

Simpson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slaton, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Gordon R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Mary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stenzel, Leroy G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strieper, Sarah S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, Walter R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sweeney, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sylvester, Marilyn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Samuel A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Warren B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Warren P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tolliver, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trotter, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Valentine, Frank J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vinten, Dean J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walz, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wampole, Harry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, Mack C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waterbury, Warren T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webb, Hershel B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wheelless, Douglas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitehead, Erwin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Charles A. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wooten, Ralph G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yon, Terry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, Lewis W., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be second lieutenant

Alberg, Walter S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arndt, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ballard, Bryant L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bassett, Sally A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beard, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beck, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Billot, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowen, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Byrne, Catherine B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cannella, Susan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Caputo, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carter, John P. II, xxx-xx-xxxx

Casarande, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cervenak, Edward S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colson, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, William J. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Corker, Harold T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cummings, Daniel N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dagley, Randall B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Danish, Clement, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Lawrence R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dewhurst, Roland W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doberenz, Raymond O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Donnellon, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Evans, Stanley L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farris, Marcia O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fox, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gafford, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaylord, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Wayne M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henderson, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, Dennis E. D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jarrett, Burton T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Anne T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Glennie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kaupp, Carl R. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kleve, Frederic W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knight, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kornacki, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kwist, Dana F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lamb, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lamond, Gregory S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Langmesser, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larson, Jon F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lemieux, Rene E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Letcher, Keith W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Majkowski, Jesse W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCollum, Fred L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMullen, Patricia L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oakley, Virginia E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owen, Orlando K. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Palmer, Allen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paluska, Aloys J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perotti, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

Peyton, Dale E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Philippon, Raymond W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Polk, Elmer J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ramsay, William T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reidinger, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ridout, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ritter, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rudd, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Russell, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schraeder, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffner, Barry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shank, Joyce G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sisson, Philip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smallman, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Stephen F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Vernon E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sparks, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Springer, Dwight S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stearns, Bryan F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strazzini, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Texer, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Timmerberg, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tucker, Calvin M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vaira, Karen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagner, Jeannine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagstaff, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wathen, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wessel, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willard, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winn, Dennis H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zuelke, Lorene E., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following named scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Flanery, Colbert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leib, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Titus, Keith R., xxx-xx-xxxx

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 17, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Be strong and of good courage, for it is the Lord your God who goes with you.—Deuteronomy 31: 6.

Eternal God, our Father, whose love will not let go and whose light follows us all our days, help us to begin this week conscious of Thy presence and ready to work diligently for the welfare of our Nation.

Give to our people a determination to strive for unity, a desire to live with good will and a dedication to seek the highest good of our country.

Deliver us from differences which divide us, from meanness which leads to misery, from criticisms which corrode our relationships, and from a pettiness which reveals a poverty of spirit.

Guide us in the way we should go with the royalty of an inward happiness, the realization of a radiant faith, and the readiness to labor to keep our Nation great and strong and good.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

- On June 30, 1972:
 - H.R. 632. An act for the relief of the village of River Forest, Ill.;
 - H.R. 1974. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gloria Vazquez Herrera;
 - H.R. 2052. An act for the relief of Luz Maria Cruz Aleman Phillips;
 - H.R. 2076. An act for the relief of Vladimir Rodriguez LaHera;
 - H.R. 3227. An act for the relief of S. Sgt. J. C. Bell, Jr., U.S. Air Force;
 - H.R. 4050. An act for the relief of Maria Manuela Amaral;
 - H.R. 4083. An act for the relief of Thomas William Greene and Jill A. Greene;
 - H.R. 6201. An act for the relief of Lesley Earle Byran;
 - H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Maj. Michael M. Mills, U.S. Air Force.
 - H.R. 6820. An act for the relief of John W. Shafer, Jr.;
 - H.R. 6907. An act for the relief of Matyas Hunyadi;
 - H.R. 7088. An act to provide for the establishment of the Tincum National Environmental Center in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes;
 - H.R. 7641. An act for the relief of Chung Chi Lee;
 - H.R. 9552. An act to amend the cruise legislation of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936;

H.R. 9580. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles, and the enforcement of traffic laws;

H.R. 10595. An act to restore to the Custis-Lee Mansion located in the Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Va., its original historical name, followed by the explanatory memorial phrase, so that it shall be known as Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial;

H.R. 12143. An act to provide for the establishment of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge;

H.R. 14423. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to enhance the ability of the rural telephone bank to obtain funds for the supplementary financing program on favorable terms and conditions;

H.R. 15587. An act to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program; and

H.J. Res. 812. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the planning and design of a national memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1972:
H.R. 15390. An act to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 1234. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1238. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief.

On July 7, 1972:

H.R. 1074. An act to amend section 220(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit motor carriers to file annual reports on the basis of a 13-period accounting year;

H.R. 4494. An act for the relief of Mrs. Latife Hassan Mahmoud.

H.R. 4679. An act for the relief of Amparo Coronado Vieuda de Pena and her three minor children: Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena; and

H.R. 6479. An act to provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels.

On July 10, 1972:

H.R. 5318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bernande M. Allen;

H.R. 8140. An act to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States;

H.R. 9410. An act to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 1 year (until June 30, 1973) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder;

H.R. 11774. An act to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13188. An act to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard;

H.R. 13955. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15259. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

On July 13, 1972:

H.R. 14734. An act to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15507. An act to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 to provide for Federal guarantees of obligations issued by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, to authorize an increased contribution by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15585. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1462. An act to provide for the establishment of the Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site, in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7378. An act to establish a Commission on Revision of the Judicial Circuits of the United States; and

H.R. 9936. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for a current listing of each drug manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed by a registrant under that act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the

Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15586) entitled "An act making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7117) entitled "An act to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to expedite the reimbursement of U.S. vessel owners for charges paid by them for the release of vessels and crews illegally seized by foreign countries, to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the collection of claims against such foreign countries for amounts so reimbursed and for certain other amounts, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. STEVENS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1497. An act to authorize certain additions to the Sitka National Monument in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Kenneth J. Wolff;

S. 2499. An act to provide for the striking of medals commemorating the 175th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constitution*;

S. 2854. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices; and

S. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution relating to the XXVth Congress of the Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers to be held in Washington, D.C., the week of August 7, 1972.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, June 30, 1972, he did on July 1, 1972, sign enrolled bills of the House and enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate as follows:

H.R. 4679. An act for the relief of Amparo Coronado Vieuda de Pena and her three children: Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena;

H.R. 9410. An act to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 1 year (until June 30, 1973) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder;

H.R. 11774. An act to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15390. An act to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month"; and

S.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages and to extend laws relating to housing and urban development.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 225(b), Public Law 90-206, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries the following members from private life: Edward H. Foley, of the District of Columbia; William S. Spoelhof, of Michigan.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

SHIPMENT TO AND FROM ALASKA AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE MOTOR VEHICLES OWNED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5621) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the shipment at Government expense of motor vehicles owned by members of the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 5621

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

- (1) striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (1);
- (2) striking out the period at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or" and
- (3) adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(3) in the case of movements to and from Alaska, by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system or other surface transportation between customary ports of embarkation and debarkation, if such means of transport does not exceed the cost to the United States of other authorized means."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 2634(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

- "(1) striking out the word 'or' at the end of clause (2);
- "(2) striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'or'; and

"(3) adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(4) in the case of movement to or from Alaska, by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system or other surface transportation between customary ports of embarkation and debarkation, if such means of transport does not exceed the cost to the United States of other authorized means."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5621, as amended and unanimously recommended by our Committee on Armed Services, provides to the Department of Defense the option of utilizing overland transportation and the Alaskan highway and ferry system for the purpose of moving privately owned vehicles of members of the uniformed services.

At the present time the Department is authorized to utilize for this purpose only the shipping services of American firms; ships which are owned, leased or chartered by the U.S. Government; or, when these two are not reasonably available, ships of foreign flags. The basis for these limitations has been the fact that, until recently, overland transportation costs were not competitive with sea-surface shipment costs.

Testimony revealed that overland transportation has now become competitive with shipping services currently authorized, both in terms of cost and timely service, between the customary port of embarkation and debarkation—Seattle, Wash.—and the various ports in Alaska. This bill provides the option to the Department of Defense to take advantage of this means of transportation and thus realize either a possible cost savings or, in some cases, more timely service.

Inasmuch as this bill provides that overland transportation may not be utilized if it were to cost more than the presently authorized shipping services, there will be no increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, this bill neither increases nor decreases benefits to the members of the Armed Forces. But it does provide an opportunity for the Department of Defense to take advantage of cost reductions which may be available. On these grounds, I am certain the Members of the House will unanimously support its enactment.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1971, I introduced a bill H.R. 5621 which would permit the use of overland—surface—transportation for the shipment, at the Government's expense, of motor vehicles owned by members of the Armed Forces to and from the State of Alaska. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Honorable F. EDWARD HEBERT, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, and the Honorable JAMES A. BYRNE, chairman of Subcommittee No. 4, for the work and effort that they and their committees have given my bill. It is before us today, and I believe it is worthy of your support.

Let me explain some of the history of

this bill. Presently the law permits for the transportation of such privately owned vehicles to and from Alaska by water carriers only. This means that the water carriers serving Alaska carry on all of the military privately owned vehicle business. This excludes the possibility of shipping such vehicles on other forms of transportation which have become competitive with the water carriers and perhaps, in some cases, even more economical.

Ten or 12 years ago the transportation price differences were great. At that time the cost of surface transportation was far below that of water transportation. The taxpayers' money would have been greatly saved. Today the prices are more competitive. While no one form of transporting vehicles has a constant advantage on the market, at present, prices and services fluctuate from season to season and a full range of transportation alternatives should be available. The Department of Defense should be allowed the freedom of choice to benefit from these changes. This broadening of possibilities will give the Defense Department more flexibility in its logistical planning and possibly result in further reduction of costs because of the additional competition.

Today Alaska is readily accessible by land. The Alaska ferry system is in operation between Seattle, Wash., and various points within Alaska. Alaska also has a highway system which is better than ever before. Such services have put the motor carriers in a competitive market with the water carriers.

By passing H.R. 5621, four major objectives can be reached with regard to the transportation of these vehicles to Alaska:

First. A more open bidding process for the shipment of such vehicles can be undertaken. This will reduce the initial cost and improve the service for the transportation of privately owned vehicles by members of the armed services. With the increased competition between the various types of carriers, the cost of transporting vehicles to and from Alaska may be reduced significantly.

Second. The military departments will have greatly increased flexibility in their contracting authority for such shipment. This can only lead to faster, more efficient service. The benefits of such improvements will be felt by the servicemen receiving their vehicles and the taxpayers whose money is being saved.

Third. The taxpayer will benefit from the resultant savings. The long-run savings seem to be great. The prices with the added competition can only decrease and the taxpayers will continue, years from now, to save their dollars.

Fourth. Greater speed and convenience will result for the servicemen whose vehicles will be shipped.

The benefits that this bill will provide may seem small but they are considerable to the servicemen involved, to the Department of Defense, and to the people of Alaska. Better transportation of motor vehicles between Alaska and the "lower 48" means a great deal to those indi-

viduals whose vehicles are being shipped. The House should not hesitate to approve this bill. I urge your support.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL 30-DAY LEAVE FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES WHO VOLUNTARILY EXTEND TOUR OF DUTY IN HOSTILE FIRE AREAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14537) to amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to grant a special 30-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 14537

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14537 is a bill to amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to grant a special 30-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas.

The current law was first enacted on November 2, 1966, and expired on June 30, 1968. It has twice been extended. As the law stood, individuals committing their services for at least 6 additional months in a hostile fire area were granted a net period of 30 days special leave at selected locations with transportation at Government expense. The law expired on June 30, 1972.

Were it not for this law, any leave, including traveltime granted under such a program, would be chargeable to the individual's leave account, and transportation could be furnished only on a space-available basis.

As you know, the normal tour of duty in Vietnam for military personnel has been 12 months. From the standpoint of stability and continuity, a 12-month tour is less than ideal. Nevertheless, the Department of Defense has concluded that any involuntary increase in the tour length would be inequitable and would affect morale adversely. It is the belief of the Department of Defense that a number of dedicated individuals would continue to volunteer to serve longer than the required period of service in Vietnam if the period could be broken into reasonable segments.

Although force levels in Vietnam have been reduced considerably, this program would continue to provide extensions of such personnel in lieu of replacements. The commander, Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, has indicated that he desires continuation of this program as long as the U.S. forces remain in Vietnam. In this regard, even with levels reduced to 49,000 on July 1, 1972, approxi-

mately 4,000 replacements per month will be required to maintain this force level.

The cumulative effect of the longer in-country service of those who extend their tours of duty has some impact on the requirement for replacements and, hence, results in some savings to offset the transportation costs. The relative value of continuing the authority, however, is not in monetary savings that might be achieved, but, rather, in effectiveness attained through the continuity of service in Vietnam of area-oriented, trained, experienced, motivated personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee were unanimous in their approval of this bill.

I urge the support of each and every Member.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCENTIVE PAY TO MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES FOR HOSPITALIZATION AND REHABILITATION AFTER TERMINATION OF MISSING STATUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14909) to amend section 552(a) of title 37, United States Code, to provide continuance of incentive pay to members of the uniformed services for the period required for hospitalization and rehabilitation after termination of missing status.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 14909

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 552(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A member of a uniformed service who is on active duty or performing inactive-duty training, and who is in a missing status, is—

"(1) for the period he is in that status, entitled to receive or have credited to his account the same pay and allowances, as defined in this chapter, to which he was entitled at the beginning of that period or may thereafter become entitled; and

"(2) for the period required for his hospitalization and rehabilitation after termination of that status, under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, with respect to incentive pay, considered to have satisfied the requirements of section 301 of this title so as to entitle him to a continuance of that pay.

However, a member who is performing full-time training duty or other full-time duty without pay, or inactive-duty training with or without pay, is entitled to the pay and allowances to which he would have been entitled if he had been on active duty with pay."

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill which is designed to assure that the income of POW families is not reduced after the POW returns if he requires hospitalization or rehabilitation.

The bill continues the payment of in-

centive pay for hazardous duty to servicemen who have been in a missing status for a period of hospitalization or rehabilitation following return from missing status.

Present law continues incentive pay while a man is in a missing status. But the entitlement ceases when the missing status is terminated.

Now what we are thinking of in this bill, of course, are the American POW's held for such tragically long periods in Southeast Asia. Our POW's have averaged more than 5 years in missing or imprisoned status, and some have been prisoners as long as 8 and 9 years.

Obviously, many will require extended hospitalization and rehabilitation on return.

Many of these men receive incentive pay—most for flight duty. If that pay is terminated when they return, family income would be reduced during the difficult period of adjustment while the men are undergoing hospitalization or rehabilitation. This bill will prevent that.

The bill will result in no increase in budgetary requirement.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOVEMENTS AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN A MISSING STATUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14915) to amend chapter 10 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize at Government expense, the transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings, in place of household and personal effects, of members in a missing status, and the additional movement of dependents and effects, or trailers, of those members in such a status for more than 1 year.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 14915

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, chapter 10 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The catchline of section 554 and the corresponding item in the analysis for that section are each amended by inserting "trailers; additional movements;" after "household and personal effects".

(2) Section 554(a) is amended by adding the following at the end: "Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, and in place of the transportation of household and personal effects, a dependent, who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of household and personal effects under this section, may transport a house trailer or mobile dwelling within and between the areas specified in section 409 of this title for use as a residence by one of the following means—

"(1) transport it and be reimbursed by the United States;

"(2) deliver it to an agent of the United States for transportation by the United States or by commercial means; or

"(3) have it transported by commercial means and be reimbursed by the United States.

If a trailer or dwelling is transported under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection, that transportation may include one privately owned motor vehicle which may be shipped at United States expense. Transportation, and incidental costs, authorized by this section shall be at United States expense without any cost limitation, and any payment authorized may be made in advance of the transportation concerned."

(3) Section 554(b) is amended by adding the following at the end: "In addition, he may authorize additional movements of, and prescribe transportation for, the dependents and household and personal effects, or the dependents and house trailer or mobile dwelling, of a member who is officially reported as absent for a period of more than one year in a missing status."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 2, strike the period immediately following the word "effects" and insert a semicolon in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 14915, provides for additional movement at Government expense of the dependents, household goods and personal effects of members of the armed services who are in a missing status. Included in the definition of "missing" are both prisoners of war and men who are missing in action.

Under existing law one movement at Government expense of the dependents and household goods of such members is authorized. Testimony from both Department of Defense officials and representatives of some of the families of prisoners and missing in Southeast Asia revealed that in some cases the initial decisions of such families, made during the understandably traumatic period immediately following notification of the missing status of their husbands, have proven to be less than desirable. In addition, recognizing the unfortunate fact that some men have been in a missing or captured status for over 8 years, family circumstances may have changed considerably and an additional movement may well have become necessary. This bill would authorize such additional movements at the discretion of the Secretary concerned after consideration of individual requests on a case-by-case basis.

In addition, this bill provides for the movement at Government expense of trailers or mobile homes of servicemen carried in a missing status. There is currently no statutory authority for this purpose. The bill places the burden for the costs associated with such movements entirely upon the Government. This differs from present law pertaining to the movements of trailers or mobile homes of service members under permanent change of station orders in which cases Government liability for costs is somewhat limited. Testimony indicated that, on the average, military families who move mobile homes pay approximately \$243 out of their own pockets due to this limited liability. In the case of families of missing servicemen, the bill provides for Government reimbursement for all costs associated with the movement of mobile homes.

Mr. Speaker, as of July 1, 1972, there were a total of 1,757 members of the armed services who were being carried on the rolls in a missing status. These members have a total of 1,120 families who will be eligible for the benefits afforded by this bill. However, according to Defense estimates, only about one-tenth of that number are expected to take advantage of these benefits—not counting those who might desire to take advantage of the mobile home provisions.

There are no estimates as to how many there might be in this category, but they are believed to be few in number. The Department of Defense has indicated that this bill would require no increase to its budgetary requirements.

The Department supports this bill and the Office of Management and Budget has interposed no objection to its consideration. Your Committee on Armed Services unanimously endorsed enactment of this bill and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL PERSONS TO THE SERVICE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2945) to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit the appointment by the President of certain additional persons to the service academies.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 2945

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4342(a)(1) is amended by striking out "40" and inserting in place thereof "65" and by striking out "service." at the end of the first sentence and by inserting in place thereof "service, and sons of members who are in a 'missing status' as defined in section 551(2) of title 37."

(2) Section 6954(a)(1) is amended by striking out "40" and inserting in place thereof "65" and by striking out "service." at the end of the first sentence and by inserting in place thereof "service, and sons of members who are in a 'missing status' as defined in section 551(2) of title 37."

(3) Section 9342(a)(1) is amended by striking out "40" and inserting in place thereof "65" and by striking out "service." at the end of the first sentence and by inserting in place thereof "service, and sons of members who are in a 'missing status' as defined in section 551(2) of title 37."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike everything after the enacting clause and substitute the following:
That title 10 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4342(a)(1) is amended by striking out "40" and inserting in place thereof "65" and by striking out "service." at the end of the first sentence and by inserting in place thereof "service, sons of members who are in a 'missing status' as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, and sons of civilian employees who are in 'missing status' as defined in section 5561(5) of title 5."

(2) Section 6954(a)(1) is amended by striking out "40" and inserting in place thereof "65" and by striking out "service." at the end of the first sentence and by inserting in place thereof "service, sons of members who are in a 'missing status' as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, and sons of civilian employees who are in 'missing status' as defined in section 5561(5) of title 5."

(3) Section 9342(a)(1) is amended by striking out "40" and inserting in place thereof "65" and by striking out "service." at the end of the first sentence and inserting in place thereof "service, sons of members who are in a 'missing status' as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, and sons of civilian employees who are in 'missing status' as defined in section 5561(5) of title 5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE FOR FARMERS UNDER AGE 21

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1139) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, so as to permit certain persons under 21 years of age to obtain insurance coverage under such act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire whether or not the Federal crop insurance program is now universally applicable throughout the continental United States, including Hawaii and Alaska; or, whether it is still a "pilot project" limited to selected counties throughout the United States?

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

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

Mr. POAGE. It is neither. It is a permanent program, but it is not available in every county in the United States. Certain types of insurance are available in some areas. Certain other types are available in other areas. In a good many counties no insurance at all is available.

It is available only in those areas where there is enough business and experience to determine the rates, to make the Federal agency feel that it can maintain a program in those areas.

Mr. HALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would presume that where in the crops of 18- to 21-year-olds are determined by the agency to be adequate and sufficient to bring a good return, this will be made equally applicable so far as Federal crop insurance in those areas is concerned. I know it had been permanentized. Actually, I favor the program. It has been very successful in southwest Missouri and is not duplicative.

Mr. POAGE. That is right; and that is all this bill does.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 1139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1501-1519), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"PERSONS UNDER TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF AGE

"SEC. 520. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be denied insurance under this Act solely on the ground that he is under twenty-one years of age if such person is (1) over eighteen years of age, and (2) has a bona fide insurable interest in a crop as an owner-operator, landlord, tenant or sharecropper: *Provided*, That any such person who enters into a Federal Crop Insurance contract shall be subject to the same legal liability and have the same legal rights with respect to such contract as any person over the age of twenty-one years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMINENT DOMAIN POOL ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1545) to amend section 378(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to remove certain limitations on the establishment of acreage allotments for other farms owned by persons whose farms have been acquired by any Federal, State, or other agency having the right of eminent domain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 1545

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 378(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the material preceding the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Upon application to the county committee, within three years after the date of such displacement, any owner so displaced shall be entitled to have allotments established for other farms owned by him, taking into consideration the land, labor, and equipment available on such other farms for the production of the commodity, crop-rotation practices, and the soil and other physical factors affecting the production of the commodity:"

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR PERMANENT PROFESSORS AT SERVICE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15679) to amend section 203 of title 37, United States Code, to provide additional pay for permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy, U.S. Naval Academy, U.S. Air Force Academy, and U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 15679

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section

203(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) While serving as a permanent professor at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Air Force Academy, or as a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy, an officer is, in addition to the pay and allowance to which he is otherwise entitled under this title, entitled to—

"(1) in the case of an officer who has over 31, but less than 36, years of service computed under section 205 of this title, additional pay in the amount of \$250 a month; or

"(2) in the case of an officer who has over 36 years of service computed under section 205 of this title, additional pay in the amount of \$500 a month.

This additional pay may not be used in the computation of retired pay."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, this legislation was referred to the committee originally for the purpose of providing additional longevity increases for permanent professors of the U.S. Military Academy and for the Air Force Academy, who are regular military members in uniform. Since the Coast Guard Academy has a permanent military teaching staff, and is currently included in the provisions of title 37, uniformity requires including that service in this measure. Finally, although the Navy's permanent teaching staff is composed of civilians, the Naval Academy was added during the markup, should the Navy have occasion to utilize permanent military professors in the future.

The professors involved in this bill are those with 31 years of military service who would receive \$250 extra pay per month, and those with 36 years of military service would receive \$500 additional pay per month. Such pay would not be included for retirement purposes.

By statute, uniformed professors now receive the pay and allowances of the officers of their rank but are taken off the regular promotion list. They are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and are subject to special promotion process not to exceed the grade of colonel/captain except for the academic dean at West Point and at the Air Force Academy, who may reach the rank of brigadier general. Because of restrictions on promotion, and to place them in favorable comparative pay scales with their civilian contemporaries, we have unanimously reported this bill to the committee for its approval.

Under present pay scales, a colonel reaches his maximum pay at 26 years of service, which is:

Base pay.....	\$23,198
Quarters.....	3,096
Subsistence.....	574

Total..... 26,868

This is the total figure for 10 years un-

til he reaches his 36th year, at which point he would receive an added \$250 per month by special statutory provision. Under this bill, the uniformed professor would receive an added \$250 per month or \$3,000 a year at the 31st year of service, for a total of about \$30,000 per annum and at his 36th year, another \$3,000 per year, for a total of about \$33,000. These figures are at, or sometimes below, what the senior faculty members at comparable civilian institutions are receiving. The costs will be absorbed and are generally on the order of about \$28,000 to \$56,000 a year, affecting seven to 10 professors per year over the next few years.

As you can see, these costs are minimal and will do much to assist in maintaining the top faculty billets at the Academies.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly recommend passage of this bill.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hearings on this bill, it was established that the contemporaries of military professors at civilian institutions receive considerably higher per annum income for comparative rank in the academic community. For example, one study indicated that the annual income of a military professor who is head of an academic department is at least 11 percent, and more reasonably 26 percent, less than that of his civilian counterpart.

The permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy, as well as members of the permanent military teaching staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, are covered by special statutory provisions in titles 10, 14, and 37 of the United States Code. Specifically, these officers are subject to separate appointment provisions by virtue of their permanent status at the academies, and are taken off the regular promotion lists; thus, at West Point and the Air Force Academy, they may not advance beyond the grade of colonel except for one appointment at each service academy to the office of dean, which carries with it the rank of brigadier general. At the Coast Guard Academy, by law a member of the permanent military teaching staff may not advance beyond the grade of captain. The mandatory retirement age is set at 64 years at all three institutions, which means that the permanent professors may pass well beyond 30 years of service prior to retirement. Under present pay legislation, the professor who reaches 36 years of military service receives \$250 extra pay per month, and such pay is not included for retirement purposes.

Since this measure addressed itself to the senior military professors—that is, those who have reached 31 years of military service and those who have reached 36 years of military service—the pro-

fessors affected fall within the top 5 percent of the professors at the service academies. By adding \$3,000 a year to the annual pay of the professor who reaches 31 years of military service, his income would be increased to approximately \$30,000 yearly. By adding \$500 to the senior professor who has reached his 36th year of service, his annual income would amount to approximately \$33,000. This result would approximate more closely the income of the more senior professors in civilian institutions. As will be noted from the fiscal data contained in this report, this bill would affect some eight to 10 professors per year over the next few years and should offer encouragement for ranking military professors to remain at the academies throughout their teaching careers.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of our hearings on this measure, I became convinced of the validity of its purpose and I urge its passage today.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, by existing law, there is authority for 22 permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and 22 professors at the U.S. Air Force Academy, including the deans of the faculty at each institution. At the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, the permanent commissioned teaching staff consists of professors "in such numbers as the needs of the service require." As you have heard, the permanent teaching staff at the U.S. Naval Academy is composed of civilians, but the Naval Academy was included in this legislation to provide for entitlement of any permanent military professors who may be appointed in the future.

At the present time, the pay and allowances for senior professors at the service academies are well below comparable salaries in the private sector. Under current pay scales, a colonel/captain reaches his maximum pay at 26 years of services.

The provisions of this bill would increase the annual income of professors reaching 31 years of military service by \$3,000 per annum and increase the annual income of professors reaching 36 years of military service by \$6,000 per annum. Accordingly, the academies would hope to retain their senior military professors to the maximum possible extent in all continuing competition for high-quality professionals in the academic community.

No additional funds are required by the Department of Defense or the Department of Transportation for the Coast Guard for this year or ensuing years. The financing would be absorbed within existing available resources. Taking into account the number of professors of all academies who would be eligible year by year, and those who would be retiring, the additional costs over the next 5 years would be as follows:

	Fiscal year—				
	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
U.S. Military Academy.....	\$21,250	\$24,250	\$25,250	\$33,250	\$33,250
U.S. Air Force Academy.....	3,750	9,000	9,000	12,250	19,750
U.S. Coast Guard Academy.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Total.....	28,000	36,250	37,250	48,750	56,000

Mr. Speaker, my experience on the Board of Visitors at West Point has convinced me that this legislation is necessary to maintain a high caliber, permanent staff and I urge its passage today.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF NICKEL FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3086) to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill and I have read the report in detail.

The only point I should like to raise, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not, in fact, the determination by the Office of Emergency Preparedness is worthwhile—and by "worthwhile," Mr. Speaker, I mean carefully determined, with proper judgment and complete possession of all factors—when they say that our objective in this particular stockpile of nickel is "zero" and at the present time, therefore, any is in excess?

Certainly nickel is one of the components of critical alloys of steel, and we have frittered away, given away or through a technical process gotten into the Department of State position, Mr. Speaker, where we are importing many of our alloys of steel for use in the United States.

In line with the fear of some of us that we are becoming a nonproductive nation and think we can live on service alone and procure everything from abroad, where there is more favorable production cost; I wonder if in fact we do have a nickel objective of zero?

I am glad to yield to my friend from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee, for the purpose of an answer.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, projected safe supplies of nickel in an emergency period now exceed requirements by a wide margin. In Canada, all three major suppliers, International Nickel, Falconbridge, and Sherritt-Gordon, have greatly expanded production in the last few years and have considerable potential for further expansion. Increasing amounts of nickel are being imported from New Caledonia and Australia. Future U.S. import sources of nickel also include countries in Latin America, Indonesia, and Africa.

As you know, the stockpile is not based entirely on the amount of nickel or any other product that is available in the United States per se. Reliance is had on these nations which are expected to be and hoped to be friendly from the standpoint of commerce in the future. This is the same criterion that we laid down for everyone. If we changed it, we would have to do it for all bills. It is the judgment of the authorities in the administration, including the military, that this is a wise and safe margin which we have. That is the evidence we have, and we

have no evidence to the contrary. Nobody spoke in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as of May 31, 1972, the total inventory of nickel held by General Services Administration was approximately 38,876 short tons, all of which is excess.

On February 9, 1971, the Office of Emergency Preparedness revised the nickel objective to zero, thus determining that this quantity is excess to stockpile needs.

The average acquisition cost of stockpile nickel was \$1,181.34 per short ton. The current estimated market price for standard, commercial type nickel is \$2,660 per short ton.

The nickel authorized for disposal under this proposed legislation will be transferred to the U.S. Mint for their use in the production of coinage.

This material has been in the stockpile for a period of 9 to 15 years.

The annual storage cost is \$44,000.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The legislation would provide congressional approval of the disposition of approximately 38,876 short tons of nickel from the national stockpile. In addition, the bill would waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for disposition of strategic and critical material from the national stockpile.

BASIC LAW—NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Under section 2 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act—50 U.S.C. 98a—the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness is authorized and directed to determine which materials are strategic and critical under the provisions of the act and the quality and quantities of such materials which shall be stockpiled under the act.

Section 3(e) authorizes General Services Administration, at the direction of the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, to dispose of any materials held pursuant to the act which are no longer needed because of any revised determination made pursuant to section 2. Notice of any disposition must be published in the Federal Register and transmitted to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House thereof. The plan and date of disposition must be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on the sale or transfer of material to be released, and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against disruption of their usual markets. The express approval of the Congress of any proposed disposition is required unless the revised determination, referred to above, is by reason of obsolescence of the material to be disposed of.

SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The legislation which established the supplemental stockpile, section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—68 Stat. 456—provided that materials shall be released from the supplemental stockpile only under the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

DISPOSALS FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

As indicated in the statutes cited above, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except in those instances where the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use during time of war.

Since the proposed disposal of nickel is not based on obsolescence, the proposed disposal requires the express approval of the Congress.

In addition, the bill would waive the procedural requirements of section 3 of the Stock Piling Act—50 U.S.C. 98b—with respect to publication and transmittal of notice and the 6-month waiting period. The bill would, however, preserve the substantive requirements of section 3 with respect to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets. Thus, the waiver will permit the immediate disposal of nickel upon enactment of S. 3086.

NICKEL

Nickel is a hard, silver-white, ductile metal having high resistance to corrosion and abrasion. It is used as an alloy to strengthen and harden steel and other metals. Its major use is as an alloy in steel, especially in the production of stainless steel, high-temperature alloys and monel metal. The material is essential in the production of jet engines, aircraft frames, armor plate, magnets, and electroplating.

The principal import sources for nickel are Canada and Norway.

METHOD OF DISPOSAL

The method of disposal is set forth in section 2 of the bill and provides that, unless otherwise authorized by law, disposals may be made only after publicly advertising for bids, except when: First, the material is transferred to a Federal agency, second, the Administrator of General Services determines that other methods of disposition are necessary to protect the United States against avoidable loss or to protect producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets, or third, sales are made pursuant to requests received from other Federal agencies in furtherance of authorized program objectives of such agencies.

In this instance, the General Services Administration has advised that the entire amount of nickel will be transferred to the U.S. Mint for their use in the production of coinage.

The disposal of nickel to the Bureau of the Mint, Department of the Treasury, will result in increasing budget receipts of General Services Administration in the amount of the value of such transferred nickel. The coinage metal fund, through which the Bureau of the Mint obtains coinage metal, includes as an asset of the fund the monetary value of such metals. Consequently, the acquisition of coinage metal is treated as an exchange of cash for an asset of equivalent value with no effect on the balance of the fund.

or on budget expenditures of the Treasury Department.

PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROGRAM

The disposal program will be subject to continuous scrutiny and the Administrator of General Services will consult with other Federal agencies concerned at any time he considers such action advisable, or any time consultation is requested by such agencies. If any significant modification of the program appears necessary or advisable as a result of such consultation, the change will be publicly announced.

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

U.S. mine production of nickel in 1971 amounted to 17,036 short tons. U.S. consumption of nickel was 128,806 tons in 1971. U.S. imports of nickel (metal content) were 142,083 short tons in 1971. Principal import sources for metal are Canada, 82 percent; Norway, 8 percent; and other, 10 percent.

U.S. exports—including scrap-gross weight—for 1971 were 26,143 short tons.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government. The disposal of nickel to the Bureau of the Mint, Department of the Treasury, will result in increasing budget receipts of General Services Administration in the amount of the value of such transferred nickel.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman argues persuasively, as always, and obviously he has done his homework. I only asked the question because I used to serve on the committee that the gentleman now chairs. I believe that the first 6 years I was in the Congress I served on that subcommittee.

During that time the same Office of Emergency Preparedness determined that the objective on the stockpile of lead was also zero. We raised considerable question at that time, and it involved an exchange between Mexico and Canada and led to these prearrangements. Since, a stockpile quota a short-tons has been reestablished.

I full well understand the gentlemen's remarks that we do have obligations to our sister nations of the world and we must trade and exchange with them. Actually, what he is saying, though, is insofar as the critical alloys of steels are concerned we are by this determination going on complete dependence of other nations across our borders and overseas.

Mr. BENNETT. That is certainly true as to some products in the stockpile.

Mr. HALL. I would hope the distinguished gentleman from Florida and his subcommittee will maintain active jurisdiction and surveillance in this area, not only with regard to the Office of Emergency Preparedness but with the General Services Administration, which disposes of these items. They do a good job of disposing without upsetting prices on the market, and so forth—in order to allow our consumers and manufacturers the necessities. In this case the United States mints will receive the "surplus" nickel nickles in order to have and to mint nickel-clad money with which to operate. I hope they maintain active surveillance and supervision over

the three stockpiles, to see that we keep some of the critical alloys of steel available at all times in our stockpiles regardless of the determination made either by computers or so-called stockpile experts, some of whom by appointment have become overnight experts in their field, although not in truth over and above that of the gentleman and his subcommittee.

Mr. BENNETT. We will dedicate ourselves to the purpose of careful surveillance.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the chairman of the objectors on the majority side.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Missouri for taking the time he has taken, and I wish to associate myself with the remarks he has made in this particular matter.

I will state here today we have two instances, one where it is felt the requirements are nil and we produce nothing in this country as far as adding to the nickel requirements are concerned. In the other we are dealing with the question of lead where requirements are not nil. However, the question of what this will do to the market and to the domestic industry of lead is particularly at stake here.

I wish to commend my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Colorado, for his comments on this matter, and to say that I know that the gentleman from Colorado is well aware of this situation.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time there has been testimony received by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with critical supplies and defense materials, and I have had the advantage of reading some of that testimony as well as the report put out by the subcommittee, and it "shivers my timbers" to think that we have an agency of our Government that says that we have a stockpile objective of "zero" for nickel, and then to hear the statement that we can always obtain it from our friendly neighbors with whom we engage in favored-nations trade when we are at the same time importing all of our critical steel alloys which are the result of our technical breakthroughs, magnanimously given away, and which are needed so badly if we are to maintain supremacy in technical development, engineering development, and actual production of prototypes that we will certainly need in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to this particular bill on the basis of the answer given to me by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) and I, therefore, withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 8086

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the

Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of approximately thirty-eight thousand eight hundred and seventy-six short tons of nickel now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the requirements of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided*, That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

SEC. 2. (a) Disposals of the material covered by this Act may be made only after publicly advertising for bids, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section or as otherwise authorized by law. All bids may be rejected when it is in the public interest to do so.

(b) The material covered by this Act may be disposed of without advertising for bids if—

(1) the material is to be transferred to any agency of the United States;

(2) the Administrator determines that methods of disposal other than by advertising are necessary to protect the United States against avoidable loss or to protect producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets; or

(3) sales are to be made pursuant to requests received from other agencies of the United States in furtherance of authorized program objectives of such agencies.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF LEAD FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 764) to authorize the disposal of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 764

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of approximately four hundred ninety eight thousand short tons of lead now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, 68 Stat. 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607. Such disposition may be made without regard to the requirements of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided*, That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.*

SEC. 2. (a) Disposals of the material covered by this Act may be made only after publicly advertising for bids, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section or as otherwise authorized by law. All bids may be rejected when it is in the public interest to do so.

(b) The material covered by this Act may be disposed of without advertising for bids if—

(1) the material is to be transferred to an agency of the United States;

(2) the Administrator determines that methods of disposal other than by advertising are necessary to protect the United States against avoidable loss or to protect producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets; or

(3) sales are to be made pursuant to requests received from other agencies of the United States in furtherance of authorized program objectives of such agencies.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as of May 30, 1972, the total inventory of lead held by General Services Administration was approximately 1,118,876 short tons. The present stockpile objective, established December 3, 1969, is 530,000 short tons.

General Services Administration has currently available for sale approximately 81,000 short tons. About 15,000 short tons of this is for direct use by the Government and was authorized by Public Law 89-9. Approximately 66,000 short tons are available for commercial sale under Public Law 91-46. The additional excess of approximately 498,000 short tons, is covered by S. 764.

The average acquisition cost of the lead in the national and supplemental stockpiles was \$289 per short ton. The current published market price for standard, commercial type lead ranges between \$310 and \$320 per short ton. This material has been in the stockpile for a period of 8 to 24 years. The annual storage cost is \$54,780.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The legislation would provide Congressional approval of the disposition of approximately 498,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. In addition, the bill would waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for disposition of strategic and critical material from the national stockpile.

BASIC LAW

NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Under section 2 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a), the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness is authorized and directed to determine which materials are strategic and critical under the provisions of the act and the quality and quantities of such materials which shall be stockpiled under the act.

Section 3(e) authorizes General Services Administration, at the direction of the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, to dispose of any materials held pursuant to the act which are no longer needed because of any revised determination made pursuant to section 2. Notice of any disposition must be published in the Federal Register and transmitted to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House thereof. The plan and date of disposition must be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on the sale or transfer of material to be released, and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against disruption of their usual markets. The express approval of the Congress of any proposed disposition is re-

quired unless the revised determination, referred to above, is by reason of obsolescence of the material to be disposed of.

SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The legislation which established the supplemental stockpile, section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 456), provided that materials shall be released from the supplemental stockpile only under the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

DISPOSALS FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

As indicated in the statutes cited above, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except in those instances where the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use during time of war.

Since the proposed disposal of lead is not based on obsolescence, the proposed disposal requires the express approval of the Congress.

In addition, the bill would waive the procedural requirements of section 3 of the Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b) with respect to publication and transmittal of notice and the 6-month waiting period. The bill would, however, preserve the substantive requirements of section 3 with respect to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets. Thus, the waiver will permit the immediate disposal of lead upon enactment of S. 764.

LEAD

Lead is the heaviest and the softest of the common metals. Its surface oxidizes easily, but is then resistant to corrosion. Many of its uses depend on its noncorrosion properties. It is also a poor conductor of electricity, X-rays, and gamma rays. It becomes hard and brittle on repeated melting due to the formation of oxides. The tensile strength of lead is low, but it is very malleable. Lead and its components are highly poisonous. The principal grades of pig lead marketed are: Corroding lead, 99.99 percent pure, is used in producing white lead and battery oxides; chemical lead, 99.92 percent pure with some silver and copper, is used for storage batteries, cable coverings, pipes, and sheet; desilvered lead, 99.85 percent pure, is used in cables, solder and shot; common lead 99.73 percent pure; and work lead from the blast furnaces before the silver is extracted.

Lead is used in storage batteries, cable coverings, ammunition, gasoline additives, pigments, and solder.

Sources: Canada, Australia, Peru, Honduras, Mexico, and the Republic of South Africa.

METHOD OF DISPOSAL

The General Services Administration proposes to make the lead available: For sale; for transfer to agencies of the U.S. Government; or to the extent authorized by law, as payments for expenses (including transportation and other ac-

cessorial expenses) of acquisition of materials, or of refining, processing, beneficiating, or rotating materials, pursuant to section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b, and of processing and refining materials pursuant to section 303(d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, 50 U.S.C. App. 2093(d).

RATE OF DISPOSAL

GSA proposes to make the 498,000 short tons of excess lead available for commercial sale over a period of years. The quantities and timing of disposals will be determined upon evaluation of previous sales and current market conditions. Quantities of this material required for transfer directly to Government agencies will be over and above those involved in the commercial sales program.

PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROGRAM

The disposal program will be subject to continuous scrutiny and the Administrator of General Services will consult with other Federal agencies concerned at any time he considers such action advisable, or at any time consultation is requested by such agencies. If any significant modification of the program appears necessary or advisable as a result of such consultation, the change will be publicly announced.

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

World mine production of lead (metal content) totaled 3,673,377 short tons in 1971, of which the U.S. accounted for 573,377 short tons. U.S. refinery output of primary lead was 669,731 short tons in 1971.

Domestic consumption of metal was 1,392,400 short tons in 1971, compared with 1,360,552 short tons in 1970. In 1971 imports for consumption of lead ores totaled 88,288 short tons and pigs and bars, 192,571 short tons. Import sources for ores in 1971 were Canada 41 percent; Australia 13 percent; Peru 23 percent; Honduras 21 percent; and other countries 2 percent; for pigs and bars, Australia 22 percent; Mexico 15 percent; Peru 19 percent; Canada 30 percent; and other countries 14 percent.

Exports (including scraps), for 1971 was 15,498 short tons.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government, but will result in substantial return to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the lead now held in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the armed services bills just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THE AGNES RECOVERY ACT OF 1972—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-324)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Tropical Storm Agnes has caused unparalleled destruction in many areas of the eastern United States. More than 128,000 homes and businesses have been damaged or destroyed, and whole communities have been dealt a heavy blow. The losses to so many individuals cannot be measured only in terms of destruction of property and belongings; they must also be counted in terms of loss of jobs, disruption of families, personal privation, and anxiety about the future. In the whole history of our Nation, we have not before encountered such massive destruction over so widespread an area as a result of natural disaster.

Individuals, private groups and governments have responded magnificently to this calamity in the finest tradition of neighbor helping neighbors. The stamina, the courage and the spirit to fight back and recover are already evident throughout the devastated areas. My statement of July 12, 1972 summarized these impressive efforts. I also pointed out at that time, however, that an unparalleled disaster requires extraordinary measures to help in recovery. I announced my intention to recommend to the Congress supplementary and massive measures aimed at short- and long-term recovery. I herewith transmit those recommendations, and the proposed legislation to carry them out.

My proposals are in three parts.

First, I proposed the Agnes Recovery Act of 1972. This measure deals with disaster loans for homeowners, farmers, and businessmen. Because of the unprecedented scope of the destruction, unprecedented measures to deal with it are required. Under the provisions of this proposal, disaster loans for Agnes victims would be changed from present law in the following ways:

- The maximum amount of principal which can be cancelled or forgiven would be increased from \$2,500 to \$5,000 on loans made by the Small Business Administration or the Farmers Home Administration.
- The forgiveness feature would be applicable to the first dollar of a loan rather than after the repayment of the first \$500 of principal as is now the case.
- The interest rate on the loans would be dropped to 1 percent instead of its current rate of 5½ percent.

This liberalized assistance to individual homeowners and small businessmen can mean the difference between recovery and bankruptcy or ruin. The situation is urgent. Individual people are now making decisions on whether to rebuild or not. While my proposal would apply retroactively to all victims of Agnes, it is important to them to know now the terms of assistance which will be available to them.

Therefore, I call on the Congress to respond to this emergency by acting on the Agnes Recovery Act so that it can become law within one week.

