and interest from investments or savings; but he cannot keep all of his earnings once he makes more than $1,680.

All this is well and good, except that even if a person does as he should and invests in a private pension plan or in savings, this does not assure him an income. There is a certain amount of truth in a remark made by Thomas R. Donahue, an assistant secretary of labor during the Johnson administration, who told the Senate Labor Committee:

> In all too many cases the pension promised shrinks to this: If you remain in good health and stay with the same company until you are 65 years old, and if the company is still in business, and if your department has not been abolished, and if you haven't been laid off for too long a period, and if there's enough money in the fund, and that money has been prudently managed, you will get a pension.

One study of 10 pension plans revealed that less than 10 percent of 60,000 low-paid workers would ever receive a pension benefit.

What does a person do if all his savings have been eaten away by inflation and his privately financed pension plan has collapsed or otherwise failed to provide his needs? All he can do is try to supplement his income by working, yet under present law, he is penalized for doing so.

Since 1935, when social security was enacted, property taxes have increased nearly fivefold. Rents have doubled and tripled in many cases, as have transportation costs. In many cases, it is only by working that a person can keep up with these increases.

I would like to propose a modification to my original bill to increase the earnings limitation immediately to $2,400. While I would eventually like to see a total elimination of the retirement test—and will recommend that the staff of the Senate Finance Committee make studies and that the committee hold hearings toward this end, I think we must be realistic in recognizing that this would be extremely costly if done now. It is my understanding that an immediate elimination of the "test" would cost somewhere between $2.25 and $2.50 billion in the first year.

Instead, I would modify my original proposal by raising the limitation immediately to $2,400, and by retaining the well-advised committee-approved provision whereby we increase the exempt amount automatically as the cost of living rises. Thus, the $2,400 figure would remain constant in "real" terms, and not be eroded by inflation.

The idea of removing the retirement test completely—which I feel has considerable merit—should be studied by a special advisory council for social security matters prior to our own hearings.

The cost of my amendment which I submit would be $850 million in the first year, or $280 million more than the cost of the committee bill. But because my amendment might also preclude the necessity for some aged persons to go on welfare, its additional cost over the committee bill would be offset to a certain extent.

A full one-third of all social security recipients live at or near the poverty level. By raising the earnings limitation to $2,400 instead of to $2,000, I think we could prevent some of these people from having to go on welfare, and allow them to maintain their sense of dignity and independence—so important to all of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 1151

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) to H.R. 17550 which removes discriminatory provisions of the Social Security Act applying to blind and permanently and totally disabled persons.

At present, title XIX of the Social Security Act—medicaid—in determining eligibility for the extent of medical assistance to be available to individuals, states that—

> The financial responsibility of any individual for any applicant or recipient of assistance under the Act should not be considered unless such applicant or recipient is such individual's spouse or such individual's child who is under age 21; *or is blind or permanently disabled.*

Titles X and XVI—grants to States for aid to the blind; and grants to States for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, respectively—also have the effect of allowing States the latitude to set up relative responsibility regulations. In other

words, blind or permanently and totally disabled persons over age 21 must, in many cases, undergo the humiliating, degrading experience of proving to the State that their parents lack the financial means, or the willingness, to meet their medical—or other—needs.

Nondisabled, needy adults are not subjected to this humiliating experience. Only the blind and otherwise disabled—of whom there are about 82,000 and 600,000, respectively, in the United States—are singled out and expected to bankrupt their parents.

In most cases, when the parents or relatives of adult blind or disabled children are able to offer assistance, they do so willingly. When the parents are not in a position to offer assistance, what is the point of allowing States to say to a blind or disabled individual:

Your parents are responsible for your needs, but since they will not provide them, we will not either.

This makes no sense at all in my opinion.

When one considers the hardships caused by blindness and other disabilities and the courage and self-confidence necessary to overcome handicaps so as to function in a dyanmic society, it seems even more unfortunate that we ask these people to face a humilitating, painful, and unnecessary experience before qualifying for assistance they might need. The sense of independence and self-respect that a blind or otherwise disabled adult can acquire by knowing he is no longer a burden to his family may make a significant impact on his level of aspiration and ability to move forward into real independence.