Second, I recommend supplemental appropriations totaling \$1,569,800,000 for this emergency, the largest single request of its kind in our history. The vast majority of these funds would be used for disaster loans, with \$1.3 billion for the Small Business Administration and \$1.8 million for the Farmers Home Administration. The SBA funds would be used to provide loans for homeowners and small businessmen in disaster areas whose property has been damaged or destroyed. The FHA funds would provide sufficient personnel to process expeditiously loan requests in rural areas, for which adequate loan funds now exist. Also included in my supplemental request are:

- An additional \$200 million for the President's Disaster Relief Fund, to speed repair and reconstruction of public facilities and to provide temporary housing, food and unemployment compensation.
- \$40 million for the Economic Development Administration, \$16 million for the Appalachian Regional Commission and \$12 million for the Corps of Engineers, all to assist in the recovery of damaged communities. The funds for the Corps of Engineers would go toward flood control projects in the Susquehanna River Basin.

Third, I recommend that the existing authorization for appropriations for highway emergency relief be increased by \$200 million. Current authority limits amounts to \$50 million per year, which is clearly not adequate to cope with a disaster of this magnitude.

I urge that the Congress also act promptly on these second and third proposals.

The Federal Government must act quickly and decisively to do its part in providing relief and aiding recovery in a cooperative effort with the States and communities struck by Agnes. We can do no less. I am confident that the Congress will share this view.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 17, 1972.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12350, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12350) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and for other purposes,

with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, PUCINSKI, HAWKINS, WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. MINK, and Messrs. MEEDS, QUIE, ERLBORN, STEIGER of Wisconsin, and RUTH.

EXTENDING FOR 90 DAYS TIME FOR COMMENCING ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF AN INDIAN TRIBE, BAND, OR GROUP

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 15869) to extend for 90 days the time for commencing actions on behalf of an Indian tribe, band, or group.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not have a copy of the bill available, and, from the reading of the title and the preamble, it is difficult to know whether this has been available under the Reorganization Act of 1970, the requisite 3 days or not.

I wonder, if I would yield, if the gentleman proposing the legislation would explain the document room situation and/or whether the waiver involves the Reorganization Act or not, and if so the necessity for this urgent procedure.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say, the presentation of this bill violates every rule of orderly procedure. The bill has not been available for more than 25 minutes, when it was introduced at the time the House convened.

This is an emergency and the situation very briefly is this.

Six years ago a bill was passed permitting the Federal Government to bring claims against State governments and against private individuals on behalf of Indians.

This bill, or this act rather, had a statute of limitations of 6 years and that 6-year statute of limitations will expire tonight at midnight unless some kind of extension is arranged.

This bill was in the Judiciary Committee because of a delayed report downtown. It was overlooked. No one noted it until we were getting ready to leave for this little friendly vacation that some of us had in Miami last week, and I arrived back this morning to be told that unless action were taken today in the House and in the Senate, and signed by the President, that American Indians would lose some very, very valuable rights.

So what the bill does is simply to extend the statute by 90 days. This will give us until October for the Judiciary Committee to consider this matter and to come out with some longer extension, if

that is indicated after their deliberations. It is a stopgap, hold the line for 30 days, to preserve the very valuable rights of American Indians which will be lost if we do not act today.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentleman from Arizona's forthrightness and candor in his opening statement, and I must say that I observed him performing as in an Indian rain dance on the question that he, himself, brings up re a recent convention, doubtless seeking largess from heaven, or something else that is completely nonunderstandable to most of the viewing public.

But be that as it may—

Mr. UDALL. We tried to put it off until the gentleman was in bed.

Mr. HALL. Is it his responsibility to see that this is brought up before the legislation and the existing statute lapse. Ordinarily I believe this would be in the Committee on the Judiciary; is that not correct?

Mr. UDALL. It is a Judiciary Committee bill. Because I was one of the original sponsors of the legislation, I was asked to see if I could not put together an effort here today to get this 90-day extension passed; but the bill will be referred to the Judiciary Committee, I understand.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arizona would answer further, I know that committee has been negligent and tardy, but is he certain of his facts that there are many unsettled claims still resulting with our Indian tribes? It would seem to me that with the general legislation we have passed, plus the innumerable bills that come up for adjustment, for settling claims, or for the paying out of claims that have been found under the courts and others—and in fact we have been informed by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—that most of these Indian adjustments and claims bills have been settled or will be during the year. Is this legislation therefore necessary?

Mr. UDALL. Let me correct the gentleman on a misapprehension the gentleman from Missouri may have. There are different kinds of Indian claims bills. The ones that the Congress has been concerned with are claims of Indian tribes against the United States. This has nothing to do with that kind of claim. This bill has to do with claims which American Indians have against private individuals or against State governments, and the old legislation authorizes the Federal Government on behalf of the Indians to prosecute these claims, and it is these kinds of claims which will expire tonight.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this. As I understand it, the gentleman from Arizona says that this is being brought up in this manner requiring unanimous consent as to emergency action because it does expire tonight, but that it will extend the statute for only 90 days, during which time someone will see whether or not this is needed, in spite of the fact that the Department of the Interior has been slow in processing these claims?

Mr. UDALL. That is right.

Mr. HALL. Is it entirely possible that we will either have new substantive legislation within the 90-day period or will decide to drop the whole "can of worms" by that time?

Mr. UDALL. I personally will not be back for any extension. If the Judiciary Committee and the House do not find some merit in some substantive, long-term, permanent legislation, as far as I am concerned, this matter will be ended.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is extending to October 1 the provisions of the old act; is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. Yes; the extension is for 90 days, which would be October 17, I assume.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Arizona think that the House will be in session on October 1 or October 17?

Mr. UDALL. Based upon my long experience and the counsel I have received from the gentleman from Iowa over these years, I feel quite confident that we will be here October 17.

Mr. GROSS. Based upon what happened last week in Miami, I should think the Democrats would need a lot of time to campaign rather than to go through legislative motions in Washington.

Mr. UDALL. We know the gentleman wishes us well, but Members of the House anticipate very little difficulty this year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 15869

A bill to extend for ninety days the time for commencing actions on behalf of an Indian tribe, band, or group

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title 28 of the United States Code, section 2415, is amended as follows:

(a) The period at the end of subsection (a) shall be changed to a colon, and the following provision shall be added thereto;

"Provided further, That an action for money damages brought by the United States for or on behalf of a recognized tribe, band or group of American Indians shall not be barred unless the complaint is filed more than six years and ninety days after the right of action accrued."

(b) The words, "including trust or restricted Indian lands" appearing after "lands of the United States" shall be deleted from the proviso in subsection (b), the period at the end of the subsection shall be changed to a comma, and the following words shall be added thereto: "Except that such actions for or on behalf of a recognized tribe, band or group of American Indians, including actions relating to allotted trust or restricted Indian lands, may be brought within six years and ninety days after the right of action accrues."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CAPITAL CITY'S DIRTY STREETS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital City should look like one. The city is adequately financed. It has more money to spend each year than ever before, much of it from the taxpayers of the public at large. Yet there are streets, including New Jersey Avenue on which the Capitol is located, which have filth and trash, just as those in any mismanaged city in the Nation. This is hardly to be expected in the District of Columbia, yet a drive along these streets will show trash which has not been removed for months. This can indicate nothing more than sloppy management or actual mismanagement of the city sanitary department. This is not a pretty sight for the thousands of visitors who pour through the Nation's Capital City each day. At the least, the taxpayers are entitled to see clean streets and the people who live here are entitled to enjoy clean streets. If this is not important, the city government should think of sanitary considerations.

IMPOSITION OF EXPORT CONTROLS ON CATTLE HIDES SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the present administration is now engaged in repeating a serious mistake of the previous administration on a matter of grave concern to cattlemen and farmers all over the United States. The newly announced imposition of export controls on cattle hides is for the announced reason of bringing down the price on shoes.

Experience under the last administration demonstrated that the only prices that came down were on cattle hides, and that price reduction came out of the hides of the American cattlemen and farmers. There was no appreciable reduction in the price of shoes as a result of the previous administration's effort and they wisely discarded it as unsuccessful.

Today I wired the President of the United States a request that he learn from the experience of the previous administration and set aside without delay this very ill-considered order of the Secretary of Commerce in order that our cattlemen and farmers can continue to get a fair price on cattle hides.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 261]

Abouezk	Findley	Mayne
Alexander	Flowers	Metcalfe
Anderson,	Flynt	Mikva
Tenn.	Fountain	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Fulton	Mills, Ark.
Badillo	Fuqua	Minshall
Baring	Gallfanakis	Mosher
Bergland	Gallagher	O'Konski
Bingham	Goldwater	Passman
Blanton	Gray	Patman
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	Pelly
Bolling	Hagan	Pepper
Broomfield	Halpern	Pettis
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.	Pirnie
Burlison, Mo.	Hébert	Podell
Caffery	Henderson	Pryor, Ark.
Chappell	Hollifield	Purcell
Chisholm	Howard	Rarick
Clark	Hutchinson	Rees
Clay	Ichord	Robison, N.Y.
Colmer	Jarman	Rousselot
Conyers	Jonas	Ruppe
Curlin	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Tenn.	St. Germain
Delaney	Keith	Sarbanes
Diggs	Landrum	Scheuer
Donohue	Link	Seiberling
Dow	Long, La.	Shipley
Dowdy	McClure	Spence
Dulski	McCulloch	Steiger, Wis.
du Pont	McDonald,	Stokes
Dwyer	Mich.	Stuckey
Eckhardt	McKevitt	Sullivan
Edwards, Ala.	McMillan	Tuggle, Calif.
Esch	Macdonald,	Vander Jagt
Evins, Tenn.	Mass.	Whalley

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15417, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEW, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS—1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill—H.R. 15417—making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FLOOD, NATCHER, SMITH of Iowa, HULL, CASEY of Texas, PATTEN, MAHON, MICHEL, SHRIVER, CONTE, ROBINSON of Virginia, and Bow.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill—H.R. 15635—to assist elementary and secondary schools, community agencies, and other public and nonprofit private agencies to prevent juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15635

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled, "An Act to assist the courts, cor-

rectional systems, community agencies and primary and secondary public school systems to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to support research and training efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1968, is amended to read as follows: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act'.

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"Sec. 2. The Congress finds that delinquency among youths constitutes a national problem which can best be met by providing assistance to and encouraging the coordination of efforts by public and nonprofit private agencies engaged in preventing juvenile delinquency. It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to help States and local communities in providing community based preventive services, including diagnosis and treatment, to youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent, to provide assistance in the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment in occupations involving the provision of such services, and to provide technical assistance in such field.

"TITLE I—PREVENTIVE SERVICES

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 101. The purpose of this title is to assist States, local educational agencies, and other public and nonprofit private agencies to establish and carry out community-based programs, including programs in schools, for the prevention of delinquency in youths.

"GRANTS

"Sec. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or contracts with, public or nonprofit private agencies to meet all or part of the cost of establishing or operating, including the cost of planning, programs designed to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) (1) Grants and contracts under this title may be made only upon application to the Secretary by a public or nonprofit private agency, which contains or is accompanied by satisfactory assurances that—

"(A) steps have been or will be taken toward the provision, within a reasonable period of time, of a program of coordinated youth services in the area served which will make a substantial contribution toward the prevention of delinquency of youths, including the diagnosis and treatment of youths in danger of becoming delinquent;

"(B) such applicant agency will make special efforts to assure that the services provided by the program will be available for youths with the most serious behavioral problems;

"(C) (i) such applicant agency (if it is not a local educational agency) has consulted on its application with the local educational agencies and nonprofit private schools in the area to be served and has adopted procedures to coordinate its program with related efforts being made by these agencies and schools;

"(ii) such applicant agency will provide, to the extent feasible, for coordinating, on a continuing basis, its operations with the operations of other agencies and nonprofit private organizations furnishing welfare, education, health, mental health, recreation, job training, job placement, correction, and other basic services in the community for youths;

"(D) such applicant agency will make reasonable efforts to secure or provide any services which are necessary for diagnosing and treating youths in danger of becoming delinquent and which are not otherwise being provided in the community, or if being provided are not adequate to meet its needs;

"(E) maximum use will be made under the program of other Federal, State, or local

resources available for the provision of such services;

"(F) local educational agencies and other public and private agencies and organizations providing youth services in the geographic area to be served by the applicant will be consulted in the formulation by the applicant of the program, taking into account the services and expertise of such agencies and organizations, and with a view to adopting such services to the better fulfillment of the purposes of this title;

"(G) in developing coordinated youth services, youth and public or private agencies, and organizations providing youth services within the geographic area to be served by the applicant will be given the opportunity to present their views to the applicant with respect to such development; and

"(H) the applicant agency will be responsible for organizing, maintaining, and facilitating accessibility to all available youth services.

"(2) Such application shall contain such information as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, including—

"(A) a description of the services for youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent and which are available in the State or community;

"(B) a statement of the method or methods of linking the agencies and organizations, public and private, providing these and other services, including local educational agencies and nonprofit private schools;

"(C) the functions and services to be included;

"(D) the procedures which will be established for protecting the rights, under Federal, State, and local law, of the recipients of youth services, and for insuring appropriate privacy with respect to records relating to such services, provided to any individual under coordinated youth services developed by the applicant;

"(E) the procedures which will be established for evaluation; and

"(F) the strategy for phasing out support under this Act and the continuance of a proven program through other means.

"USE OF FUNDS

"Sec. 103. (a) Funds paid to any agency (whether directly or through a State agency) under this title may be used for—

"(1) meeting the cost of securing or providing services designed to carry out the purposes of this title, but only to the extent and for the period reasonably necessary for the community to provide such services; and

"(2) meeting not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of construction of community-based special purpose or innovative types of facilities which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title, including community-based special purpose or innovative (A) half-way houses for youths who because of special behavioral problems have a high risk of becoming delinquent; and (B) small, residential facilities for the diagnosis and treatment of youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent. In developing plans for such facilities, due consideration shall be given to excellence of architecture and design.

"(b) No grant or contract may be made under this title with respect to any coordinated youth service system for a period of time exceeding three years, except that the Secretary may, in any case in which he determines that it would not be feasible for the coordinated youth service system to continue to function unassisted under this title, extend assistance for such additional years as he determines to be necessary.

"CONSIDERATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

"Sec. 104. (a) In determining whether or not to approve applications for grants or

contracts under this title, the Secretary shall consider, in the State or community of the applicant—

"(1) the relative costs and effectiveness of the program in effectuating the purposes of such title;

"(2) the incidence of and rate of increase in youth offenses and juvenile delinquency;

"(3) school dropout rates;

"(4) the adequacy of existing facilities and services for carrying out the purposes of such title;

"(5) the extent of comprehensive planning in the community for carrying out the purposes of such title;

"(6) youth unemployment rates;

"(7) the extent to which proposed programs incorporate new or innovative techniques within the State or community to carry out the purposes of such title;

"(8) the extent to which the proposed programs will make effective use of the facilities and services of the appropriate local educational agencies;

"(9) the extent to which the proposed programs incorporate participation of the parents of youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent, as well as the participation of other adults who offer guidance or supervision to such youths; and

"(10) the extent to which the proposed programs will be coordinated with similar programs assisted under other Federal laws related to the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Secretary, in making grants or contracts under this title, shall give priority to applicants serving communities which exhibit to the highest degrees the factors listed in paragraphs (2), (3), and (6) of subsection (a).

"TITLE II—TRAINING

"AUTHORIZATION

"Sec. 201. The Secretary is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to make grants to, or contracts with, public or nonprofit private agencies for projects for the training of personnel employed in or preparing for employment in fields related to the diagnosis and treatment of youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent, and for the counseling or instruction of parents in the improving of parental instruction and supervision of youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent. Such projects shall include special programs which provide youths and adults with training for career opportunities, including new types of careers, in such fields. Such projects may include, among other things, development of courses of study and of interrelated curricula in schools, colleges, and universities, establishment of short-term institutes for training at such schools, colleges, and universities, inservice training and traineeships with such stipends, including allowances for travel and subsistence expenses, as the Secretary may determine to be necessary.

"RECEIPTS AND CONDITIONS OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

"Sec. 202. Such grants may be made to and such contracts may be made with any Federal, State, or local public agency or any nonprofit private agency; and to the extent he deems it appropriate, the Secretary shall require the recipient of any such grant or contract to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the projects for which the grant or contract is made.

"TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INFORMATION SERVICES

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 301. The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with and, either directly or through grants to or contracts with any public agency or nonprofit private agency, render technical assistance to State, local, or other public or private agencies or organizations in matters relating to prevention of delinquency, and to provide short-term

training and instruction of a technical nature with respect to such matters. Particular emphasis should be placed on providing technical assistance in the development of juvenile delinquency components or plans under title I.

"STATE ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL UNITS

"Sec. 302. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State agency which is able and willing to provide technical assistance to local public agencies and nonprofit private agencies engaged in or preparing to engage in activities for which aid may be provided under this Act. No such grant may exceed 90 per centum of the cost of the activities of the State agency with respect to which such grant is made.

"INFORMATION SERVICES

"Sec. 303. The Secretary shall collect, evaluate, publish, and disseminate information and materials relating to research and programs and projects conducted under this Act, and any other matters relating to prevention or treatment of delinquency, such information and materials to be for the general public and for agencies, organizations, and personnel engaged in programs concerning youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent.

"TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATION

"PAYMENT PROCEDURE

"Sec. 401. Payments of any grant or any contract under this Act may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes for which the grant or contract is made.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated for grants and contracts under this Act, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, \$75,000,000 a year for the fiscal year 1973 and for the succeeding fiscal year. At least 80 per centum of the amount appropriated for each such fiscal year shall be used for funding programs under title I, of which no more than 10 per centum may be used to meet costs of construction.

"Sec. 403. (a) Payments pursuant to grants or contracts made under title I of this Act for any fiscal year with respect to activities in any one State may not exceed 12 per centum of the total of the funds available for such grants or contracts under such title for such fiscal year.

"(b) Of the funds available for grants or contracts under title I for any fiscal year—

"(1) \$25,000 each shall be reserved for the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

"(2) \$100,000 shall be reserved for each other State;

except that, if the Secretary determines, on the basis of the information available to him on the last day of the ninth month of any fiscal year, that any portion of such \$25,000 or \$100,000 for any State will not be required for such grants or contracts under title I of this Act for such year, such portion shall be available for grants or contracts under such title for such year with respect to activities in any other State (in the case of which such determination has not been made).

"LABOR STANDARDS

"Sec. 404. It shall be a condition of any grant under this Act which is wholly or partially for construction that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on such construction shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the local-

ity as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to these labor standards the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 P.R. 36; 64 Stat. 1267) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"EVALUATION

"Sec. 405. (a) The Secretary shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs, projects, and other activities under this Act, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals and their relationship to and impact on related Federal, State, and local activities. This evaluation shall include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in programs under this Act. The results of such evaluations shall be included in the report required by section 409.

"(b) In addition to funds otherwise available for evaluation, such portion of any appropriation under section 402 as the Secretary may determine, but not exceeding 1 per centum thereof, shall be available for evaluation by the Secretary (directly or by grants or contracts) of the activities for which such appropriation is made.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"Sec. 406. In the case of action taken by the Secretary terminating or refusing to continue financial assistance pursuant to a grant or contract under this Act to a grantee, such grantee may obtain judicial review of such action in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"JOINT FUNDING

"Sec. 407. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to an agency assisted under this Act, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

"COORDINATION

"Sec. 408. (a) In the administration of this Act, the Secretary shall limit assistance under this Act to programs and activities which are carried on outside of the juvenile justice system (which encompasses agencies such as the police, the courts, correctional institutions, detention homes, and probation and parole authorities).

"(b) (1) There shall be established an Interdepartmental Council on Juvenile Delinquency (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council') whose function shall be to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

"(2) The Council shall be composed of the Attorney General, the Secretary, or their respective designees, and representatives of such other agencies as the President shall designate.

"(3) The Chairman of the Council shall be appointed by the President.

"(4) The Council shall meet a minimum of six times per year and the activities of the Council shall be included in the annual report as required by section 409 of this title.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"Sec. 409. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Interdepartmental Council, with the appropriate assistance and concurrence of other Federal agencies who are consulted and whose activities are coordinated under

section 408 shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on all Federal activities in the field of juvenile delinquency, youth development, and related fields. Such report shall include, but not be limited to—

"(1) planning, program, and project activities conducted under this Act;

"(2) the nature and results of technical assistance conducted under title III of this Act;

"(3) the number and types of training projects, number of persons trained and in training, and job placement and other follow-up information on trainees and former trainees assisted under title II of this Act; and

"(4) steps taken and mechanisms and methods used to coordinate and avoid duplication of Federal activities in the fields of juvenile delinquency, youth development, and related fields and the effectiveness of such steps, mechanisms, and methods.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Sec. 410. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, or physical development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which is otherwise provided by law.

"(b) The Secretary is directed to establish appropriate procedures to insure that no child shall be the subject of any research or experimentation under this Act other than routine testing and normal program evaluation unless the parent or guardian of such child is informed of such research or experimentation and is given an opportunity as of right to except such child therefrom.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 411. For purposes of this Act—

"(1) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(2) The term 'public agency' means a duly elected political body or a subdivision thereof and shall not be construed to include the Office of Economic Opportunity. Such term includes an Indian tribe.

"(3) The term 'nonprofit private agency' means any accredited institution of higher education, and any other agency, organization, or institution no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, or which is owned and operated by one or more such agencies, but only if such agency, organization, or institution was in existence at least two years before the date of an application under this Act. Such term shall not be construed to include the Office of Economic Opportunity. Participation by the Office of Economic Opportunity is expressly prohibited in administering this Act.

"(4) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(5) The term 'construction' includes construction of new buildings and acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings, or any combination of such activities (including architects' fees but not the cost of acquisition of land for new buildings). For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'equipment' includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them.

"(6) The term 'youth service' means services which assist in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, including, but not limited to: individual and group counseling, family counseling, diagnostic services, remedial education, tutoring, alternate schools (institu-

tions which provide education to youths outside the regular or traditional school system), vocational testing and training, job development and placement, emergency shelters, halfway houses, health services, drug abuse programs, social, cultural, and recreational activities, the development of paraprofessional or volunteer programs, community awareness programs, foster care and shelter care homes, and community-based treatment facilities or services.

"(7) The term 'coordinated youth services' means a comprehensive service delivery system, separate from the system of juvenile justice (which encompasses agencies such as the juvenile courts, law enforcement agencies, and detention facilities) for providing youth services to an individual who is in danger of becoming delinquent and to his family in a manner designed to—

"(a) facilitate accessibility to and utilization of all appropriate youth services provided within the geographic area served by such system by any public or private agency or organization, which desires to provide such services through such system;

"(b) identify the need for youth services not currently provided in the geographic area covered by such system, and, where appropriate, provide such services through such system;

"(c) make the most effective use of youth services in meeting the needs of young people who are in danger of becoming delinquent, and their families;

"(d) use available resources efficiently and with a minimum of duplication in order to achieve the purposes of this Act; and

"(e) identify the types and profiles of individual youths who are to be served by such a comprehensive system.

"(8) The term 'local educational agency' means a public body of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools."

Sec. 2. The title of such Act is amended to read as follows: "An Act to assist elementary and secondary schools, community agencies, and other public and nonprofit private agencies to prevent juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 of this Act shall be effective July 1, 1972.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 15635, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

Juvenile crime has reached terrifying proportions in this country within the last decade. Arrests of juveniles for violent crimes have increased by 18 percent. Almost two-thirds of all arrests for serious crimes today are of young people under the age of 21. And surprisingly the rate of increase in arrests of girls with the past few years has been twice the rate for boys.

What are we to make of all this? I believe that one of the basic causes of these statistics is that we are spending

far too much money far too late in the lives of these youngsters. This is clear from the fact that we are spending massive sums on prisons and on rehabilitation but we still have a recidivism rate for institutional juvenile delinquents of between 74 to 85 percent.

I believe that we must start much earlier than we have been in working with youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent. The bill now before us today would do that.

The basic purpose of H.R. 15635 is to provide funds for community-based preventive programs, especially those operated through or with the cooperation of the schools.

This is no longer a research program—we have repealed the authority to conduct research. And it is no longer a program dealing with delinquents—youngsters who have been arrested and convicted. The Safe Streets Act has that responsibility. Rather it is a bill providing that at least 80 percent, and hopefully more, of its funds must be used for local programs to prevent delinquency. It is our hope that this program will at last get down to the local level where the problem exists.

The only authorized activities under this new bill will be for these local preventive programs, training of personnel to assist these local programs, technical assistance for them, and some information services. It is definitely our intent to have as much of this money as possible used locally.

These local grants will be for the purpose of funding coordinated youth service systems. This means that a local grantee will have the responsibility for finding out which are the services available within its community which can help in preventing delinquency, trying to coordinate them so that a youth who is in danger of becoming delinquent will have easy access to them, and in those circumstances where vital services are absent or deficient actually operating these services. In other words, coordination of accessibility to other services and "filling in" of absent services will be the job of the local grantees.

I do not think that I have to describe the proliferation of services available in local communities. YMCA's, YWCA's, Boys Clubs, CAP agencies, model city programs, neighborhood community health clinics, drug abuse centers, neighborhood Legal Services offices. These and many more are strewn throughout our communities. Very infrequently is there one point where a boy or girl in trouble with himself or his home can go for help. It is the purpose of this new bill to create that focal point for children who are in danger of becoming delinquent so that they can be helped to utilize existing facilities before they destroy themselves and cause harm to society.

The emphasis is definitely to help the child before he or she becomes delinquent. But in isolated instances it may be impractical to limit this assistance to those who are in danger of becoming delinquent. In some neighborhoods it would be almost impossible to separate the pre-delinquents from the already delinquents. And we do not want to add to the bureaucratic mess by requiring that chil-

dren be turned away just because they have been arrested. But we do want to emphasize that the focus of this program is on the child who has not as yet become a delinquent.

In conclusion let me say that I believe that we lost a tremendous opportunity when we did not fund the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 to the full amount authorized—\$75 million. I truly believe that if we had given that program our full support, we would not be faced today with the sorry statistics on juvenile crime.

But I urge you to look upon that as an opportunity lost and to realize that the same thing can happen with this new act. Regardless of how finely we try to write the authorizing legislation unless the administration asks for sufficient appropriations and the Congress provides them it is all for naught. I hope that in 2 years we can look back upon this new act as an opportunity regained. I urge passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I read the report, and I could not find out how much had been spent since 1968 and what had been accomplished, if anything. I do gather that delinquency has almost doubled during the last 10 years. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me whether the past programs have been more or less of a flop and if he feels this is a new departure.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It is a new departure only to the extent that it tries to recognize what our community leaders have been telling us all over America in testimony before our committee; namely, that most of our money is now spent on trying to rehabilitate youngsters who for various reasons have become delinquents and are part of the juvenile justice system. We have the Safe Streets Act to deal with that problem, and we recently had a bill passed here in this body, sponsored by my colleague from Illinois, Mr. RALLSBACK, which has yet to be acted on by the Senate, dealing with the juvenile justice system. That is where the failures have been. We have concentrated on rehabilitation but have paid too little attention to juvenile delinquency prevention.

This bill is in response to pleas from all over America that we provide a program to help the youngster before he or she becomes a delinquent.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I understand that. I wonder if I could present a concrete case. I have had the case of a boy who had been failing in his school and had dropped out. The parents suspect that he has probably been taking marijuana. Now, just exactly what can be done under this program to help this boy before he gets in any more serious trouble?

Mr. PUCINSKI. In the first place, this program is designed to help the local community. It is a program directly from the Department to the local community. The local community makes the application for a grant and designs a program to prevent juvenile delinquency that will best suit the needs of that community.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I understand.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The local community with that grant would then set up a focal point where this youngster, regardless of what the nature of his problems were, this youngster can go to that focal point and that focal point will then show him what facilities are available in the community to help him or her, as the case may be, with that particular problem. This bill makes possible creation of a "cleaning house" in a local community to coordinate existing facilities and create new ones in a concentrated drive to prevent delinquency.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. In other words, you will give the boy psychiatric treatment among other things.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There are existing facilities in these communities already that are not being used for various reasons, and one of the most prominent reasons being that young people, that young boy the gentleman was talking about who is having a problem with narcotics, or the mother who senses that her child is experimenting with drugs, today that mother has no place to go. Although there are already existing facilities she does not know where they are. We do not intend to duplicate those facilities. We know that there are such existing facilities in that community in all probability, but unfortunately the people do not know where those facilities are located, how to get to them, and so forth. Too often the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing to prevent crime.

This bill is designed to help the local communities coordinate their existing programs and their existing facilities so that they can help that mother or that child.

Also there could be the example of a schoolteacher who has a disruptive child, and she sees that that child is headed for trouble, yet she knows of no place to go for help. What this bill would do would be to help the local community coordinate their facilities, so that that disturbed child or that worried mother, or the schoolteacher with the disruptive child in her class will be able to find these facilities in the community so as to help out these youngsters with whatever problems they may have.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Why \$75 million? Can the gentleman tell me that?

I would think that the problem of juvenile delinquency or of potential delinquency is so vast that they probably can not be solved with billions of dollars. Yet this bill proposes to solve it with \$75 million.

I wonder whether there is any real likelihood that this legislation is going to accomplish anything?

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from Maryland raises a very good question. It has been our experience since 1961, and that is how long this committee has been involved with these matters—and may I remind the gentleman from Maryland that it was President Kennedy who first proposed this program in 1961, and we have had jurisdiction over this matter since then—and our experience has been that even though we might authorize substantially larger sums of money, there is just no sense in kidding America or kidding the people, because we are not

going to get past the appropriating process for that amount of money. So what we have done, after very careful consideration and after extensive studies of the existing legislation, we have patterned the program with a \$75 million authorization which, if fully funded, will make an appreciable dent in helping local communities develop effective prevention programs.

We leave to the Safe Streets Act, and we leave to the Juvenile Justice and Research Institute, the handling of those areas that deal with youngsters who are already in trouble—and that is a very serious problem as we all know. What we are trying to do with this program, with the \$75 million, is concentrate on prevention. I agree with the gentleman from Maryland that this is not enough, and I would give my left arm if we could persuade the Committee on Appropriations to fully fund this program for the next 2 years, and then I believe that we could make an honest-to-goodness contribution toward preventing the rapid rise in the increase of juvenile crimes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman from Illinois then feels that the figure of \$75 million was set simply because the committee did not feel they could go to the Committee on Appropriations and fund a larger sum?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is right. We stopped at \$75 million in order to give the Congress an opportunity to see how this program works for the next 2 years—and hopefully the program will work, and we believe that it will, as it is now structured—and that then Congress will probably want to appropriate substantially more money at some future time—but I think that it is good and wise in ascertaining before we jump overboard that we make sure that it is working. Therefore, I think the Congress would be showing great wisdom in fully funding this program.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I was just wondering whether the \$75 million spread over the whole country would not be spread too thinly.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not believe it will.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, first let me compliment the distinguished chairman of the general subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI). He has worked untiringly for many years on this difficult subject. The bill under consideration represents still another of his great efforts to control and prevent the incidence of juvenile crime.

In previous years \$75 million has been authorized for the act. However, when we look back, appropriations have been at only the \$10 million level.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that in the future we will be able to do more and help put into effect the good features in this bill by appropriating the full \$75 million.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) and his subcommittee have done a wonderful job in this area over a period of years and they deserve the compliments of the whole House. More ade-

quate funding and enactment of this legislation, which will greatly strengthen and enhance the program, will in my judgment be of tremendous benefit throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency reached epic proportions in this country in the last decade. The number of juvenile arrests for violent crimes increased almost threefold. The arrest of juveniles for crimes against property increased almost 100 percent. At the present time, almost two-thirds of all arrests for serious crimes are of young people under the age of 21.

In 1968 the Congress responded to the alarming increase in juvenile crime by passing the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act. That act, Public Law 90-445, provided a broad program of support for State and local government projects to rehabilitate the juvenile delinquents and to prevent development of additional juvenile delinquents. That act expired in June 1971, and last year we extended the act with some relatively minor amendments.

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 15635, would extend the Juvenile Delinquency Act for an additional 2 years. In addition, H.R. 15635 redirects the program emphasis from the rehabilitative toward the preventative aspects of the program, requires involvement in the schools, and directs the greatest effort toward those areas of greatest need.

It is commonsense that the costs of operating preventative programs designed to insure a reduction in the number of young delinquents would be much less than the costs of rehabilitating youths who have become delinquent after arrest and conviction. For some time the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has acknowledged this fact; to some extent they have redirected their efforts and put greater emphasis on prevention. Their efforts in this respect, however, have not been satisfactory. The committee bill, therefore, redirects the focus of the Juvenile Delinquency Act toward the prevention of delinquency and away from rehabilitation efforts.

It is expected that the preventive effort will be directed toward attempts to identify and to help those youngsters most likely to become delinquents before they become police statistics. That will not be an easy task but an effort must be made.

If children who are potentially delinquent are to be identified and to be helped, it is clear that the effort must involve the school systems of the Nation. It is, therefore, the purpose of this legislation to insure that programs will either be centered in the schools or operated in close cooperation with them.

The committee bill emphasizes that school districts may receive grants to mount preventative programs. If they do not actually receive the grant in their local area then they must be intimately involved in the planning and operation of the local program.

The funds made available by the act must be concentrated in those areas having the greatest number of school dropouts and the highest rates of youth crime and unemployment. This has not heretofore been the case, unfortunately.

While the committee bill permits a

continuation of authority to use some of the funds for training, technical assistance and information, it would require that at least 80 percent of the funds be used to support programs actually assisting youths in local areas. The committee expects there to be a substantial reduction in the use of funds for national conferences and the publication of literature.

The problem of juvenile delinquency is a local one. The fight must be conducted at the local level, using local people and local resources supported and supplemented by the funds made available under this act. To the degree that funds are used for nonprogram purposes, it is expected that they will be tied insofar as possible with such local efforts.

We also expect substantial emphasis on the coordination of juvenile delinquency programs at the local level with substantial effort being made to pull together local, State, and other resources to render the collective efforts more effective.

Grants shall be made for longer periods of time. Grants and contracts for the programs shall be more sizable than has heretofore been the case. There has been a tendency to make large numbers of small grants which have relatively minor impact.

In this connection it might also be pointed out that the committee has decreased the percentage of total appropriations which can be spent in any State from 15 to 20 percent. Too many of the grants under the old program were being awarded to a small number of States.

I would be remiss if I did not comment again at this point on the fact that the first 3 years of the operation of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act were seriously hampered by the very limited appropriations that were made available and by the sometimes confused administration of this program. It is also to be hoped that both the Administration and the Congress will improve their efforts to prevent further increases in juvenile delinquency as part of the national effort to reduce crime.

Finally, let me say that the committee bill contains an amendment which states that nothing in the act shall impinge upon the moral and legal rights or responsibilities of parents for their children with respect to their moral, mental, emotional, or physical development. It is the committee's intention that all rights and privileges both of children and parents of children involved in the program be fully recognized and protected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support and passage of H.R. 15635, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to yield as I promised to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) as the first one to whom I will yield.

I now reserve the balance of my time so the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) may be recognized.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15635, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

The cost of juvenile delinquency and youth crime is great in both human and economic terms.

In 1970, 40 percent of all armed robberies, assaults, and burglaries were committed by individuals under the age of 18, and two-thirds of the arrests for serious crime were of persons under 21.

Juvenile arrests for violent crimes have increased in the last decade by 167 percent.

Narcotic drug arrests for those under 18 are up 2,453 percent.

And in 1 year, suburban prostitution in the same age group increased 43.5 percent.

I believe we have a moral responsibility to attack this problem.

One of the tools we use in the fight against juvenile delinquency has been the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act which we passed in 1968.

The program is an on-going one.

Its authorization expired on June 30 of this year, and it is presently operating under a continuing resolution.

Together with our distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. PUCINSKI, I introduced legislation designed to reshape the existing law so that an emphasis would be placed on prevention.

By identifying a young person in danger of becoming delinquent—by helping him before he has a chance to come into contact with the police—we can reduce the chances that he will permanently sever all bonds with society.

Prevention benefits not only the individual, however; the cost to society of crime prevention is significantly less than the cost of rehabilitation.

As my colleagues are well aware, many programs now exist supporting mental health, education, job training, family counseling, and child protective services that clearly relate to delinquency prevention.

The major need at this time is to coordinate the planning and implementation of those programs.

I also believe that the HEW juvenile delinquency effort should focus on the prevention of delinquency, and leave the correctional and rehabilitation efforts to the Justice Department and other appropriate institutions.

The bill before us today does just that.

It is intended to eliminate duplication with law enforcement agencies through a prevention orientation.

By emphasizing the role of schools in prevention projects, the bill recognizes that area where youth is most easily reached and influenced—where operative measures can be implemented to recognize and aid those who are in danger of becoming delinquent.

Finally, one important point should be noted.

The committee worked very closely with the administration in developing this bill.

The bill incorporates almost all of the administration's proposals in the area of juvenile delinquency, and it has the full support of the administration.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in voting for this legislation.

We must prevent delinquency to protect our youth—and our society.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 min-

utes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the further extenuation of this act, especially at the cost of \$75 million, \$65 million of which is unrequested for fiscal year 1973, and \$75 million additionally drawn out of thin air and not requested by anybody for 1974. The best that can be said about this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that it is the least of all evils suggested up to now by the process of perfection in committee. These are the basic reasons I decided against granting unanimous consent for earlier consideration.

I thought that the questions asked by the gentleman from Maryland were very apropos, and perhaps not adequately answered.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is fraught with phrases such as "those in danger of becoming delinquent." There are vague promises made that there has been a technical breakthrough so that we can ascertain those impinging upon near delinquency. In fact, the report states in one place it has been asserted that as early as the age of 12 the "indicia" can be discerned that a particular child is on his way to becoming a delinquent. As a professional, I just do not believe it. I severely question this statement and its assumptions.

But more basic than that, Mr. Speaker, I question whether it is the function of the Federal Government to intercede between parents, school, church, local community, or the State, if necessary, by throwing more money and more personnel into an admittedly bad problem. I think perhaps if we adjusted other contacts so that there was a little more hide warming and "wood shedding" on the part of parents as these children evolved, and a better example set for them, we would not be faced with these so-called delinquents or troublemakers. So I think the basic issue is that this, indeed, is not a Federal problem; this is very basic, and it is such a nervous Nellie and bleeding heart social proposal as far as those who would pose a political ploy in a mandated Congress against the executive branch of another party, that it becomes rather obvious.

I repeat that there was a real question of whether this bill is not the least of many evils. This is a poor excuse for legislation, Mr. Speaker. To wit: What does the Institute of Juvenile Delinquency that failed a passage in this body back on December 6, 1971, and then was brought up under a rule rather than under suspension on April 18, 1972, have to say about the problem of juvenile delinquency in the United States of America? If they have not, indeed, yet had the time to get organized; why pass blind legislation with open-ended commitments, when we already have an Interdepartmental Council on Juvenile Delinquency, to say nothing of the Juvenile Research Council of the Department of Justice?

Now we are having a government by crony, and we are having a government by commission, and we are adding one more heap to the pile of inadequate legislation in the vain hope and the

emotional hurrah of the social bleeding hearts and the "Harbinger of Doom," to do something about a problem that you cannot solve by legislation. You cannot legislate morals; you cannot legislate the need to raise people properly, you cannot legislate enforceable niceties, and this is the wrong kind of a bill.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the question I wanted to address to the gentleman from Illinois is this: What have we obtained for money already spent? How many millions have already been spent on this proposition?

Mr. PUCINSKI. As the gentleman from Iowa knows, this is a problem that society has indeed had for 2,000 years. I remember an ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic on the cavern wall relating some of the problems that they had in those days with wayward children and children disrespectful of parents. Mr. Speaker, this is not a new problem.

And nobody here suggests to the gentleman that we have the panacea in this bill. The programs we have been funding since 1961 have had considerable success, and they have had considerable failure.

Mr. GROSS. The fact of the matter is the gentleman from Illinois in his previous remarks said juvenile delinquency had practically doubled rather than decreased despite the millions expended.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) asked the question, What have we obtained from the millions already spent on this problem? The answer seems to be very little.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we have obtained since 1961 with this and subsequent legislation an enormous amount of knowledge, and we have many programs that are working. One of the great problems we have had with this legislation since 1961, and particularly this legislation, has been that it has never been fully funded. We never have given this program a chance. We in our subcommittee conduct extensive hearings and come up with figures we think will target in on the problem, but the Appropriations Committee says they will not give us that much money. So the gentleman, if he would do nothing, would not only see the problem doubling, but he would also see it tripling and quadrupling. We cannot quit with this problem.

Mr. GROSS. I must agree with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) that morality, and discipline cannot be bought. We cannot solve this problem of juvenile delinquency by throwing more and more money at it. It will not be cured in that way.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, this country is spending \$85 billion on various forms of public assistance programs. Much of that money is being spent by the taxpayers of the country, because we have failed to deal adequately and effectively with the problems of juvenile crime. I am not saying this is a complete answer, but I am saying this country cannot

quit trying to find an answer to juvenile crime, since this is America's No. 1 social problem.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit that the committee on which I serve, and the subcommittee on which I have served in the past, have tried very hard to come up with an answer to a most difficult problem. I believe they have in many ways made changes in this legislation to meet objections. Yet there is too much experimentation. Some experimentation may be needed, but I think we should at least note in this debate that we are considering embarking on a very dangerous concept.

There is no question in my mind that, when a youth runs afoul of the law, the courts and the government have something to say about how the young man or young woman will conduct himself or herself, and how the person will be supervised in the months and years following that time; but, in a free society, there is a very grave question as to how much the government should be involved before the so-called criminal or illegal actions or the indication of delinquency manifests itself to an extent where the law is actually called into cooperation with the parents in rectifying these supposed delinquent tendencies.

On page 3, I would call to the attention of the Members something which I think is a very questionable procedure. It is that of directing actions under this legislation toward including diagnosis and treatment of youths in danger of becoming delinquent. The more we think about that, the more we realize that delinquency is a most difficult thing to detect and it can open up a Pandora's box. How do we diagnose and treat a youngster in danger of becoming delinquent? I think anybody with common sense knows that every youth is in danger of becoming delinquent. Simply by having a matter of choice he is in danger of becoming delinquent. Where do we draw the line?

As I stated earlier, I believe this committee has tried to circumscribe this danger. I am one of those who do not believe this questionable language should be in the bill at all.

The committee did agree, on page 17, under the general provisions, to place in the bill a provision that would at least require the permission of a parent before the so-called diagnosis and treatment of a youth in danger of becoming delinquent was carried into effect. This is my amendment. Even with it I am concerned about this legislation and think it is dangerous experimentation.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, just for the purpose of legislative history, to indicate what the intention of the bill is in regard to pre-delinquency diagnosis and testing?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 1 additional minute.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe the gentleman from Illinois knows and has been aware of the fact that there are a great number of parents, many people, concerned about this particular aspect. I know he was willing to go as far as he could in making this provision in the law some protection against abuse. For the purpose of legislative history, could we have some statement from the chairman as to how he views this very, very sensitive problem of diagnosis and treatment of youths in danger of becoming delinquent.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I congratulate my colleague on the committee for including the amendment that he did in this bill. I believe it addresses itself to the very valid questions raised by the gentleman from Missouri as to Federal control over children.

This language clearly establishes the doctrine, and for the purpose of legislative history I want to make the intent very clear. This provides that for any type of testing, psychological testing or psychiatric testing, beyond the normal educational testing we now use in our school systems, as presently being used, any special testing of a youngster will first have to undergo approval of the parents.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

This will protect the rights of the parent to first be consulted and advised and apprised of what is going to happen.

In other words, the gentleman has quite properly put into this bill the safeguard that there is not going to be extensive psychological and psychiatric testing of youngsters without the permission of their parents. The intent of the gentleman's language is very clear. It states:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, or physical development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which is otherwise provided by law.

I congratulate the gentleman for including this amendment in the bill. I believe it strengthens the bill in regard to the points raised by our colleague from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for that statement.

I do believe my amendment improves the bill, but I would have to admit candidly that it still will not give protection against prying bureaucrats. Since I have

been a Member of this body for more than a decade now, I can think of instance after instance where we have clearly stated our purpose on the floor, where we have clearly incorporated into legislation the intent of the Congress, only to watch in subsequent years the bureaucracy go its own way. I am reasonably certain this will happen in the area of predelinquency detection. Their part statements read like a roadmap and this legislation will start them on their way.

I certainly hope in this case the gentleman and the committee will exercise some oversight because I happen to believe there is in the bureaucracy, and particularly in HEW, an inclination and a tendency to want to engage in this type of diagnosis and testing. I do believe it is something we should watch very closely on our committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield for a question?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the upper age limit for a juvenile?

Mr. BELL. I understand it is 18.

Mr. GROSS. It would be 18 in all States; is that correct?

Mr. BELL. There may be some differences in some States, but I would think it would be 18 generally for most of the States.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I merely wish to point out that this legislation has been requested by the administration.

We worked very closely with the administration on this bill. I do believe it meets the requirements and the tacit recommendation of the administration. I have already discussed the bill with my colleague from Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK and I assured him this bill is not intended to conflict with the legislation he has been supporting. This bill simply addresses itself to preventive programs. It is my hope that we will be able to persuade our colleagues the bill as now proposed is going to make a very substantial impact on local communities.

One thing that I want to underscore—and this point was raised by my colleague from Missouri, who raised very pertinent and very proper and pointed questions—this bill will be controlled by the local communities. They must come before the agency and ask for a grant. The local community will draw up the program that they believe can most effectively help prevent young people from entering the world of juvenile crime. For those of you who may be concerned, you will find solace in the fact that nothing can happen under this bill unless the local community specifically requests it. This is a strong point of the bill. I urge enactment of this bill and consider it a great privilege to be its principal sponsor in the House. I wish to thank the members of my committee for cosponsoring this important measure.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15635, a bill to assist elementary and secondary schools, community agencies, and other public and nonprofit private agencies to prevent juvenile delinquency—and want to commend my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee for their fine work in reporting out this legislation.

As a cosponsor last year of a bill to establish an independent Institute for the Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, I am particularly interested in legislative efforts in the field of juvenile justice. H.R. 15635 would extend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act for an additional 2 years and refocus its program toward the task of preventing juvenile delinquency—especially through local efforts involving the schools—in local communities which show the greatest need for assistance. Putting the emphasis of assistance on preventive programs on the local level is, I believe, the most workable solution to the ever-growing problem of juvenile crime, for what better place to reach youngsters in danger of becoming delinquent than through their schools?

I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this bill.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the local control concept advocated in the bill H.R. 15635, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1972.

This bill is another step in the efforts which we have been making to return localized programs to local control. In providing for 80 percent of the funding to be used in assisting local youth services we are giving each community the opportunity to provide programs to service its own particular problems.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15635, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1972.

I support the bill reluctantly, because I fear it is merely another one of those self-deluding congressional packages which does not authorize enough money, which barely coordinates new projects between agencies, and which employs make-do Federal plaster in a crumbling wall.

"Juvenile delinquency" is a nice, anti-septic term which clothes human suffering with statistics. We have heard those statistics over and over again.

We have read that arrests of children under 15 years old have increased 165 percent from 1960. We know that almost 18,000 crimes were committed by children under 15. In one city of my district alone—Haverhill—crimes by juveniles more than doubled from 1969 to 1970.

The bill before us will authorize \$150 million for the next 2 years to be used for juvenile delinquency prevention programs. It is an improvement over the existing Juvenile Delinquency Control and Prevention Act of 1968, for it specifies that at least 80 percent of the money must be used for local youth service programs, rather than for Federal projects like conferences and research projects. It also requires that the money be used in areas of high youth crime and unem-

ployment; in other words, where the money is needed the most.

The bill also attempts to sort out the typical administrative mess of such programs by limiting the use of the funds to projects outside the traditional juvenile court system, leaving that area to the Justice Department, which administers the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

The bill is a good bill, but before we congratulate ourselves and go home to our children, let us think about the appropriations that may result.

Each year, the Nixon administration has requested less money than the Congress has authorized for the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1968. The Congress, in turn, has appropriated even less. As a result, the total authorization for the act from 1969-71 has been \$150 million, while the total appropriation for those years has been a mere \$30 million.

In addition, most grants under the new bill will have but a 3-year life. After that time, the projects will be required to find their own funding.

I will vote for the bill, Mr. Speaker, because, as I have said, it is a good bill. My complaint with it is that it is hardly enough.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15635, extending for 2 years the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act. Like the author of the bill, Mr. PUCINSKI, I hope these amendments will encourage HEW and the Justice Department to bury the hatchet in their longstanding jurisdictional war over juvenile delinquency programs.

Federal programs to prevent and control juvenile delinquency have proliferated over the years, but there has been little coordination and little attempt to make available to juvenile court judges and probation workers the results of federally funded programs.

A few months ago the House passed H.R. 45, a bill I sponsored along with Congressman RAILSBACK of Illinois, to establish an independent Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. Modeled after the highly successful FBI training institute, the Institute is designed to train personnel working in the field of juvenile justice, and to serve as a clearinghouse for information about new programs and ideas developed under legislation such as the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act.

The most important function of the Institute will be to provide training. Fully one-fifth of the juvenile court judges in the country have no legal training. The President's Crime Commission in 1966 recommended that juvenile specialists should be present to aid in the disposition of juvenile first offenders, yet they also found that barely 5 percent of all the personnel employed in State juvenile facilities were professionally trained treatment personnel.

The Institute proposed in H.R. 45 will not compete with the programs funded by HEW under the bill before us today, or with those funded by the Justice Department. Rather it will complement them, and insure that what is learned

in those programs will be put to use in the courtrooms and probation offices and juvenile homes around the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we could make no better social investment than attempting to prevent and control juvenile crime fully two-thirds of all major crime arrests involve people under 21 years old. The recidivism rate among juvenile offenders is the highest of any group—nearly 75 percent. We ought to be able to reach first offenders and move them away from a life of crime, making productive citizens out of the individuals involved and making the streets safer for all of us in the process.

The bill before the House today can help move us toward that goal. I commend the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership in bringing H.R. 15635 before the House, and urge the bill be passed.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the programs carried out under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act are most important to our communities, and I certainly support this bill extending that act for an additional 2 years. I support and commend the committee for including provisions in this legislation especially encouraging programs that go beyond the traditional juvenile justice system. In particular, I note that the bill urges that the schools be included in the task of preventing juvenile delinquency.

As many Members of this House and the Committee on Education and Labor are aware, I have been particularly concerned about the rising incidence and impact of acts of crime and violence in the schools, and last year I originated the Safe Schools Act which would provide Federal financial assistance to the schools for the purpose of better assuring the safety and security of school students, staff, and property.

The fact that the legislation currently before the House specifically recognizes the needs and potential role of the schools in juvenile delinquency prevention is a step in the right direction toward ending the terror and fear that reigns in many of our schools as a result of high incidences of violence. Prevention is an essential element in our total effort to restore an atmosphere in our schools that is free of fear and conducive to creativity and learning, and I wholeheartedly support programs like those made possible by this legislation which focus on the preventive aspects of juvenile crime.

But we have done too little too late as far as preventing juvenile crime is concerned, and as a result many of our schools are now faced with rampant crime and disorder. Such schools have a need not just for preventive programs, but for programs of security to protect innocent students and school personnel against crimes that are being committed now, every day, in the schools—crimes which our programs of prevention have failed to deter.

With that in mind, I hope and trust that the distinguished Committee on Education and Labor will not stop with this legislation as far as helping the schools and our school people. I hope that the committee will see the need to

provide schools with funds to deal with the immediate fact of crime in the schools as well as with preventing it for the future. The Safe Schools Act which I originated and introduced with the co-sponsorship of the distinguished chairman and a number of members of the Education and Labor Committee, would provide Federal aid for this purpose, and I take this opportunity not only to commend the committee for the recognition of the problems of the schools contained in the legislation now before us, but to urge the committee to follow up this legislation by bringing the Safe Schools Act or similar legislation to improve immediate security in the schools to the floor of the House for action in the near future.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill H.R. 15635, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. This bill would assist elementary and secondary schools, community agencies, and other public and nonprofit private agencies in the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Having actively participated in the development of this bill in the Education and Labor Committee and as a cosponsor of the measure, I am delighted that the main thrust of the bill is directed at preventing juvenile delinquency rather than merely taking action after a youngster is already involved in a crime. The advantages to the young person and society in general from this course of action are patently obvious.

First, it is an established fact that institutionalized youthful offenders have a higher rate of recidivism than any other age group. This is partially because once a juvenile is labeled as a "delinquent" or a "troublemaker" he has already severed the bonds between himself and society. Once that occurs the juvenile is much more prone to repeat his delinquent acts.

Second, from the standpoint of society as a whole the costs of operating preventive programs are actually much less than the costs of rehabilitating a youth who has become delinquent in the sense of having been arrested and convicted. We must, therefore, act to prevent a youngster from becoming delinquent rather than react to him after he is already in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, the incidence of juvenile crime in this country has reached epidemic proportions. In the last decade, for example, the arrests of juveniles for violent crimes have increased by 167 percent. Moreover, the arrests of juveniles for property crimes, such as burglary and auto theft, have jumped 89 percent. Finally, almost two-thirds of all arrests for serious crimes are of young people under the age of 21. Surely, the time for preventive action by the Congress is here and I believe that this legislation is a giant step in the right direction.

This bill authorizes a yearly appropriation of \$75 million with at least 80 percent of the funds being spent assisting local youth services programs, in coordination with local schools, in an effort to

prevent delinquency. In addition, up to 20 percent of the funds could be used for training, technical assistance and information services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure in order that we may get on with the fight against juvenile delinquency and deter the youth of America from a life of crime.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15635 because of the obvious merit of the proposal and also because I think it makes possible the type of grant that I have sought over a long period of time to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach moral and ethical principles. I think legislation of this sort is very much needed and I sincerely hope that this new legislation will make possible that type of grant and I assume that this is the case and, therefore, enthusiastically support this legislation. The legislation which I have previously introduced reads as follows and in fact is the wording of H.R. 527, which I introduced on January 22, 1971:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"GRANTS FOR TEACHING MORAL AND ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

"SEC. 810. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and carrying out programs under which students attending public elementary and secondary schools will be provided instruction in moral and ethical principles. The content and nature of such instruction shall conform to general standards prescribed by such State agencies.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years."

SEC. 2. Section 804 of such Act is amended by inserting after "this Act" the following: "(other than section 810)".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15635 as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 338, nays 12, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

YEAS—338

Abbutt	Fish	Mazzoli
Abernethy	Fisher	Meeds
Abzug	Flood	Melcher
Adams	Foley	Michel
Addabbo	Ford, Gerald R.	Mikva
Alexander	Ford,	Miller, Ohio
Anderson	William D.	Mills, Md.
Anderson, Calif.	Forsythe	Minish
Anderson, Ill.	Fountain	Mink
Andrews	Fraser	Mizell
N. Dak.	Frelinghuysen	Mollohan
Annunzio	Frenzel	Monagan
Archer	Frey	Montgomery
Arendis	Gallfanakis	Moorhead
Ashley	Garmatz	Morgan
Aspin	Gaydos	Moss
Aspinall	Gettys	Murphy, Ill.
Badillo	Gibbons	Murphy, N.Y.
Baker	Gonzalez	Myers
Barrett	Gooding	Natcher
Begich	Grasso	Nedzi
Belcher	Gray	Nelsen
Bell	Green, Pa.	Nichols
Bennett	Griffin	Nix
Betts	Griffiths	Obey
Bevill	Grover	O'Hara
Biaggi	Gubser	O'Neill
Blester	Gude	Patman
Bingham	Haley	Patten
Blackburn	Hamilton	Perkins
Boland	Hammer-	Peysers
Bow	schmidt	Pickle
Brademas	Hanley	Plke
Brasco	Hanna	Pirnie
Bray	Hansen, Idaho	Poage
Brinkley	Harrington	Poff
Brooks	Harsha	Powell
Brotzman	Harvey	Preyer, N.C.
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Price, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hathaway	Price, Tex.
Broyhill, Va.	Hawkins	Pucinski
Buchanan	Hays	Quie
Burke, Fla.	Hechler, W. Va.	Quillen
Burke, Mass.	Heckler, Mass.	Rallsback
Burleson, Tex.	Heinz	Randall
Burton	Helstoski	Rangel
Byrne, Pa.	Henderson	Rees
Byrnes, Wis.	Hicks, Mass.	Reld
Byron	Hicks, Wash.	Reuss
Cabell	Hillis	Rhodes
Caffery	Hogan	Riegler
Carey, N.Y.	Holifield	Roberts
Carlson	Horton	Robinson, Va.
Carney	Hosmer	Rodino
Carter	Hull	Roe
Casey, Tex.	Hungate	Rogers
Cederberg	Hunt	Roncallo
Chamberlain	Jacobs	Rooney, N.Y.
Clancy	Jarman	Rooney, Pa.
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Rosenthal
Clausen,	Johnson, Pa.	Rostenkowski
Don H.	Jones, N.C.	Roush
Clawson, Del.	Karth	Roy
Cleveland	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Collier	Kazen	Runnels
Collins, Ill.	Keating	Ruppe
Collins, Tex.	Kee	Ruth
Conable	Keith	Sandman
Conover	Kemp	Satterfield
Conte	King	Saylor
Conyers	Kluczynski	Scherle
Corman	Koch	Scheuer
Cotter	Kuykendall	Schneebell
Coughlin	Kyl	Schwengel
Culver	Kyros	Scott
Daniel, Va.	Latta	Sebellus
Daniels, N.J.	Leggett	Shoup
Danielson	Lennon	Shriver
Davis, S.C.	Lent	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	Lloyd	Sisk
de la Garza	Lujan	Skubitz
Delienback	McClary	Slack
Dellums	McCloskey	Smith, Calif.
Denholm	McCormack	Smith, Iowa
Dennis	McCulloch	Smith, N.Y.
Dent	McDade	Snyder
Derwinski	McEwen	Springer
Devine	McFall	Staggers
Dickinson	McKay	Stanton
Dingell	McKinney	J. William
Dorn	Macdonald,	Stanton,
Downing	Mass.	James V.
Drinan	Madden	Steed
Duncan	Mahon	Steele
Edmondson	Malliard	Stevens
Edwards, Calif.	Mallary	Stratton
Ellberg	Mann	Stubblefield
Erlenborn	Martin	Symington
Esch	Mathias, Calif.	Talcott
Eshleman	Mathis, Ga.	Taylor
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Teague, Calif.
Fascell	Mayne	Teague, Tex.

Terry	Waldie	Wolf
Thompson, Ga.	Wampler	Wright
Thompson, N.J.	Ware	Wyatt
Thomson, Wis.	Whalen	Wyder
Thone	White	Wylie
Tiernan	Whitehurst	Wyman
Udall	Whitten	Yates
Ullman	Widnall	Yatron
Van Deerlin	Wiggins	Young, Fla.
Vander Jagt	Williams	Young, Tex.
Vanik	Wilson, Bob	Zablocki
Veysey	Wilson,	Zion
Vigorito	Charles H.	Zwach
Waggonner	Winn	

NAYS—12

Ashbrook	Green, Oreg.	Long, Md.
Camp	Gross	McCollister
Crane	Hall	Schmitz
Gialmo	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.

NOT VOTING—82

Abourezk	Eckhardt	Metcalfe
Anderson,	Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Tenn.	Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.
Andrews, Ala.	Findley	Minshall
Baring	Flowers	Mitchell
Bergland	Flynt	Mosher
Blanton	Fulton	O'Konski
Blatnik	Fuqua	Passman
Boggs	Gallagher	Pelly
Bolling	Goldwater	Pepper
Broomfield	Hagan	Pettis
Broyhill, N.C.	Halpern	Podell
Burlison, Mo.	Hansen, Wash.	Pryor, Ark.
Celler	Hébert	Purcell
Chappell	Howard	Rarick
Chisholm	Hutchinson	Robison, N.Y.
Clay	Ichord	Rousselot
Colmer	Jonas	Ryan
Curlin	Jones, Ala.	St Germain
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Tenn.	Sarbanes
Delaney	Landrum	Seiberling
Diggs	Link	Shipey
Donohue	Long, La.	Spence
Dow	McClure	Steiger, Wis.
Dowdy	McDonald,	Stokes
Dulski	Mich.	Stuckey
du Pont	McKevitt	Sullivan
Dwyer	McMillan	Whalley

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Robison of New York.
Mrs. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. McKevitt.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Shipey with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Celler with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Rousselot.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. du Pont.
Mr. Howard with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Spence.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Link with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Passman.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Sarbanes.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Curlin.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Abourezk.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Seiberling.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Bergland.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Poedel.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPREHENSIVE OLDER AMERICANS SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15657) to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15657

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972".

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 101. The Congress finds that millions of older citizens in this Nation are suffering unnecessary harm from the lack of adequate services. It is therefore the purpose of this Act, in support of the objectives of the Older Americans Act of 1965, to—

(1) make available comprehensive programs which include a full range of health, education, and social services to our older citizens who need them,

(2) give full and special consideration to older citizens with special needs in planning such programs, and, pending the availability of such programs for all older citizens, give priority to the elderly with the greatest economic and social need,

(3) provide comprehensive programs which will assure the coordinated delivery of a full range of essential services to our older citizens, and, where applicable, also furnish meaningful employment opportunities for many individuals, including older persons, young persons, and volunteers from the community, and

(4) insure that the planning and operation of such programs will be undertaken as a partnership of older citizens, parents, community, and community, State and local governments, with appropriate assistance from the Federal Government.

SEC. 102. Section 101(8) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after "services" the following: ", including access to low-cost transportation."

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION ON AGING RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMISSIONER ON AGING

SEC. 201. (a) Section 201(b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Commissioner on Aging shall be the principal officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for carrying out this Act. In the performance of his functions, he shall be directly responsible to the Secretary and not to or through any other officer of that Department. The Commissioner shall not delegate any of his functions to any other officer who is not directly responsible to him unless he first submits a plan for such delegation to the Congress. Such delegation is effective at the end of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date on which the plan for such delegation is transmitted to it, unless, between the day of transmittal and the end of the thirty-day period either House passes a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such delegation. For the purpose of this section, continuity of session is

broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the thirty-day period. Under provisions contained in a reorganization plan, a provision of the plan may be effective at a time later than the date on which the plan otherwise is effective;

(b) (1) Section 202(3) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof ", except for title V. thereof". Section 202 of such Act is further amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (7), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(9) develop basic policies and set priorities with respect to the development and operation of programs and activities related to the purpose of this Act;

"(10) provide for the coordination of Federal programs and activities related to such purposes;

"(11) coordinate, and assist in, the planning and development by public (including Federal, State, and local) and nonprofit private agencies of programs for older persons, with a view to the establishment of a nationwide network of comprehensive, coordinated services and opportunities for such persons,

"(12) call conferences of such authorities and officials of public (including Federal, State, and local) and nonprofit private agencies or organizations concerned with the development and operation of programs for older persons as the Commissioner deems necessary or proper for the development and implementation of policies related to the purposes of this Act;

"(13) develop and operate programs providing services and opportunities related to the purposes of this Act which are not otherwise provided by existing programs for older persons;

"(14) carry on a continuing evaluation of the programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act, with particular attention to the impact of medicare and medicaid, the Age Discrimination Act, and the programs of the National Housing Act relating to housing for the elderly and the setting of standards for the licensing of nursing homes, intermediate care homes, and other facilities providing care for older people;

"(15) provide information and assistance to private nonprofit agencies and institutions for the establishment and operation by them of programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act; and

"(16) develop, in coordination with other agencies, a national plan for meeting the needs for trained personnel in the field of aging, and for training persons for carrying out programs related to the purposes of this Act, and conduct and provide for the conducting of such training."

(2) Section 202(4) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) develop plans, conduct and arrange for research in the field of aging, and assist in the establishment of and carry out programs designed to meet the needs of older persons for social services, including nutrition, hospitalization, preretirement training, continuing education, low-cost transportation and housing, and health services;"

(3) Section 202 of the Act (as amended by the preceding provisions of this subsection) is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC 202.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In executing his duties and functions under this Act and carrying out the programs and activities provided for by this Act, the Commissioner shall take all possible steps to encourage and permit voluntary groups active in social services, including youth organizations active at the high school

and college levels, to participate and be involved individually and through representative groups in such programs and activities to the maximum extent feasible, through employment, through the performance of advisory or consultative functions, and in other appropriate ways."

(c) Title II of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"FEDERAL AGENCY COOPERATION

"SEC. 293. Federal agencies proposing to establish programs related to the purposes of this Act shall consult with the Administration on Aging prior to the establishment of such programs, and Federal agencies administering such programs shall cooperate with the Administration on Aging in carrying them out.

"INFORMATION AND RESOURCE CENTER FOR THE AGING

"SEC. 204. (a) There is hereby established, within the Administration on Aging, a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging (hereinafter referred to as the 'Center'). The Center shall have a Director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Center to carry out its duties and functions.

"(b) (1) It shall be the duty and function of the Center to collect, review, organize, publish, and disseminate (through publications, conferences, workshops, or technical consultation) information and data related to the particular problems caused by aging, including information describing measures which are or may be employed for meeting or overcoming such problems, with a view to assisting older individuals, and organizations and persons interested in the welfare of older persons. In meeting problems which are peculiar to or are made more difficult for, older individuals.

"(2) The Center shall also (A) act as a clearinghouse for referrals to and from the information and referral sources required by section 305(a)(8), (B) provide information on a case-by-case basis either directly to individuals or to individuals through such sources, and (C) coordinate the activities of such centers to assure their maximum effectiveness.

"(3) The information and data with respect to which the Center shall carry out its duties and functions under paragraph (1) shall include (but not be limited to) information and data with respect to the following—

"(A) medical and rehabilitation facilities and services, including medicare, medicaid, and other programs operating under the Social Security Act;

"(B) education;

"(C) vocational training;

"(D) employment;

"(E) transportation;

"(F) architecture and housing (including household appliances and equipment);

"(G) recreation;

"(H) public or private programs established for, or which may be used in, solving problems of older persons; and

"(I) methods of involving older persons in the planning and administration of programs designed to meet their needs.

"(c) (1) The Secretary shall make available to the Center all information and data, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which may be useful in carrying out the duties and functions of the Center.

"(2) Each other department or agency of the Federal Government is authorized to make available to the Secretary, for use by the Center, any information or data which the Commissioner may request for such use.

"(3) The Commissioner shall, to the maximum extent feasible, enter into arrangements whereby State and other public and private agencies and institutions having information

or data which is useful to the Center in carrying out its duties and functions will make such information and data available for use by the Center.

"(d) There is authorized to be appropriated \$750,000 for carrying out this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each succeeding fiscal year ending before July 1, 1975, such sums as may be necessary.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE AGING

"Sec. 205. (a) There is established a National Advisory Council on the Aging to be composed of fifteen members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for terms of three years without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code. Members shall be appointed so as to be representative of older Americans, national organizations with an interest in aging, business, labor, and the general public. At least five of the members shall themselves be older persons.

"(b) (1) Of the members first appointed, five shall be appointed for a term of one year, five shall be appointed for a term of two years, and five shall be appointed for a term of three years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

"(2) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. Members shall be eligible for reappointment and may serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors have taken office.

"(3) Any vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner by which the original appointment was made.

"(4) Members of the Council shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates not to exceed the rate specified at the times of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including traveltime, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(c) The President shall designate the Chairman from among the members appointed to the Council. The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than four times a year. The Secretary and the Commissioner on Aging shall be ex officio members of the Council.

"(d) The Council shall—

"(1) advise and assist the President as he may direct on matters relating to the special needs of older Americans;

"(2) assist the Commissioner in making the appraisal of needs required by section 402;

"(3) review and evaluate programs and activities conducted or assisted by departments and agencies of the Federal Government with particular emphasis upon identifying unsolved special problems of older Americans; and

"(4) make recommendations to the President, to the Secretary, the Commissioner, and to the Congress for the establishment of new programs and activities for older Americans in view of the evaluation conducted by the Council.

"(e) The Secretary and the Commissioner shall make available to the Council such staff, information, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its activities.

"(f) Beginning with the year 1974, the Council shall make such interim reports as it deems advisable and an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President not later than March 31 of each year. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(g) The Council shall undertake a study of the interrelationships of benefit programs for the elderly operated by Federal, State, and local government agencies. Following the completion of this study, the President shall submit to Congress no later than eighteen months after the enactment of this Act recommendations for bringing about greater uniformity of eligibility standards, and for eliminating the negative impact that one program's standards may have on another.

"(h) The Council shall undertake a study of the combined impact of all taxes on the elderly—including but not limited to income, property, sales, social security. Upon completion of this study, but no later than eighteen months after enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress, and to the Governor and legislatures of the States, the results thereof and such recommendations as he deems necessary.

"ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

"Sec. 206. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to provide consultative services and technical assistance to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions; to provide short-term training and technical instruction; to conduct research and demonstrations; and to collect, prepare, publish, and disseminate special educational or informational materials, including reports of the projects for which funds are provided under this Act and to provide staff and other technical assistance to the President's Council on Aging.

"(b) In administering his functions under this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit private agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Commissioner and the head thereof, and to pay therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in the agreement.

"(c) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

"EVALUATION

"Sec. 207. (a) The Secretary shall measure and evaluate the impact of all programs authorized by this Act, their effectiveness in achieving stated goals in general, and in relation to their cost, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for delivery of services, including, where appropriate, comparisons with appropriate control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs. Evaluations shall be conducted by persons not immediately involved in the administration of the program or project evaluated.

"(b) Before funds are released for the programs and projects covered by this Act, the Secretary shall develop and publish general standards for evaluation of the program and project effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this Act. Reports submitted pursuant to section 208 shall describe the actions taken as a result of these evaluations.

"(c) In carrying out evaluations under this title, the Secretary shall, whenever possible, arrange to obtain the opinions of program and project participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs and projects.

"(d) The Secretary shall publish the results of evaluative research and evaluations of program and project impact and effectiveness no later than sixty days after the completion thereof.

"(e) The Secretary shall take the necessary action to assure that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds shall become the property of the United States.

"(f) Such information as the Secretary may deem necessary for purposes of the evaluations conducted under this title shall be made available to him, upon request, by the agencies of the executive branch.

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to use such sums as required, but not to exceed 1 per centum of the funds appropriated under this Act, or \$1,000,000 whichever is greater, to be available to conduct program and project evaluations (directly, or by grants or contracts) as required by this title. In the case of allotments from such an appropriation, the amount available for such allotments (and the amount deemed appropriated therefor) shall be reduced accordingly.

"REPORTS

"Sec. 208. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on the activities carried out under this Act. Such annual reports shall include statistical data reflecting services and activities provided individuals during the preceding fiscal year.

"JOINT FUNDING OF PROJECTS

"Sec. 209. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to an agency, organization, institution, or person assisted under this Act, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

"ADVANCE FUNDING

"Sec. 210. (a) For the purpose of affording adequate notice of funding available under this Act, appropriations under this Act are authorized to be included in the appropriation Act for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which they are available for obligation.

"(b) In order to effect a transition to the advance funding method of timing appropriation action, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding that its initial application will result in the enactment in the same year (whether in the same appropriation Act or otherwise) two separate appropriations, one for the then current fiscal year and one for the succeeding fiscal year."

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR STATE AND AREA PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. The Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by striking out title III and inserting in lieu thereof the following new title:

"TITLE III—GRANTS FOR STATE AND AREA PROGRAMS

"PURPOSE

"Sec. 301. It is the purpose of this title to encourage and assist State or local agencies to concentrate resources in order to develop greater capacity and foster the development of comprehensive and coordinated service systems to serve older persons by entering into new cooperative arrangements with each other and with providers of social services for planning for the provision of, and providing, social services and, where necessary, to reorganize or reassign functions, in order to—

"(1) secure and maintain maximum independence and dignity in a home environment for older persons capable of self-care with appropriate supportive services; and

"(2) remove individual and social barriers to economic and personal independence for older persons.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 302. For purposes of this title—
 "(1) The term 'social services' means any of the following services which meet such standards as the Commissioner may prescribe:

"(A) health, continuing education, welfare, informational, recreational, homemaker, counseling, or referral services;

"(B) transportation services where necessary to facilitate access to social services;

"(C) services designed to encourage and assist older persons to use the facilities and services available to them;

"(D) services designed to assist older persons to obtain adequate housing; or

"(E) any other services;

if such services are necessary for the general welfare of older persons.

"(2) The term 'unit of general purpose local government' means (A) a political subdivision of the State whose authority is broad and general and is not limited to only one function or a combination of related functions, or (B) an Indian tribal organization.

"(3) The term 'comprehensive and coordinated system' means a system for providing all necessary social services in a manner designed to—

"(A) facilitate accessibility to and utilization of all social services provided within the geographic area served by such system by any public or private agency or organization;

"(B) develop and make the most efficient use of social services in meeting the needs of older persons; and

"(C) use available resources efficiently and with a minimum of duplication.

"AREA PLANNING AND SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 303. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975 to enable the Commissioner to make grants to each State with a State plan approved under section 305 for paying part of the cost (pursuant to subsection (e) of this section) of—

"(1) the administration of area plans by area agencies on aging designated pursuant to section 304(a)(2)(A), including the preparation of area plans on aging consistent with section 304(c) and the evaluation of activities carried out under such plans; and

"(2) the development of comprehensive and coordinated systems for the delivery of social services.

"(b) (1) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of this section, each State shall be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to such sum as the population aged sixty or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty or over in all States, except that, for the fiscal year for which the determination is made, (A) the amount allotted to each State shall not be less than \$250,000, and (B) Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall each be allotted an amount of not less than \$50,000. For the purpose of the exception contained in this paragraph, the term 'State' does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(2) The number of persons aged sixty or over in any State and for all States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent and satisfactory data available to him.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner determines that any amount allotted to a State for a fiscal year under this section will not be used by such State for carrying out the purpose for which the allotment was made, he shall make such amount available for carrying out such purpose to one or more other States to the extent he determines such other States will be able to use such additional amount for carrying out such purpose. Any amount made available to a State from an appropriation for a fiscal year pursuant to the preceding sentence shall, for purposes of this title, be regarded as part of such State's allotment (as determined

under the preceding provisions of this section) for such year.

"(d) The allotment of a State under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, shall remain available until the close of the following fiscal year.

"(e) From a State's allotment under this section for a fiscal year—

"(1) such amount as the State agency determines, but not more than 15 per centum thereof, shall be available for paying such percentage as such agency determines, but not more than 75 per centum, of the cost of administration of area plans; and

"(2) such amount as the State agency determines, but not more than 20 per centum thereof, shall be available for paying such percentage as such agency determines, but not more than 75 per centum, of the cost of social services which are not provided as a part of a comprehensive and coordinated system.

The remainder of such allotment shall be available to such State only for paying such percentage as the State agency determines, but not more than 90 per centum of the cost of social services provided in the State as a part of comprehensive and coordinated systems in planning and service areas for which there is an area plan approved by the State agency.

"ORGANIZATION

"STATE ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 304. (a) In order for a State to be eligible to participate in the programs of grants to States from allotments under section 303 and section 306—

"(1) The State shall, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, designate a State agency as the sole State agency (hereinafter in this title referred to as 'the State agency') to: (A) develop the State plan to be submitted to the Commissioner for approval under section 305, (B) administer the State plan within such State, (C) be primarily responsible for the coordination of all State activities related to the purposes of this Act, (D) review and comment on, at the request of any Federal department or agency, any application from any agency or organization within such State to such Federal department or agency for assistance related to meeting the needs of older persons; and (E) divide the entire State into district areas (hereinafter in this title referred to as 'planning and service areas'), after considering the geographical distribution of individuals sixty and over in the State, the incidence of the need for social services, the distribution of resources available to provide such services, the boundaries of existing areas within the State which were drawn for the planning or administration of social services programs, the location of units of general purpose local government within the State, and any other relevant factors: *Provided*, That any unit of general purpose local government which has an existing office on aging and includes 25 per centum of the State's population age sixty and older shall be designated as a planning and service area; and

"(2) The State agency designated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

"(A) determine for which planning and service areas an area plan will be developed, in accordance with subsection (c) of this section, and for each such area designate, after consideration of the views offered by the unit or units of general purpose local government in such area, a public or nonprofit private agency or organization as the area agency on aging for such area; and

"(B) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that the State agency will take into account, in connection with matters of general policy arising in the development and administration of the State plan for any fiscal year, the views of recipients of social services provided under such plan.

"Area Organization

"(b) In order to be eligible for designation under subsection (a), an area agency on aging—

"(1) must be—

"(A) an agency of a unit of general purpose local government,

"(B) an agency designated to act on behalf of a combination of such units, or

"(C) a public or nonprofit private agency or organization which can engage in the planning or provision of a broad range of social services within a planning and service area, and

"(2) must provide assurance, found adequate by the State agency, that it will have the ability to develop an area plan and carry out, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, a program pursuant to the plan within the planning and service area.

In designating an area agency on aging, the State agency shall give preference to an agency of a unit of general purpose local government, unless the State agency finds that no such agency within the planning and service area will have the capacity to carry out the area plan.

"Area plans

"(c) In order to be approved by the State agency, an area plan for a planning and service area shall be developed by the area agency on aging designated with respect to such area under subsection (a) and shall—

"(1) provide for the establishment of a comprehensive and coordinated system for the delivery of social services within the planning and service area covered by the plan, including determining the need for social services in such area, evaluating the effectiveness of the use of resources in meeting such need, and entering into agreements with providers of social services in such area, for the provision of such services to meet such need;

"(2) in accordance with criteria, established by the Commissioner by regulation, relating to priorities, provide for the initiation, expansion, or improvement of social services in the planning and service area covered by the area plan; and

"(3) provide that the area agency on aging will—

"(A) conduct periodic evaluations of activities carried out pursuant to the area plan;

"(B) render appropriate technical assistance to providers of social services in the planning and service area covered by the area plan; and

"(C) take into account, in connection with matters of general policy arising in the development and administration of the area plan, the views of recipients of services under such plan.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 305. (a) In order for a State to be eligible for grants for a fiscal year from its allotments under section 303 and section 306, except as provided in section 307(a), it shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan for such year which meets such criteria as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation and which—

"(1) provides that the State agency will evaluate the need for social services within the State and determine the extent to which existing public or private programs meet such need;

"(2) provides for the use of such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Commissioner shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of an individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan;

"(3) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information, as the Commis-

sioner may from time to time require, and comply with such requirements as the Commissioner may impose to assure the correctness of such reports;

"(4) provides that the State agency will conduct periodic evaluations of activities and projects carried out under the State plan;

"(5) establishes objectives, consistent with the purposes of this title, toward which activities under the plan will be directed, identifies obstacles to the attainment of those objectives, and indicates how it proposes to overcome those obstacles;

"(6) provides that preference shall be given, in establishing objectives under the State plan, to areas with large concentrations of older persons;

"(7) provides that each area agency on aging designated pursuant to section 304(a) (2) (A) will develop and submit to the State agency for approval an area plan which complies with section 304(c); and

"(8) provides for establishing and maintaining information and referral sources in sufficient numbers to assure that all older persons in the State will have reasonably convenient access to such sources. For purposes of this section, an information and referral source is a location where the State or a political subdivision (1) maintains current information with respect to the opportunities and services available to older persons, and develops current lists of older persons in need of services and opportunities, and (2) employs a specially trained staff to inform older persons of the opportunities and services which are available, and assists such persons to take advantage of such opportunities and services."

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which he finds fulfills the requirements of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan, or any modification thereof, or make a final determination that a State is ineligible under section 304, without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(d) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

"(1) the State is no longer eligible under section 304,

"(2) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

"(3) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments from its allotments under section 303 and section 306 will be made to the State (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State from its allotments under section 303 and section 306 (or payments shall be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure). The Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations he may prescribe, disburse the funds so withheld directly to any public or nonprofit private organization or agency or political subdivision of such State. Any such payment or payments shall be matched in the proportions specified in sections 303 and 306.

"(e) A State which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b), (c), or (d) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The

Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Commissioner may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

"PLANNING, COORDINATION, EVALUATION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"Sec. 306. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, to make grants to States for paying such percentage as each State agency determines, but not more than 75 per centum of the cost of the administration of its State plan, including the preparation of the State plan the evaluation of activities carried out under such plan, the collection of data and the carrying out of analyses related to the need for social services within the State, the dissemination of information so obtained, the provision of technical assistance to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations engaged in activities related to the problems of older persons, and the carrying out of demonstration projects of statewide significance relating to the initiation, expansion, or improvement of social services.

"(b) (1) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of this section, each State shall be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to such sum as the population aged sixty or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty or over in all States, except that (A) no State shall be allotted less than one-half of 1 per centum of the sum appropriated for the fiscal year for which the determination is made, or \$200,000, whichever is greater, and (B) Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall each be allotted an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum of the sum appropriated for the fiscal year for which the determination is made, or \$50,000 whichever is greater. For the purpose of the exception contained in this paragraph, the term 'State' does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(2) The number of persons aged sixty or over in any State and for all States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (b) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for that year shall be reallocated, from time to time and on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection

(b) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Such reallocations shall be made on the basis of the State plan so approved, after taking into consideration the population aged sixty or over. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (b) for that year.

"PAYMENTS

"Sec. 307. (a) Payments of grants or contracts under this title may be made (after necessary adjustments on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, as the Commissioner may determine. From a State's allotment for a fiscal year which is available pursuant to section 306 the Commissioner may advance to a State which does not have a State plan approved under section 305 such amounts as he deems appropriate for the purpose of assisting such State in developing a State plan.

"(b) Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, not less than 25 per centum of the non-Federal share (pursuant to section 303 (e)) of the total expenditures under the State plan shall be met from funds from State or local public sources.

"(c) A State's allotment under section 303 for a fiscal year shall be reduced by the percentage (if any) by which its expenditures for such year from State sources under its State plan approved under section 305 are less than its expenditures from such sources for the preceding fiscal year.

"MODEL PROJECTS

"Sec. 308. (a) The Commissioner may, after consultation with the State agency, make grants to or contracts with any public or nonprofit private agency or organization within such State for paying part or all of the cost of developing or operating statewide, regional, metropolitan area, county, city, or community model projects which will expand or improve social services or otherwise promote the well-being of older persons.

"(b) For the purposes of carrying out this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

TITLE I—TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Sec. 401. The Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by striking out titles IV and V and by inserting immediately after title III the following new title:

"TITLE IV—TRAINING AND RESEARCH

"PART A—TRAINING

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 401. The purpose of this part is to improve the quality of service and to help meet critical shortages of adequately trained personnel for programs in the field of aging by (1) developing information on the actual needs for personnel to work in the field of aging, both present and long range; (2) providing a broad range of quality training and retraining opportunities, responsive to changing needs of programs in the field of aging; (3) attracting a greater number of qualified persons into the field of aging; and (4) helping to make personnel training programs more responsive to the need for trained personnel in the field of aging.

"APPRAISING PERSONNEL NEEDS IN THE FIELD OF AGING

"Sec. 402. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time appraise the Nation's existing and future personnel needs in the field of aging, at all levels and in all types of

programs, and the adequacy of the Nation's efforts to meet these needs. In developing information relating to personnel needs in the field of aging, the Commissioner shall consult with, and make maximum utilization of statistical and other related information of the Department of Labor, the Office of Education, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, State educational agencies, other State and local public agencies and offices dealing with problems of the aging, State employment security agencies, and other appropriate public and private agencies.

"(b) The Commissioner shall prepare and publish annually a report on the professions dealing with the problems of the aging, in which he shall present in detail his view on the state of such professions and the trends which he discerns with respect to the future complexion of programs for the aging throughout the Nation and the funds and the needs for well-educated personnel to staff such programs. The report shall indicate the Commissioner's plans concerning the allocation of Federal assistance under this title in relation to the plans and programs of other Federal agencies.

"ATTRACTING QUALIFIED PERSONS TO THE FIELD OF AGING

"SEC. 403. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to State agencies referred to in section 304, State or local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, and he is authorized to enter into contracts with any agency, institution, or organization for the purpose of—

"(1) publicizing available opportunities for careers in the field of aging;

"(2) encouraging qualified persons to enter or reenter the field of aging;

"(3) encouraging artists, craftsmen, artisans, scientists, and persons from other professions and vocations and homemakers, to undertake assignments on a part-time basis or for temporary periods in the field of aging; or

"(4) the preparation and dissemination of materials, including audiovisual materials and printed materials, for use in recruitment and training of persons employed or preparing for employment in carrying out programs related to the purposes of this Act.

"TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PERSONNEL IN THE FIELD OF AGING

"SEC. 404. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution or with State agencies referred to in section 304, or contracts with any agency, organization, or institution, to assist them in training persons who are employed or preparing for employment in fields related to the purposes of this Act—

"(1) to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study (including short-term or regular session institutes and other inservice and preservice training programs),

"(2) for establishing and maintaining fellowships to train persons to be supervisors or trainers of persons employed or preparing for employment in fields related to the purposes of this Act,

"(3) for seminars, conferences, symposiums, and workshops in the field of aging, including the conduct of conferences and other meetings for the purposes of facilitating exchange of information and stimulating new approaches with respect to activities related to the purposes of this Act.

"(4) for the improvement of programs for preparing personnel for careers in the field of aging, including design, development, and evaluation of exemplary training programs, introduction of high quality and more effective curricula and curricula materials, and

"(5) the provision of increased opportunities for practical experience.

"(b) The Commissioner may include in the terms of any contract or grant under this part provisions authorizing the payment, to persons participating in training programs supported under this part, of such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine which shall be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs. Where the Commissioner provides for the use of funds under this section for fellowships, he shall (in addition to stipends for the recipients) pay to the institution of higher education in which the fellowship is being pursued such amounts as the Commissioner shall determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"PART B—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

"DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 411. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution and contracts with any agency, organization, or institution or with any individual for the purpose of—

"(1) studying current patterns and conditions of living of older persons and identify factors which are beneficial or detrimental to the wholesome and meaningful living of such persons;

"(2) developing or demonstrating new approaches, techniques, and methods (including the use of multipurpose centers) which hold promise of substantial contribution toward wholesome and meaningful living for older persons;

"(3) developing or demonstrating approaches, methods, and techniques for achieving or improving coordination of community services for older persons;

"(4) evaluating these approaches, techniques, and methods, as well as others which may assist older persons to enjoy wholesome and meaningful living and to continue to contribute to the strength and welfare of our Nation;

"(5) collecting and disseminating, through publications and other appropriate means, information concerning research findings, demonstration results, and other materials developed in connection with activities assisted under this part; or

"(6) conducting conferences and other meetings for the purposes of facilitating exchange of information and stimulating new approaches with respect to activities related to the purposes of this part.

"PART C—MULTIDISCIPLINARY CENTERS OF GERONTOLOGY

"SEC. 421. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants for the purpose of establishing multidisciplinary centers of gerontology or supporting such existing centers. A grant may be made under this section only if the application therefor is approved by the Commissioner upon his determination that the application—

"(1) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend the full amount of the grant to establish or support a multidisciplinary center of gerontology which shall—

"(A) recruit and train personnel at the professional and subprofessional levels,

"(B) conduct basic and applied research on work, leisure, and education of older people, living arrangements of older people, social services for older people, the economics of aging, and other related areas.

"(C) provide consultation to public and voluntary organizations with respect to the needs of older people and in planning and developing services for them,

"(D) serve as a repository of information

and knowledge with respect to the areas for which it conducts basic and applied research,

"(E) stimulate the incorporation of information on aging into the teaching of biological, behavioral, and social sciences at such institution of higher education.

"(F) help to develop training programs on aging in schools of social work, public health, health care administration, education, and in other such schools at such institution of higher education, and

"(G) create opportunities for innovative, multidisciplinary efforts in teaching, research, and demonstration projects with respect to aging;

"(2) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(3) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"PART D—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 431. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out part A of this title \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under part B and part C of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"PAYMENTS OF GRANTS

"SEC. 432. (a) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Commissioner shall require the recipient of any grant or contract under this title to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant or contract was made.

"(b) Payments under this part pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Commissioner may determine.

"(c) The Commissioner shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of title III of this Act unless the Commissioner has consulted with such State agency regarding such grant or contract."

TITLE V—MULTIPURPOSE SENIOR CENTERS

SEC. 501. The Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by inserting immediately after title IV the following new title:

"TITLE V—MULTIPURPOSE SENIOR CENTERS

"PART A—CONSTRUCTION OF MULTIPURPOSE SENIOR CENTERS

"CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

"SEC. 501. In order to provide a focal point in communities for the development and delivery of social services and nutritional services designed primarily for older persons, the Commissioner may make grants to units of general purpose local government or other public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations and may make contracts with any agency or organization to pay not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of leasing, altering, or renovating existing facilities to

serve as multipurpose senior centers (including the initial equipment of such facilities), and, where utilizing existing facilities is not feasible, not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of constructing new public or non-profit private multipurpose senior centers. Facilities assisted by grants or contracts under this part shall be in close proximity to the majority of individuals eligible to use the multipurpose senior center, and within walking distance where possible, except that the total payments made pursuant to such grants or contracts in any State for any fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total amount appropriated for the year for the purposes of carrying out this part.

"REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

"Sec. 502. (a) A grant of contract for construction under this part may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Commissioner upon his determination that—

"(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than ten years after completion of construction, the facility will be used for the purposes for which it is to be constructed, (B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, and (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the purpose for which it is being constructed;

"(2) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that there are no existing facilities in the community suitable for leasing as a multipurpose senior center, and that there are no existing facilities in the community which could be altered or renovated to serve such a purpose;

"(3) the plans and specifications are in accordance with regulations relating to minimum standards of construction and equipment; and

"(4) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on the construction of the facility will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(b) In making grants or contracts under this part, the Commissioner shall—

"(1) give preference to the construction of multipurpose senior centers in areas where there is being developed a comprehensive and coordinated system under title III of this Act; and

"(2) consult with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the technical adequacy of any proposed construction.

"PAYMENTS

"Sec. 503. Upon approval of any application for a grant or contract under this part, the Commissioner shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant or contract; the amount so reserved may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as the Commissioner may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"RECAPTURE OF PAYMENTS

"Sec. 504. If, within ten years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this part—

"(a) the owner of the facility ceases to be a public or nonprofit private agency or organization, or

"(b) the facility shall cease to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed (unless the Commissioner determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so), the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 505. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants or contracts under section 501, \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1975.

"(b) Sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of this section and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available for such purpose of the next fiscal year.

"MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR MULTIPURPOSE SENIOR CENTERS

"Sec. 506. (a) It is the purpose of this section to assist and encourage the provision of urgently needed facilities for programs for the elderly

"(b) For the purpose of this part the terms 'mortgage', 'mortgagor', 'mortgagee', 'maturity date', and 'State' shall have the meanings respectively set forth in section 207 of the National Housing Act.

"(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on such mortgage during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and make commitments for insurance of such mortgage prior to the date of its execution or disbursement thereon.

"(d) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is authorized to insure any mortgage which covers a new multipurpose senior center, including equipment to be used in its operation, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) The mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor, approved by the Secretary, who demonstrates ability successfully to operate one or more programs for the elderly. The Secretary may in his discretion require any such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to minimum charges and methods of financing, and, in addition thereto, if the mortgagor is a corporate entity, as to capital structure and rate of return. As an aid to the regulation or restriction of any mortgagor with respect to any of the foregoing matters, the Secretary may make such contracts with and acquire for not to exceed \$100 such stock or interest in such mortgagor as he may deem necessary. Any stock or interest so purchased shall be paid for out of the Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund, and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Secretary under the insurance.

"(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed \$250,000 and not to exceed 90 per centum of the estimated replacement cost of the property or project, including equipment to be used

in the operation of the multipurpose senior center, when the proposed improvements are completed and the equipment is installed.

"(3) The mortgage shall—

"(A) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Secretary shall prescribe, and

"(B) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance and service charges, if any) at not to exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding at any time as the Secretary finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

"(4) The Secretary shall not insure any mortgage under this section unless he has determined that the center to be covered by the mortgage will be in compliance with minimum standards to be prescribed by the Secretary.

"(5) In the plans for such Multipurpose Senior Center, due consideration shall be given to excellence of architecture and design, and to the inclusion of works of art (not representing more than 1 per centum of the cost of the project).

"(e) The Secretary shall fix and collect premium charges for the insurance of mortgages under this section which shall be payable annually in advance by the mortgagee, either in cash or in debentures of the Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund (established by subsection (h)) issued at par plus accrued interest. In the case of any mortgage such charge shall be not less than an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any one time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. In addition to the premium charge herein provided for, the Secretary is authorized to charge and collect such amounts as he may deem reasonable for the appraisal of a property or project during construction; but such charges for appraisal and inspection shall not aggregate more than 1 per centum of the original principal face amount of the mortgage.

"(f) The Secretary may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property or project from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

"(g) (1) The Secretary shall have the same functions, powers, and duties (insofar as applicable) with respect to the insurance of mortgages under this section as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has with respect to the insurance of mortgages under title II of the National Housing Act.

"(2) The provisions of subsections (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n) of section 207 of the National Housing Act shall apply to mortgages insured under this section; except that, for the purposes of their application with respect to such mortgages, all references in such provisions to the General Insurance Fund shall be deemed to refer to the Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund, and all references in such provisions to 'Secretary' shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(h) (1) There is hereby created a Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund for carrying out all the insurance provisions of this section. All mortgages insured under this section shall be insured under and be the obligation of the Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund.

"(2) The general expenses of the operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to mortgages insured under this section may be charged to the Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund.

"(3) Moneys in the Multipurpose Senior

Center Insurance Fund not needed for the current operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to mortgages insured under this section shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of such fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. The Secretary may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued as obligations of the Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"(4) Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees received on account of the insurance of any mortgage under this section, the receipts derived from property covered by such mortgages and from any claims, debts, contracts, property, and security assigned to the Secretary in connection therewith, and all earnings as the assets of the fund, shall be credited to the Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund. The principal of, and interest paid and to be paid on, debentures which are the obligation of such fund, cash insurance payments and adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling, management, renovation, and disposal of properties acquired, in connection with mortgages insured under this section, shall be charged to such fund.

"(5) There are authorized to be appropriated to provide initial capital for the Multipurpose Senior Center Insurance Fund, and to assure the soundness of such fund thereafter, such sums as may be necessary.

"ANNUAL INTEREST GRANTS

"Sec. 507. (a) To assist States and public and nonprofit private agencies to reduce the cost of borrowing from other sources for the construction of facilities, the Secretary may make annual interest grants to such agencies.

"(b) Annual interest grants under this section with respect to any facility shall be made over a fixed period not exceeding forty years, and provision for such grants shall be embodied in a contract guaranteeing their payment over such period. Each such grant shall be in an amount not greater than the difference between (1) the average annual debt service which would be required to be paid, during the life of the loan, on the amount borrowed from other sources for the construction of such facilities, and (2) the average annual debt service which the institution would have been required to pay, during the life of the loan, with respect to such amounts if the applicable interest rate were 3 per centum per annum: *Provided*, That the amount on which such grant is based shall be approved by the Secretary.

"(c) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for the payment of annual interest grants in accordance with this section.

"(2) Contracts for annual interest grants under this section shall not be entered into in an aggregate amount greater than is authorized in appropriation Acts; and in any event the total amount of annual interest grants in any year pursuant to contracts entered into under this section shall not exceed \$1,000,000, which amount shall be increased by \$3,000,000 on July 1, 1974, and by \$5,000,000 on July 1, 1975.

"(d) Not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in this section for grants may be used within any one State.

"PART B—INITIAL STAFFING OF MULTIPURPOSE SENIOR CENTERS

"PERSONNEL STAFFING GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 511. (a) For the purpose of assisting

in the establishment and initial operation of multipurpose senior centers the Commissioner may, in accordance with the provisions of this part, make grants to meet, for the temporary periods specified in this part, all or part of the costs of compensation of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation of new multipurpose senior centers and for the delivery of social services established therein.

"(b) Grants for such costs of any center under this title may be made only for the period beginning with the first day of the first month for which such grant is made and ending with the close of three years after such first day. Such grants with respect to any center may not exceed 75 per centum of such costs for the first year of the project, 66½ per centum of such costs for the second year of the project, and 50 per centum of such costs for the third year of the project.

"(c) In making such grants, the Secretary shall take into account the relative needs of the several States for community centers for senior citizens, their relative financial needs, and their population of persons over sixty years of age.

"(d) For the purposes of this part, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 512. For purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'multipurpose senior center' means a community facility for the organization and provision of a broad spectrum of services (including provision of health, social, and educational services and provision of facilities for recreational activities) for older persons.

"(2) the term 'cost of construction' includes the cost of architects' fees and acquisition of land in connection with construction, but does not include the cost of offsite improvements."

TITLE VII—NATIONAL OLDER AMERICANS VOLUNTEERS PROGRAM

Sec. 601. Section 601 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no compensation provided to individual volunteers under this part shall be considered income for any purpose whatsoever."

Sec. 602. Section 603 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

Sec. 603. (a) The heading of part B of title VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows: "FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM AND OTHER SENIOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS".

(b) Section 611 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 611. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to or contracts with public and nonprofit private agencies and organizations to pay part or all of the cost of the development and operation of community projects designed to provide opportunities for low-income persons aged sixty or over to render supportive services to people having exceptional needs.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), grants or contracts shall be made principally for projects providing services as 'foster grandparents' to children receiving care in hospitals, homes for dependent and neglected children, or other establishments providing care for children with special needs.

"(c) The total amount of Federal financial assistance for projects described in subsection (b) shall not be less than the total amount expended for such projects for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

"(d) Payments under this part pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments and on such conditions, as the Director may determine."

(c) The first sentence of section 613 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 613. In administering this part, the Director shall consult with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and any other Federal agencies administering relevant programs with a view to achieving optimal coordination with such other programs and shall promote the coordination of projects under this part with other public or private programs or projects carried out at State and local levels."

Sec. 604. Section 614 of the Older Americans Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and 535,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

Sec. 605. (a) Title VI of such Act is amended by striking out the word "Secretary" wherever it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "Director".

(b) Such title is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"MEANING OF DIRECTOR

"Sec. 615. For purposes of this title, the term 'Director' means the 'Director of Action'."

TITLE VII—NUTRITION PROGRAM

AVAILABILITY OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Sec. 701. Section 707 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"AVAILABILITY OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES

"Sec. 707. (a) Agricultural commodities and products purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) may be donated to a recipient of a grant or contract to be used for providing nutritional services in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(b) The Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of food commodities under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431) by donating them to a recipient of a grant or contract to be used for providing nutritional services in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(c) Dairy products purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (7 U.S.C. 1446a-1) may be used to meet the requirements of programs providing nutritional services in accordance with the provisions of this title."

Sec. 702. Section 705(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) provide that, whenever possible, nutrition projects assisted under this title shall be made a part of the comprehensive and coordinated systems established under title III of this Act."

STATE PLANNING

Sec. 703. Section 705(a) (2) (B) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "not to exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount allotted to the State unless a greater amount in any fiscal year is approved by the Secretary", and inserting in lieu thereof "funds allotted to a State for State planning and administration pursuant to section 306 of this Act may be used for the Administration of the State plan submitted pursuant to this section, except that, whenever the Governor of a State

designates an agency other than the agency designated under section 304(a)(1) of this Act, then the Secretary shall determine that portion of a State's allotment under section 306 which shall be available to the Agency designated under section 705(a)(1) for planning and administration".

CONFORMING AMENDMENT

Sec. 704. (a) The first sentence of section 705(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "303" the first time it appears in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "304" and by striking out "303" the second time it appears in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "305".

(b) Section 705(a)(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "303" and inserting in lieu thereof "304".

(c) Title VII of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "Secretary" wherever in such title the term refers to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioner".

TITLE VIII—IMPACT PROGRAMS

Sec. 801. Title VIII of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE VIII—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 801. The purpose of this title is to establish special demonstration and model programs which (1) are directed to the solution of critical problems confronting older persons in the areas of preretirement, housing, transportation, employment, and continuing education, (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in meeting the needs of older persons in their communities and neighborhoods, (3) show promise of providing a solution to problems in the field of aging which are common to a number of communities, and (4) will improve the quality and comprehensiveness of the comprehensive and coordinated systems established under title III of this Act.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

"Sec. 802. (a) The Commissioner, after consultation with the State agencies designated under title III of this Act, is authorized to make grants to public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations or contracts with any agency or organization for payment of part of the cost of programs to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of any program established under title III of this Act and are designed to—

"(1) assist in meeting the special housing needs of older persons by (A) providing financial assistance to such persons, who own their own homes, necessary to enable them to make the repairs and renovations to their homes which are necessary for them to meet minimum standards, (B) studying and demonstrating methods of adapting existing housing, or construction of new housing, to meet the needs of older persons suffering from physical disabilities, and (C) demonstrating alternative methods of relieving older persons of the burden of real property taxes on their homes;

"(2) improve the transportation services available to older persons by (A) establishing special transportation subsystems for older persons or similar groups with similar mobility restrictions, (B) providing portal-to-portal service and demand actuated services, (C) payment of subsidies to transportation systems to enable them to provide transportation services to older persons on a reduced rate basis, with special emphasis on transportation necessary to enable older persons to obtain health services, (D) payments directly to older persons to enable them to obtain reasonable and necessary transportation services, (E) programs to study the economic and service aspects of transportation for older persons living in urban or rural

areas, (F) programs to study transportation and social service delivery interface;

"(3) meet the needs of unemployed low-income older persons who are unable, because of physical condition, obsolete or inadequate skills, declining economic conditions, or other causes of a lack of employment opportunity to secure appropriate employment, which will enable such persons to participate in projects for public service in such fields as environmental quality, health care, education, public safety, crime prevention and control, prison rehabilitation, transportation, recreation, maintenance of parks, streets, and other public facilities, solid waste removal, pollution control, housing and neighborhood improvements, rural development, conservation, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and community improvement;

"(4) provide continuing education to older persons designed to enable them to lead more productive lives by broadening the educational, cultural, or social awareness of such older persons; or

"(5) provide preretirement education, information, and relevant services (including the training of personnel to carry out such programs and the conducting of research with respect to the development and operation of such programs) to persons planning retirement.

"(b) The Commissioner shall not award any financial assistance under this section for the cost of a program in any State unless the appropriate State agency (referred to in subsection (a)) has had not less than thirty days in which to review the program and make comment thereon.

"FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

"Sec. 803. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this title shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such programs, including costs of administration, unless the Commissioner determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

"EVALUATION

"Sec. 804. Each program for which payments are made under this title shall provide for a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of the program in achieving the goals of this title. This evaluation shall be conducted by such public or private organizations as the Commissioner may designate, and up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid from funds appropriated to carry out this title. The results of such evaluations or a summary of them, together with the Commissioner's findings and recommendations concerning the program, shall be included in the report required by section 208.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 805. There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for providing assistance under this title.

"INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

"Sec. 806. In administering this part, the Commissioner shall consult with the Office of Economic Opportunity, ACTION, the Department of Labor, and any other Federal agencies administering relevant programs with a view to achieving optimal coordination of the program under this part with such other programs and shall promote the coordination of programs under this part with other public or private programs or projects carried out at State and local levels. Such Federal agencies shall cooperate with

the Commissioner in disseminating information about the availability of assistance under this part and in promoting the identification and interest of older persons whose services may be utilized in programs under this part."

TITLE IX—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS

Sec. 901. (a) The Library Services and Construction Act (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IV—OLDER READERS SERVICES

"GRANTS TO STATES FOR OLDER READERS SERVICES

"Sec. 401. The Commissioner shall carry out a program of making grants to States which have an approved basic State plan under section 6 and have submitted a long-range program and an annual program under section 403 for library services for older persons.

"USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"Sec. 402. (a) Funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 4(a) shall be available for grants to States from allotments under section 5(a) for the purpose of carrying out the Federal share of the cost of carrying out State plans submitted and approved under section 303. Such grants shall be used for (1) the training of librarians to work with the elderly; (2) the conduct of special library programs for the elderly; (3) the purchase of special library materials for use by the elderly; (4) the payment of salaries for elderly persons who wish to work in libraries as assistants on programs for the elderly; (5) the provision of in-home visits by librarians and other library personnel to the elderly; (6) the establishment of outreach programs to notify the elderly of library services available to them; and (7) the furnishing of transportation to enable the elderly to have access to library services.

"(b) For the purposes of this title, the Federal share shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out the State plan.

"STATE ANNUAL PROGRAM FOR LIBRARY SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY

"Sec. 403. Any State desiring to receive a grant from its allotment for the purposes of this title for any fiscal year shall, in addition to having submitted, and having had approved, a basic State plan under section 6, submit for that fiscal year an annual program for library services for older persons. Such program shall be submitted at such time, in such form, and contain such information as the Commissioner may require by regulation and shall—

"(1) set forth a program for the year submitted under which funds paid to the State from appropriations pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 4(a) will be used, consistent with its long-range program for the purposes set forth in section 302, and

"(2) include an extension of the long-range program taking into consideration the results of evaluations.

"COORDINATION WITH PROGRAMS FOR OLDER AMERICANS

"Sec. 404. In carrying out the program authorized by this title, the Commissioner shall consult with the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging for the purpose of coordinating, where practicable, the programs assisted under this title with the programs assisted under the Older Americans Act of 1965."

(b) Section 4(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) For the purpose of making grants to States to enable them to carry out public library service programs for older persons authorized by title IV, there are authorized to be appropriated \$11,700,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$12,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$12,900,000

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and \$13,700,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976."

(c) Section 5(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3), or (4)".

(2) Section 5(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3), or (4)".

(3) Section 5(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of such paragraph (B) thereof, by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and", and by inserting after subparagraph (C) thereof the following:

"(D) with respect to appropriations for the purposes of title IV, \$40,000 for each State, except that it shall be \$10,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(4) The last sentence of section 5(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3), or (4)".

(5) Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3), or (4)".

(c) Section 6(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "and III" and inserting in lieu thereof "III and IV".

(d) (1) Section 7(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3), or (4)".

(2) Section 7(b)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "and title IV" after "title III".

(d) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall be effective after June 30, 1972.

Sec. 902. (a) Section 5(a)(2) of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act (20 U.S.C. 1504(a)(2)) is amended by striking out "and" after "areas" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting after "deprived persons," the following: "and of elderly persons."

(b) The second sentence of section 6(a) (20 U.S.C. 1505(a)) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and at least one other of whom shall be knowledgeable with respect to the library and information service and science needs of the elderly".

Sec. 903. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating sections 110 and 111 (and cross references thereto) as 111 and 112, respectively, and by inserting after section 109 the following new section:

"SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS RELATING TO PROBLEMS OF THE ELDERLY

"Sec. 110. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education (and combinations thereof) to assist such institutions in planning, developing, and carrying out, consistent with the purpose of this title, programs specifically designed to apply the resources of higher education to the problems of the elderly, particularly with regard to transportation and housing problems of elderly persons living in rural and isolated areas.

"(b) For purposes of making grants under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1977.

"(c) In carrying out the program authorized by this section, the Commissioner shall consult with the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging for the purpose of coordinating, where practicable, the programs assisted under this section with the programs assisted under the Older Americans Act of 1965."

Sec. 904. (a) The Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) is amended by redesignating sections 310, 311, and 312 (and cross references thereto) as sections 311, 312, and 313,

respectively, and by inserting after section 309 the following new section:

"SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR THE ELDERLY

"Sec. 310. (a) The Commissioner' is authorized to make grants to State and local educational agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies for programs to further the purpose of this Act by providing educational programs for elderly persons whose ability to speak and read the English language is limited and who live in an area with a culture different than their own. Such programs shall be designed to equip such elderly persons to deal successfully with the practical problems in their everyday life, including the making of purchases, meeting their transportation and housing needs, and complying with governmental requirements such as those for obtaining citizenship, public assistance and social security benefits, and housing.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this section there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1975.

"(c) In carrying out the program authorized by this section, the Commissioner shall consult with the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging for the purpose of coordinating, where practicable, the programs assisted under this section with the programs assisted under the Older Americans Act of 1965."

(c) Section 313(a) of such Act, as redesignated, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "(other than section 310)".

Sec. 905. (a) Section 5(g)(2)(B) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 954(g)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting after "of this section" the following: ", with a preference in the case of productions referred to in subsection (c)(2) of this section with respect to which a special effort has been made to bring the production to older persons".

(b) Section 5(g)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and up to 100 per centum of the total cost of a production referred to in subsection (c)(2) of this section where such production is presented primarily to older persons".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 15657, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents the culmination of 14 days of hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor on various proposals to extend and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965 and to amend other legislation in order to provide services to older persons.

The bill was reported unanimously both by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Education and Labor. This bipartisan support indicates, I believe, the widespread concern in the House of Representatives and throughout the country about the problems of the aged.

Members on both sides of the aisle on our subcommittee and committee contributed long hours to hearings and to

the formulation of the bill that we bring to you today.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I feel it appropriate to pay particular tribute to several Members of the House who have made substantial contributions to this legislation—Mr. PERKINS, the distinguished chairman of the full Education and Labor Committee offered many innovative features to the legislation, as did the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUÉ), along with my other distinguished colleagues, the gentlelady from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN), the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. Speaker, in considering the legislation now before you, the subcommittee heard from witnesses from various departments of the executive branch, organizations representing the aged, as well as private individuals, Governors, other State officials, and Members of Congress. In addition, the subcommittee took note of the many recommendations made by the recent White House Conference on Aging.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to provide much needed opportunities and supportive services to our older population. Since the older American Act was passed in 1965, community programs have been developed across the Nation to serve the aging. These programs have included services designed to promote independent living, nutritional services, transportation services, senior centers, and health and health-related services. In addition, the highly successful foster grandparents program has made it possible for thousands of low-income older persons to provide valuable services to children in institutions.

The amendments contained in H.R. 15657 would continue the Older American Act programs already underway as well as providing for expansion in areas where the need is great.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

First of all, the bill would strengthen the role of the Administration on Aging as a focal point of Federal concern for older persons. The Older Americans Act of 1965 established the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and provided for a Commissioner on Aging appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. H.R. 15657 provides that the Commissioner would be directly responsible to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and could delegate his functions only to an officer who is directly responsible to him.

When Congress passed the Older Americans Act in 1965, Congress clearly intended to create an entity highly visible in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to serve as a focal point for dealing with the problems of the aged. Yet, in 1967, the Administration on Aging

was placed within the Social and Rehabilitation Service with the Commissioner on Aging reporting to the Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service rather than to the Secretary. Since that time, the responsibilities of the Commissioner have been progressively lessened. For instance, the title IV research and demonstration programs have been placed under an Associate Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the title VI retired senior volunteer and foster grandparent programs have been moved to the new Action agency.

If the Commissioner on Aging is to be effective, he must have grant authority to launch programs in areas where there is demonstrated need. For example, the title IV research and demonstration program was designed to move into areas where gaps in knowledge exist and to test approaches to services ignored by other agencies. To delegate these activities to another unit within the social and rehabilitation service only creates more division of responsibility and a need for more coordination, while at the same time weakening the role of the Commissioner on Aging and diminishing his ability to focus research efforts on meeting the unique needs of the elderly.

In addition, to achieve effective coordination with other agencies, the Commissioner should have the financial resources to share in the costs of the development and operation of programs. An advocacy role is difficult to carry out if there is no capability provided in the form of grant money to be used in cooperation with other programs or to innovate and lead the way in areas where gaps exist. Yet as a result of these various reorganizations, the Commissioner on Aging has been left with control of very little in the way of discretionary grant authority.

The provisions in H.R. 15657 are intended to alleviate these problems by reasserting the congressional mandate to the Commissioner on Aging and giving him the powers and responsibilities he needs to carry out effective programs for older people and to work on a more equal basis with other agencies which have programs of benefit to the aged.

NATIONAL INFORMATION AND RESOURCE CENTER

Next, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for the establishment of an Information and Resource Center. The White House Conference on Aging identified a number of problems in obtaining coordinated information on problems and programs in the field of aging. Therefore, H.R. 15657 would establish a National Information and Resource Center as an integral organizational mechanism within the Administration on Aging. The major function of the Center would be to collect, review, organize, publish and disseminate information and data related to the particular problems caused by aging.

The Center would provide information to older persons directly or through State information and referral sources, thereby creating a vital information link between Federal, State, and local aging agencies or service providers, and directly to older persons themselves.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON AGING

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the fact that the problems, issues, and recommendations developed by the White House Conference on Aging go far beyond the scope of activities conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, H.R. 15657 creates a Presidential Advisory Committee. This National Advisory Council on the Aging would advise and assist the President on matters relating to the special needs of older Americans. It would review and evaluate programs and activities conducted or assisted by departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and it would make recommendations to the President, to the Secretary, to the Commissioner, and to Congress for the establishment of new programs and activities for older Americans. Beginning with the year 1974, the Council would make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President, who would transmit the report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

In addition to its regular responsibilities, the Council would be charged with the responsibility for undertaking two important studies. First of all, the Council is to conduct a study of the interrelationships of benefit programs for the elderly operated by Federal, State and local government agencies. At least nine major programs, operated by five Federal departments and agencies, impinge directly on each other. These include social security, veterans benefits, old age assistance, medicare, medicaid, low-rent public housing, federally assisted private housing—section 202, 236—food stamps, and manpower training.

At present, problems occur when older people are eligible for assistance from more than one of these programs. For instance, when there is an increase in social security benefits, an individual who receives both social security and old age assistance may, unless corrective legislative action is taken each time there is an increase, receive no increase in total income since his old age assistance benefit is reduced to take account of his increase in social security. The study called for in these amendments should provide the information necessary to come up with a comprehensive solution to this and to similar problems that occur in other areas.

Second, the Council would be responsible for undertaking a study of the combined impact of all taxes on the elderly—including but not limited to income, property, sales, and social security taxes.

Upon completion of each of these studies, but no later than 18 months after enactment of this act, the President would submit the results and recommendations to Congress and, in the case of the tax study, to the Governors and legislatures of the States.

GRANTS FOR STATE AND AREA PROGRAMS

Mr. Speaker, another significant change this bill makes in the Older Americans Act deals with the grants for State and community programs.

Since 1965, when the Older Americans Act was first passed, some 1,700 com-

munity projects have received funding under its community grant program. Approximately 1,000 projects are still receiving Federal support. These projects have had significant impact on the lives of many older persons. During 1971 alone, over 800,000 older Americans were served. However, the lack of a specific goal orientation has sometimes resulted in these funds being spread too thinly over too wide a variety of activities with consequently lessened impact.

H.R. 15657 would substantially revise the present program in order to encourage and assist State or local agencies to concentrate resources in order to serve older persons. Under the revised program, State and local agencies on aging would enter into new cooperative arrangements with each other and with providers of social services. The final objective would be to secure and maintain maximum independence and dignity in a home environment for older persons capable of self-care with appropriate supportive services and to remove individual and social barriers to economic and personal independence for older persons.

The Committee on Education and Labor was also concerned that the State agencies on aging established under the present title III program had not developed into strong and effective advocates for older people at the State level. H.R. 15657 therefore strengthens these agencies by first reasserting the requirement for a sole State agency; second, increasing the funding available for the administration of the State plan required under title III; third, providing that the State agency could designate area agencies on aging when this would serve to strengthen the State's program for its older citizens; and fourth, providing for the establishment of State information and referral sources.

The committee believes that in order to set responsibility and to provide the power necessary to take effective action in behalf of older Americans, a strong and easily identifiable single State agency on aging is necessary. There should be coordination between this and other agencies but this agency should maintain its own identity in order to serve as a strong advocate for the needs of the older population.

H.R. 15657 would authorize appropriations of \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1974, and \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 1975 for the Commissioner to make grants to States for the title III programs.

Mr. Speaker, in some cases, States are too large and diverse to be covered by a single comprehensive, coordinated area plan for the elderly. Consequently, H.R. 15657 provides that whenever appropriate and feasible such States may be divided into planning and service areas. However, small States and rural States can often best be served by a single State agency rather than several area agencies and should not be divided. In such cases, it should be made clear that it is the intent of the committee that one area plan would be permitted to cover an entire State.

H.R. 15657 also authorizes appropriations of \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1974, and

\$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1975, to make grants to States for paying the cost of the administration of its State plan.

H.R. 15657 also authorizes appropriations of \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1974, and \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1975 for the Commissioner, after consultation with the State agency to make grants to or contracts with any public or nonprofit private agency or organization for paying part or all of the cost of developing or operating statewide, regional, metropolitan area, county, city, or community model projects which will expand or improve social services or otherwise promote the well-being of older persons. This direct funding provision will, hopefully, strengthen the position of the Commissioner on Aging.

Mr. Speaker, this revised title III program builds on the experience obtained from almost 7 years of operation under the Older Americans Act of 1965. The Committee on Education and Labor feels that the States and communities are now ready to accept the challenge of this restructured program which would greatly expand the resources available to meet the needs of older people at the community level.

TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Another important feature of H.R. 15657 is that it would extend the research and training programs of the Older Americans Act. However, H.R. 15657 changes the language of the present act to make it clear that Congress intends that the Commissioner on Aging carry out this program through grants to or contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, institutions, or individuals.

H.R. 15657 also adds a new provision to the Older Americans Act which would authorize the Commissioner to make grants for the purpose of establishing multidisciplinary centers of gerontology or supporting existing centers.

The 1967 amendments to the Older Americans Act provided for a study of the need for trained personnel in the field of aging. The report that resulted from this study pointed out that multidisciplinary institutes of gerontology increase the visibility of the field of aging; often afford the only opportunity students and faculty may have for exposure to the broad interdisciplinary aspects of the field of gerontology; constitute a focal point for research and training; and can provide many significant services to State and other agencies serving older people. The report went on to declare that a major hindrance to the development of such centers has been the lack of general purpose financial support from the Federal Government, which limits its aid to funding specific research and training projects.

The recent White House Conference on Aging also recommended that:

Multidisciplinary research and training centers of excellence in gerontology with a relationship to service-delivery systems should be developed, and research and training should be fostered in a wide range of colleges, universities and other institutions.

The multidisciplinary centers authorized by the bill would primarily focus and concentrate on recruiting and train-

ing personnel. The centers could also, however, conduct research into a variety of matters which affect the elderly, ranging from education to living arrangements; provide consultation and technical assistance regarding the planning of services for older persons; act as a repository of information related to its areas of basic and applied research, encourage the incorporation of aging information into the teaching of biological, behavioral, and social sciences in institutions of higher education; develop and operate short course training sequences for staffs of State, area, and local aging agencies; develop training programs on aging in schools of social work, public health, health care administration, and education; and create opportunities for multidisciplinary efforts in teaching, research, and demonstration projects related to aging.

The visibility of such multidisciplinary centers on gerontology would help attract students to the field, and build core faculties of distinction. Individual courses offered by these centers would be of value in improving the sensitivity and competence of students specializing in related fields in dealing with the special problems of the aged.

The results of the multidisciplinary research conducted by the centers could provide a foundation for administrative and program policy decisions, and generate program models for State, local, and national action in the field of aging, as well as stimulating increased or improved community effort on behalf of the elderly.

The research and training offered by these multidisciplinary centers is not intended to duplicate or supplant similar research and training programs already in existence. Rather, such centers would coordinate their activities with others, and serve as a link between related federally supported research and training programs.

MULTIPURPOSE SENIOR CENTERS

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15657 also adds a new feature to the act by providing for multipurpose senior centers.

The committee believes that very often the elderly need a single place, a focal point, where they can gather, receive a variety of services, and be referred to other services they need. The location of services in a single place is one effective way of making the range of services and personal needs accessible to him or her. However, the committee is firmly of the belief that whenever possible existing facilities should be utilized for such multipurpose senior centers. Schools, libraries, and other neighborhood facilities can be ideal locations for such centers.

Under the bill, the Commissioner on Aging would be authorized to make grants to public and nonprofit private agencies and contracts with any agencies to pay up to 75 percent of the costs of leasing, repairing or altering existing facilities so that they could be used as multipurpose senior centers. Grants and contracts could also be made for construction of facilities, but only where it is not feasible to utilize existing facilities for such purposes—through leasing, repair or alteration.

Since one of the primary purposes of this bill is to focus resources on the development of comprehensive and coordinated services for the elderly, the Commissioner would be required to give priority to applications for assistance for centers that would be a part of a comprehensive program being developed under the title II State grant program. The Commissioner would also be required to consult with and utilize the assistance of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development on the technical aspects of any proposed construction.

NATIONAL OLDER AMERICANS VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, two of the most popular and successful programs developed under the Older Americans Act are the foster grandparent program and the RSVP or the retired senior volunteer program.

The foster grandparent program provides part-time volunteer opportunities for low-income persons age 60 and over to serve needy children in institutions on a person-to-person basis. The program seeks to establish a useful way for older adults to contribute to their community in their retirement years and to enjoy the self-respect and satisfaction that come from being needed and serving others. The retired senior volunteer program establishes a recognized role in the community and a meaningful life in retirement for older adults through significant volunteer service.

On July 1, 1971, through the Executive Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1971, the foster grandparent program and the retired senior volunteer program were transferred to ACTION. Although the Committee on Education and Labor did not, in H.R. 15657, seek to change this decision, the committee expects ACTION to work closely with the Administration on Aging and the State agencies on aging in administering these programs.

H.R. 15657 expands the foster grandparent program to provide new opportunities for low-income older Americans to render meaningful community service. Low-income persons, 60 years and over, would be enabled to serve both children and adults with special needs in community settings.

A major component of the program would be services to assist needy elderly in their own homes, in nursing homes, and in institutions. One of the key efforts will be to provide services to older persons in their own homes in an effort to delay or possibly avoid the necessity for placement in nursing care. Volunteers serving in this program will also expand the foster grandparent program concept by serving children in their own homes as tutors or teachers' aides in schools or day care settings.

NUTRITION PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Congress initiated and passed legislation to establish a nutrition program for the elderly under the Older Americans Act. H.R. 15657 would only make minor amendments to this program.

First, as I indicated at the outset of my remarks, it is the intention of H.R. 15657 that comprehensive services be planned and delivered for older Ameri-

cans. In this connection, wherever possible, nutrition projects funded under title VII shall be part of comprehensive and coordinated systems funded under title III. The research and demonstration projects which provided nutrition for the elderly indicated that nutrition projects were more effective where they were part of a comprehensive service program.

Second, the amendments seek to assure that commodities purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture, including dairy products, could be donated to title VII grantees and used for providing nutrition services. The same is true of food commodities under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Third, wherever title VII programs operate as a part of a title III comprehensive system, funds for planning and administration for title VII programs may come from the title III appropriations. By having, wherever possible, only one planning authority, more funds will be available for providing additional nutrition services.

SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15657 adds a new title VII to the Older Americans Act establishing special programs which are directed to the solution of critical problems confronting older persons in the areas of preretirement, housing, transportation, employment, and continuing education. These programs would be designed to be of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in meeting the needs of older persons in their communities and neighborhoods and to show promise of providing a solution to problems in the field of aging which are common to a number of communities. The program would also be designed to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of the comprehensive and coordinated systems established under the title III program.

The Commissioner, after consultation with the title III State agencies, would be authorized to make grants to public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations or contracts with other private agencies or organizations for not more than 90 percent of the costs—unless the Commissioner determines that assistance in excess of such percentage is required—of programs to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of any program established under title III and designed to—

Assist in meeting the special housing needs of older persons by: providing financial assistance to such persons to enable them to make the repairs and renovations to their homes which are necessary for them to meet minimum standards; studying and demonstrating methods of adapting existing housing, or construction of new housing, to meet the needs of older persons suffering from physical disabilities; and demonstrating alternative methods of relieving older persons of the burden of real property taxes on their homes.

Improve the transportation services available to older persons by: Establish-

ing special transportation subsystems for older persons or groups with similar mobility restrictions; providing portal-to-portal service and demand actuated services; payment of subsidies of transportation systems to enable them to provide transportation services to older persons on a reduced rate basis, with special emphasis on transportation necessary to enable older persons to obtain health services; payments directly to older persons to enable them to obtain reasonable and necessary transportation services; service aspects of transportation for older persons living in urban or rural areas; programs to study transportation and social service delivery interface.

Meet the needs of unemployed low-income persons who are unable, because of physical condition, obsolete or inadequate skills, declining economic conditions, or other causes of a lack of employment opportunity to secure appropriate employment, which will enable such persons to participate in projects for public service in such fields as environmental quality, health care, education, public safety, crime prevention and control, prison rehabilitation, transportation, recreation, maintenance of parks, streets and other public facilities, solid waste removal, pollution control, housing and neighborhood improvements, rural development, conservation, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and community improvement.

Provide continuing education to older persons designed to enable them to lead more productive lives by broadening the educational, cultural, or social awareness of such older persons.

Provide preretirement education, information, and relevant services—including the training of personnel to carry out such programs and the conducting of research with respect to the development and operation of such programs—to persons planning retirement.

Authorizations of appropriations of \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, \$75,000,000 for fiscal year 1974, and \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1975 are provided for these special impact programs.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today also amends various acts in ways which can have beneficial effects on the lives of many Americans.

For instance, H.R. 15657 would add a new title IV to the Library Services and Construction Act authorizing the Commissioner of Education to carry out a program of grants to the States for older readers services. In making these grants, the Commissioner of Education would consult with the Commissioner of Aging. Grants could be used for the training of librarians to work with the elderly; the conduct of special library programs for the elderly; the purchase of special library materials for use by the elderly; the payment of salaries for elderly persons who wish to work in libraries as assistants on programs for the elderly; the provision of in-home visits by librarians and other library personnel to the elderly; the establishment of outreach programs to notify the elderly of library services available to them; and the furnishing of transportation to en-

able the elderly to have access to library services.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE ACT

H.R. 15657 also would amend the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act to provide that the Commission should conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the library and informational needs of elderly persons.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

H.R. 15657 would amend title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to institutions of higher education—and combinations therefore—to assist such institutions in planning, developing, and carrying out programs specifically designed to apply the resources of higher education to the problems of the elderly, particularly with regard to transportation and housing problems of elderly persons living in rural and isolated areas. In making such grants, the Commissioner of Education would consult with the Commissioner on Aging.

ADULT EDUCATION ACT

The bill would also amend the Adult Education Act to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to State and local educational agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies for educational programs for elderly persons whose ability to speak and read the English language is limited and who live in an area with a culture different than their own. In making grants, the Commissioner of Education would consult with the Commissioner on Aging. Programs should be designed to equip these elderly persons to deal successfully with the practical problems in their everyday life, including the making of purchases, meeting their transportation and housing needs, and complying with governmental requirements such as those for obtaining citizenship, public assistance and social security benefits, and housing.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

H.R. 15657 would amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 to provide a preference for projects and productions where a special effort has been made to bring the production to older persons. Where a production is presented primarily to older persons, a State's allotment for projects and productions could be used to pay up to 100 percent of the total cost.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude these remarks in explaining H.R. 15657, I should like to recall the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who once said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add much to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

The Comprehensive Older American Services Amendment of 1972 will mean much to older people throughout our country. It will indicate to older Americans that we have not forgotten the great debt we owe them for their past contributions and that we are concerned that they continue to have the oppor-

tunity to contribute to society and live independently in their home communities with needed services readily available.

Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress has the opportunity to help bring 20 million elderly Americans back into the mainstream of American life. The time for action is now.

I urge all Members of the House to support H.R. 15657.

At this point I want to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) for yielding.

First, let me state that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) as chairman of the subcommittee has worked for several years in trying to strengthen the Older Americans Act, an act which has been of tremendous benefit to our senior citizens.

The gentleman from Indiana is to be complimented for his untiring efforts. Due to his leadership in conducting oversight hearings on the act there have already occurred many important improvements in programs and services for the elderly. The excellent bill before us represents still another effort to expand and improve these programs. Mr. Speaker, the other members of the subcommittee have also worked very diligently and I wish to praise them also.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly urge the adoption of H.R. 15657.

The Older Americans Act has been of great benefit to our senior citizens. It has, until now, consisted of State and community programs, training programs, the foster grandparents program, and the retired senior volunteer program. These programs have proven their value to older persons, and the best evidence of that is the fact that we bring this bill before the House today under suspension of the rules.

In 1971, this fine act provided the funding for 1,721 projects administered by our communities and States which served a total of 800,313 older persons. These projects included a wide variety of services to the elderly. Programs designed to maintain independent living arrangements for older persons, including shut-ins, were offered. Senior citizens were encouraged and organized as volunteers who visited, telephoned, transported, taught adult education courses, and prepared and delivered meals—all for other older persons. In fact, almost 25,000 meals were provided to older persons, and those who could not afford to pay for this service received it without cost.

Transportation is a critical need of older persons, and a number of projects included such services as a part of their program. You and I take our mobility for granted, but the older persons without transportation cannot get to a doctor's appointment, or to health clinics, or the food stamp office, or to visit with other people and overcome the great problem of loneliness among the elderly, or to pursue civic interests and activ-

ities. The Older Americans Act makes it possible to provide transportation.

Problems of failing health often plague our senior citizens and here again the Older Americans Act attempts to meet that need. Projects provide visiting nurses and in-house health aides for the home-bound elderly. In addition, health education, geriatric screening and referral, immunization programs, and homemaker services are provided. A number of programs have attempted to deal with particular emotional and physiological problems associated with old age, such as blindness, deafness, or loneliness.

This act has established a solid record of service to people which, to my way of thinking, is what good government is all about.

Two programs that have been especially well received have been the foster grandparents program and the retired senior volunteer program. Foster grandparents, which was developed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, currently has 67 projects serving over 200 different child care programs in 40 States and Puerto Rico. They utilize over 4,400 foster grandparents per day. However, there has been a major expansion of this program so that we can now look forward to 11,000 foster grandparents serving 22,000 children each day. This program has been of inestimable value not simply to the children who have benefited from the warmth and patience and interest of a foster grandparent, but to those foster grandparents themselves who derive enormous satisfaction in knowing that they are still capable of and are in fact making valuable contributions to their communities.

While the retired senior volunteer program is newer—it was first authorized in 1969—it too has built an impressive record of service and acceptance. RSVP, as it is known, offers opportunities for community services to persons aged sixty or over without regard to their income or station in life. RSVP permits senior volunteers to participate in a variety of service organizations, agencies, and institutions.

So the 1972 Older Americans Amendments will rest on a solid foundation of tested success. The bill seeks to improve the Administration on Aging, to upgrade its functions, to broaden its duties, and to insure that all Federal programs and information affecting the older persons are more effectively coordinated and developed in the hope that we can improve the level and quality of services to the most deserving of all our citizens—the older American.

This is a bill that all Members can unite on and support. We cannot do enough to reward those whose sweat and labor and perseverance have built this great country of ours.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for his gracious remarks. Few persons are so dedicated to the cause of lifting the level or the quality of life of the older people of our country than the gentleman from Kentucky, CARL PERKINS.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, first let me compliment the gentleman on this legislation to help older people. All of us feel very strongly that we need to help provide a better life for our older people.

The gentleman from Indiana has made a great contribution.

I am troubled by two aspects of the bill, however.

The first is regards the provision for a 15-member National Advisory Council on the Aging. These people will be GS-18's and will make \$39,693 a year—a little less than Congressmen earn. That seems to be an excessive number of people and possibly an excessive salary—but especially an excessive number of people.

The Federal Reserve Board has seven members.

The Atomic Energy Commission has five members.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has five members.

The Civil Service Commission has three members.

I could go on down the list—there are about 10 or 11 of the major agencies that have far smaller numbers. Why 15 members and why such tremendous salaries?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, that the number of members as proposed for the National Advisory Council on the Aging is identical with the number of members who are presently on the Advisory Committee on Older Americans, which is to be replaced by a new National Advisory Council on the Aging.

So we did not seek to make any changes in the number.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Should we not have cut this down in the interest of economy and efficiency?

Mr. BRADEMAS. That might have been done, but in all candor, the gentleman from Maryland is the first Member of this body to express this concern to the gentleman from Indiana. I know of no evidence that the present Council is too large and unwieldy.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman for his initiative and the Members on both sides of the aisle for this legislation, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services amendments, which I think will open a new chapter and a new day for the senior citizens of America.

If the gentleman will yield, might I ask just a few brief questions to pinpoint one or two of the areas in this legislation that can be particularly significant and are clearly needed by our senior citizens?

As I understand the legislation, in the first instance, the National Information and Resources Center is being set up basically because senior citizens do not have all the information that they need and this will collect and review and organize information so that senior citizens

can know what services are available to them.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REID. Second, it is my understanding that the National Advisory Council on the Aging will meet at least four times a year and, moreover, the importance of this, we think, is there should be a review at the top—the White House—and not just at a departmental level.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. The gentleman is again correct. This purpose will be achieved with the newly shaped National Advisory Council, which will report to the President, as distinguished from the present Council, which reports to the Secretary.

In this connection, the committee wishes to make clear its intent that the problems of older Americans will receive the attention of the highest official of the Federal Government, namely, the President of the United States.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding further that title III represents a very major increase from \$44 to \$100 million. In the case of New York it will mean funds of between \$1.6 million as of last year to at least \$9.6 million this fiscal year. Fundamentally title III represents not only an increase but a new concept in the title which is to secure and maintain maximum independence of our senior citizens, both in terms of home environment and in terms of their personal dignity, as well as in terms of their economic and personal independence.