The ability to perform successfully and to be a contributing member of society is a necessary foundation for the self-respect of a young blind or disabled adult. As he becomes no longer a burden to his family, the improved attitudes and the more wholesome relationship between him and his parents can be expected to result in increased support and encouragement from them. We thus will have provided the conditions under which a seriously handicapped person can aspire to freedom and achievement and can move forward into real independence.

I, therefore, urge support for this amendment so that we can do away with this glaring inequity and discrimination against blind and disabled citizens within our society.

Mr. President, the cost is actually too small to estimate according to the Social Security Administration. But the benefit to those affected is great, indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 1152

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators KENNEDY, PROXMIRE, GOODELL, GORE, HUGHES, INOUYE, MCINTYRE, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, NELSON, PASTORE, PELL, RIBICOFF and myself, I submit an amendment to H.R. 17550, the social security bill. I ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The amendment ends the oil import quota system effective January 1, 1972.

It makes the provisions of the National Security Clause, Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, inapplicable to petroleum and petroleum products, thus ending the President's authority to restrict the free importation of oil.

Import quotas on petroleum do not protect the national security. They impose a severe burden on the American consumer. The staff of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the commission on the Judiciary has estimated the cost of this system as $7 billion.

When a system costs $7 billion, it should deliver as promised or be eliminated. This system should be eliminated.

The elimination of oil import restrictions will give Congress the opportunity to consider the question of how to best guarantee the country a secure supply of low cost oil. A number of ideas, all superior to quotas have been put forward. I would hope that in the debate on this amendment they will be discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1153 THROUGH 1157

Mr. HARTKE submitted five amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17550, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1158

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to House bill 17550, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he proposed the amendment appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1970

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the President's veto of the Employment and Training Opportunities Act of 1970 reflects a callous disregard of the unemployment problems of the seventies.

The President showed no understanding of the purpose of this bill and no concern for the problems which it would help alleviate.

The President based his objection to this bill on the argument that it would create "temporary" and "dead end" jobs of a "WPA type." Yet, the President has insisted on enactment of the famliy assistance program, and we all know of the success of the Works Projects Administration.

Like the President's FAP program and the WPA, this bill would take people off the welfare rolls and put them to work. Like the WPA, this bill would provide useful public service jobs in areas such as public safety, health, pollution control—jobs which deserve neither the classification of "temporary" nor the condemnation of "dead end."

In fact, public service jobs are some of the most important in the economy. We need people to fill them, and the money to train them and pay them. A study completed in 1966 by the Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress estimated that over 5 million jobs could be filled through public service employment programs. The number is higher today.

This veto is also out of step with the President's commitment to reform social services programs and to provide work instead of welfare support. The administration's welfare reform package includes a public-service employment program for welfare recipients. The President's veto is inconsistent with that commitment.

This veto contradicts the President's own support for returning the responsibility for local programs to people on the local level. Last year, the President said that—

It is time for a new federalism in which power, funds, and responsibility will flow from Washington to the states and the people.

While other manpower programs are criticized for limited local involvement, this new program would give mayors of cities throughout the country an opportunity to play a major role in planning and operating manpower programs.

Finally, the President's veto offers little hope that this administration will make a significant effort to shift the priorities of employment. The WPA and the CCC of the thirties were successful not only because they gave people work, but also because the people who worked gave their country something in return—the benefit of their skills in public service. Given a choice, the President has vetoed a program which would have provided as many as 40,000 public service jobs in its first year, and he has supported an SST project that would provide half as many jobs at one and a half times the price.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN—REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of the President at the White House Conference on Children on December 13, 1970.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN, THE SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen, all of the delegates to this Conference:

Before I begin my prepared text, I would like to express my deep appreciation to all of you who have come to this Conference, and also for the very special entrance that was arranged on this occasion.

One of the great privileges for the President of the United States, of course, is to hear Hail to the Chief. I have heard it many times since I became President almost two years ago. I have never heard it played better than by the East Atlanta School from over here, an elementary school.

Speaking as one who played a very poor