Lastly, of course, it seems to me the major step forward is to strengthen State agencies while building in requirements of coordination with all groups, profit or nonprofit, that can help in this area.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Speaker, who has made most valuable contributions to the shaping of this legislation, is correct on all of those points.

Mr. REID. There are just one or two brief other points, Mr. Speaker. Title IV, I think, represents the first time that there has been a total recognition that in the field of gerontology there must be a multi-disciplinary approach. I also think the multi-purpose senior centers and the \$35 million authorization for these centers will provide a focal point for a variety of services. And the understanding is that where those services are inadequate, the State will have the responsibility of referring persons to available services located elsewhere. I might add that H.R. 15657 provides insurance on construction mortgages up to about \$250,000, which I think is a step forward.

Finally, the foster grandparent and RSVP programs are getting major impetus, and the RSVP could truly be the Peace Corps for senior citizens, involving perhaps 2 million Americans in good works in their local communities.

Lastly, title VIII, it seems to me, will provide needed emphasis to solve particular problems and to provide fine solutions for preretirement, housing, transportation, and employment problems, all of which are critically needed. I think for our 25- to 30-million senior citizens,

their most useful years in many cases lie ahead, and this bill would offer a new vista with specific help that I think is a major step forward by this Congress.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. The gentleman from New York is correct on all of those points as well, and I thank him for his observations, Mr. Speaker.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) who has also helped in the shaping of this legislation.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and congratulate him on his leadership on this legislation.

It has been my privilege to participate with the chairman and serve with him on the committee during the drafting of this important measure. I rise in support of the bill and hope it will pass. It offers great hope and promise for the older Americans who are so deserving and so in need.

The Comprehensive Older Americans Services amendments would strengthen and improve the programs under the Older Americans Act of 1965.

The elderly have been a sorely neglected segment of our population for a long time. While they have provided their services for the development of this country and given this Nation the highest standard of living anywhere in the world, they now find that the country has turned its back on them in their time of need.

This legislation will expand and strengthen the various programs to help these Americans enjoy their later years.

The bill provides improved social services to the elderly on both the Federal and State levels, new services to senior citizen centers and strong improvements in the areas of nutrition, transportation, housing, employment, preretirement counseling and continuing education programs.

In particular, the bill would add a new title to the Older Americans Act to provide for and help staff multipurpose senior citizen centers. At last there will be a single place—or focal point—where older Americans can gather together to discuss mutual problems, share a common fellowship, be advised of services available and receive various services.

I had advocated just such a program for New York City and am pleased that this proposal was included in the final version of these amendments. An elderly person cannot travel to all points of the city to obtain the assistance and advice he or she may need. A central location is a must if they are going to be able to avail themselves of the many programs authorized by this bill.

One of the programs in particular offers great promise to these older Americans. All too frequently, our senior citizens caught in the inflationary bind of too little money and too many bills, forego a proper diet. Or, in many cases, they are unable to prepare their own meals. The nutrition program section of this bill will offer a free or reduced price meal to all older Americans who need it—a service that will be very important to the elderly poor of New York and other metropolitan areas.

Another important section of the bill calls for special impact programs to meet

the transportation needs of the elderly. This is in keeping with my amendment to the Urban Mass Transportation Act which set out for the first time that it was national policy that elderly and handicapped people have an equal right to mass transportation facilities.

This section will expand the focus of that act to include both the urban and rural poor and will help provide the supplemental services needed by those who, even with special accommodations, will not be able to use mass transit systems.

Mr. Speaker, this bill marks the conclusion of a great effort by the Committee on Education and Labor. I am proud to have been a part of it. But our obligation to older Americans does not stop here. We must work to provide the funds necessary to translate the promise into action. Empty are the words in this bill, if we do not back them up with dollars. The older Americans we are talking about built this Nation into what it is today. Their hard work and energy, their dedication in the time of war, in peace, in national turmoil, helped build the character of the United States in the 1970s. Let us reward their efforts by fulfilling the promises enunciated in the bill before us today. The reward is little compensation for a lifetime of service to their country.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) who helped greatly on this bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to join in urging support in the enactment of this legislation. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana for bringing this very important bill to the floor.

There is no question that half of the households with heads aged 65 and older in the United States have incomes of only \$5,053 a year, and in fact a fourth of these households have incomes of less than \$3,000 a year. Of the older people living alone, half had incomes of less than \$1,951 a year. While this bill does not address itself to that problem, it does provide services for older Americans to make retirement somewhat more meaningful than the nightmare which it has now become for a very, very large segment of our senior citizen population.

We have good reason to be embarrassed when we consider the lot facing the 20 million older citizens in this country.

Think of that—half of the older people who live alone in this country have incomes of less than \$37.50 a week. Yet the medical costs of an older person are three and a half times as great as those of a person under 65 years of age. And all our publicly assisted health programs only pay two-thirds of the medical costs for our older citizens. They are forced to pay from their meager savings for the other one-third.

But the important fact is that we have it within our power to change those sorry statistics. I believe that the most fundamental change will come about when we provide our older citizens with decent incomes. I have voted for social security increases three times since 1969 and each time we were faced by hostile opposition

by this administration. Twice the President threatened until the last minute to veto the bills, but fortunately sounder reason finally prevailed.

Even with the most recent increase we still have left our older people in a sorry situation. The maximum payment under social security with the three recent increases is still only \$162 a month for a retired person, \$271 a month for a retired couple, and \$138 a month for a widow. For that reason I have pledged myself to working for further increases in social security benefits and for a guaranteed minimum income for our senior citizens.

But we must also strive to provide basic services for our senior citizens. For that reason I have been working since 1965 on the Older Americans Act. I am proud to have been the chairman of the subcommittee which had responsibility for the implementation of that act in 1966, and I have maintained my interest in its progress since JOHN BRADEMAS assumed the subcommittee's chairmanship. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate JOHN BRADEMAS for his leadership on behalf of these most recent amendments to that act. He has made a great contribution to the welfare of our older citizens.

These amendments build upon our experience over the years since 1965 to fashion a better program for our older Americans. First of all the administrative structure for the delivery of these programs is strengthened at both the national and State levels. By giving the Administration on Aging a semi-autonomous status within Health, Education, and Welfare, its role as the chief Federal agency for the aging is clarified. The State agencies on the aging are also strengthened.

Other aspects of the bill are—

The State grant program under title III is expanded so that we can reach far more than the 800,000 older Americans who are now being served.

Establishment of gerontology centers for the conduct of research on the work, leisure, and education of older people, the economics of aging, and other areas.

Establishment of multipurpose senior centers to provide focal points within local communities for the provision of comprehensive social services for older people.

Strengthening of the retired senior volunteer program by exempting all compensation from being considered as income for whatever purpose.

Expansion of the foster grandparent program by authorizing low-income older people to work with children with exceptional needs in their own homes and with children and adults with exceptional needs in community settings. These programs will be in addition to the present services being provided to children in institutions by older people. Currently 4,400 foster grandparents are working each day in those institutions. Next year the program will be expanded to include 11,000 older people helping 22,000 children each day.

Improved coordination of the nutrition program for the elderly with other feeding programs under this act.

Establishment of special programs to provide transportation for the elderly directly or through subsidies to public transportation companies, financial assistance to the elderly to help them make repairs and renovations to their homes in order to bring them up to minimum standards, and public service jobs for unemployed low-income older persons.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a worthy continuation and expansion of our efforts for our older citizens and deserves the full support of this House.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my admiration for the leadership shown by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) and congratulate the gentleman on the enormous advances in the perception of the needs of the elderly as well as in the funding that is included for additional services.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) on his constant effort to improve the plight of our Nation's elderly. During consideration of this legislation, as with so many other bills which have come before my subcommittee, he has persuasively and effectively worked for more imaginative and generous programming to solve the problems confronting the elderly and the poor. He is one of this Congress' outstanding leaders in the fight to create a better life for senior citizens throughout the land.

Mr. SCHEUER. Thank you. I rise in support of the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972.

After several years of neglect by the current administration, the Congress is finally forced to take decisive action and legislate some solutions to the problems which threaten to strangle older Americans. We can no longer wait for reluctant executives and hesitant bureaucrats to provide the answers. The Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments, which we are now considering, provide for the investment and utilization of the talent and resources necessary to fulfill the desperate needs of our older citizens.

By upgrading the status of the Administration on Aging, H.R. 15657 insures that the Federal bureaucracy will no longer be able to ignore the fact that the elderly are more poor, more hungry, more lonely and more frustrated than any other citizen group in this country. The Commissioner on Aging will now have the authority to focus Federal attention on eradicating the misery which confronts our older citizens. Furthermore the bill creates a National Advisory Council which will allow our older citizens themselves to become involved in the selection and design of Federal programs for the elderly. This is an essential improvement because no one is more qualified to solve the problems of the elderly than the elderly themselves.

Aside from neglect and lack of recognition, one of the major problems which beset the elderly is the complexity and disorganization of information about

available services. In order to help communities thread their way through this disjointed maze, H.R. 15657 establishes the National Information and Resource Center to collect, organize, and disperse valuable information on the problems and programs affecting the elderly.

In New York City, there are more than 1 million senior citizens. More than half of these live in poverty, and are in desperate need of social services. The House recognized that need when it supported my amendment to the poverty bill to provide \$50 million in additional funding to the elderly poor. But this is clearly not sufficient. The elderly need reduced fares on transportation. They need rent subsidies and nutrition programs. They need gainful part-time and full-time employment and volunteer programs so their skills and energies are not just wasted. They need household aides and senior centers. These are desperate needs which must be met before most of our older citizens can live in even minimal comfort.

H.R. 15657 is a comprehensive effort which provides increased funding, better organization, and new and innovative programs. Every Member who votes for this bill can report to his constituency that has supported firm and effective action to provide solutions to the problems which face all of our older citizens. We shall begin to replace neglect with concern, loneliness with companionship, hunger with nutrition, stagnation with contribution, and isolation with involvement.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), who also cooperated in preparation of this bill and who supported this bill, such time as he may consume.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation for the impressive leadership of the subcommittee chairman in bringing this legislation to fruition.

I am grateful for the inclusion of section 205(g), my proposal for a study of the interaction of Federal aid programs for the elderly. Under this provision, the President is required, upon completion of this study, to submit recommendations to eliminate the negative impact that one program's standards may have on another.

A growing number of older people in Minnesota have found that when benefits are increased for one program—social security, for example—they lose their eligibility for the nutritional, health or housing aid that they have been receiving from other Government agencies. At least nine major programs for the elderly operated by five different Federal departments directly impinge on each other.

Section 205(g) should eliminate a great source of frustration and hardship for millions of older Americans.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of this bill,

of which I am a cosponsor, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972. I am happy to have joined with others who have spoken on this measure in helping to shape the legislation in the Select Subcommittee on Education under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

I think it might be useful at this point to touch on a point raised by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) with reference to the rate of compensation payable to the members of the National Advisory Council. The bill actually provides that the payment is not on a per annum basis, but it is on a per diem basis. That is, the maximum rate of pay shall be for the period when members are actually serving on business of the Council, so on those days and those days only when the members are serving on business of the Council, they would be paid at a rate not to exceed the level of a GS-18, and they may be paid at a lower level.

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

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be reassured on that point.

I would like to ask the gentleman, why are there 15 on this Council, a number which would seem to be excessive. I would think it would be difficult to get anything done.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. It is my understanding this is a fairly standard per diem payment.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. No, I am talking about the number of people, not the payment. It seems 15 is a very large body.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. The purpose of the number on the Advisory Council is to get broad representation.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. It has a political rather than a substantive purpose?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. It is not intended to be.

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

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an observation on that particular point. As my friend, the gentleman from Maryland knows, there are many advisory councils on many programs. Fifteen is not an unusual number. As the gentleman knows, people of considerable ability and experience are assigned to these councils and they are therefore, very busy people, and it would be unusual for all 15 members to turn up for any given meeting. I am, however, grateful for the concern of my economy-minded friend, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of the subcommittee noted, this bill was unanimously reported, not only by the subcommittee, but also by the full Committee on Education and Labor, and it truly represents a bipartisan effort.

The bill has the support of the administration. It embodies the main features of the administration's recommendations for improving the operation of pro-

grams authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and at the same time it incorporates important recommendations of the recent White House Conference on Aging.

Also it includes provisions formulated by the subcommittee, and growing out of extensive hearings held in Washington and other parts of the country. We listened to the testimony of older Americans concerning their needs and the responsibility of the Government to help meet those needs. In a true sense they helped to shape this legislation. This bill is responsive to their needs.

The thrust of this bill is twofold: To vastly strengthen the position of the Administration on Aging within the Federal Government, thus providing greater visibility and a stronger voice for our senior citizens; and, second, to begin to provide more effective delivery systems for services at State and local levels to insure better coordination of such services. Our goal is to reach more people in a much more meaningful way. In order to achieve that objective, the bill strongly emphasizes research in the non-biomedical aspects of aging, and in the improvement of information services at all levels.

We need to know a great deal more about how to design various programs, whether for nutrition, housing, transportation or other fields, to best meet the needs of the older population, and we must make certain that the people who need services can easily get information concerning them.

Both these goals are emphasized in this legislation.

As recently as March 22 of this year the President signed into law S. 1163, which amended the Older Americans Act to add a new program of nutrition for the elderly. That is now title VII of the act. The President moved swiftly to amend his budget for fiscal 1973 to request the entire \$100 million authorized for title VII. For technical reasons the House Committee on Appropriations did not include an amount for title VII in its HEW-Labor appropriations bill, but the Senate committee included the entire \$100 million and I hope this body will approve that amount. Adequate nutrition is a critical need for older people, some 40 percent of whom have incomes at or below the poverty level, and programs for adequate nutrition can form the nucleus for the provision of a whole range of other services.

The President's recommended amendments to the Older Americans Act proposed weaving the new nutritional services into a fabric of comprehensive State and area planning and programing to meet the needs of older people in a coordinated way. H.R. 15657 effectively implements the President's proposal, except that it retains title VII as a separate title with appropriate cross-referencing to the new delivery system provided under the new title III of the act. The same result is achieved—more comprehensive, better coordinated, community-based services for the elderly.

Another effect of the President's proposal is to vastly strengthen the State Agencies on Aging, and that is retained by this bill. Virtually all of the service programs authorized by the act will be

channeled through the State agencies, and through local area agencies on aging approved by the State agency in accordance with an overall State plan. The new emphasis upon coordinated State and local planning and programing will replace the scattered project grant approach which largely characterized the old act despite the provisions in it for State agencies and State plans. The existing act requires that Federal support for any project be provided on a sliding scale, beginning with 75 percent maximum in the first year, 60 percent for the second, and 50 percent for the third and any succeeding fiscal year.

As a result, projects have tended to terminate after 3 years. This bill provides for a maximum of 90 percent Federal support for any project which is part of a comprehensive area plan approved by the State, without time limitation. Our aim is continuity of services. Under this bill the authorizations for State grants are considerably increased aside from the \$100 million authorized for the nutrition program, and the emphasis is shifted to greater State responsibility for comprehensive services within local areas. The 1972 authorization for State activities under title III was \$30 million. The new authorization under title III for 1973 is \$132 million. Moreover, other portions of the bill, such as the establishment of multipurpose senior centers under title V and the special impact programs in title VIII—in such fields as housing, transportation, education, and employment—all are keyed into State activities under title III. This is an exceptionally well-designed bill, calculated to achieve the goals outlined by the President.

The bill contains a separate authorization for the national older Americans volunteer program—consisting principally of the Foster Grandparents and retired Senior Volunteer program—RSVP—but places operating authority in the Director of Action as requested by the President. It increases the authorization for these programs at a steady and, I feel, reasonable rate over the next 3 years, so that the increase will be from \$15 million for fiscal 1972 to \$40 million for fiscal 1975. These have been some of our most successful and rewarding programs for senior citizens, permitting the participants to make enormous contributions to the well-being of the larger community. Probably the Foster Grandparents program is the most popular of these. The bill places a floor under the support for this program at the level of the amount available for it in fiscal 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I have not attempted to describe the entire bill, as that has been done by the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. BRADEMAS). I concur with his analysis of the merits of this legislation, including a much strengthened research and training authorization. The special impact programs will permit the Administration on Aging to experiment with projects in fields normally dealt with by other government agencies that are of special interest to older citizens. This will help other agencies to take into account the needs of the older person in shaping programs such as housing, transportation and employment. There is also adequate provision for the coor-

dination of the activities of the Administration on Aging with those of other Federal agencies.

The new and elevated status of the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is highly desirable. Beginning in President Johnson's administration, the agency had been buried within that Department. Currently it falls under the new Social and Rehabilitation Service, even though the Commissioner on Aging—but not the head of SRS—is a Presidential appointee. This bill by law places the agency directly under the Secretary, with the Commissioner on Aging reporting directly to him. Our 20 million citizens 65 years of age or older are important enough, and their problems are sufficiently urgent to merit this change. The action of our committee is also consistent with that of President Nixon in establishing a Special Cabinet Committee on Aging in the Domestic Council, headed up by Secretary Richardson, and with many other actions of the President to give effect to recommendations of the White House Conference.

In short, this bill launches a new era for the Administration on Aging, one in which it will not only be the focal point for expressing the concerns of our older citizens within the Federal Government, but for galvanizing the potential of State and local government to better meet the needs of older Americans. This is extremely important and needed legislation. I urge your approval of H.R. 15657.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

I want to commend my friend and colleague from Idaho for the work he did, and I also wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) and Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, senior citizens face some very real problems today as we all know. One-fourth of all persons 65 years of age and older have incomes below the poverty line. The spiraling cost of living places an especially heavy burden on those relying on a fixed income. Health costs have soared 170 percent within the past 10 years, making it difficult for many senior citizens to afford proper medical care. Many cannot drive, and public transportation is often expensive and inconvenient. Housing for the elderly is difficult to obtain and maintain. At least 30 percent of their homes are classified as substandard. And, finally, it is especially depressing for senior citizens to face the possibility of being institutionalized because they are no longer able to care for themselves.

Of some encouragement to senior citizens was the recent White House Conference on Aging at which several suggestions and proposals were made to improve services for the elderly in the areas of health, housing, income, employment, and retirement. However, recommendations have been put forth year after year. Now is the time for action.

The legislation before us today, the

Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972, is a necessary step toward providing better and more comprehensive social services for the elderly.

After talking to several groups of senior citizens, such as the Rock Island County Chapter of the Association of Retired Persons, in my own congressional district, I am convinced of the need to provide multipurpose senior centers. I am encouraged that H.R. 15657 would grant authority to local agencies to lease, renovate and construct such multipurpose centers through grants, contracts, or mortgage insurance. I know enactment of this bill is extremely important to all senior citizens, and I hope we will pass it without delay.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ESHLEMAN).

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15657, of which I am a cosponsor. As the new ranking Republican member on the Select Subcommittee on Education, I am pleased that this bill includes the major administration proposals for making the Older Americans Act a more effective piece of legislation.

The heart of this bill is increased State and local responsibility to put together comprehensive, coordinated programs to help older citizens lead happier and more productive lives. Every other part of the bill—such as the increased authorization for older Americans volunteer programs under the new Action volunteer agency— dovetails with this concept. We have barely begun taking advantage of the great contributions older citizens can make to building better communities.

For example, the foster grandparents program not only has been a good experience for the older people taking part in it, but it has been found to be one of the most effective methods we have to help preschool children from disadvantaged families. I am glad to say that this bill further strengthens the foster grandparents program and sets a floor—the fiscal 1972 level of \$25 million—under its funding.

I fully endorse another major purpose of this bill, which is to place the Administration on Aging directly under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to limit the authority to delegate its functions to other agencies. I think our 20 million citizens who are 65 years old or older deserve at least that status for their principle spokesman in the Federal Government, the Commissioner on Aging, who will now report directly to the Secretary. Some have suggested that he report directly to the President, but I accept the view that there are enough people reporting directly to the President, and that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can represent the views of older persons. Besides, President Nixon has already moved to make Mr. John Martin, the Commissioner on Aging, his special assistant in matters affecting the aging. So we do not need to take additional action in this legislation.

The bill will vastly strengthen the ability of the Commissioner on Aging

to launch special experimental projects for the aging in such vital areas as transportation, housing, and education. It will give him far more authority to make the Administration on Aging a central source of information for programs for older Americans, and in the years ahead university-based gerontological institutes should produce a lot more useful knowledge about the social and economic aspects of aging. Other legislation, not before our committee, authorizes gerontological institutes to study the biological and medical aspects of aging. We need to know far more than we do about how to meet the needs of the elderly. Also, we need to do a better job in getting to the elderly information about existing programs for their benefit. This bill will help do that, also, at both the Federal and the State and local levels.

The Administration on Aging, prior to fiscal 1972, was limping along on appropriations of less than \$40 million for all its programs. In fiscal 1972 this was increased to more than \$100 million. President Nixon has asked for about \$259 million for fiscal 1973. I think the President has shown that despite the need for fiscal prudence in this time of budget deficits we must begin to make up for our neglect of America's older citizens. This bill is consistent with the President's direction and leadership, and I urge its approval.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking minority member of the full Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is completely bipartisan, and while it may contain features not proposed or favored by the administration it does embody the major new direction charted by President Nixon for the programs administered by the Administration on Aging. That new direction is to encourage and adequately fund comprehensive and coordinated services for our older citizens which are planned and placed into operation by the States. Title III of this bill—completed by all of the other programs authorized by other titles—establishes a State and areawide delivery system of programs for the elderly. That is the heart of this bill.

I think great credit is due to the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, JOHN BRADEMAS, for bringing together all points of views to the end that we have a bill which we can all enthusiastically support. In this he was supported by the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, Ed ESHLEMAN, who is a cosponsor of the bill. And I want to particularly commend the tireless efforts of ORVAL HANSEN to conform this legislation to the administration's forward-looking proposals, while adding ideas of his own gleaned from his close contacts with senior citizens in his district. Likewise, PETER PEYSER and others on our side of the aisle made constructive contributions to this bill.

I need not dwell on the details of the bill, which have been discussed thoroughly. It pleases me that this legislation will place the Congress squarely behind President Nixon in his commendable ac-

tions to follow up on the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging, held in December of 1971. The President has acted with customary swiftness and decisiveness.

First, he established a Cabinet Committee on Aging as a part of the Domestic Council, headed by Secretary Richardson. He also made the Commissioner on Aging, Mr. John Martin, a Special Assistant to the President, and persuaded Arthur Flemming, the Chairman of the White House Conference, to stay on as his consultant in following up on the Conference.

Then, in March of this year, the President sent to the Congress a special message on aging in which he outlined a comprehensive strategy for meeting the complex problems of older Americans. The five major elements were:

First. Improving the income position of older Americans;

Second. Upgrading the quality of nursing homes;

Third. Helping older Americans lead dignified, independent lives in their own homes;

Fourth. Expanding opportunities for the involvement of older persons in community life; and

Fifth. Organizing the Government to set the changing needs of older Americans.

There is not time to discuss in any detail the proposals of the President. But I would say that the legislation before us touches on most of these elements in his program and is a major step toward achieving the objectives he outlined. The President has already shown his faith in the Administration on Aging—and his commitment to the programs authorized by the Older Americans Act—by increasing his budget request for it to \$259 million for fiscal 1973, or more than five times the 1971 appropriations.

In a time of budgetary crisis particularly, that is a remarkable act of matching money to rhetoric—or in more delicate terms, of putting your money where your mouth is.

President Nixon surely deserves credit for these actions. He has asked for the full funding of the \$100 million authorization for the nutrition for the elderly program; he has asked that funds for the senior volunteer program of Action be tripled and that funds for the foster grandparent program be doubled. As all of us know, the President has asked for a number of steps to be taken to improve the income position of older Americans, including a more favorable treatment of outside income under social security, additional tax relief, and a guarantee of a decent basic income under welfare reform proposals for the indigent elderly. The bill before us does not directly deal with income. It deals with other parts of the President's broader program, but they are important parts. Many aspects of this bill certainly will contribute to income maintenance for many elderly people—such as the nutrition program and the foster grandparents, as well as the provision of services which otherwise might have to be purchased.

This bill at many points—including its strengthened research provisions—is designed to encourage older Americans to live dignified, independent lives, hopefully in their own homes where possible, and to contribute more fully to the quality of life in America. I very deeply believe that one of the greatest untapped human resources of 20th-century America is the knowledge, insight, and experience of our older citizens.

It is a bitter irony that as the percentage of older people in our society has increased astronomically, their influence in our daily life has diminished. At the turn of the century only one in 25 Americans was over 60 years of age, yet the 1970 census found their numbers to be one in 10. However, thanks to the custom of mandatory retirement at age 65, the disincentives to add to retirement income, today only 20 percent of our citizens aged 65 or older are in the civilian work force, as compared with 70 percent in 1900. I do not think we should force people to work past retirement age, but I do not think we should prohibit it, either. One thing I favor is the complete removal of income restrictions on social security benefits, which I regard as being inconsistent with the very nature of social security as something the worker and his employer have paid for. I am happy that the President has proposed a considerable liberalization of these restrictions.

If we have learned anything in the past few years, it should be that legislation such as that we have before us will not bring a millennium of progress in treating the problems of older Americans. We should neither expect nor imply that it will. Yet, I believe it is sound legislation which, effectively utilized, will help on a number of crucial fronts. It moves in the right direction. In this age of the so-called atomic family we are suffering from our neglect of the older generations. We may never be able to return as a society to the multigenerational family life which characterized our agricultural past. But we can assure that there is a productive and respected place for people of all ages in this society.

A century ago the poet Walt Whitman movingly expressed the sentiment of that age in these words:

Youth, large, lusty, loving—Youth full of grace, force, fascination—Do you know that Old Age may come after you, with equal grace, force, and fascination.

It is that "equal grace, force, and fascination" which we must strive so hard to achieve in this society, and to which this legislation is addressed. I urge the speedy enactment of H.R. 15657.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) who has contributed immeasurably to the shaping of this legislation.

Mr. PEYSER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

As a new Member of Congress serving on this committee, I have been deeply impressed by the depth of the study which has taken place on this piece of legislation, not only by the gentleman

from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) but also by all members of the committee.

I should like to call attention to one section of this bill which I believe is innovative and of the greatest importance, and which costs no money.

I refer to page 6, the section dealing with the Commissioner on Aging, where we have instructed the Commissioner to take all steps possible to bring in voluntary organizations, particularly the youth groups, high school students and college students, to take an active role in working with our senior citizens.

I believe that this part of the program can lend a great deal of human understanding to this legislation aimed at helping our senior citizens.

I believe the 92d Congress can truly take pride in this act knowing that they are taking an action that will provide real help for many millions of deserving Americans.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY).

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15657, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972. I am a sponsor of this measure because I am convinced it moves forcefully to deal with a series of problems facing our senior citizens today.

The isolation that oppresses so many seniors will be alleviated by provisions for expanded low cost transportation. This expanded new service will help older persons to keep doctor appointments, to go to health clinics and food stamps offices, to make trips at a distance and visits to senior centers for other significant activities.

New authority is provided to lease, renovate and construct multipurpose senior centers through grants and contracts. Funds to staff the centers are also included. Two of the most popular and worthwhile senior programs, "meals on wheels" and the foster grandparent program, are continued and expanded.

In keeping with the recommendation of President Nixon's White House Conference on Aging, a new visibility and emphasis on senior citizen programs will be implemented by this bill. No longer will the Administration on Aging be tucked away in the dim recesses of the HEW Social and Rehabilitation Service. H.R. 15657 provides that the Commissioner on Aging will be directly responsible to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and will not delegate its programs to lower level bureaus.

The bill establishes a Presidential Advisory Commission on the problems of aging whose responsibility will include reviewing and evaluating senior citizen programs, studying the impact of existing programs and laws, and recommending the establishment of new activities for older persons.

These are just a few of the expanded services provided by this bill. But just as important is that the bill also includes, for the first time, a specific requirement that comprehensive evaluations of these activities be conducted to allow us to channel our extremely scarce

resources into those programs which prove themselves most effective in aiding senior citizens.

The committee has included my evaluation amendment which will guarantee for the first time: First, a specific requirement for evaluation of these programs; second, a requirement that the evaluations be conducted by independent persons not involved in execution of the programs; third, a requirement that the results of the evaluation be published regularly; fourth, a requirement that these results be used in deciding which programs are to be expanded; and fifth, a specific sum of money set aside to pay for the evaluation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, with these guarantees, represents a huge step forward in dealing with the problems of the aging in America. I urge my colleagues to recognize the merit of this measure and vote for it.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss the merits of this bill, which, so far as I am advised, may indeed be a very good and most meritorious piece of legislation, as meritorious as all of its sponsors have suggested; but I take this occasion to register my protest with regard to the procedure by which a bill of this magnitude is being handled. These remarks would apply not merely to this bill but to any bill of similar importance.

Here is a bill, obviously on an important subject, very long and complicated, and providing for substantial sums of money, and I presume that it might have been reported by this committee at any time in the past 6 months and have been taken up under a rule in the normal procedure, which would have granted time for adequate debate, so that I and other Members of the House would be fully cognizant of its merits, as we should be before voting on a matter of this importance.

Yet here we come in with an 89-page report and a 74-page bill the day before the recess and bring it back without any hearings by the Committee on Rules, under suspension of the rules, on the day after the recess and with no opportunity for the average Member even to read the report, let alone the bill.

The bill, indeed, may be a most meritorious one. Again I say I make no criticism of the measure, but I do deprecate the method used, and I would be interested in learning just what the justification is for this particular type of procedure with respect to a measure of this importance, which certainly deserves to have debate.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will respond briefly to the gentleman from Indiana, my colleague (Mr. DENNIS).

I suppose the answer to the gentleman's question is that on a measure which so clearly has commanded the overwhelming support of the members of the authorizing committee, indeed, the

unanimous support, I would say to my colleague from Indiana, it seems not unreasonable to assume that there will be a wide degree of support in the House.

The report on the bill has been available for some time. In an effort to expedite consideration of the bill, as there are many other bills before us, it seemed most reasonable—and I think it is reasonable—that measures of this kind with such wide bipartisan support in the committee be, save exceptional circumstances, brought to the floor of the House under suspension, and I see no exceptional circumstances in respect to this measure.

Moreover, I must say to my friend from Indiana, the bill was placed in suspension with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee as well as of the Chairman.

Mr. DENNIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. I will say to my good colleague and friend from Indiana that we have a great many bills here which are unanimously supported in the committee, as the gentleman knows. Yet we have usually a rule providing for adequate debate. All I am asking or suggesting is that with bills of this importance—and I think it is an important bill—the normal procedure be followed instead of an extraordinary procedure.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Consideration of legislation under suspension of the rules is not an extraordinary procedure. It is a part of the normal procedures and rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho for yielding this time.

I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 15657, which is entitled "The Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972." I think it could properly be said that the entire objective of this bill and these amendments is to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the opening paragraph of the report employs some words which precede the listing of nine separate objectives of H.R. 15657. As I read that paragraph, the purpose of this bill is not simply to make a few modifications in some of the grant programs. The main thrust is to extend the provisions of the old law and strengthen and improve the programs under the old law.

It is a privilege to be accorded this time to join in the support of legislation of this kind. It has been my honor to chair a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations known as the Special Studies Subcommittee. When it became apparent that there would be no available space or facilities

to accommodate a Select Committee on the Problems of the Aging, the House leadership and the chairman of the Rules Committee in the summer of 1971, 1 year ago, asked my chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) if my subcommittee would conduct hearings of inquiry into the problems of the aging. The subcommittee started in the early fall and proceeded to hold hearings throughout the winter and this spring in all of the major cities in the East and the South. We held hearings in the Middle West, and in all portions of the country except the west coast.

Again and again, in city after city where our hearings were held, there was a parade of witnesses who discussed the very needs that are provided for in this legislation. We heard repeatedly that there should be improvements in the Administration on Aging. As H.R. 15647 provides, the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging, while heretofore appointed by the President, will in the future be responsible directly to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. At present the Commissioner in the Administration on Aging reports to the Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, who is not a Presidential appointee. Within the last few years, the responsibilities of the Commissioner seem to have been lessened to a point where his effectiveness as an administrator may be in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed a moment further, I want to commend the subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) for its good work in bringing up for the consideration of the House these very important amendments. They have worked long and hard on this measure, and they deserve our commendation for writing into the law many of the things that my subcommittee found from our hearings were needed.

Our hearings concluded that there are four major facets to the problem of aging: first, income maintenance, which means social security, and thus the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee; second, health, which is once again a problem we cannot address ourselves to in this legislation because medicare and related matters are handled by the Committee on Ways and Means. The third category of problems we found to be housing; and the fourth major category, that of transportation, covered by this legislation today.

In this bill under title I, for the first time, we clearly indicate that we are going to do something about the problem of transportation of the aging in our rural areas. For far too long there has been too much said about the problems of the aging in the urban areas, but this legislation provides directly for a very sensitive need; that of transportation for our elderly in the rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many good things contained in this legislation that I shall not take the time of the Members to enumerate all of them.

However, we should take a moment to point out that the very heart of this

legislation is to be found in title III. There has long been a concern that the State agencies on the aging have not developed into strong and effective advocates on the State level. This bill would establish the requirement that there be a sole State agency and increase the funding for the administration of a State plan. It would also provide what would seem to be a very worthwhile provision, that is, to designate area agencies on the aging within each State. Finally there would be established a State information and referral service.

H.R. 15657 establishes at the State level new policy goals by fixing responsibility and giving adequate power and authority to take effective action in one easily identifiable single State agency on the aging in each State.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should not yield back the balance of my time without directing attention to title V which provides for multipurpose senior centers. If there is one thing that the hearings of my subcommittee have brought out within the past year it is the need for some single place in each community, or a kind of gathering place where our senior citizens can know that they may there receive a variety of services, and, even if the particular service is not available at these so-called senior centers, they will know that at that place they can be referred to other services elsewhere which they need.

The concept of the location at a single place has been testified to all over the country as the most effective way of making available the range of services to our older citizens. I am pleased to note that even though this bill provides for some new multiservice senior centers, the report recommends that existing facilities should be utilized. This means schools, libraries, and other neighborhood places as an ideal location for such centers. On the other hand, the report clearly provides that the Commissioner on the Aging may make grants to non-profit private agencies up to 75 percent of the cost for leasing, repairing, or altering existing facilities to be used as multipurpose senior centers. Moreover, the Commissioner could arrange under title V to insure construction mortgages of up to \$250,000, not to exceed 90 percent of the cost of the construction projects.

Oh, there are so many other good things contained in this bill. The national older Americans volunteer program is strengthened. The older foster grandparents program and the retired senior volunteer program authorized by the 1969 amendments to the Older Americans Act have been expanded by this bill even though these programs were transferred by the reorganization policy adopted in 1971 to Action.

Title VII makes some amendments to the nutrition program. The most important is the assurance that commodities purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture, including dairy products, could be donated to grantees and utilized for providing nutrition services to the elderly. And, of course, the same assurances are spelled out in the food commodities under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Finally, I cannot join with those critics who say that this is the wrong way to consider such an important bill. Some say it should not have been considered under suspension of the rules, that a rule should have been granted giving more time for debate. That kind of argument does not seem quite valid. This is not a controversial measure. Every Member of this House should cheerfully support this bill. By considering it today under suspension of the rules, we can send it to the other body in the hopes that action will be completed and it will be signed into law in the very near future.

Once again let me express my appreciation for the excellent work of the gentleman from Indiana, the gentleman from Idaho, and all the members of the subcommittee who worked so long and hard to bring this very important bill to the floor today.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADENMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like, at the outset, to thank my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) for his kind remarks, and to observe that, in his capacity as the chairman of the Special Studies Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman has given great leadership in alerting the Members of this House to the problems of the elderly.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that the 92d Congress has been a Congress that has been most responsive to meeting the needs of the elderly people of our country. Last year the President signed into law a bill initiated from within the Congress, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, and our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) to provide nutritional services for the elderly.

Only a few days ago Congress voted an increase in social security benefits of 20 percent. Although President Nixon strongly opposed this increase, I was very glad, as I am sure were most Members on both sides of the aisle, to see the President yield to congressional leadership and sign that bill into law within hours after the House and Senate had sent the legislation to him.

Third, Mr. Speaker, we are here today about to pass another major bill to assist older persons, a bill which provides a variety of comprehensive services for the elderly. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to report the Comprehensive Services for Older Americans bill was also initiated from within Congress, and is supported by both Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it has been an outstanding Congress for America's older citizens, and I want here to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I want to say a particular word of thanks to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) as well as to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUITE) for their help in working out some of the major problems connected with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that I hope that this bill will have the support of all of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15657, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972. This bill amends the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide better and more comprehensive social services for the elderly. This measure is especially designed to implement the major recommendations of last winter's White House Conference on Aging.

Specifically, H.R. 15675 modifies the grant programs of the Older Americans Act to encourage and assist State and local agencies in developing social services programs for the elderly, and provides for the strengthening of State agencies on aging. The bill also strengthens the role of the Administration on Aging in HEW, creates a National Advisory Council on Aging to assist the President, establishes a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging, and provides authority to lease, renovate, and construct multipurpose senior centers through grants, contracts or mortgage insurance. In addition, the bill expands the research, demonstration and training programs of the Older Americans Act, expands the National Older Americans Volunteer program, coordinates the nutrition program for the elderly, and provides for special impact demonstrations in the areas of transportation, housing, employment, pre-retirement and continuing education as part of a comprehensive, coordinated service system for the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, the population of Americans 65 and older is growing at a faster rate than our population as a whole, and it is estimated that by the end of the century they will comprise 11 to 16 percent of our population or 28 million Americans. The problems and special needs of the elderly are also increasing as our society becomes more complex and as services increase in cost. The bill before us today is especially designed with those problems and needs in mind by attempting to provide a more comprehensive approach to services for the elderly. My questionnaire results and the mail I have received from Illinois indicate just how pressing and urgent these needs are, and I am hopeful with the passage of this legislation we can begin to address these needs in a more comprehensive and effective fashion.

Under this bill, \$100 million is authorized in fiscal 1973, \$200 million in 1974, and \$300 million in 1975 for the Commissioner to make grants to States for the administration of State and area plans by their agencies on the aging, and for the development of comprehensive and coordinated systems for the delivery of social services. Of the \$100 million authorized for these grants in fiscal 1973, Illinois would be entitled to approximately \$5.4 million under the bill's allocation formula, which is based on the number of citizens in the State aged 60 and over, compared with the national population for that age group.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, especially the title III grant program, has the backing of the administration, and I strongly urge its passage today.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word of strong support for the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972, which we are considering today under a suspension of the rules.

I became a cosponsor of an earlier version of this legislation when it was introduced shortly after the White House Conference on Aging last November. I became a cosponsor because I feel obligated to assure that something more than rhetoric comes out of the White House Conference.

Preparations for the conference encompassed more than a year's active work on the local, State, and national level. The Government went to the older citizens of this country and said, "We want to know what are your problems, where do you think the Government needs to act, what kind of assistance do you really need, what can we do better?"

We asked these questions assuring the answers would receive serious consideration by the Administration and Congress, and that the recommendations submitted by the conferees in Washington would be given immediate attention.

These people took us at our word and submitted long lists of well-discussed findings and recommendations, on a wide variety of topics. The bill we have before us today is a first attempt at trying to put some of these recommendations into action.

Of course, this bill does not attempt to encompass all the areas of study covered by the White House conferees. It does, however, try to hit some target areas where specific recommendations can be enacted immediately.

These requests are not farfetched—they are sensible and reflect much thought and ordering of priorities on the part of the very people who will be affected by them. The bill will assist State and local agencies in developing social service programs for the elderly; it will help construct multipurpose senior citizen centers; establish gerontology study centers, expand senior citizen volunteer programs, and establish special impact demonstrations in several vital areas, among other things.

I think this bill makes a lot of sense and has the full backing of senior citizen leaders, the administration, the Education and Labor Committee, and as many of Indiana's Fifth District senior citizens as have seen the bill.

It is time we fulfill our promises and act. The senior citizens of this country have done the legwork on this legislation for us. We now have the opportunity to transform their recommendations into reality. I urge that you join me today in giving full support to this important measure.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to express my firm support for H.R. 15657. This bill represents a comprehensive effort to alleviate a broad range of problems facing the elderly of this country to-

day. H.R. 15657 seeks to reinforce and elaborate upon the programs of the Older Americans Act of 1965; programs which have an established record of success and effectiveness. I do not think that there is a Member present in this Chamber today who can find fault with the accomplishments of such worthy programs as the Retired Senior Volunteer program, the Foster Grandparent program, and others. Last year, under title 3 of the Older Americans Act of 1965, 1,721 projects provided assistance for 800,313 elderly citizens of this country. These projects serve to comfort and ease the loneliness of much neglected shut-ins. They provide essential transportation that enables the elderly to visit their physicians and attend religious services. These projects help provide nutritional meals, decent housing, training and guidance, plus a host of other services which are urgently needed by our senior citizens.

When the Older Americans Act of 1965 was passed and signed into law, all of us here in Congress had high hopes for it. Some of these hopes were realized, as I have indicated, but it has become increasingly more difficult for many of the goals of this bill to be accomplished. The 1965 Older Americans Act established the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This Administration was to be a highly visible body within HEW and was to be headed by a Commissioner appointed by the President. This organization was function as a national clearinghouse for dealing with the problems of the elderly. Instead, in 1967 the AOA was placed within the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the programs initiated by AOA became diffuse. Since that time the responsibilities of the Commissioner have continued to decline, and so has his effectiveness.

This bill seeks to restore the Commissioner of AOA to an effective and respected position. H.R. 15657 provides the Commissioner with the authority to issue grants in order to initiate programs in gap areas where demonstrable need is evident. Financial resources to share in the costs of development and operations of programs are essential if the Commissioner is to achieve effective coordination with other agencies. H.R. 15657 aims at achieving maximum effectiveness in all programs for the aging by requiring that all Federal agencies desiring to create programs related to the purposes of the Older Americans Act shall consult with the AOA in executing these policies. Such reforms represent significant qualification and innovation in the present law and in my opinion will go a long way toward increasing the effectiveness with which the AOA can deal with the problems facing our senior citizens.

This bill also establishes a National Advisory Council on the Aging to keep the President informed on matters relating to the special needs of the elderly. This Council is required under H.R. 15657 to undertake two major studies. The first study is to be for the purpose of examining the interrelationships of Federal, State, and local agencies operating

to benefit the elderly. Many of these agencies overlap one another under existing structures. The resultant inequity becomes manifest when older people receiving benefits under the jurisdiction of more than one agency are appropriated an increase in benefits from one program, in the former program reductions in benefits often occur proportionately. In effect there is no increase at all for the individual. The tragedy here is that the reason for the initial increase is often a very pressing one, and yet the net result is self-defeating. I feel very strongly, as I am sure you are well aware, that every effort should be made to help free our senior citizens from the unreasonable burdens brought on by a fixed income.

The second study that the Council will undertake is a review of the combined impact of all taxes on the elderly. Taxes on income, property, sales, and social security among others will be examined. Hopefully this study will find a solution to the tax burden under which our elderly suffer. Consider the implications of an elderly homeowner who is retired and living on a fixed income. How is he to cope with a sudden rise in property taxes? Is he to be expected to abandon the home which in many cases he has worked for all his life? Certainly there exists a better solution.

Fellow colleagues, the bill which is before you today represents a realistic approach toward solving the problems of the elderly. It will establish a single, clearly identifiable Federal agency to handle all matters related to our senior citizens. It also establishes a single State agency on aging in each of our States so that the elderly citizens will have better access to much needed assistance. This bill provides funds for the study of all problems encountered by the elderly. It will fund organizations to assist the elderly in education, transportation, medical needs and most importantly, it does so with the aim in mind to enable our senior citizens to live independent lives in the dignity of their own homes.

I am proud to support this bill. It is a bill that encompasses not just a single interest group, but all Americans. Most every person in the United States will some day reach the twilight of his or her years, and will have to confront the problems of being a senior citizen. When that time comes, they will appreciate the efforts which I hope all of you will make today in passing this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, although I recognize that this bill will not solve many of the problems of our senior citizens, at least it is an attempt to do something to make life easier and more meaningful for this wonderful group of people from whom we have heard so little in the way of protest and for whom we have done on a relative basis so little. It seems that in too many cases, Government responds to protests or the volume of the voice of groups; but senior citizens are a law-abiding, reserved, relatively quiet, group who simply would not indulge in loud protest. Inflation has been especially severe on the group of senior

citizens who primarily depend upon fixed incomes. They are the ones who have most of the problems with regard to transportation. Senior citizens are the ones who must make major social and economic adjustments and deal with more health problems than the average citizen. The young can walk or, if necessary, hitchhike, but the senior citizens in many cases find both too difficult. The young do not have as many sick days and senior citizens are less able to sustain the physical drain caused by epidemics and the more common chronic and contagious diseases.

This bill will provide for action to make available a wide range of services, including transportation, pre-retirement training, health services and senior citizen community centers. This bill expands the services of the Older Americans Act and provides a program for low cost transportation. This bill provides expanded work service opportunities, including strengthening the retired senior volunteer program and the foster grandparents program. This bill provides for the coordination of Federal aging programs and senior citizen community centers as well as other health, education and social services.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill and take this opportunity to again say to the House that I think Congress has not given enough attention to the problems of the senior citizens of this country in comparison to the amount of time we have given to some other problems and that instead of being given less attention because they do not protest loudly, we should reward this group for making such a tremendous contribution to the permanent well-being for our country by bringing us through the serious economic conditions of past generations and developing this country to the place where resources per person are far beyond what anyone could have imagined a few years ago.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Older Americans Act of 1965 amendments before the House today. I believe that his bill is important to achieve the full commitment to the Nation's elderly.

The elderly face serious problems and inequities in our society. They have suffered from neglect far too long. Of the 19 million elderly in the United States, over 25 percent live below the poverty line. Many suffer from inadequate housing, poor nutrition, limited health care, and perhaps most importantly from a feeling of personal isolation and uselessness. They have worked hard all their lives and awaited retirement with high hopes only to find that the reality of old age is far different than the golden years image we have all been led to believe exists. The elderly have waited too long for the decent and dignified retirement they have earned.

The bill before us today gives us the opportunity to help rectify somewhat the situation confronting our older Americans. The Older Americans Act of 1965 was an important Federal vehicle for the development and coordination of social

services for older Americans. Now we must continue to show our concern for the elderly by correcting the inadequacies that have been found to exist in the 1965 bill.

This bill will provide a comprehensive range of services readily available to older Americans. Special programs will be established, directed to the solution of critical problems confronting older persons in the areas of health, nutrition, housing, transportation, employment, and continuing education.

This act as well provides for the expansion of volunteer work service opportunities for the elderly, such as the foster grandparent program. The elderly are willing and able to contribute to society and have unique talents to offer if they only have the opportunity to use them. As things stand now many elderly are without this opportunity and as a result both they and society suffer.

One of the major problems in the field of aging seems to be the lack of coordination among the various programs offered. One purpose of the amendments offered today is to strengthen the role of the Administration on Aging as a focal point of Federal concern for older Americans. In the past the Administration on Aging has been characterized by uncoordinated programs, scattered concerns and few clear-cut goals. This situation has created chaos as well as a lack of direction in Federal and State programs. I made this identical point last February when introducing my bill calling for a strengthened Administration on Aging and the situation since then has only deteriorated. The second-class treatment given to the Administration on Aging reflects the second-class treatment we have been giving our elderly. The bill before us now would help alleviate this situation by giving the Commissioner on Aging the powers and responsibilities he needs to carry out effective programs for older people.

It is time that the Congress stop paying simple lip service to the plight of the elderly and instead enact significant legislation to help the elderly lead the kind of useful, productive life to which all of us look forward in old age. I urge you to support this amendment.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. I rise in support of H.R. 15657, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972. I am the cosponsor of a similar bill, H.R. 12719 which I sponsored would also strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965. The Older Americans Act of 1965 has been an important development and coordination of social services for our older Americans.

The State and community programs established under the Older Americans Act of 1965 served 800,313 older persons during 1971. Services in 235 community programs were designed to maintain independent living arrangements for the elderly and assisted in reaching a large portion of elderly shut-ins. These in-home and out-of-home services made it possible for the elderly to maintain a sense of dignity and independence in

their own familiar community environment.

Training programs under this law were held at 17 universities across the country to provide well-trained personnel capable of providing a variety of professional services to the older population.

Since 1969, the foster grandparents program has also been funded and administered under this law. Currently there are 67 foster grandparent projects serving over 200 different care programs in 40 States and Puerto Rico which utilize the servicing of over 4,400 foster grandparents per day.

The retired senior volunteer program was also authorized by the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969. As of June 30, 1972 Action has funded 51 developmental grants and 300 project grants for RSVP. Action's projections indicate that these grants will support over 60,000 volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, the past and continuing successes of the Old Americans Services will be heightened by the addition of the amendments contained in H.R. 15657, the purpose of which is to extend, strengthen and modify the grant programs authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965 through Fiscal Year 1975. In addition H.R. 15657 seeks to:

First, strengthen the role of the Administration on Aging as a focal point of Federal concern for older persons and upgrading its organizational status;

Second, create a National Advisory Council;

Third, strengthen State agencies on aging as the focal points in planning and developing service systems and area agencies for providing comprehensive coordinated, community-based services for the elderly;

Fourth, establish a national information and resource center for the aging and develop a network of information and referral sources in the States and communities;

Fifth, provide authority to lease, renovate and construct multipurpose senior centers through grants, contracts or mortgage insurance and support staffing grants for the initial operation of such centers and the delivery of social services;

Sixth, expand the research, demonstration, and training programs of the act and authorize the establishment and support of multidisciplinary centers of gerontology;

Seventh, expand the National Older Americans Volunteer program;

Eighth, assure that the nutrition program for the elderly is operated, wherever possible, in conjunction with comprehensive, coordinated service systems; and

Ninth, provide for special impact demonstrations in the area of transportation, housing, employment, preretirement and continuing education as a part of comprehensive, coordinated service systems for the elderly.

I feel that passage of this legislation is necessary if we are to make the waning years of many, many Americans more comfortable, and useful. There are

presently almost 20 million senior citizens in our country, and the number is expected to increase to 28 million by the end of the century, it is important therefore that the services provided to them are in keeping with the level of those provided to other citizens. I am happy therefore to be able to support the bill before the House and I ask my colleagues to vote for the passage of H.R. 15657.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 15657, the Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972. This bill, which is a product of the White House Conference on Aging, will provide many urgently needed services for senior citizens, as well as providing a sense of usefulness for them.

This bill provides for the strengthening of the State agencies on aging, and centralizes Federal concerns in the Administration on Aging. It creates a National Advisory Council on Aging and a National Information and Resource Center. It expands research, demonstration and training programs, and coordinates nutrition programs with service systems of State and local agencies.

I strongly support this bill as a necessary beginning to make good the hopes of the White House Conference on Aging.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15657, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972.

More than 7 years ago, on March 31, 1965, the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate a bill which its principal sponsor, Representative John Fogarty of Rhode Island, called "practical, modest, and without frills." It created an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and authorized \$6.5 million in grants for fiscal year 1966. The bill, later passed by the Senate and signed into law by President Johnson, was known as the Older Americans Act of 1965.

In 1971, more than 1,700 individual projects received funds under the provisions of this act, providing services for almost 1 million senior citizens in the United States. Among these projects were 400 community volunteer programs, 250 transportation programs, 160 health programs, career training programs at 17 universities, the highly successful foster grandparent program, and the new retired senior volunteer program. The Older Americans Act has become the most important Federal effort in the development and coordination of social services for the elderly.

But in the 7 years since passage of the act, the Administration on Aging—AOA—has slowly been swallowed by the administrative morass that is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In 1967, the AOA, supposedly headed by a Commissioner appointed by the President, was transferred to HEW's Social and Rehabilitative Service. Since that time, according to the report of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

The responsibilities of the Commissioner have been progressively lessened to the point where the Committee fears that his effectiveness is in jeopardy.

H.R. 15657, which was unanimously approved by the Select Subcommittee on Education and the full Education and Labor Committee, revitalizes the Administration on Aging by reestablishing its independence, transferring new and existing social services programs to its jurisdiction, creating a new National Advisory Council on the Aging and a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging, and increasing the authorization for programs under the Older Americans Act to \$335.5 million.

REVITALIZATION

H.R. 15657 forbids the Commissioner on Aging from delegating any of his authority to other officers or agencies, and increases the Commissioner's authority over the policy, development, and coordination of social service programs for the elderly. In effect, title II establishes AOA as the focal point of Federal efforts in this area, as the sponsors of the original Older Americans Act intended it to be.

INCREASED JURISDICTION

H.R. 15657 expands the training and research programs of the Older Americans Act, adds a new title V for the creation and staffing of multipurpose senior citizens centers, expands the foster grandparent program and the retired senior volunteer program, and creates a new and very promising category of grants for special impact programs for senior citizens in such areas as housing, health, education, and transportation.

In addition, this bill makes important administrative changes in the recently enacted senior citizens nutrition program, providing low-cost meals to the elderly. The hot meal program would be amended to bring it under the direct control of the Commissioner on Aging.

CREATION OF ADDITIONAL ADVISORY BODIES

H.R. 15657 would amend title II of the Older Americans Act to create a National Advisory Council on the Aging as a Presidential advisory committee of 15 members. The bill would also create a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging to serve as a Federal clearinghouse for information and data on problems associated with aging.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

H.R. 15657 rewrites title III of the act, authorizing \$132 million for State agency administration and changing the antiquated distribution formula. The bill also authorizes \$35 million for training and research, \$46 million for new multipurpose senior citizens center programs, \$55 million for expansion of the foster grandparent and retired senior volunteer programs, \$50 million for special impact programs, and \$17.5 million for other purposes.

These provisions are only a small fraction of the many highly laudable improvements in the Older Americans Act that H.R. 15657 would effect. I congratulate the members of the Select Subcom-

mittee on Education, and particularly the chairman of that subcommittee, my friend and colleague Representative JOHN BRADEMAs, for the excellent work they have done in preparing this bill.

I am very pleased to note that H.R. 15657 will bring \$3,050,757 to Massachusetts in the fiscal year of 1973. Substantially more will come to Massachusetts in 1974 when this act will distribute \$200 million nationwide, and even more will come to my State in 1975 when \$300 million will be authorized.

To provide older Americans with the basics of health, income, and a sense of purpose, yet to do so without diminishing their dignity, in their eyes or in our own—these are the purposes of the Older Americans Act, and of H.R. 15657, the bill we are considering today. I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments.

The legislation before us today will provide specific steps to strengthen, improve, and extend many of the programs authorized under the Older Americans Act. The Commissioner of the Administration on the Aging has been charged with the coordination and development of programs to help our senior citizens. In order to carry out the mandate of the Congress and to implement the recommendations of the delegates to the Conference on the Aging, the Commissioner must have the power and financial resources to launch new programs and to coordinate with other Federal agencies. This legislation will do much to achieve these goals.

In some communities, there are senior centers to offer information, counseling and referral services, recreational and educational programs, and volunteer opportunities for the elderly. H.R. 15657 would add a new title V to the Older Americans Act, relating to the provision and staffing of multipurpose centers for the elderly. These centers would be the focal point for the coordination and development of services to the elderly.

In Springfield, Mass., we have such centers. The Hobby Club does a great job for the elderly of the community. Unfortunately, it simply is not large enough to extend its services to all of our senior citizens. The opportunity to be useful, needed, and counted should be available to all older people, and this bill would be a great step in this direction.

H.R. 15657 will broaden the functions of the Administration on the Aging to include the carrying out of programs designed to meet the needs of older persons for social services. It will provide for such services as nutrition, hospitalization, pre-retirement training, and continuing education.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, older Americans in communities across the Nation need our help. Senior citizens have given their energies to the growth and success of our country. They deserve not only respect, but also a retirement of security, honor, and dignity, as well

as every opportunity to maintain a full life and good health.

The bill before us today, H.R. 15657, is important legislation. For example, my State of Connecticut would receive \$1.4 million toward its plan to develop a comprehensive and coordinated system of social services for older citizens. This legislation would extend, strengthen, and improve the grant programs authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965. The objectives of the original legislation remain the same, but the means have been reevaluated and updated to meet more effectively the needs of the elderly. In fact, H.R. 15657 is designed to tear down the barriers which tend to confine older Americans—barriers which long have restricted older Americans who could and should lead constructive lives. Most important, this legislation would make it possible to build comprehensive programs that encourage older citizens to participate actively in the mainstream of community life.

During 1971 alone, 800,313 older Americans were served by a wide range of community programs. However, funds were used in a haphazard approach to problem solving. Consequently, the impact of Federal support was not as great as it should have been. The amendments contained in H.R. 15657 authorize appropriations of \$100 million for fiscal year 1973. This funding would substantially revise the State and community grant program in a way that fosters the development of comprehensive and coordinated service systems. This change is effected, first of all, by strengthening the State agencies. H.R. 15657 calls for the establishment of a single easily identifiable State agency on aging. In addition, title III provides that the State agency designate area agencies which would assure effective attention to the particular local needs of older persons. Finally, there is a significant increase in funds to States, but the funding is accompanied by a more rigorous accountability process.

A primary agent of the concentrated social services is the development of multipurpose senior centers. Such facilities provide a focal point in the communities for the delivery and dispensation of social services and nutritional services designed primarily for older persons. These centers would be accessible neighborhood gathering places. They would provide a sense of community, dependability, and security which are essential to our senior citizens. Such centers can bring about a constructive change in the lives of the elderly by providing a headquarters for action in the solution of transportation, social, recreational, civic, attitudinal, and financial problems. A multipurpose center can provide the impetus necessary to make the elderly citizen an integral part of his community and create the atmosphere in which he will make further contributions to society.

H.R. 15657 contains a new title VIII, establishing special demonstration and model projects which are directed at the solution of critical problems confronting older persons in the areas of pre-

retirement, housing, transportation, employment, and continuing education.

This legislation also alters the Administration on Aging. First, it provides that the Commissioner on Aging be directly responsible to the Secretary of HEW. The function of this amendment is to better coordinate the programs, activities, and personnel on a national level. A National Information and Resource Center is also established within the Administration on Aging. The Center would collect, review, organize, publish, and disseminate information and data relating to the particular problems caused by aging. Such a service would work in conjunction with similar centers to be established by the States. Finally, this bill replaces an Advisory Committee on Older Americans in HEW with a National Advisory Council with an expanded scope of activities.

Mr. Speaker, let us give our older citizens the reverence that is their due. Let us not turn our backs on those who have made us the great Nation that we are. Instead, let us pass H.R. 15657, a bill to increase benefits and expand services to the elderly—a program that will give brightness and meaning to the lives of so many older Americans.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15657, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972.

The recent White House Conference on Aging highlighted the need for the strengthening and improvement of the existing Older Americans Act of 1965. After numerous hearings and careful deliberation, the Committee on Education and Labor reported a comprehensive bill to meet the challenge of improving programs and introducing new facilities and services to help older citizens. This bill, H.R. 15657, is an important step in the progress of understanding and combating the unique and often forgotten problems of older Americans.

Our older population has increased more than six times since 1900. Today, one in every 10 Americans has reached age 65. This is an overwhelming figure and one that can no longer be overlooked.

The Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972 strengthens the role of the Administration on Aging as a focal point of Federal concern for older persons. This bill creates a National Advisory Council on the Aging and establishes a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging. It strengthens State agencies on the aging by encouraging them to develop and foster comprehensive service systems with each other and related agencies.

The bill expands the foster grandparent program and the retired senior volunteer program under ACTION. It creates multipurpose senior centers for the elderly where they can gather, receive a variety of services, and be referred to other services that they might need. It also strengthens the presently inadequate nutrition program for older persons and provides additional nutritional services. Special impact demonstrations for service systems for the elderly in the areas of housing, employ-

ment, preretirement, and continuing education are also provided.

I feel that two new provisions in this bill are particularly important. First, H.R. 15657 provides for the improvement of transportation services available to older persons by establishing special transportation subsystems for older persons or groups with similar mobility restrictions. It also provides payment of subsidies for transportation services to enable older persons to travel on a reduced rate basis. Programs are also established to study the economic and service aspects of transportation for older persons living in urban and rural areas.

Second, under H.R. 15657 the Commissioner on Aging is authorized to make grants for the purpose of establishing and supporting multidisciplinary centers of gerontology. These centers would recruit and train personnel, conduct research into a variety of matters affecting the elderly, and provide consultation and technical assistance regarding the planning of services for older persons. The centers would also act as a repository of information and encourage the incorporation of aging information into the teaching of biological, behavioral, and social sciences in institutions of higher education. These centers will help to attract new students to this field and become the coordinating units for related federally supported research and training programs.

H.R. 15657 represents a small part of our debt to our older Americans and I urge my colleagues to join me in full support of this very worthwhile legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15657 provides the Congress an opportunity to further the goals of our older Americans. I advocate the passage of H.R. 15657 because it is the most comprehensive answer to the needs of older Americans at the present time. Failure to enact this legislation would not only impede expansion of benefits that older Americans rightly deserve, but would also deprive them of satisfaction of needs previously provided under the Older Americans Act of 1965. For this reason alone, the amendments merit passage, but there are also many important new provisions which make their passage essential.

I have long supported and introduced many resolutions on a variety of concerns of older Americans. I am, therefore, happy to see that the legislation under consideration incorporates many of these concerns into a cohesive program.

If enacted, H.R. 15657 would declare access to low-cost transportation one of the main priorities of the Older Americans Act. During the White House Conference on Aging, one of the most persistent requests of older Americans was for some sort of low-cost transportation. Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 14432 designed to guarantee low-cost transportation for the elderly. The pending bill is a step in that direction.

The replacement of the present advisory committee within the Depart-

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare by a National Advisory Council on Aging reflects my request to establish a Department of Elder Affairs which was presented as H.R. 14434. As I had recommended at the time I submitted that bill, this new agency will not only provide older Americans with a direct input to the President; it will also provide for the consolidation of existing programs for the elderly under a single agency; serve as a clearinghouse for pertinent information; conduct research; and coordinate all older American affairs more efficiently than in the past.

One of the main tasks of this new advisory council would be to investigate the impact of taxes on the elderly and make recommendations based on their findings. Again, although this is only a first step, it is an important one in order to relieve the heavy and inequitable tax burdens placed on fixed incomes. I have in the past in both H.R. 13170 and H.R. 14437 advocated the lessening of the tax burden on older Americans with fixed incomes and I believe that the advisory council will recommend such measures.

H.R. 15657 would also supply funds needed to overcome the problems of older Americans in employment and housing. H.R. 14431 and H.R. 14433 which I submitted earlier this year provided for housing and employment opportunities for older Americans. Although the actions provided in H.R. 15657 are not as immediate as the measures I have presented, they still constitute important progress in the satisfaction of older Americans needs.

Because the Older Americans Service Amendments provide such an astute recognition of the needs of the elderly and comprehensive plan of action to satisfy those acute needs, I support H.R. 15657 and urge my colleagues in the House to enact this legislation.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 15657, amending the Older Americans Act to provide much needed assistance to social service programs serving senior citizens.

The United States is an increasingly younger country, and in our worship of youth we have been careless about caring for the no-longer-young who worked so hard to produce the prosperity which the youth have inherited.

The bill before us today will help to restore dignity and comfort to many older Americans by providing funding for numerous programs specially designed to meet their needs.

In 1971, I introduced H.R. 12136, a proposal to amend the Older Americans Act. Subsequently the White House Conference on Aging issued its report and H.R. 12136 was broadened in many respects, eventually taking the form of the bill we are now considering.

I am especially pleased to see that this bill highlights the need for reduced cost transportation for the elderly. The elderly must rely on public transportation and sometimes on special private transportation in order to maintain mobility and some measure of self-sufficiency in spite of declining physical condition.

H.R. 15657 will permit Federal assistance to go to transportation systems in order to make low-cost transportation available to the elderly. For many, this can mean the difference between being a shut-in and living an active life.

A similar provision ought to be included in the Omnibus Housing Act now pending in the Banking and Currency Committee, as I have proposed in H.R. 11282 and H.R. 14432, so that urban public transportation systems are also able to offer reduced or free transportation to the elderly.

The Chicago City Council recently passed a resolution calling on Congress to enact such legislation, and a copy of that resolution follows:

RESOLUTION—CITY OF CHICAGO

Whereas, the number of persons 65 years or older in the United States today is approximately 20 million—ten percent of the total population; and

Whereas, between 1960 and 1970, older Americans increased in number throughout the Nation by 21 percent, as compared with an 18 percent growth in the under 65 population; and

Whereas, nearly 6.5 million older Americans are now classified as poor or near poor, and one of every four individuals 65 and older—in contrast to one in nine for younger persons—lives in poverty; and

Whereas, the ability to travel is vital to the elderly in order to acquire basic living necessities and to participate in spiritual, cultural and recreational activities; and

Whereas, the White House Conference on Aging, on December 2, 1971, adopted recommendations which call for "travel at half fares or less on a space available basis on all modes of public transportation", for the elderly, and "operating and capital subsidies" by the Federal government to make this and other recommendations possible; and

Whereas, in February, 1972, Mayor Richard J. Daley and Michael Cafferty, Chairman of the Board, Chicago Transit Authority, testified before Congressional Committees, urging that the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 be amended to provide operating subsidies for urban mass transportation systems; and

Whereas, on March 8, 1972, Robert J. Ahrens, Director, Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens, in testimony before the U.S. House Select Subcommittee on Education recommended operating subsidies for mass transit systems for any proven loss which results from a program of reduced fares for the elderly; and

Whereas, numerous mass transit systems, including the Chicago Transit Authority, have instituted reduced fare programs for senior citizens and continue to experience fiscal difficulty in attempting to provide an adequate level of services; and

Whereas, Congress is currently considering legislation (as part of the "Omnibus Housing Act of 1972") that carries the important provision of subsidy for urban mass transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mayor and members of the City Council of the City of Chicago in meeting assembled this 14th day of June, A.D., 1972, urge the inclusion within the "Omnibus Housing Act of 1972" of provisions calling for the reimbursement to urban mass transit systems for proven losses attributed to the reduction of fares for senior citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the House Banking and Cur-

rency Committee of the United States Congress.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the legislation currently before the House, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1972 (H.R. 15657), makes a number of helpful additions and modifications to major laws affecting senior citizens. In particular, it contains new authority and funds for the development of "multi-purpose" senior citizen centers, which are so badly needed throughout this country, through renovation or other modification of existing facilities. It expands the volunteer programs such as foster grandparents and the retired senior volunteer programs—RSVP—under which older Americans find opportunities to remain involved, to apply their experience and skill, and to continue to contribute significantly to the betterment of their communities. This legislation also contains new authority and funds for special impact projects to help senior citizens with their many transportation, housing, employment, and educational problems.

The total funds authorized by this legislation for these and various other programs for senior citizens is over \$335,450,000 for 1973, \$510,300,000 for 1974, and \$682,900,000 for 1975. Of those amounts, \$132 million in 1973, \$245 million in 1974, and \$345 million in 1975 are allocated to the States for support of State and community senior citizen projects. These figures represent considerable increases over the past years, and I note that the formula for the allocation of funds among the States is altered by this legislation in such a manner that the State of New York, where the problems of senior citizens are particularly severe, due to uncommonly high prices, congestion, and other factors, will receive substantially greater proportion of these funds for State and local projects than in the past. On the basis of that and the many other positive elements of this legislation I plan to vote for it and I want to commend the committee for bringing it to the floor of the House.

My one disappointment with this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that it fails to provide for programs and funds so that senior citizens in community service jobs may receive some compensation. While I support the voluntary programs expanded by this legislation, I have long believed that senior citizens should also have the option and opportunity to put their energy and skills to use in the community and to be compensated for that service. I submitted testimony to the committee in the course of its deliberations on this legislation urging that it provide for such programs in this bill. As I pointed out in that testimony, poverty affects one in four persons over 65 years of age. Yet only 1 percent of the persons employed under our existing government employment programs are 65 or older. We simply must provide salaried community service jobs specifically and exclusively for older Americans.

A few such programs—such as "Senior Aides" which I was instrumental in getting started—do exist under the jurisdic-

tion of the Labor Department. But these programs have no statutory basis or congressionally earmarked funds, and are therefore subject to termination of funding cutbacks at any time. I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that such community service programs which permit hard-pressed senior citizens to earn some income to supplement whatever meager retirement benefits they may have in return for their contributions to the community should not only be continued and expanded, but should be specifically provided for by the Congress. This might be done through additional separate legislation or, should the Senate see fit to include such a provision in their version of this legislation, as I will be urging that body to do, then through House acceptance of the Senate position in conference. I take this opportunity again to urge the Committee on Education and Labor one way or the other to fill this important gap in the otherwise very comprehensive and constructive legislation now before the House.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in most societies of the world, the elderly members are revered. They are looked to for advice and counsel, and their judgments on important issues are usually held conclusive. In sharp contrast, we in America have made our preoccupation with youth into almost a religion. The older members of our society are increasingly neglected and find themselves in poverty, isolated from their family and former friends, often in desperate need of material and emotional support.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we of the Congress can take a long stride toward remedying this sad situation by passing the bill now before us, H.R. 15657, the proposed Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972.

The basic thrust of H.R. 15657 is to extend and strengthen the existing programs established under the Older Americans Act of 1965, whose grant authorizations expired several weeks ago. Appropriations of more than \$1.2 billion are authorized over the 3 fiscal years beginning with 1973.

Central to the new legislation is the authorization of \$600 million over the 3 years for funding programs which result in the direct provision of social services for the elderly, so-called title III programs. According to the formula included in the bill, my own State of Hawaii would receive \$250,000 each year for such programs. Some 1,700 community projects of various types have received aid under this part of the law. Nutrition projects, transportation, older volunteer programs and local out-reach efforts were among the kinds of activities to receive title III funds. Along with greatly increasing the funding levels for title III, H.R. 15657 provides a much-needed focus, so that available funds are not diffused to such a degree that their impact is imperceptible.

In addition, the pending bill would substantially upgrade the money available for two highly successful senior programs, the foster grandparents program, and the retired senior volunteer pro-

gram—RSVP. A program for more than 60,000 volunteers could be funded under the new authorization levels.

Mr. Speaker, the funds authorized in this legislation are vital to the effort to bring a reasonable level of living to the great mass of older Americans who find themselves on the edge of poverty if not over the brink. But, perhaps more importantly, the enactment of this landmark legislation will signify to older Americans that they have not been forgotten by their country, and that America is concerned over their well-being. A measure of dignity and respect is as important to the elderly as is economic sufficiency.

I commend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS), chairman of the subcommittee from which this measure has come, along with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), chairman of the full committee, for providing the House with this opportunity to extend a helping hand toward America's elderly citizens. I urge the House to seize that opportunity and approve H.R. 15657 overwhelmingly.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support the purpose and provisions of the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972.

H.R. 15657 builds upon the programs of the Older Americans Act of 1965. Our 20 million citizens who are 65 years old or older are rightfully entitled to the services and efficient administration which this bill provides.

Specifically, the bill:

First. Strengthens the Administration on Aging by placing the Commissioner on Aging directly under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and limiting the authority of the Secretary to delegate functions to other agencies. Presently the Administration on Aging is but one of several programs under the Social and Rehabilitation Services Administration. Programs serving older Americans are splintered among several agencies and are often uncoordinated. By placing the Commissioner in an independent position, he can better serve as a focal point within HEW, and thereby better reflect the concerns of the elderly. Strengthening the position and the authority of the Administration on Aging was one of the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging.

Second. Establishes a National Information and Resources Center. This Center would collect, catalog, publish, and disseminate information on the problems and programs on aging. A wide range of information will be available in such areas as education, employment, transportation, housing, and recreation. We need to do a better job of getting information to the elderly, and to programs serving the elderly at the local and State levels. This legislation is directed toward this purpose.

Third. Creates a Presidential advisory committee. An advisory committee would be appointed by the President and would have authority to evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and call atten-

tion to unmet special needs of older Americans. The committee would prepare a report to the President on its findings and this report would be transmitted to Congress with the President's comments and recommendations.

Fourth. Strengthens State and area commissions on aging. Under provisions of the bill, the State and area commissions will serve as a focal point for the planning and delivery of services to the elderly. One State agency would be responsible for programs in such areas as transportation, nutrition, health care, and housing. Area agencies would be designated by the State agency to oversee and coordinate services in a local area and to insure that maximum services are provided to the elderly with a minimum of duplication.

The bill would provide State programs with \$100 million in fiscal year 1973; \$200 million in fiscal year 1974; and \$300 million in fiscal year 1975. Each State would be allotted an amount related to its population, age 65 and over, Wisconsin, for example would receive \$2,275,646.

Fifth. Authorizes increased funding for training and research in the area of aging. Multidisciplinary centers of gerontology would be established to aid us in increasing our knowledge about the needs and how to meet the needs of our elderly. Such centers would broaden the training of the specialists serving the elderly in the related fields of public health and social work. The centers will develop models for the planning and delivery of comprehensive services to older persons as well as short-term training institutes.

Sixth. Provides assistance for renovating, leasing, and renting facilities for senior citizen centers. Centers will be located within convenient reach of our elderly population and will provide a full array of services. Such centers have already proved their value in several hundred areas throughout the Nation. In the Sixth District of Wisconsin, centers to meet the needs of older people are available in Fond du Lac, Ripon, Plymouth, and Campbellsport.

Seventh. Expands volunteer opportunities, including the popular Foster Grandparent program and the Retired Senior Volunteer program. The Foster Grandparent program provides part-time volunteer opportunities for low-income persons age 60 and over to serve needy children in institutions on a person-to-person basis. The amendments will allow senior citizens to serve both children and adults with special needs.

For example, the elderly could be served in their own homes, in nursing homes, and in institutions. The RSVP program has also been meeting a need by enabling older citizens to play a role in a variety of needed community activities; \$20 million will be provided for these two programs.

Eighth. Strengthens the Administration on Aging by authorizing experimental projects for the elderly in such vital areas as transportation, housing, and education. During fiscal year 1973,

\$50 million will be provided to show how these important needs can be met.

The United States has been slow in recognizing the needs of the elderly. Prior to fiscal year 1972, the Administration on Aging received less than \$40 million for all its programs. In fiscal 1972, this was increased to \$100 million. For fiscal 1973, President Nixon has asked for almost \$259 million. I fully support the provisions of this legislation and an appropriation that will adequately fund its provisions.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the elderly have at long last begun to receive some of the attention they have so long deserved. For too long, these problems have been swept under the rug; for too long, the elderly themselves have been largely ignored. We heard so much about the War on Poverty, and were called upon to spend billions to fight it; yet somehow, those crusaders often neglected to notice that a quarter of our poor are over 65, although only 10 percent of our population is over 65.

It is true that medicare is now an accepted fact, and senior citizens across this land at last have assurance that most of their health needs will be met. But continuing review and improvement are needed, and the extension of medicare to cover nursing care is long overdue.

Last month Congress raised social security payments by 20 percent across the board. I not only voted for the increase, I voted against an amendment which sought to reduce it to 10 percent. Last year, there was a 10-percent increase in benefits. In 1970 there was a 15-percent increase, and in 1968 there was a 13-percent increase. I voted for all of these. It is true that benefits were low to begin with, and that inflation though slowed, has been great during this period. However, the figures do support as fact the point that Congress has begun responding to the serious needs of our senior citizens.

SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED

I hasten to add, however, that we have much work to do to modernize our social security system. The earnings limitation needs to be raised and eventually eliminated, so as to encourage our senior citizens to help themselves, as so many of them are willing and able to do. Full benefits should be made available to men at age 62. The minimum level of benefits should receive a thorough overhaul, so that those who have worked under social security for many years will be able to live out their time in reasonable comfort. Many of these reforms have already been passed by the House but are stuck in the Senate, held hostage to unpopular welfare proposals.

Indeed, what is necessary is for us to at last recognize that the time has come to convert social security to a basic pension program covering our working men and women, with benefit levels high enough to insure that all retired people are above the poverty level. As a Nation, we must make a commitment to assure that after working a lifetime, people will not have to retire into poverty.

While making these improvements, it is time for us to have a thorough review

of the method of financing the social security program. It may well be that the present financing system, established during the 1930's, is outdated and should be changed.

SERVICES FOR OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, with this as background, it was particularly pleasing for me to be able to vote this week for the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972. This bill, which extends for 3 years the historic Older Americans Act of 1965, came to the floor with impressive bipartisan support.

Briefly summarized, it is the purpose of this bill, H.R. 15657, to extend, strengthen, and modify the grant programs authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965 through fiscal year 1975. In addition, it seeks to:

First. Strengthen the role of the Administration on Aging as a focal point of Federal concern for older persons and upgrading its organizational status;

Second. Create a National Advisory Council;

Third. Strengthen State agencies on aging as the focal points in planning and developing service systems and area agencies for providing comprehensive coordinated, community based services for the elderly;

Fourth. Establish a national information and resource center for the aging, and develop a network of information and referral sources in the States and communities;

Fifth. Provide authority to lease, renovate and construct multipurpose senior centers through grants, contracts or mortgage insurance and support staffing grants for the initial operation of such centers and the delivery of social services;

Sixth. Expand the research, demonstration, and training programs of the act and authorize the establishment and support of multidisciplinary centers of gerontology;

Seventh. Expand the National Older Americans Volunteer program—including Foster Grandparents and the retired senior volunteer programs;

Eighth. Assuring that the nutrition program for the elderly is operated, wherever possible, in conjunction with comprehensive, coordinated service systems developed under title III; and

Ninth. Provide for special impact demonstrations in the areas of transportation, housing, employment, preretirement, and continuing education as a part of comprehensive, coordinated service systems for the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that earlier this year, Congress passed legislation extending and expanding low cost nutritional programs for the aged. I supported this needed legislation.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

During the White House Conference on Aging, held in December 1971, it was my pleasure to invite the New Hampshire delegates to my office. They provided both information on and added emphasis to the problems of our older citizens. I remember that there was some question whether tangible results would flow from the conference. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation yesterday,

following as it does so closely the 20-percent hike in social security benefits, should provide a clear affirmative answer. What has come about is that there is a new visibility and emphasis on the needs of senior citizens. Hopefully, this will give momentum to meeting other problems, such as reforming social security, providing decent housing at a cost the elderly can afford, meeting the serious transportation needs of the aged, and finding ways to better utilize the often neglected but very valuable experience and abilities of our senior citizens.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of similar legislation, I rise in support of the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972, and commend our colleagues Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS and Chairman CARL PERKINS for their leadership and initiative in developing the proposal under consideration today. The provisions included in this bill clearly indicate a careful analysis of the needs of our senior citizens, and of the effectiveness of existing programs in meeting those needs.

The problems of our nearly 20 million senior citizens are serious ones, deserving special attention and demanding special solutions. They are problems involving inadequate housing, poor nutrition, insufficient health care, and loneliness. Each of these problems contributes to the isolation of our senior citizens from the mainstream of today's activities.

Our senior citizens deserve a retirement of security, honor, and dignity. The bill before us extends, strengthens, and improves existing law, making it possible to develop comprehensive programs that will encourage older Americans to participate fully in community life, and help provide them with the resources to do so.

Key provisions of the bill are designed to correct organizational deficiencies which have constrained the potential effectiveness of existing programs. First, H.R. 15657 strengthens the Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by reasserting the Congressional mandate to the Commissioner on Aging and giving him the powers and responsibilities he needs to carry out effective programs for older people and to work on a more equal basis with other agencies which have programs of benefit to the aged.

Further, the bill strengthens the State agencies authorized by the Older Americans Act of 1965, title III, by reasserting the requirement for a sole State agency, by increasing the funding available for the administration of the State plan required under title III, by giving large diverse States certain latitude with respect to determining planning areas within the States, and by establishing State information and referral services.

In efforts to focus greater attention and resources on problems unique to older Americans, the bill creates a National Advisory Council on the Aging, a committee to advise and assist the President on matters relating to the special needs of older Americans. Aside from making annual recommendations to the President and the Congress for new programs and activities for older Americans, the Council is charged with mak-

ing two very important studies: first, a study of the inter-relationships of benefit programs for the elderly operated by Federal, State, and local government; and second, a study of the combined impact of all taxes on the elderly.

As a further step to highlight the needs of senior citizens, H.R. 15657 provides for the establishment of an Information and Resource Center within the Administration on Aging. The major objective of the Center would be to collect, review, organize, publish, and disseminate information and data related to the particular problems caused by aging.

The bill also extends research and training programs, authorizing grants for the establishment of multidisciplinary centers of gerontology and the support of existing centers. Establishment of such centers, with primary focus on recruiting and training personnel, should help attract students to the field and build the necessary expertise for handling the special problems experienced by the elderly.

The most important obligation we have to our senior citizens, in my judgment, is to allow them to live a full life, with the opportunity to make contributions of their own and participate in life in a meaningful way. The establishment of multipurpose senior centers, to provide focal points within local communities for the provision of comprehensive social services for older people, will help meet that obligation. Strengthening of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program—RSVP—and expansion of the foster grandparent program will also help provide an opportunity for older Americans to contribute their talents and abilities to their community.

And finally, the bill provides for the establishment of special programs designed to meet the needs of older persons in the areas of housing, transportation, employment, continuing education, and preretirement education.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15657, the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972, will, I believe, achieve its goal of providing more comprehensive services, more effectively, to more senior citizens. I urge the support of all our colleagues.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15657.

The question was taken.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 351, nays 3, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—351

Abbott	Addabbo	Anderson, Ill.
Abernethy	Alexander	Andrews,
Abzug	Anderson,	N. Dak.
Adams	Calif.	Annunzio

Archer	Frey	Mollohan
Arends	Fuqua	Monahan
Ashbrook	Galifianakis	Montgomery
Ashley	Garmatz	Moorhead
Aspin	Gaydos	Morgan
Aspinall	Gettys	Moss
Badillo	Gialmo	Murphy, Ill.
Baker	Gibbons	Murphy, N.Y.
Barrett	Gonzalez	Myers
Begich	Goodling	Natcher
Bell	Grasso	Nedzi
Bennett	Gray	Nelsen
Betts	Green, Oreg.	Nichols
Bevill	Green, Pa.	Nix
Blaggi	Griffin	Obey
Blester	Griffiths	O'Hara
Bingham	Gross	O'Neill
Blackburn	Grover	Patman
Boggs	Gubser	Patten
Boland	Gude	Pepper
Bow	Haley	Perkins
Brademas	Hamilton	Peyster
Brasco	Hammer-	Pickle
Bray	schmidt	Pike
Brinkley	Hanley	Pirnie
Brooks	Hanna	Poage
Brotzman	Hansen, Idaho	Poff
Brown, Mith.	Harrington	Powell
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Preyer, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.	Harvey	Price, Ill.
Buchanan	Hastings	Price, Tex.
Burke, Fla.	Hathaway	Pucinski
Burke, Mass.	Hawkins	Purcell
Burleson, Tex.	Hays	Quile
Burton	Hechler, W. Va.	Quillen
Byrne, Pa.	Heckler, Mass.	Rallsback
Byrnes, Wis.	Heinz	Randall
Byron	Helstoski	Rangel
Cabell	Henderson	Rees
Caffery	Hicks, Mass.	Reid
Camp	Hicks, Wash.	Reuss
Carey, N.Y.	Hillis	Rhodes
Carlson	Hogan	Riegle
Carter	Hollifield	Roberts
Casey, Tex.	Horton	Robinson, Va.
Cederberg	Hosmer	Rodino
Celler	Howard	Roe
Chamberlain	Hull	Roncallo
Clancy	Hunt	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Jacobs	Rooney, Pa.
Clausen,	Jarman	Rosenthal
Don H.	Johnson, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Clawson, Del.	Johnson, Pa.	Roush
Cleveland	Jones, N.C.	Roy
Collier	Karth	Roybal
Collins, Ill.	Kastenmeier	Runnels
Collins, Tex.	Kazen	Ruppe
Conable	Keating	Ruth
Conover	Kee	Sandman
Conte	Keith	Satterfield
Conyers	Kemp	Saylor
Corman	King	Scherle
Coughlin	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Crane	Koch	Schneebell
Culver	Kyl	Schwengel
Daniel, Va.	Kyros	Scott
Daniels, N.J.	Latta	Sebelius
Danielson	Leggett	Shoup
Davis, S.C.	Lennon	Shriver
Davis, Wis.	Lent	Sikes
de la Garza	Lloyd	Sisk
Dellenback	Long, Md.	Skubitz
Dellums	Lujan	Slack
Denhelm	McClory	Smith, Calif.
Dennis	McCloskey	Smith, Iowa
Dent	McCollister	Smith, N.Y.
Derwinski	McCormack	Snyder
Devine	McCulloch	Springer
Dickinson	McDade	Staggers
Dingell	McEwen	Stanton,
Dorn	McFall	J. William
Downing	McKay	Stanton,
Drinan	McKevitt	James V.
Dulski	McKinney	Steed
Duncan	Macdonald,	Steele
Edmondson	Mass.	Steiger, Ariz.
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Stephens
Elberg	Mahon	Stratton
Erlenborn	Mailliard	Stubbsfield
Esch	Mallory	Sullivan
Eshleman	Mann	Symington
Evans, Colo.	Martin	Talcott
Fascell	Mathias, Calif.	Taylor
Fish	Mathis, Ga.	Teague, Calif.
Fisher	Matsunaga	Teague, Tex.
Flood	Mayne	Terry
Foley	Mazzoli	Thompson, Ga.
Ford, Gerald R.	Meeds	Thompson, N.J.
Ford,	Melcher	Thompson, Wis.
William D.	Michel	Thone
Forsythe	Mikva	Tiernan
Fountain	Miller, Ohio	Udall
Fraser	Mills, Md.	Ullman
Frelinghuysen	Minish	Van Deerin
Frenzel	Mink	Vander Jagt
	Mizell	Vanik

Veysey	Widnall	Wylder
Vigorito	Wiggins	Wyllie
Waggonner	Williams	Wyman
Waldie	Wilson, Bob	Yates
Wampler	Wilson,	Yatron
Ware	Charles H.	Young, Fla.
Whalen	Winn	Young, Tex.
White	Wolf	Zablocki
Whitehurst	Wright	Zion
Whitten	Wyatt	Zwack

NAYS—3

Hall Landgrebe Schmitz

NOT VOTING—78

Abourezk	Eckhardt	Metcalfe
Anderson,	Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Tenn.	Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.
Andrews, Ala.	Findley	Minshall
Baring	Flowers	Mitchell
Belcher	Flynt	Mosher
Bergland	Fulton	O'Konski
Blanton	Gallagher	Passman
Blatnik	Goldwater	Pelly
Bolling	Hagan	Pettis
Broomfield	Halpern	Podell
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.	Pryor, Ark.
Burlison, Mo.	Hébert	Rarick
Carney	Hungate	Robison, N.Y.
Chappell	Hutchinson	Rogers
Chisholm	Ichord	Rousselot
Clay	Jonas	Ryan
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	St Germain
Curlin	Jones, Tenn.	Sarbanes
Davis, Ga.	Kuykendall	Seiberling
Delaney	Landrum	Shipley
Diggs	Link	Spence
Donohue	Long, La.	Steiger, Wis.
Dow	McClure	Stokes
Dowdy	McDonald,	Stuckey
du Pont	Mich.	Whalley
Dwyer	McMillan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rousselot.	Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McDonald.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. du Pont.	Mrs. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Broomfield.	Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.	Mr. Chisholm with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Ryan.	Mr. Stokes with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. McClure.	Mr. Flowers with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Finley.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Robison of New York.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Gallagher.	Mr. Rogers with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Spence.	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Miller of California.	Mr. Link with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Pelly.	Mr. Baring with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Long of Louisiana.	Mr. Ichord with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. McMillan.	Mr. Dow with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Mosher.	Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Dwyer.	Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Bergland with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.	Mr. Curlin with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Sarbanes.	Mr. Hagan with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Seiberling.	Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Abourezk with Mr. St Germain.	Mr. Carney with Mr. Hungate.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROGERS FAVORS OLDER AMERICANS AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the President's National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, I was attending open hearings on the Senate side of the Capitol when the vote on the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972 was taken.

Unfortunately, I arrived just after the final vote was tallied and although the 351 to 3 vote was overwhelmingly in favor, I would like to go on record as supporting the provisions of the legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR USE AS HISTORIC MONUMENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1152) to facilitate the preservation of historic monuments, and for other purposes, as amended.

(The Clerk read as follows:)

S. 1152

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484), is further amended by redesignating section 203(k)(3) as section 203(k)(4) and by adding a new section 203(k)(3) as follows:

"(k)(3) Without monetary consideration to the United States, the Administrator may convey to any State, political subdivision, instrumentalities thereof, or municipality, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any surplus real and related personal property which the Secretary of the Interior has determined is suitable and desirable for use as a historic monument, for the benefit of the public. No property shall be determined to be suitable or desirable for use as a historic monument except in conformity with the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments established by section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes', approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), and only so much of any such property shall be so determined to be suitable or desirable for such use as is necessary for the preservation and proper observation of its historic features.

"(A) The Administrator may authorize use of any property conveyed under this subsection or the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, for revenue-producing activities if the Secretary of the Interior (1) determines that such activities are compatible with use

of the property for historic monument purposes, (ii) approves the grantee's plan for repair, rehabilitation, restoration, and maintenance of the property, and (iii) approves the grantee's plan for financing repair, rehabilitation, restoration, and maintenance of the property. The Secretary shall not approve a financial plan unless it provides that incomes in excess of costs of repair, rehabilitation, restoration, and maintenance shall be used by the grantee only for public historic preservation, park, or recreational purposes. The Administrator may not authorize any uses under this subsection until the Secretary has examined and approved the accounting and financial procedures used by the grantee. The Secretary may periodically audit the records of the grantee, directly related to the property conveyed.

"(B) The deed of conveyance of any surplus real property disposed of under the provisions of this subsection—

"(i) shall provide that all such property shall be used and maintained for historic monument purposes in perpetuity, and that in the event that the property ceases to be used or maintained for that purpose, all or any portion of the property shall, in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and

"(ii) may contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States.

"(C) 'States' as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 13(h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(h)) is repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1152 was unanimously approved on June 14, 1972, by the Committee on Government Operations. The objective of S. 1152 is to assist State and local governments in obtaining and preserving surplus Federal properties having historic or architectural significance. Without this legislation, many former Federal buildings having historic or architectural significance will probably face destruction. Our Nation has already lost too many of its historical and architectural treasures. As we are approaching our Nation's bicentennial era, it would be especially fitting for Congress to pass legislation that would help preserve these former Federal buildings and other properties that constitute a valuable part of our Nation's heritage.

S. 1152 provides that the Administrator of the General Services Administration—GSA—may convey Federal surplus real and related personal property for historic monument purposes to State and local governments and other public bodies, without monetary consideration, provided that the Secretary of the Interior first determines that the property is suitable and desirable for use as an historic monument for the benefit of the public. S. 1152 further provides that the Administrator of GSA, in his discretion, may authorize revenue-producing use of

these properties, if the Secretary of the Interior has first determined that such activities are compatible with the use of the property for historic monument purposes and has approved the grantee's plan for repair, rehabilitation, restoration, and maintenance of the property, as well as the grantee's plan for financing this work and future preservation activities.

This feature of S. 1152 is a departure from present law. Currently, State and local governments may receive, without cost, Federal surplus properties for historic monument use. However, the term historic monument has been defined to mean using a donated property only as a passive memorial. Active utilization was precluded. State and local governments, therefore, find it economically difficult to accept and maintain surplus Federal buildings of historic and architectural significance. This bill provides a mechanism, with appropriate controls, to allow the recipients of these properties to use them in order to help defray the costs of repair, rehabilitation, preservation and maintenance.

S. 1152 relies upon the experience and expertise of the Secretary of the Interior to determine the suitability and desirability of using a particular property for historic monument purposes. He is given the authority to determine whether any plan that a grantee may have for revenue-producing activities is compatible with the property's use as an historic monument.

S. 1152 also recognizes the unique expertise of the Administrator of GSA in utilizing and disposing of surplus Federal property. Accordingly, the administration is given authority to make the actual conveyance; authority to permit revenue-producing activities with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior; and the right to set conditions and restrictions on the conveyance of the property which the Administrator may determine necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States.

The House Committee on Government Operations has recommended adoption of two amendments to S. 1152:

First, On page 2, line 17, after "subsection," insert "or the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended."

The purpose of this amendment is to give retroactive effect to the provisions of this legislation so that properties previously conveyed for historic monument use under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 can be used for revenue-producing activities, provided that the pertinent provisions of S. 1152 are met.

Second, On page 3, line 3, strike out "public park or recreational purposes" and insert in lieu thereof "public historic preservation, park, or recreational purposes."

The purpose of this amendment is to insure that any income from these properties in excess of the costs of repair, rehabilitation, restoration and maintenance will be used for public historic preservation purposes.

S. 1152 will benefit many citizens of the United States while costing the Gov-

ernment only some minor administrative expenses. Although the Government might lose some revenues by donating these properties rather than selling them, this anticipated revenue loss is insignificant compared to the immense contribution that preservation of these buildings will make to our Nation's heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of S. 1152 by the House.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, I would be pleased to yield.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Under the present surplus property law, after the other Federal agencies determine they do not need the building, and the building is not to be used for education or health purposes, the municipality or county government can acquire at less than appraised value certain Federal surplus properties for local use. I am not arguing with the gentleman. I just want to make sure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield myself 1 additional minute to handle this query.

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman tell us whether it could be possible after this date for any community or any government entity wanting to take over a surplus Federal building to say it is of historical significance; therefore, we should get it free, and we will be able to use it as our seat of city government, county government, et cetera?

Mr. BROOKS. Not necessarily. They have to meet the provisions of this legislation. The Secretary of the Interior has to first determine that the property is suitable and desirable for use as a historic monument. The Secretary of the Interior must then determine that the proposed use is compatible with the property's historical and/or architectural features. If a potential recipient wants to use a surplus building as a city hall, and he meets the requirements, then he will be able to. If he wants to make it into a honky-tonk, I do not believe that would qualify.

Mr. KYL. But there are hard requirements regarding the stipulation of a historic site or monument?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. KYL. To allay another suspicion that might be harbored by some individuals, in the report it says S. 1152 will primarily encompass a group of surplus buildings, or buildings soon to become surplus, that have been used either as post offices, custom houses, or other Federal office space. Did either the committee of the Senate or the House have in mind certain specific buildings when it wrote this act?

Mr. BROOKS. Not particularly. This bill was originally introduced in the House by the Honorable GERALD R. FORD and by the Honorable BELLA ABZUG.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BROOKS. At that time I believe that they might have had specific buildings in mind. But the legislation itself would potentially apply to buildings throughout the United States. Several Members have indicated to me their own personal interest because of a building or site in their districts. But generally, S. 1152 is legislation that would make this opportunity available to every portion of the United States.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1152 which provides an added incentive for the preservation of America's historic properties.

This bill is a bipartisan effort, recommended by the President, and reported unanimously by the Government Operations Committee.

Over the years, the public has become increasingly aware of our country's traditions and heritage. In support of this awareness, Congress has provided an expanded package of legislation designed to enlarge our parklands, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, wilderness reserves, and historic monuments and places. As we approach the bicentennial of our founding, it is to be hoped that the people's feeling and awareness of the greatness of our Nation and society will grow. The bill before us is comparatively modest in nature, but I believe it will contribute to this cause.

For many years now the Federal Government through the Interior Department and the General Services Administration has been charged with the responsibility for preserving our historic heritage. The Interior Department has performed exemplary service in identifying historic properties. Where funds exist and national significance is determined, they establish, manage and preserve such properties on a national basis. The General Services Administration, for its part, has exercised authority conferred upon it by Congress in 1944 to make surplus Federal property available to State and local governments for historic monument purposes where such properties are deemed to have more of a regional or local, rather than national significance. This authority has been put to good use by GSA over the years so that many places of historic significance have been preserved which would otherwise have been destroyed.

Up to the present, however, the law has been interpreted to prohibit the generation of revenue from such surplus properties with the exception of any limited admission fees that could be exacted for visits to museums that might be set up in connection with the historic places. The practical effect of this prohibition has been to limit the amount of property that could be accepted by State or local governments since, in the absence of a property's revenue-producing capacity, such governments lack sufficient resources to maintain or preserve such properties. The purpose of S. 1152 is to overcome this impediment.

This bill authorizes GSA, when conveying surplus property to State and local governments for historic monument pur-

poses, to authorize the use of such property for revenue-producing purposes. Recognizing full well, however, the potential for misuse that this new grant of authority possesses, the committee has been exceedingly careful to surround it with safeguards.

First, only those properties will be determined suitable for historic monument purposes which conform to the recommendations of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments.

Second, any conveyed property may only be used for revenue-producing purposes if the Secretary of the Interior determines that such use will be compatible with the historic nature of the property. This compatibility requirement is one of the most essential safeguards in the bill because it seeks to assure the preservation of the historic character of the conveyed property in the face of any threat to prostitute such character to revenue-producing purposes. As we on the committee see it, a historic property—such as a post office or custom house—could be remodeled to include offices or even shops. But, such would have to be incorporated into the structure in a way that preserved its historic character. Gaudy, bizarre or honky-tonk facilities are not to be permitted. In providing for revenue-producing facilities, moreover, every effort must be made to provide for the admission of the public to at least part of a building in order to permit its examination.

Third, Interior is required to approve all arrangements for the repair, rehabilitation, restoration, and maintenance of the property as well as the grantee's plans for financing such arrangements.

Fourth, while it is not anticipated that significant revenues will be generated on a property in excess of that needed to finance restoration, repair, and related arrangements, any excess that is generated must be used by the grantee only for historic preservation, park, or recreational purposes, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Fifth, the Secretary of the Interior is charged with the responsibility for examining and approving the accounting and financial procedures used by the grantee, as well as being authorized to periodically audit the grantee's records.

Sixth, the General Services Administrator is authorized to withhold the conveyance of any property under this act unless he is satisfied that all the above conditions are met.

Seventh, every deed of conveyance shall contain provisions providing for the reversion of the property to the Government if any of the above safeguards are violated or if the property ceases to be used for historic purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I look upon this legislation as a meaningful contribution to the preservation and improvement of the historic tradition of our country. Its passage can be looked upon as a worthy assist to our bicentennial celebration that is fast approaching. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is an excellent act. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Historic Monument Conveyance Act stands as a beacon of light on the horizon to those of us with a deep and abiding interest in historic preservation. It remedies a long-standing problem that has plagued State and local governmental units seeking to acquire Federal excess property with local historical or architectural significance. While the Surplus Property Act of 1944 provided for the conveyance of excess Federal property to State and local bodies for the purpose of historic preservation, subsequent interpretation of the act prohibited the property from being used as a revenue-producing unit to offset the often significant costs of rehabilitation, restoration, repair and maintenance. Thus, many local jurisdictions which sought to acquire and preserve their historic sites lacked the financial resources to restore and maintain the property. The Historic Monument Conveyance Act seeks to overcome this financial obstacle to historic preservation.

This legislation enables the General Services Administration to convey to a State or local body, without monetary consideration, surplus Federal property that is determined by the Secretary of the Interior to have local or regional historic or architectural significance. The act also provides that the property so conveyed may be used for revenue producing activities if the Secretary of the Interior has determined that such activities are compatible with the use of the property for historic monument purposes.

With the 200th Anniversary of the birth of our Nation approaching, every American has a keen awareness of our rich national history. A history laden with significance for each of us. A history the Historic Monument Conveyance Act will make easier to preserve.

One local landmark which has historical significance for residents of my district, indeed for many people throughout our Nation, are the buildings located at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center Annex in Forest Glen, Md. Numbered among these buildings are some that appeared at the Chicago Worlds Exposition of 1898. Historic and architectural styles of different lands and periods are represented among these buildings. These structures represent a significant period of American architecture—an eclectic style of architecture which was widely used in the latter part of the nineteenth century. This legislation could well provide one solution to the problems presented in the possible preservation of these buildings on their site at Forest Glen, Md.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I concur in his remarks.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Under the provisions of this legislation, I am going to ask the gentleman a direct question: Would this permit our Government to turn over to the city of New York the post office, the Morgan Station Post Office we had debated here some time ago? Is this post office again in this picture?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No. It has not been recommended as a monument by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments and it has not been approved by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator of the General Services Administration. This bill covers only those properties which will be determined to have historic purposes and which conform to the recommendations of the Advisory Board.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, is it not true, in response to the query just made, that the present law with respect to qualifying a piece of property or a historic monument remains unchanged? So this bill does not affect that process one way or the other. Under the present law, a building can qualify if it is determined by the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Advisory Board, whatever the exact title of it is. If it qualifies under the present law, it can continue to do so under this bill. All this bill does, once the Department of Interior has approved the site, is permit submission of a plan for revenue-producing operations on the historic site subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior and GSA, so the present law on designation remains unchanged.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Florida has answered with clarity and eloquence as well as accuracy.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, to answer the specific question raised by the gentleman, this does not involve in any way the post office in New York. If any building would come under this, it would be the Customs House. This has nothing to do with the Morgan Post Office, which is not a historic site under this bill in my judgment.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have that clarification, because funny things happen. We get these buildings classified in one respect, and the next thing I know, they are being used for something else. I was curious about it, because it does permit renting out of facilities and buildings. We beat that Morgan Station bill, and I am interested to know if we have to beat it again.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If it is found that a building is being used for other than that for which it was approved, it can be taken back by the Federal Government under

this legislation. Also, it is not anticipated there will be significant revenues generally raised on the properties so conveyed in excess of that needed to finance restoration and repairs and related arrangements, but any excess generated must be used by the grantees only for park, recreational, and historic presentation purposes as approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, do I understand this designates the Secretary of the Interior as the authorizing authority and he alone?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There has to be approval at the outset by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, the Secretary of the Interior and the General Services Administration.

Mr. GROSS. All three?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They all have authority in this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Who appoints the Advisory Board?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is set up under law already, and this simply continues that arrangement, as provided under current law. This does not change anything in that respect.

Mr. GROSS. Does the Secretary of the Interior pick any of the members of the Advisory Board?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is by statute, I will say to the gentleman. He does not name the advisory board.

Mr. GROSS. He does not name the advisory board?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, sir, although the Secretary of the Interior is one of the twenty members of the council. We do not change anything about that setup in this legislation. All requirements stand which are present requirements.

Mr. GROSS. But once the Secretary of the Interior designates an historic monument there is no provision for coming back to the Congress for further authorization or confirmation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Nothing changes about that, either. The only thing which changes is to let them generate revenue. The whole thing remains the same except that a State or local government can generate revenue, with restrictions and as approved by the Secretary of the Interior. They can generate certain revenues on that property, which revenues must be used for historic restoration or preservation or other such purposes, and which purposes have to be approved in advance.

Nothing is changed otherwise by the law. It is just letting property that could already be conveyed also produce a limited amount of revenue to help the State and local governments restore and maintain such property.

Mr. GROSS. I am curious as to how the bill got into the hands of the committee. I do not question the broad jurisdiction or the Committee on Government Operations, but is this not more importantly a matter for the Committee on Public Works rather than the Committee on Government Operations?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is surplus property legislation, which is normally handled by the Government Activities Subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Texas, of the Government Operations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PATMAN was allowed to speak out of order.)

CHAIRMAN PATMAN ANNOUNCES HEARINGS ON PRESIDENT'S DISASTER LEGISLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the President transmitted a message to Congress calling for legislation which would relieve the victims of tropical Hurricane Agnes.

In his message the President called upon the Congress "to respond to this emergency by acting on the Agnes Recovery Act so that it can become law within 1 week."

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the debate on H.R. 15692, to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans, which passed the House by a vote of 325 ayes to 9 noes, disaster legislation should not be considered in any partisan way whatsoever, nor should such needed legislation be held up for any reason. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am announcing hearings beginning this Thursday, July 20. It is my intention to sit continuously for as long as necessary to finish the hearings on this legislation. Immediately after the hearings, it is my intention to have your House Committee on Banking and Currency meet in executive session to mark up this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, assuming the House Committee on Banking and Currency can move expeditiously, it is my hope in carrying out the wishes of the President to aid the victims of this and other disasters which have occurred in recent times, that it may be possible for the leadership to schedule this legislation for immediate House floor action.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1152 which would assist State and local governments in obtaining and preserving surplus Federal properties which have historic or architectural significance.

Under existing law, the Secretary of Interior must first determine that a given building is suitable and desirable for use as an historic monument. Buildings qualify as historic monuments if they are associated with some historic event or person, or if they exhibit an architectural style or type of construction that is representative of the technology, tastes or values of specific periods in our country's history.

While State and local governments can receive surplus property free of cost for use as historic monuments under current law, they cannot use the properties to produce revenue. Consequently, many State and local governments have found it economically impossible to operate such properties as historic monuments because funds would have to be provided from local taxes.

The legislation which we are considering would permit a recipient governmental unit to work out plans for revenue-producing operations, thereby generating the necessary funds for repair, rehabilitation, and maintenance, thus making it possible to preserve many fine buildings that might otherwise have to be demolished.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on this important legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this bill, of which H.R. 6769, introduced by Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and H.R. 11206, introduced by me, are the House counterparts. S. 1152 would permit State and local governments to accept and maintain historic properties without undue burden on their limited financial resources.

Under existing law, surplus Federal properties of historic value may be conveyed to State and local governments for preservation as historic sites, but no revenue-producing uses are permitted. Because expenses of rehabilitation and maintenance in old structures are especially high, preservation is often not feasible unless some revenue-producing use of the property can be made. This bill would provide that when a surplus property of historic significance is conveyed to a State or local government, the grantee may permit revenue-producing use of the property if it is compatible with the preservation of the property for historic monument purposes. By permitting such uses in limited, carefully controlled circumstances, it will be possible to develop and maintain certain historic monument sites which would otherwise be left to deteriorate or be demolished to make way for new construction.

Many historically significant structures across the Nation will be eligible for conveyance under this bill. One structure which we expect to be conveyed under this new provision is the New York Customs House, located at the southern tip of Manhattan Island. Designed by Cass Gilbert and constructed in the early part of the 20th century, this seven-story French-style building may be lost to posterity if this bill is not enacted. The General Services Administration may soon declare it as surplus property, and I am informed that the city of New York cannot afford to maintain it unless it produces some revenue. The use of a portion of the building for appropriate and compatible revenue-producing purposes would enable the use of the remainder for such cultural and educational activities as a museum, study programs, lectures, and research.

The professional judgment of the Secretary of the Interior and the Advisory Board on National Parks, both of which will review plans for the operation and maintenance of properties conveyed under this act, will prevent any frivolous or improper use of them.

Far too often, monuments worth preserving for their architectural or historic value are lost because there is no money available to maintain them. In other in-

stances, such structures are turned into unbearable tourist traps. This bill will prevent either fate from befalling properties conveyed under its provisions, and I urge its passage by the House.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

It is my understanding from our discussions during our committee's consideration of this measure that, assuming a building or a structure qualifies under historical criteria, it need not be limited to purely museum purposes and, therefore, if a proposed usage comes within the guidelines established by the Department of the Interior the structure could be used, for example, for routine municipal purposes, so long as such usage is consistent with historical preservation.

I have in mind a historical Federal building in my State that would qualify under historical criteria. It is my understanding that this building could be used as a courthouse by a State or local unit of government, assuming of course that the Interior Department guidelines are met. I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if that is correct?

Mr. BROOKS. The answer is a qualified yes. Under current law, that type of usage is not allowed but would be allowed under this legislation, so long as it was compatible with the historical and/or architectural features of the property. In other words, the proposed usage of the property will not be permitted to destroy the historical or architectural character of the property.

Mr. MOORHEAD. If I have time, I would like to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. MOORHEAD.

Would this exclude the old part of the courthouse now at 9th and Market in Philadelphia, at Independence Hall? After the new courthouse is opened around the first of the year, could this building be used by the city for a court to take care of about 20 judges?

Mr. BROOKS. It might well meet the qualifications of the legislation. I am not familiar with the building. My tenure in Philadelphia was cut short by orders from Broad Street to report to New Caledonia about 30 years ago, so I am not familiar with it.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. It is now a courthouse for the Third District of Pennsylvania. It includes the probation court, the clerk of the court, and the circuit court. They are going to move to the new courthouse.

Mr. BROOKS. I am certain the Department of the Interior would be willing to look objectively at such a request. It may well meet the historical preservation requirements.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I understand this legislation, there is an attempt to provide a consideration of both the contemplated use of the building as well as its historic significance. To the extent that it eliminates the age requirements, that is a liberalization of the test. Is that not correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Am I not correct that it is not essential for a building of this nature to qualify for transfer under this legislation to be specifically determined to be a site on the National Register? Is that not correct?

Mr. BROOKS. I believe it is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. In other words, the advisory board can make recommendations in favor of a transfer without requiring that the site actually be determined to be registered on the National Register. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Was that the same question you asked me before?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. There seems to be some question about this. The legislation says that it shall be in conformance with the recommendations of the advisory board. I do not think it necessitates an actual determination and placement on the National Register. I am hoping that is the response of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. The accurate response would be that the Department of the Interior can determine that a property is suitable and desirable as an historic monument, whether it is listed on the National Register or not.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Thank you very much. That is basically my understanding of the legislation and I am glad to have it confirmed by the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1152, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days within which to place their remarks in the Record on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL ANIMAL DAMAGE CONTROL ACT OF 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13152) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory animals; to establish a program of research concerning the control and conservation of predatory animals; to restrict the use of toxic chemicals as a method of predator control; and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13152

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Animal Damage Control Act of 1972".

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) the term "person" means any individual, organization or association, including any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, a State government, or a political subdivision thereof;

(b) the term "State" means the several States of the Union, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the District of Columbia, but shall not include any political subdivision of the foregoing entities;

(c) the term "chemical toxicant" means any chemical substance which, when ingested, inhaled, or absorbed, or when applied to, or injected into the body, in relatively small amounts, by its chemical action may cause significant injury, illness, or death to animals or man;

(d) the term "predatory animal" means any mammal or reptile which habitually preys upon other animals;

(e) the term "depredating animal" means any nonpredatory mammal or reptile causing damage to agricultural crops or natural resources; and

(f) the term "secondary poisoning effect" means the result attributable to a chemical toxicant which, after being ingested, inhaled, or absorbed by or into, or when applied to or injected into a mammal, bird, or reptile, is retained in its tissue, or otherwise retained in such a manner and quantity that the tissue itself or retaining part if thereafter ingested by man or another mammal, bird, or reptile, produces the effects set forth in subsection (c) hereof.

(g) the term "field use" means any use on lands not in or immediately adjacent to occupied buildings.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory and depredating animals, and in order to encourage the use by States of animal damage control methods which are consistent with accepted principles of wildlife management and the maintenance of environmental quality, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to conduct directly or by agreement with qualified agencies or institutions, public and private, a program of research which shall concern the control and conservation of predatory and depredating animals and the abatement of damage caused by such animals. Research objectives, and the program of research authorized by this subsection, shall be developed by the Secretary in cooperation with each of the affected States.

(b) The program of research authorized by subsection (a) hereof shall include, but need not be limited to (1) the testing of methods used for the control of predator and depredating animals and the abatement of damage caused by such animals; (2) the development of effective methods for predator control and the abatement of damage caused by predatory and depredating animals which contribute to the maintenance of environmental quality and which conserve, to the greatest degree possible, the Nation's wildlife resources, including predatory animals; (3) a continuing inventory, in cooperation with the States, of the Nation's predatory animals, including the identification of those species which are or may become threatened with extinction; and (4) the development of means by which to disseminate to States the findings of studies conducted pursuant to this section.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to conduct such demonstrations of methods developed pursuant to subsection (b) and to provide such other extension services as may be rea-

sonably requested by the duly authorized wildlife agency of any State.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed \$1,500,000 for each fiscal year occurring after fiscal year 1972.

SEC. 4. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to any State, through the agency designated by the State for wildlife management, which may annually propose to administer a program for the control of predatory and depredating animals. To qualify for assistance under this section, any such State program must be approved by the agency designated for wildlife management and found by the Secretary to meet such standards as he may, by regulation, establish: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary shall not approve any such State program which entails the field use of chemical toxicants for the purpose of killing predatory animals or the field use of any chemical toxicant which causes any secondary poisoning effect for the purposes of killing other mammals, birds, or reptiles: *Provided further, however*, That he may approve a State program which entails such emergency use of chemical toxicants as he may authorize, in each specific case, for the protection of human health or safety; the preservation of one or more wildlife species threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become so threatened, or for the prevention of substantial irretrievable damage to nationally significant natural resources, or for the prevention of major damage to domestic livestock in an area where he determines that other means of predator control will not prevent such major damage.

(b) An annual payment under subsection (a) hereof may be made to any State in such amount as the Secretary may determine: *Provided, however*, That no such annual payment shall exceed an amount equal to 75 percent in each of the first two years, or 50 percent in each of the succeeding fiscal years of the cost of the program approved under subsection (a) hereof: *And provided further*, That no such annual payment to any State shall exceed \$300,000 in each of the first two fiscal years following enactment, or \$200,000 in each of the succeeding fiscal years following enactment. No payment otherwise authorized by this section shall be made to a State whose share, in whole or part, of the cost of the program approved under subsection (a) hereof is to be paid from funds not appropriated or otherwise authorized by its legislature: *Provided, however*, That not more than 10 percent of the State share may be from funds derived from sale of hunting, fishing, and trapping licenses or permits.

(c) The Secretary shall conduct such operational programs for the control of predatory and depredating animals as he may deem necessary or desirable and is authorized to assist the States in their implementation of programs proposed under section 4 hereof.

(d) The head of a Federal department, agency, or establishment may authorize on lands subject to his jurisdiction, subject to such terms and conditions as he may impose, the conduct by a State of an operational program for the control of predatory and depredating animals.

(e) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of this section \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1973 and 1974, and \$2,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter.

(2) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of subsection (c) of this section not to exceed \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year occurring after fiscal year 1972.

SEC. 5. (a) No person shall (1) make field use of any chemical toxicant on any Federal lands for the purpose of killing predatory animals; or (2) make field use on such lands of any chemical toxicant which causes any

secondary poisoning effect for the purpose of killing other mammals, birds, or reptiles: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be deemed to affect the administration of lands held in trust for Indians.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) hereof, the head of a Federal department, agency, or establishment may authorize on lands subject to his administrative jurisdiction the emergency field use of a chemical toxicant for the purpose of killing predatory animals or of a chemical toxicant which cause a secondary poisoning effect for the purpose of killing other mammals, birds, or reptiles, but only if in each specific case he makes a written finding, following consultation with the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, that an emergency exists that cannot be dealt with by means which do not involve use of chemical toxicants, and that such use is essential—

(1) to the protection of human health or safety;

(2) to the preservation of one or more wildlife species threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become so threatened;

(3) to the prevention of substantial irretrievable damage to nationally significant natural resources; or

(4) to the prevention in specific areas of major damage to domestic livestock.

(c) Any person convicted of any violation of this section, or of any regulation promulgated under this Act, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 6. Heads of Federal departments, agencies, or establishments are hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. There is hereby repealed in its entirety the Act of March 2, 1931 (7 U.S.C. 426-426(b)), pertaining to the eradication and control of predatory and other wild animals.

SEC. 8. Prior to five years from the date of enactment, the Secretary shall submit to the President and the Congress a report which evaluates the status of the programs authorized by this Act and makes such recommendations concerning these programs as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act other than sections 3 and 4 hereof.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation arises from the fact that in February of this year, the President issued an executive order which prohibited, except in emergency situations, the use of chemical toxicants in the control of predatory mammals on Federal lands. In supplementing the President's order, in March of this year, the Administrator of EPA, Mr. Ruckelshaus, took an unprecedented action and issued an order suspending and canceling the use of all

products containing thallium sulfate, sodium fluoracetate—better known as 1080—sodium cyanide, or strychnine for use in predator control. Mr. Speaker, these chemicals are among the most toxic chemicals known to man. They are not only toxic to target species but also to other animals and wildlife as well. This order, in general, had the effect of banning the use of chemical toxicants for predator control on Federal, State, and private lands.

Mr. Speaker, subsequent to the issuance of these orders, the Department of the Interior immediately modified its predator control program and began to retrieve all of the poison baits that were put out to control predators. Naturally, these actions have given the livestock industry of this Nation considerable concern since chemical toxicants have accounted for approximately 80 percent of all predatory animals killed annually by the Department of the Interior in the administration of a predatory control program.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was well aware of the concern expressed on behalf of the livestock industry, and we think the bill—which incidentally was unanimously reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—will satisfy this concern. In fact, we are confident that with the passage of this legislation, the Department of the Interior and the States, with the full cooperation of the livestock industry, will be able to hold depredations at a reasonable level without the use of chemical toxicants. In general, this goal would be accomplished by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out an expanded research program; by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the States on a matching fund basis; and by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct such operational programs as he may deem necessary to assist the State in the control of predatory animals.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13152 was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Mr. GARMATZ, and 24 other members of the committee, as a result of an executive communication from the Department of the Interior. It is a part of the President's environmental program. The bill has the support of environmental and conservation organizations, humane groups, State fish and wildlife agencies, all agencies of the Federal Government reporting on the bill, and it satisfies the concerns expressed on behalf of the National Wool Growers Association.

Mr. Speaker, briefly explained, Section 1 of the bill would cite this act as the Federal Animal Damage Control Act of 1972.

Section 2 of the bill would define certain terms used throughout the bill such as, person, State, chemical toxicant, predatory animal, depredating animal, secondary poisoning effect, and field use.

Section 3 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in the control of predatory and depredating animals by conducting directly or by agreement with qualified

public or private concerns a program of research in cooperation with the affected States concerning the control and conservation of such animals and the abatement of damage caused by such animals.

In carrying out the research program authorized by this section, the Secretary would be required to include such things as the testing and development of effective methods for the control of predatory and depredating animals; the abatement of damage caused by such animals; a continuing inventory of the Nation's predatory animals, including the identification of those species which are or may become threatened with extinction; and an appropriate means of disseminating to the States the results of such research.

Also, the Secretary would be authorized to conduct demonstrations of methods developed pursuant to such research and to provide such other extension services to State wildlife agencies as may be reasonably requested to assist such States in carrying out animal damage control programs.

There would be authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section of the bill not to exceed \$1.5 million per year beginning with fiscal year 1973.

Section 4 of the bill would authorize the Secretary to provide financial assistance to any State, through the agency designated by the State for wildlife management, which agrees to annually administer a program for the control of predatory and depredating animals, subject to such standards as the Secretary may by regulation establish.

To qualify for the financial assistance, the State program could not entail the field use of chemical toxicants for the purpose of killing predatory animals or the field use of chemical toxicants which would cause any secondary poisoning affect on other mammals, birds, or reptiles, except in certain emergency situations. Chemical toxicants could be used to control predatory animals but only after the Secretary, in each particular case, has made a determination that an emergency exists and such toxicants are needed for the protection of human health or safety; for the preservation of endangered species of fish or wildlife; for the prevention of substantial irretrievable damage to nationally significant natural resources, or for the prevention of major damage to domestic livestock in an area where he determines that other means of predator control will not prevent such major damage.

There would be authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of providing financial assistance to the States under this section not to exceed \$3 million per year for fiscal years 1973 and 1974, and \$2 million for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter. Of this amount, not more than \$300,000 could be paid to any State during the first 2 years of the program and \$200,000 in any of the succeeding fiscal years, provided, however, that any payment to a State could not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of carrying out a State approved program in each of the first 2 years of the program and 50 percent in any of the succeeding fiscal years thereafter.

The State share of matching funds

under this section would have to come from appropriated funds or from funds otherwise authorized by its legislature, provided, however, that not more than 10 percent of such funds could come from funds derived from the sale of hunting, fishing, and trapping licenses or permits.

In addition, this section of the bill would authorize to be appropriated up to \$5 million per year, beginning with fiscal year 1973, for the Secretary to use in carrying out operational programs for the control of predatory depredated animals as he may deem necessary or desirable and in assisting the States in their implementation of proposed programs.

Also, with the approval of the head of any Federal agency, and subject to such terms and conditions as he may impose, a State could under this section carry out programs to control predatory and depredated animals on lands subject to the jurisdiction of such agency.

Section 5 of the bill would make it unlawful for any person, except in emergency situations, to make field use of chemical toxicants on any Federal lands for the purpose of killing predatory mammals or make field use of any chemical toxicants which would cause any secondary poisoning effect on other mammals, birds, or reptiles on such lands. In such emergency situations, the head of a Federal agency could authorize chemical toxicants to be used for the control of predatory animals but only after the head of such agency has made a written finding in each particular case, following consultation with the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, HEW, and the Administrator of EPA, that an emergency exists that cannot be dealt with by means which do not involve the use of chemical toxicants, and such toxicants are needed for the protection of human health or safety; for the preservation of endangered species of fish or wildlife; for the prevention of substantial irretrievable damage to nationally significant natural resources; or for the prevention in specific areas of major damage to domestic livestock.

Any person convicted of any violation of this section, or any regulation promulgated under this act, would be subject to a fine of \$10,000 or an imprisonment of 1 year, or both.

Section 6 of the bill would authorize the heads of such Federal agencies or establishments to issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Section 7 of the bill would repeal in its entirety the act of March 2, 1931, which pertains to the eradication and control of predatory and other wild animals.

Section 8 of the bill would require the Secretary to make a thorough review of programs and policies instituted pursuant to this legislation and, prior to 5 years from date of enactment of the legislation, submit a report to the President and the Congress evaluating the status of the programs authorized to be carried out. Included in the report would be such recommendations concerning these programs as he may deem appropriate.

Section 9 of the bill would provide that nothing in this legislation shall be con-

strued as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities of the Administrator of EPA under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended—FIFRA.

Section 10 of the bill would authorize to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this legislation other than sections 3 and 4 of the bill which are estimated to be minimal only.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt passage of this legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13152, a bill proposed and strongly supported by the administration, which is based on the principle that management of resident species of wildlife, as are most predators, is and should be primarily a State responsibility, that additional research is needed to develop alternate and more selective means of predator control, safeguard important wildlife species, and protect the quality of the environment, and that poisons are too hazardous and potentially damaging to use in controlling predators.

As reported out by your committee, the bill would:

First, assist the States in damage control programs by a Federal research program on predator/prey relationships and development of selective, humane, and safe methods for controlling such animals;

Second, demonstrate to the States methods of control developed under this research program by implementation of a Federal extension program;

Third, ban the field use of chemical toxicants for killing of predators;

Fourth, terminate the existing program as conducted by Bureau of Sport Fisheries, Department of the Interior, by repealing the existing Damage Control Act, the act of March 1931, and transferring authority and responsibility for animal damage control directly to the States;

Fifth, authorize the conduct, by the Department of Interior, of animal damage control operational programs in order to assist the States in implementation of a State program;

Sixth, authorize the field use of chemical toxicants by other Federal agencies after consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency; Health, Education, and Welfare; and Interior; and upon a finding that use of such chemicals is essential to: Protection of human health or safety, preservation of endangered wildlife, prevention of damage to nationally significant natural resources, and prevention of major damage to domestic livestock;

Seventh, require the Secretary of the Interior to report to Congress as to effective implementation of the legislation;

Eighth, authorize appropriations for the section 3 research program of \$1.5 million for the first year and \$1.5 million for each year thereafter; \$3 million for 1973 and 1974, and \$2 million for each year thereafter for Federal financial assistance to the States; \$5 million for 1973, and \$5 million for each year thereafter for conduct of Federal operational

programs pending the phase-in and establishment of a State implementation program of animal control.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been involved in predatory animal control for the past 57 years, during which time increased use of toxic chemicals, on a nondiscriminate basis, has come under a great deal of public, congressional, and administrative agency scrutiny. Objections to the continued use of chemical toxicants for predator control on a widespread basis is objectionable for the following reasons:

First. Implementation of this program has caused the decline of wildlife populations;

Second. Research data fails to substantiate the degree of livestock losses claimed by stockmen just as predation-caused losses in game populations could be substantiated;

Third. Use of poisons as a control practice is inhumane and hazardous to non-target animals due to secondary poisoning effects; and

Fourth. Efforts to control coyote depredation of livestock by use of widespread poisoning of total predator populations has not eliminated losses and is a biologically unsound vehicle to minimize losses.

These conclusions have been substantiated by several investigations conducted over the years, culminating in the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Predator Control—better known as the Cain Committee—which were recently published and which formed the basis for many of the legislative concepts embodied in this bill.

As this country's environmental awareness has increased over the years, it has become even more apparent that no longer can we use control methods that are nonselective and place in jeopardy nonoffending animals, predators, and nonpredators alike. All wildlife species have value, even those which are predators, for nature's delicate balance requires an appropriate level or presence of each. Thus this legislation approaches the delicate complex and controversial problem of attempting to provide some degree of protection to livestock from predators by prohibiting the use of those control methods which are extremely hazardous, given widespread use to other animals and humans alike and by permitting the utilization of other control methods, such as trapping and hunting, which are selective and concentrate on the offending animal in its individual capacity. Thus the bill moves away from the complete eradication of entire wildlife species concept embodied in the old predator control Federal law, the act of March 1931, and adopts the more rational, logical, and scientifically supported basis of individual control and management of offending species given the applicable factual situation involved. However recognizing that there may be situations where chemical toxicants should be employed to provide appropriate protection for livestock, your committee authorized such use where major livestock damage has or will occur as long as certain criteria are met which tend to clearly show the overriding need for chemical use and application.

Enactment of this legislation will provide the proper legislative basis for an orderly and fast transition on the part of the States and livestock owners from previously used methods of chemical control which now have been found to be unacceptable in regard to the social, humane, and economic values involved, toward a predator control program conducted on the local and State level so that local and State needs may be more adequately met. Authorization for the continued conduct of a Federal operational program of predator control is provided to handle the period of time between the effective date of this act and the time that States and ranchers involved can implement their own programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee some questions.

We have a great interest in this bill in my area regarding prairie dogs, coyotes, and small species of bobcats and so forth that attack our animals and have caused large losses to the producers.

I notice here in the report that the Federal Government has the responsibility to act to protect livestock when complaints of predator damage are received.

My first question is this: In other States such as Utah, Montana, and many of these States, they have lost over 300,000 or 400,000 head of lamb and sheep and in south Texas the same way.

What would this bill do with regard to losses to the producers of these animals in reindemnifying them for their loss?

Mr. DINGELL. There was such legislation relating to indemnification that came before the House very recently, as the gentleman will recall, from the Committee on Agriculture.

This legislation very carefully avoids going into that question because of the question of jurisdiction. I believe it has been established, with regard to the Committee on Agriculture.

So this legislation does nothing on that particular matter.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. The second question I would like to ask is this.

It speaks here of restricting the use of toxic chemicals as a method of predator control. Now, what are you speaking of there? What chemicals are you going to take away from the producer?

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to answer that first, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I would point out that this bill does not deal with specific toxicants.

I do not recall the toxicants that are treated by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, but this legislation does not affect the order issued under that act. It does, however, state that except in emergency instances—and the emergencies are defined, as the gentleman will note, on pages 13 and 14 of the bill—there may be no use of these toxicants on Federal lands.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. On Federal lands? What about private lands?

Mr. DINGELL. That is left up to the States under the State programs which will be financed under the bill that is before us.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I see one of my fellow colleagues from Texas shaking his head, "No, that this is not the case." I wish to clarify this.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Texas is perfectly free to get better clarification elsewhere, but I am not sure that the gentleman from Texas to whom he alludes can give any better answer than I have given.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I should like to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. My understanding of the bill—and I stand to be corrected—is that no poison can be used on any land anywhere. It is just prohibitive to use poison to kill predators. Am I correct or wrong?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is entirely incorrect. The question of whether or not poisons can be used for predators is a matter of control under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. This bill states that private citizens may not use predator-killing poisons on Federal land, but it does say that it may be done by the Federal and State governments, under an agreement, where an emergency is found. It does also say in essence that on State and private lands, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act controls. I would commend to the gentleman from Texas a reading of that particular statute.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I just would like to clarify what is the intention of the committee, for the record—

Mr. DINGELL. I would hope the gentleman from Texas will let the record stand as it is. I think if we say much more, the gentleman may find that he is liable to restrict still further the statute than it is in the debate so far.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I am not a member of the committee, and I am not trying to butt in.

Mr. DINGELL. No. The gentleman's comments are welcome, and I want to be helpful to him.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I am interested, for instance, in prairie dogs in our area which are a tremendous menace, and which use up a lot of the grass for grazing, and bobcats that kill a lot of calves. I am beginning to find that, like the EPA that they have taken away a lot of the chemicals—the only method that the farmer has of killing the insects—but they have not come up with a substitute chemical with which to deal with the problem. The same situation exists here. They tell us we cannot use 2-4-D, and we cannot use DES in cattle, and we cannot use 10-80 that we used to inject in animal carcasses to kill the coyotes, and they have left us no other chemical with which to fight predators.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield, we are not going into those questions. We do not wish to impinge upon the jurisdiction of the EPA. We do not impinge upon the jurisdiction of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended. We very carefully avoided that particular situation. If the gentleman from Texas does have a con-

flict of interest—and it appears that he does—I should suggest that his communications on this matter should be made to the Agriculture Committee who has fundamental jurisdiction over the statutes to which I referred, and not the committee that now handles the bill on the floor.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I just wanted a clarification of it.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I notice Chairman POAGE is on the floor, and he might choose to query Chairman POAGE on this matter to which he has been addressing himself on matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and not the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GOODLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. I should like to say I think the question is made very clear on page 11 in the bill. It states that he may—meaning the Secretary of the Interior—approve a State program which entails such emergency use of chemical toxicants as he may authorize for the prevention of major damage to domestic livestock in an area where he determines that other means of predator control will not prevent such major damage.

SEC. 5. (a) No person shall (1) make field use of any chemical toxicant on any Federal lands for the purpose of killing predatory animals; or (2) make field use on such lands of any chemical toxicant which causes any secondary poisoning effect for the purpose of killing other mammals, birds, or reptiles: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be deemed to affect the administration of lands held in trust for Indians.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Of course, I cannot see here anything which refers to the private landowners. I do not want to prolong this thing, but if the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture would have something to shed a little further light on this, I would appreciate it. I am simply trying to protect our private landowners in this matter.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the language referred to says essentially—and I am interpreting it in the light of other sections—that private citizens may not engage in predator control on public lands. This has to be done by the Federal Government or perhaps through the States under and by agreement with the Federal Government. That is what the section says. It does not indicate what private citizens may do on their own lands or what States may do within the State boundaries.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I can yield any additional time at this point. I suggest the gentleman get his time from the other side.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to take this time to point out that in the committee we did make

two concessions to the livestock industry in that we did provide—and this is on page 11—in the event of major damage to domestic livestock under a State program, that on approval of the Secretary poisons could be used, and additionally on page 14, we provided, on lines 9 and 10, that in the administration of the Federal program on Federal lands, we could use poisons in the prevention of specific areas of major damage to domestic livestock.

I would like to pose a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done an excellent job on the management of this legislation. Certainly under the bill poisons are outlawed for predators or for any animals that have a secondary killing effect with the exceptions that have been noted. In addition poisons are outlawed with respect to any State which chooses to participate in this program subject to the limitations that are specified. As I understand it, of course, we have got \$3 million for the first year of the State programs, with a limitation of \$300,000 per State. So if we have a big State like California or Texas that raises sheep, the maximum extent to which they could participate under what we called the State grant program, would be \$300,000, but they would have to comply with the no-poison limitation that we have on the Federal land. Is that not correct?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, subject, of course, to the emergency exceptions which we have set forth very clearly, to which the gentleman has alluded.

Mr. LEGGETT. Would it be possible under this legislation for a State to develop a State program for a part of the State lands and qualify for the payment, but in other areas, perhaps, that are very heavily subject to predation, they could choose to exclude those lands from the State program?

Mr. DINGELL. I can tell the gentleman I think the answer to that question is, "No."

Mr. LEGGETT. So generally if the State would want money under this program, it is going to have to generally comply with what we call the Federal standards under the Executive order as interpreted by this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. They will come forward with one program meeting generally the requirements of the emergency situation set out in the bill.

Mr. LEGGETT. I should like to ask one further question.

Has the committee determined or has the Department of the Interior determined the effects of this legislation on the domestic livestock industry either by the implementation of the Executive order or by the enactment of this legislation, with respect to damage to livestock owned State by State, or on a county-by-county basis, or does the committee have any figures whatsoever?

Mr. DINGELL. In response to the gentleman, I would advise that the Department of the Interior was before the committee and was queried in considerable detail and anticipated no adverse effect on the livestock industry from the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEGGETT. I believe we further asked the Secretary of the Interior at

the time he was before the committee, in the event that unanticipated damage did occur, certainly it was the intention of the Department to see that either the regulations were modified to obviate the excessive damage or that indemnities were provided to those who were unnecessarily damaged.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield, we took the amendment which the gentleman offered, on page 14 of the bill, which authorized the utilization of poisons on public lands in instances where there were specific areas of major damage to domestic livestock, to protect the livestock growers where there was major damage to domestic livestock.

I would also advise I anticipate under the criteria generally set out in the bill the Secretary of the Interior would impose a somewhat similar criterion with regard to State and Federal cooperative programs under other sections of the bill. Essentially, if there was a determination there were major areas of damage, he would allow appropriate Federal participation to exist with regard to the major damage to domestic livestock.

Mr. LEGGETT. Considering that a lot of this depredation occurs on Federal land, and considering that the ban on poisons will probably have the effect of increasing the depredations, is it not conceivable to the gentleman, since this Federal land is rented from the Federal Government, that increased costs to ranchers or wool growers in the raising of livestock could be reflected in modifications of rentals charged for the Federal land?

Mr. DINGELL. I would have to inform my good friend from California that is a matter under the jurisdiction of other committees, and it is not the intention of this committee to intrude upon the jurisdiction of other committees.

Mr. LEGGETT. I understand.

Mr. DINGELL. I could only speak for this particular Member, and not another committee.

Mr. LEGGETT. I understand that.

Under the bill we allow for the use of poisons under certain conditions of extremism.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LEGGETT. As I understand it, under the Executive order we have banned as of early February all manufacture, interstate shipment, et cetera, of poisons. In the event that the Secretary is called upon under this legislation to use poisons to control large depredations, et cetera, or for the protection of human health, where will he get the poisons to do the job?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman refers, I believe, to the Executive order of March of this year.

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. I would have to advise that we do not alter the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the Executive order. Those would remain intact and remain under the jurisdiction of other committees, and I am quite content they would take care of it.

Mr. LEGGETT. I did not understand the gentleman's answer. Where do they get the poison?

Mr. DINGELL. The authorization as to the use of poisons must be procured from the Environmental Protection Agency, which already has issued orders with relations to those matters, and other than those chemicals on the suspension lists, he would be able to use them, subject to their availability.

This bill does not affect the standards under which the Environmental Protection Agency acts, nor do we affect the orders of the Environmental Protection Agency.

That is not within the jurisdiction of this committee and, as I indicated to the gentleman from California, we are quite content to leave it so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DINGELL. If the time of the gentleman from California has expired, I will be happy to yield to my good friend from Iowa for a question, but the time-keeper and the Speaker will have to advise.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 8 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my good friend from Iowa for a question.

Mr. GROSS. I note on page 14 of the bill, in section 6 it states:

Heads of Federal departments, agencies, or establishments are hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

It seems to be very broad to me as to the authority of the various departments, agencies, and establishments to issue regulations.

Mr. DINGELL. That, I will say to my good friend, refers only to the carrying out of activities on Federal lands particularly authorized by this legislation. It is intended to cover Federal agencies that happen to have lands which might fall under the jurisdiction of a particular department.

Mr. GROSS. It is limited to the extent that the gentleman specified?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am sure the gentleman has no intention of causing any problems to the military, but I think the way the bill is written it would probably cause irreparable harm to the military, particularly in the southern States, where the fire ant is a great problem. You probably could not operate a military base without fire ant control. Just a few months ago we authorized fire ant control specifically. On page 11, the way your chemical toxicant is described, fire ant control would be covered under that. I hope the gentleman will knock that out.

Mr. DINGELL. I would have to inform my good friend from Texas that first of all, in my view, the fire ant is not a predatory animal and is not within the purview of this statute also, it falls under the jurisdiction of other statutes not covered by this legislation.

Mr. ROBERTS. There was another bill that was passed which was not under your jurisdiction, but it was passed and

we have to live with it. This says specifically any poison which causes any secondary poisoning effect. Therefore the fire ant program would be covered, and I hope that the gentleman's bill is not referring to that.

Mr. DINGELL. I would refer my friend from Texas to the definition of "secondary poisoning effect" contained on page 8, and I advise that the Department of Defense has reported very favorably with regard to the bill.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries 2 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. You are convinced that it does not cover the fire ant?

Mr. DINGELL. I am satisfied it does not. It is not a predatory animal.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland 2 minutes.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 13152, because I think it represents a reasonable approach to the problem of predator control. For more than half a century, the Federal Government has struggled with this difficult problem, but a true solution has yet to be found.

Although poison has been used over the years to assist in the control of predators, this practice has met increased objections and resistance from the general public—not only because it is inhumane, but because its effectiveness is questionable and because it is killing many innocent animals that are not the target of the poisoning.

In addition to the fact that innocent, nonpredatory animals are being killed through residual poisoning, this method is also objectionable because it tends to decimate entire populations of certain predators which are not either endangered or threatened with extinction.

Mr. Speaker, all animals, even predators, have a place in nature's delicately balanced system, and they should be preserved—for both practical, and esthetic reasons.

It was with that purpose in mind, as well as a desire to find other more acceptable methods of preventing predators from preying upon the livestock of farmers and ranchers, that I scheduled hearings on H.R. 13152. Those hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, under the able chairmanship of my distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN DINGELL.

I think that Congressman DINGELL will agree with me that, while this legislation is far from a perfect solution to a complex problem, it is at least a step in the right direction. In addition to prohibiting the use of toxic chemicals to control predators—with the exception of emergency situations—it is also designed to help the farmers and ranchers cope with these predators in other ways; it would authorize research programs on other possible methods of control and it would provide financial assistance to the States for predator control programs.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill at the request of the administration. I think the hearings held by our subcommittee documented the need for this legislation, and I urge its rapid approval.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have

promised some time to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE). However, I do not have very much time remaining, and I therefore will yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the real problem involved here is who is going to pay the bill, and it is the same problem which is involved in a great many of these environmental and ecological programs.

The other night this House voted overwhelmingly not to pay the bill for any kind of ecology improvement. Of the 25 Members who signed this present bill, only three voted to pay the losses occasioned by the restrictions imposed by the Federal Government. I think it is fair to say that these three were the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD).

Presumably, the rest of them felt that society should not pay the bill.

That gives me little comfort. There is doubtless some good in this bill but most of its sponsors have shown a great deal more compassion for predators than they have shown for producers. They have indicated that they feel that individual livestock producers—not society—should pay the bill. That is what is involved here, and if we keep on adding to the producer's bill, the consumer's bill must go up.

I would not object to the bill as presented, although I feel that it is poorly drawn, had this committee left out the repeal of our existing predatory laws, but they repealed the authority for the Government the help on private land in its entirety, and the report says so. It says they repealed every bit of the existing authority for the Secretary to carry out the programs of predator control and eradication. In its place they establish a program only on the public lands, and that means in only 17 States of this Nation. That means that the greater part of the Nation is denied any opportunity whatever to share in any program of control of predators.

They suggest that the States should provide any assistance which may be justified for the producers.

I think this is wrong. Were the Federal Government leaving the States and the producers free to control these predators, this might be logical. But when the Federal Government is controlling the means which the farmer must use to control these predators, that same Federal Government ought to accept some responsibility in connection therewith. Turn us loose and we will control our own predators—and we will take our own losses. But you have tied our hands. We know not why. We cannot believe that it is better to grow and protect coyotes and bobcats than it is to grow lambs, deer, turkeys, or pheasants.

But our Government has answered the demands of those citizens who seems to want predators on every hill. It has denied producers the right to control these pests or to pay for the damage they do. That is neither honest nor right.

I regret to have to oppose the bill, but I do so because under the rules we cannot amend the bill. I know the committee has done some hard work on this bill, and I know that there is much to be commended about it, but with a complete repeal of our entire existing authority for a Federal predator control program I simply cannot support it. The whole thing ought to be voted down, and the committee ought to bring this in under a rule so we can amend their bill.

In addition to the fundamental injustice of taking property without compensation, I wonder if the sponsors of the measure really know just what species they really do want to protect. The bill gives protection only to predators. What about man's domestic animals? For them the bill provides neither protection nor compensation.

Surely we do not want to go back to the ecology which existed on this continent before the landing of Columbus. Man's domestic animals, most of which were imported from Europe, are just as much a part of our ecology as the human beings who came from Europe and Africa. On the other hand, we oftentimes, see our importations destroying native animals. For instance starlings and English sparrows have, all too often, displaced native birds like woodpeckers, bluebird, and scissortails. Some times it works the other way. I am told that in South Dakota alone, the pheasant population has dropped from 50 million down to 1 million as the very predators which this bill will encourage have increased. Of course, we have seen the same thing happen in varying degrees all over the country with our dear population.

Clearly, there is no generally accepted set of priorities as to just what animal or plant life we want to encourage, but I can see little good for society in substituting coyotes for calves unless we are seriously anxious to force the price of beef still higher.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) the chairman of the full Committee on Agriculture, about the elimination of one program before we have the solution to the action. I think that the gentleman from Texas has hit the nail right on the head. And I submit that what we are doing in this bill is saying that we are eliminating the process that has no substitute. The House has already eliminated the indemnity payments to the people who are going to suffer as a result of that program. Therefore we are clearly premature in the passage of that portion of the bill which eliminates the predator control as it now exists.

However, more than that, I call your attention to page 6 of the report, and I urge the House to seriously consider what we are doing when we endorse the language of the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior in which he says—and I would like to have the at-

tention of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) because I am going to address a question to him, and I wonder if the gentleman would be prepared to respond to my question.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. DINGELL) to page 6 of the report in which Mr. Reed of the Office of the Secretary, I believe, is quoted as saying:

No longer can we ignore the fact that predators have social, esthetic, recreational and economic value.

I wonder if the gentleman would respond and tell me what social esthetic recreational and economic value the coyote has—I would be interested.

Mr. DINGELL. It is a major game species in many States, I would tell my good friend. Also, it is an animal which is much admired by the Indians and it is one of the sacred animals of a number of western tribes. It is also an animal which is found to be most pleasing to a number of visitors in the West, and there are organizations such as the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, and Friends of the Earth and others who regard it as a very precious and important part of our natural history and of wildlife heritage.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for responding, but I would also point out I personally have no knowledge of any Indian tribe that reveres this particular animal. But I will not ask my friend what tribes do.

I will ask my friend, however, if it is not true that the people who feel a possible benefit from a coyote are able to enjoy that benefit now even after some 50 years of poisoning.

Would the gentleman say that the coyote is about to become extinct as a result of poison practices heretofore observed?

Mr. DINGELL. I will point out that there have been instances where the coyote population has been poisoned down to practically nothing with the clear result that there have been great outbursts of population increases on the part of rodents and mice and things of that kind.

I would also point out that this legislation does not outlaw poisoning, but simply controls it.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Arizona that he is certainly correct. But what is more important—to have a bunch of prairie dogs, coyotes, and bobcats to live—or to produce beef and something that people can eat in this country, as a means of support?

Page 11 of the report very distinctly answers the gentleman's question that was asked a while ago:

The Secretary could not approve of a State program which entails the field use of chemical toxicants for the purpose of killing predatory animals or the field of use of any chemical toxicant which would cause any sec-

ondary poisoning effect for the purpose of killing other mammals, birds or reptiles.

This is the point we are trying to make. What about Federal laws where a man pays for a large lease which the Government required him to pay—\$1.50 or \$2 for the Federal lease, and then he has prairie dogs all over it and there is no grass there for them to graze their cattle on? What are you going to do about that?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I think the gentleman's point is well taken. In this situation, we are abandoning one program which, however ineffective it may have been in the eyes of the department—is the only program that has been effective at all. We are saying we need time to develop a new program—let us abandon this one before we have a new one developed.

Gentlemen, you are doing a disservice and I think we have our priorities confused here. Let us not put the coyotes ahead of folks. I would have to believe for all those who love the coyote, I am sure that they can still return to the West anytime they should so desire and find more coyotes than the West would like for them to enjoy.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER).

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to direct some questions to the committee concerning the bill, if the spokesman for the committee, the gentleman from Michigan, would yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I would be glad to respond to the questions the gentleman from Montana asks.

Mr. MELCHER. I am interested in the intent of the bill concerning control of contagious diseases in predators and particularly rabies, and what the legislation intends in relation to State and Federal responsibility.

As I read the report, the bill seeks to return to the States the primary responsibility, in fact, the leadership as it were, in the control of predators.

Where does this leave us in the control of infectious diseases among predators?

Mr. DINGELL. I would respond to the gentleman by pointing out that in several instances in the bill we find language which deals with the question. First of all, the handling of predator control programs is reposed in the States, and the Federal Government will participate on either 75-25 for the first 2 years and on a 50-50 basis thereafter. In instances where the control must be done on public lands where an emergency condition exists, and it becomes necessary to act, the gentleman will find the sections under which the Federal Government may act, which appear at page 14, and I would refer him to line 3, beginning with item (1),

"to the protection of human health or safety;"

That would very clearly cover the situation on public lands with regard to the handling of rabies, and that sort of thing. In other instances, on State and private lands, the State would take over under its agreement with the Federal Government,

and that portion of the State activities would be financed by Federal assistance.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman for his answer. I believe the bill is weak and ineffective in establishing responsibility for controlling outbreaks of contagious diseases such as rabies in predators. The bill weakens the Federal responsibility to control the threats of predators and would lead to ineffective handling of emergency conditions. The various States are urged, under the bill, to develop their own programs for predator control with very small amounts of money which will likely jeopardize the rapid and effective control of not only the economic losses suffered from predators but also threatens to weaken dangerously control of contagious diseases in predators.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, since 1967 I have introduced legislation to eliminate the use of toxic chemicals in the control of predatory animals. I, therefore, rise in support of the Federal Animal Damage Control Act of 1972.

The war that has been waged on predatory mammals by the Federal Government for almost 60 years has been exposed as cruel, dangerous, and self-defeating. Non-selective control measures in the past have jeopardized innocent animals and offended human sensibilities. Fortunately, this bill will go far in outlawing the abominable practice of counteracting the relatively limited dangers posed by predators with the indiscriminate use of poisons.

My enthusiasm for this legislation, however, is tempered somewhat by an uneasiness over an exception in the bill which would permit the use of poison in emergency situations when essential to the prevention in specific areas of major damage to domestic livestock. This provision was not requested by the administration and to my mind opens up a glaring loophole in the bill. What constitutes major damage to livestock is not spelled out at all. Nor is the term "emergency" specified with sufficient clarity and precision.

I am also troubled by the fact that the bill authorizes annual appropriations of \$5 million for Federal predatory control activities, which is more than the \$3.4 million that is estimated will have been expended for fiscal 1972.

It has been demonstrated in the past that the Interior Department program has been excessive and wasteful. This bill commendably establishes Federal assistance to the States for predatory control programs and thereby envisions a shift away from the Federal Government in this activity. Increasing the authorization for Federal control programs only invites a duplication of effort and a reversion to the past philosophy of indiscriminate killing which this legislation is designed to reject.

It is my hope that these objectionable features will be eliminated before final

congressional enactment of this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. In section 4 of the committee report here it says:

Subsection (a), of the bill would authorize the Secretary to provide financial assistance to any State, through the agency designated by the State for wildlife management, which agrees to annually administer a program—

It says "annually administer a program for the control of predatory and depredate animals."

Mr. CONTE. Could the gentleman give me that page again? I am sorry.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Page 11 of the report.

Mr. CONTE. I have it.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Section 4:

To qualify for this assistance, the State program would have to be approved by the appropriate State agency and found by the Secretary to meet such standards as he may by regulation establish.—

And so forth, on down the way.

This is questionable in my mind as far as the effectiveness of this bill. As the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee said, this completely wipes out and repeals every existing authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13152, the Federal Animal Damage Control Act of 1972. As one of the cosponsors of the original version of the bill, I favor the intent and purpose of this important environmental legislation designed to halt the wholesale and indiscriminate slaughter of predatory animals in the interests of protecting the Nation's livestock.

However, I wish to bring to the attention of the committee one section of the bill which, I fear, if enacted might seriously vitiate its purpose. I refer to section 4, lines 18 through 20, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to approve a State program authorizing the emergency use of chemical toxicants for preventing major damage to domestic livestock, when he determines that other methods would not suffice to prevent such major damage.

As stated in the committee print, this language was not in the original bill but was included at the request of the National Wool Growers Association to deal with genuine emergency situations. I feel that the language major damage could be sufficiently vague to allow ranchers to blame, as they have in the past, weather, disease, and other large range losses on predators. I do not believe that it was the intention of the committee to include such a potential loophole in this bill. I hope legislative history will indicate this provision should only be used in extremis and be construed very narrowly. As an author I would expect such a construction.

I would have considered deleting this language from the bill if it had not come up under suspension. However, it is my sincere hope that the other body will clarify or delete this language when it

considers the bill, and that the conference committee will sustain this action.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 13152, a bill which would prohibit the field use of chemical toxicants on Federal lands for the purpose of killing predatory animals.

In 1970, the Federal Government killed no less than 73,093 coyotes, 8,403 bobcats, 121 mountain lions, and 403 black bears.

But these figures represent only the tip of the iceberg. Many animals, which were not discovered, autopsied, and credited to the Department of Interior, died in the wilds and were not discovered.

In fact, the Department of Interior, with only one of their favorite poisons—Compound 1080—distributes enough poisoned bait to kill 36.7 million coyotes, and that figure assumes that each coyote ate twice as much poisoned meat as is required to kill it.

In its policy of saturation and overkill, the Department of Interior in 1970 distributed enough 1080 bait to eliminate every coyote in an area covering 388,800 square miles—an area larger than the combined States of California, Colorado, and Idaho.

But 1080 is not the only deadly poison used to kill predators. In 1970, the Department of Interior also placed 822,043 strychnine baits.

These poisons are not selective. According to research conducted by the Denver Wildlife Research Center, 13 dead endangered birds—out of 19 examined—contained lethal doses of 1080. These included one California condor, one bald eagle, and 11 golden eagles.

This legislation would prohibit the placing of poisons on public lands—lands owned by all the people of the United States, not the private reserve of the ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, we must reverse the schizophrenic attitude that, on the one hand spends millions of dollars annually to kill animals, while the other acts to protect wildlife.

I support this bill which is patterned after my bill, H.R. 9669, introduced July 1971, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in this step toward preserving our national environment.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pending bill. It is most regrettable that a measure of this importance is brought up on a procedure which limits debate and allows no amendments to be offered.

This is a bad bill. It should be entitled "A bill to protect predators and further prevent livestock owners from protecting their flocks and herds."

Predator attacks on sheep, goats, and poultry have increased substantially in recent years. That fact is a matter of record. The battle against predators has been going on for decades. It has always been an uphill battle.

In the past the Government has been fairly helpful in aiding farmers and ranchmen in this struggle. The Department of the Interior earlier this year stated:

It has been estimated that poisons account for about 80 percent of all predatory animals that are killed annually by the Department's current program.

In addition, the Federal Government has helped fund the cost of trappers to supplement the use of poisons. But during the past year or two, by Executive orders and by legislation, concerted efforts have been made to hamstring the livestock owners in their fight against predators. This move has been aided and abetted by some uninformed people who seem to be determined to protect predators in every possible way.

To begin with, on March 9, 1972, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency took an unprecedented action by issuing an order suspending and canceling the use of the following chemicals for use in predator control: All products containing thallium sulfate, sodium fluoroacetate (1080), sodium cyanide, or strychnine. This order was later extended to include 19 types of poison. And on top of all that we are today faced with this bill which would make the restrictions against use of poisons against predatory animals even more binding. It would make the executive orders the law of the land, not subject to any change by the agency which issued them.

In addition, the bill would repeal in its entirety the act of March 2, 1931, pertaining to the eradication and control of predatory and other wild animals.

Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the indifference and lack of knowledge exhibited by sponsors of this legislation, I call attention to words of a department witness during hearings, as set forth on page 6 of the committee report, as follows:

No longer can we ignore the fact that predators have social, esthetic, recreational, and economic value.

This is the kind of thinking that has been infused into this legislation. It totally ignores the problem of controlling predators and, in effect, supports a concept of protecting and preserving them.

There is clearly a movement afoot to increase the number of predators whose numbers are increasing at an alarming rate. These results of Government actions are already being felt, and this trend will undoubtedly be accelerated in the immediate future.

Mr. Speaker, under present Government policies, aided by the pending bill, livestock producers really have their backs to the wall in their ability to protect their property. Let us hope the Senate, when it considers this measure, will recognize that fact and apply the brakes. I repeat, this is bad legislation and it should not be enacted.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13152, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I object

to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 73, not voting 80, as follows:

- [Roll No. 264]
YEAS—279
- Abzug
 - Adams
 - Addabbo
 - Alexander
 - Anderson, Calif.
 - Anderson, Ill.
 - Annunzio
 - Archer
 - Arends
 - Ashley
 - Aspin
 - Badillo
 - Begich
 - Bell
 - Betts
 - Bevill
 - Blaggi
 - Blester
 - Bingham
 - Blackburn
 - Boggs
 - Boland
 - Bow
 - Brademas
 - Brasco
 - Bray
 - Brinkley
 - Brotzman
 - Brown, Mich.
 - Brown, Ohio
 - Broyhill, N.C.
 - Broyhill, Va.
 - Buchanan
 - Burke, Fla.
 - Burke, Mass.
 - Burton
 - Byrne, Pa.
 - Carey, N.Y.
 - Carlson
 - Carter
 - Casey, Tex.
 - Cederberg
 - Celler
 - Chamberlain
 - Chappell
 - Clancy
 - Clark
 - Clausen, Don H.
 - Clawson, Del
 - Cleveland
 - Collier
 - Collins, Ill.
 - Collins, Tex.
 - Conable
 - Conover
 - Conte
 - Conyers
 - Gorman
 - Cotter
 - Coughlin
 - Culver
 - Daniels, N.J.
 - Danielson
 - Davis, Wis.
 - Dellums
 - Dennis
 - Dent
 - Derwinski
 - Devine
 - Dickinson
 - Diggs
 - Dingell
 - Downing
 - Drinan
 - Dulski
 - Edwards, Calif.
 - Eilberg
 - Erlenborn
 - Esch
 - Eshleman
 - Fascell
 - Fish
 - Flood
 - Ford, Gerald R.
 - Ford, William D.
 - Forsythe
 - Fountain
 - Fraser
 - Frelinghuysen
 - Frenzel
 - Frey
 - Fuqua
 - Gallfanakis
 - Garmatz
 - Gialmo
 - Gibbons
 - Goodling
 - Grasso
 - Gray
 - Green, Oreg.
 - Green, Pa.
 - Griffin
 - Griffiths
 - Grover
 - Gubser
 - Hamilton
 - Hanley
 - Hanna
 - Hansen, Idaho
 - Harrington
 - Harsha
 - Harvey
 - Hastings
 - Hathaway
 - Hawkins
 - Hays
 - Hechler, W. Va.
 - Heckler, Mass.
 - Heinz
 - Helstoski
 - Henderson
 - Hicks, Mass.
 - Hicks, Wash.
 - Hillis
 - Hogan
 - Horton
 - Hosmer
 - Howard
 - Hunt
 - Jacobs
 - Jarman
 - Johnson, Pa.
 - Johnson, N.C.
 - Karth
 - Kastenmeier
 - Keating
 - Keith
 - Kemp
 - King
 - Kluczynski
 - Koch
 - Kuykendall
 - Kyl
 - Kyros
 - Landgrebe
 - Leggett
 - Lennon
 - Lent
 - Long, Md.
 - Lujan
 - McClory
 - McCloskey
 - McCulloch
 - McDade
 - McEwen
 - McKevitt
 - McKinney
 - Macdonald, Mass.
 - Madden
 - Mailliard
 - Mallary
 - Mann
 - Mathias, Calif.
 - Mathis, Ga.
 - Mayne
 - Mazzoli
 - Meeds
 - Michel
 - Mikva
 - Miller, Ohio
 - Mills, Md.
 - Minish
 - Mink
 - Mizell
 - Molohan
 - Monagan
 - Moorhead
 - Morgan
 - Moss
 - Murphy, Ill.
 - Murphy, N.Y.
 - Myers
 - Nedzi
 - Neisen
 - Nichols
 - Nix
 - Obeys
 - O'Hara
 - O'Neill
 - Patten
 - Pepper
 - Perkins
 - Peyster
 - Pickle
 - Pike
 - Pirnie
 - Powell
 - Preyer, N.C.
 - Price, Ill.
 - Pucinski
 - Quile
 - Rallsback
 - Randall
 - Rangel
 - Rees
 - Reid
 - Reuss
 - Riegler
 - Rodino
 - Roe
 - Rogers
 - Roncalio
 - Rooney, N.Y.
 - Rooney, Pa.
 - Rosenthal
 - Rostenkowski
 - Roush
 - Roybal
 - Ruppe
 - Ruth
 - Sandman
 - Scheuer
 - Schneebell
 - Schwengel
 - Sebelius
 - Shriver
 - Sikes
 - Slack
 - Smith, Calif.
 - Smith, Iowa
 - Smith, N.Y.
 - Snyder
 - Springer
 - Staggers
 - Stanton, J. William
 - Stanton, James V.
 - Steele
 - Stephens
 - Stratton
 - Stubblefield
 - Sullivan
 - Symington
 - Talcott
 - Taylor
 - Teague, Calif.
 - Teague, Tex.
 - Terry

- Thompson, Ga.
- Thompson, N.J.
- Thomson, Wis.
- Tieman
- Udall
- Ullman
- Van Deerlin
- Vander Jagt
- Vanik
- Vigorito
- Waldie
- Wampler
- Ware
- Whalen
- Whitehurst
- Widnall
- Wiggins
- Williams
- Wilson, Bob
- Wilson, Charles H.
- Winn
- Wolff
- Wright
- Wyatt
- Wyder
- Wyllie
- Wyman
- Yates
- Young, Fla.
- Zablocki
- Zion
- Zwach

NAYS—73

- Abbitt
- Andrews, N. Dak.
- Ashbrook
- Aspinall
- Baker
- Barrett
- Belcher
- Bennett
- Burleson, Tex.
- Byron
- Cabell
- Caffery
- Camp
- Crane
- Daniel, Va.
- Davis, S.C.
- de la Garza
- Dellenback
- Denholm
- Dorn
- Duncan
- Evans, Colo.
- Fisher
- Foley
- Gaydos
- Gettys
- Gonzalez
- Gross
- Gude
- Haley
- Hall
- Hammer-schmidt
- Hull
- Johnson, Calif.
- Kazen
- Kee
- Latta
- Lloyd
- McCollister
- McCormack
- McFall
- McKay
- Mahon
- Martin
- Matsunaga
- Melcher
- Montgomery
- Natcher
- Patman
- Poage
- Price, Tex.
- Purcell
- Quillen
- Roberts
- Robinson, Va.
- Roy
- Runnels
- Satterfield
- Saylor
- Scherle
- Schmitz
- Scott
- Shoup
- Sisk
- Skubitz
- Steed
- Steiger, Ariz.
- Veysey
- Waggoner
- White
- Whitten
- Yatron
- Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—80

- Abernethy
- Abourezk
- Anderson, Tenn.
- Andrews, Ala.
- Baring
- Bergland
- Blanton
- Blatnik
- Boiling
- Brooks
- Broomfield
- Burison, Mo.
- Byrnes, Wis.
- Carney
- Chisholm
- Clay
- Colmer
- Curlin
- Davis, Ga.
- Delaney
- Donohue
- Dow
- Dowdy
- du Pont
- Dwyer
- Eckhardt
- Edmondson
- Edwards, Ala.
- Evins, Tenn.
- Findley
- Flowers
- Flynt
- Fulton
- Gallagher
- Goldwater
- Hagan
- Halpern
- Hansen, Wash.
- Hébert
- Hollifield
- Hungate
- Hutchinson
- Ichord
- Jonas
- Jones, Ala.
- Jones, Tenn.
- Landrum
- Link
- Long, La.
- McClure
- McDonald, Mich.
- McMillan
- Metcalfe
- Miller, Calif.
- Millis, Ark.
- Minshall
- Mitchell
- Mosher
- O'Konski
- Passman
- Pelly
- Pettis
- Podell
- Poff
- Pryor, Ark.
- Rarick
- Rhodes
- Robison, N.Y.
- Rousselot
- Ryan
- St Germain
- Sarbanes
- Selberling
- Shibley
- Spence
- Steiger, Wis.
- Stokes
- Stuckey
- Thone
- Whalley

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rousselot.
- Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
- Mr. Blanton with Mr. du Pont.
- Mrs. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Poff.
- Mr. Shipley with Mr. Broomfield.
- Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. O'Konski.
- Mr. St Germain with Mr. Rhodes.
- Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Dowdy.
- Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ryan.
- Mr. Stokes with Mr. Eckhardt.
- Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. McClure.
- Mr. Flowers with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
- Mr. Fulton with Mr. Findley.
- Mr. Delaney with Mr. Robison of New York.
- Mr. Clay with Mr. Gallagher.
- Mr. Carney with Mr. Jonas.
- Mr. Flynt with Mr. Spence.
- Mr. Donohue with Mr. Minshall.
- Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Miller of California.
- Mr. Link with Mr. Goldwater.
- Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Pelly.
- Mr. Baring with Mr. Whalley.

- Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
- Mr. Ichord with Mr. Hutchinson.
- Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. McMillan.
- Mr. Dow with Mr. Halpern.
- Mr. Podell with Mr. Mosher.
- Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
- Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Dwyer.
- Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Pettis.
- Mr. Bergland with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

- Mr. Curlin with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
- Mr. Passman with Mr. Sarbanes.
- Mr. Hogan with Mr. Rarick.
- Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Selberling.
- Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
- Mr. Hungate with Mr. Thone.
- Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. FOLEY and Mr. LLOYD, changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COTTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 13152) just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE SECTOR AIDS FLOOD VICTIMS

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today a very proud man. Proud of my Nation, proud of my State, and particularly proud of my community and its people. I believe this pride is well founded, and I have asked for this time today to report to you a source of that pride, a generous and historic flood relief program undertaken in New York by the private sector.

Last Thursday, I met with representatives of the Savings and Loan League of New York State, and at this meeting this group of civic minded men established a flood relief fund which will total about \$2.7 million. The most amazing thing about this total, though, is not the figure itself, but how that money is to be spent. It is not low-interest loan money, it is money that will be given as outright grants to needy flood victims. Every savings and loan association in the league will be assessed \$200 for every million in capital they possess. This money will be made available on a priority basis to the people of New York, the people of their communities, the people with whom they live and do business.

To my knowledge, this is the first time in the history of our Nation where the business community came forward in such a courageous manner to lead the way to recovery from a natural disaster. And the time was right, because accord-

ing to the Vice President, Agnes ravaged this Nation like no other natural disaster ever has. The damage has been astronomical, and the Federal Government simply cannot handle the recovery costs alone.

Governor Shapp, of Pennsylvania, for example, has estimated the costs of recovery in his State alone at \$2.5 to \$3 billion. The "Agnes Recovery Act," a commendable program indeed, calls for only \$1.7 billion for all of the recovery. This is certainly not out of miserliness.

The program is generous when compared to the Federal deficit and the money available. The simple truth is that the damages outstrip the Federal Government's resources. The private sector must help out, and I am happy to report that in New York they are.

I am hoping to motivate others to encourage the establishment of similar programs in New York and other flood damaged States.

Business seems to be the current whipping boy for the ills of the Nation. This trend could be blunted by vigorous and determined action coming from the business community. I know business people are not the selfish, narrow people they are often painted to be, and the action of the men of the Savings and Loan League of New York, led by Mr. Robert F. Oliver, has underlined that knowledge. Their action was warming to me, and I am sure it will fill more than the hearts of those it benefits. Other businesses and industries can and must join in this humanitarianism. It will help spike the myth that business is bad, and by doing so will help this Nation bind its wound of division.

Today I have communicated with the President, advising him of the action of the New York Savings and Loan League, and urging him to use his good offices to provide motivation to the businesses of the Nation to follow the lead of this notable group.

I would also urge my colleagues to contact those in their own constituencies in this regard.

In all times of crisis and mutual suffering, man is reminded that there is more in this world to bring us together than to tear us apart, and there is more value in human life than there is in any of our material possessions. It is a basic affirmation in the values that underlie our society and the society of man. It is at once religious and humanitarian.

The action of the savings and loan people of New York honestly touched my heart and bolstered my hope and faith in this Nation. By working together in this disaster recovery period, we can do much to rescue America from the yawning pit of cynicism we seem to be heading for. I commend the league and ask others to join them. It is not only good business for you, but good business for your country and mankind.

SAFETY AWARD TO GENERAL MOTORS

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pro-

test the shocking action of the National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council in giving an award to Edward N. Cole, the president of General Motors Corp., for his allegedly "outstanding contributions to automotive safety."

Mr. Speaker, the amazing thing about this award by the council is that with Mr. Cole as one of its leading policy-makers, General Motors has compiled anything but an outstanding record in automotive safety. Since the enactment of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act in 1966, General Motors has been forced to recall 17,794,164 of its cars, fully 54 percent of its production, because of safety defects. This is hardly a record upon which to base an award for contributions to automotive safety.

Over a similar period of time the Ford Motor Co. has recalled some 7.5 million cars—40 percent of its production—and the Chrysler Corp has recalled 1.2 million cars—16 percent of its production.

A complete list of recalls since September 1966, is as follows:

Manufacturer	Recall campaigns	Number of vehicles recalled	Approximate production	Percentage recalled
General Motors	129	17,794,164	32,377,401	54.7
Ford	81	7,576,523	18,604,105	40.6
Chrysler	151	1,260,835	7,912,635	16.0

Nor has General Motors adopted a progressive attitude on new auto safety legislation. During this session of Congress General Motors, together with other automobile manufacturers, did its best to defeat the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (H.R. 11627), which will authorize a new Federal program designed to reduce the damageability and the repair costs of new automobiles. These actions by the motor vehicle manufacturers and General Motors are hardly the basis for an award for contributions to automotive safety.

The action of the National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council in presenting this shocking award establishes two things:

First, the Executive has packed the council with industry representatives to the virtual exclusion of effective consumer representation. Out of 22 members of the council at least 10 work for auto manufacturers, equipment manufacturers, or related concerns. Only one or two represent consumer organizations. Of these, Walker Sandbach, executive director of Consumers Union, has now resigned in protest over the council's action.

Second, the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act is too vague on the composition of the advisory council. An amendment to the act is necessary to spell out a requirement that the council have a truly balanced representation from members of the public, consumer organizations, industry, and government. In addition, such an amendment should define the appropriate duties of the council and prevent a waste of public time and money on frivolous awards for dubious accomplishments. I intend to offer such legislation shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I request that an arti-

cle by Morton Mintz which appeared in the Washington Post on July 16, 1972, describing the action of the council be reprinted. The article follows:

CONSUMERS AIDE QUILTS IN GM TIFF

(By Morton Mintz)

The top executive of Consumers Union resigned from a federal advisory committee yesterday to protest an award made to Edward N. Cole, president of General Motors, for outstanding contributions to automotive safety.

Walker Sandbach, executive director of CU, said in a telegram to Judson B. Branch, chairman of the National Motor Vehicle Safety Council, that the choice of Cole as the first winner of the council's award "makes a mockery of the council's efforts to stimulate the development of safer cars."

A separate protest came from Ralph Nader, who denounced the award as "outrageous." He said it had been instigated by Trevor O. Jones, a GM official who is the council's vice chairman.

Cole is "known in the automotive industry as the 'father of the Corvair,' one of the most dangerous cars produced in recent years," Sandbach told Branch, who is chairman of the executive committee of the All-state Insurance Co.

PRESENTATION MONDAY

The award is scheduled to be presented to Cole on Monday in San Francisco at the First International Council on Automobile Safety.

Because of the importance attached to the award by the council, which Congress created in 1966 to advise the Secretary of Transportation on vehicle safety, "it seems particularly important to me that the first recipient be someone who has been truly outstanding in the effort to develop safer cars," Sandbach told Branch. "By no stretch of my imagination could that person be Edward Cole."

The council, which deals principally with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, has 22 members drawn from industry, public and consumer organizations. Vice Chairman Jones, director of advance product engineering for GM, could not be reached for comment.

Of the 22 members, 12 voted to present the award to Cole, a source said. Seven were said to have voted for the late Edward Speno, a New York state senator, a former council chairman, the initiator of the experimental safety vehicle program and a pioneer in state-level auto safety legislation. One vote went to Col. John Stapp, an early leading researcher in auto safety. Two members abstained.

The Center for Auto Safety, which has ties to Nader as well as to CU, the non-profit organization that publishes Consumer Reports, said it plans to picket the award ceremony and will try to present Cole "with a statue comprised of remnants of defective GM parts."

NEWS STORIES CITED

Sandbach, a member of the council for four years, cited news stories that said Cole knew of "the roll-over potential of the Corvair when he made the decision to remove the car's front-roll stabilizer on a safety-be-damned cost basis." Cole was manager of the Chevrolet Division when that GM unit began to produce the Corvair in 1959.

Less than a year ago, Cole contended that there was no safety problem associated with the failure or engine mounts that led to the recall of 6.7 million Chevrolets, Sandbach pointed out.

In a letter to Cole, the Center for Auto Safety requested an "immediate recall of 1971 and 1972 full-sized GM cars other than Cadillacs for repair of a steering lock-up defect."

The letter cited 14 cases in which a steering lockup occurred after a foreign object

lodged between the car frame and the steering coupling joint.

In six of the 14 cases crashes resulted, with five injuries reported, the letter said. The center said that the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety told the Safety Administration of the problem last March, that GM has been aware of the problem for months, that it has issued a dealer technical bulletin describing the defect in May, and that it should solve the problem on all affected cars with an inexpensive, quick-to-install plastic shield.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF AHEPA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this month a very fine American organization celebrates its golden anniversary.

I would, therefore, like to pay personal tribute to the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, the Order of Ahepa, and to urge my colleagues to recognize this organization's half century of contributions to this country.

I am including a brief recitation of AHEPA's activities to demonstrate the scope of its work and the great good it has accomplished.

In my own State of Massachusetts there are 23 local chapters of AHEPA, all of them living up to the ideals and goals of the great parent organization.

The Fall River Chapter is headed by John N. Parandelis, as president; Christos Liaos, vice president; Andrew G. Dangelas, secretary; and John N. Jamoulis, treasurer.

I congratulate AHEPA on its 50 years and wish it 10 times 50 more years of success and service.

The material follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE AND ACCOMPLISHMENT: 1922-72

The Order of Ahepa was founded July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Ga., and its jurisdiction extends to 49 states, Canada, and Australia, with 430 local chapters. The Order of Ahepa is a secret fraternal organization, which is non-political and non-sectarian. The word "AHEPA" is an acrostic, and is derived from the first letters of the following: American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

Membership in the Order of Ahepa is open to men of good moral character who are citizens of the United States of America, or Canada, or who have declared their intention to become citizens.

The "AHEPA Family" is composed of four separate organizations, all of which work in harmony on a local, district and national level. They are: The Order of Ahepa—The Daughters of Penelope (senior women's auxiliary)—The Sons of Pericles (junior young men's auxiliary)—Maid of Athena (junior young women's auxiliary).

OBJECTS OF AHEPA

1. To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America.
2. To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind.
3. To instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship.
4. To encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social and commercial fields of human endeavor.
5. To pledge its members to do their ut-

most to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor and integrity of every nation.

6. To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture.

7. To promote good fellowship, and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense.

8. To endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness.

9. To champion the cause of Education, and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

AHEPA'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORTHY CAUSES

The Order of Ahepa has contributed financially to many worthy causes during its 50 years of existence, on a national and international level. These contributions do not take into account the many local activities of our chapters within the realm of their communities. Local Ahepa chapters have always given generously and vigorously supported local community undertakings in the fields of education, charity and civic improvement. The national and international contributions include:

- Relief of Florida hurricane victims.
- Relief of Mississippi flood victims.
- Relief of Corinth Earthquake victims.
- For the War Orphans of Greece.
- Relief of Dodecanese Earthquake victims.
- For the fatherless children of refugees, through the Near East Relief.
- For the Hellenic Museum.
- National Scholarships to worthy students.
- For the Theological Seminaries at Brookline and Pomfret.
- Ahepa Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial at Hyde Park.
- Ypsilanti and Dilboy Memorials.
- Sons of Pericles Memorial to the American Philhellenes of 1821, at Missolonghi, Greece.
- Relief of Turkish Earthquake victims.
- For the Patriarchate of Jerusalem.
- For the Patriarchate of Constantinople.
- Ecuadorean Relief.
- Kansas City Flood Relief.
- Greek War Relief.
- Ahepa Hospitals in Athens and Thessaloniki, and 7 Health Centers in Greece.
- Ahepa Agricultural College in Greece.
- Ionian Islands earthquake relief.
- Ahepa Preventorium in Volos.
- Penelopion Shelter Home in Athens.
- Ahepa Hall for Boys at St. Basil's Academy.
- The Ahepa School at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, N.Y.
- Sale of 500 million dollars in U.S. War Bonds during World War II as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury.
- Truman Library.
- Dr. George Papanicolaou Cancer Research Institute at Miami.
- The Ahepa Truman Memorial, Athens, Greece.
- The New Smyrna Beach, Fla. monument commemorating the First Landing of Hellenes in the New World in the year 1768.
- The Ahepa Educational Journey to Greece Student Program.

These are some of Ahepa's contributions to worthy causes during its 50 years of existence. Members of the Ahepa take justifiable pride in Ahepa's record of accomplishment. Ahepa has championed the cause of education—it has successfully fought for the freedom and self-respect of the minorities in its Justice for Greece and Justice for Cyprus programs, and Ahepa has always displayed its benevolence and generosity to the stricken victims of disaster both here and abroad.

WHAT DOES THE ORDER OF AHEPA OFFER?

The Order of Ahepa offers its members the opportunity of membership in an organization with an unexcelled reputation for good

fellowship and family participation in an active social program.

District Conventions are held annually in each of the 24 Districts, and a Supreme Convention is held during August of each year. Ahepa Conventions are always "family conventions" wherein full programs of social events, combining fun and relaxation, are provided for all in attendance. At the local chapter level, many social and educational affairs are held during the year so that Ahepa Families may join together in fellowship and relaxation.

Citizenship

Ahepa's requirements stipulate that members must be citizens, or have indicated their intention to become citizens. Ahepa chapters assist non-citizens in attaining their full citizenship, and also inculcate their members with the obligations that go hand-in-hand with citizenship.

Education

Ahepa has been participating in the awarding of Scholarships to worthy students in the past 41 years on local, district and national levels. The Ahepa Hall for Boys and the Ahepa School, both at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, N.Y., have been donated to the Academy by the Order of Ahepa. In Greece, an Ahepa Agricultural School was established. More than 40,000 American books have been donated to schools and libraries in Greece by Ahepa. The Ahepa Medal for Scholastic Excellence in the Greek Language is presented annually to their local Greek Schools by Ahepa Chapters. The Seven-Volume set of the "Greek Classics" are donated to high school and college libraries by Ahepa Chapters, and also donated as scholastic awards to outstanding high school graduates. Annual scholarships are awarded through the American Farm School, and Anatolia College, in Thessaloniki, Greece. Surveys are conducted of courses offered in colleges and universities in Modern and Ancient Greek, and in the Classics. Students are offered summer studies in Greece that cover the Greek language, history and culture, through the Ahepa Educational Journey to Greece Programs.

Civic participation

The local chapters of the Ahepa are active in their own civic affairs and projects, all of which conforms to Ahepa's program of urging its members to be model citizens through planned civic activity. Ahepa chapters are foremost in aiding and contributing to worthy fund drives.

Sports programs

The Ahepa sponsors annual national tournaments in basketball, bowling, golf and track events. Local chapters maintain active sports programs, and District tournaments are offered.

International relations

Ahepa's aid to the people of Greece in various respects such as Greek War Relief; Ahepa Hospitals in Athens and Thessaloniki; seven Ahepa Health Centers in Greece at Chrysoupolis, Kalavryta, Meligala, Thebes, Ierapetra (Crete), Farsala, and Filiatra; Ahepa Preventorium in Volos; American Books for Greece; CARE Tool Kits for Greece; annual Ahepa Excursion to Greece; various Relief Drives for Greek disaster victims; Ahepa Refugee Relief Committee enabling Greek citizens to emigrate to the United States; Daughters of Penelopion Shelter Home in Athens; annual donations to the Queen's Fund; annual donations to the Blind in Greece; these are all some of the outstanding examples of Ahepa's own "People-to-People" program. Ahepa has been a forerunner in this major American program of aid to less fortunate people of the world.

The Ahepan magazine

The fraternity's national magazine is mailed to all good standing members without additional charge.

Ahepa group insurance

An Ahepa Group Life Insurance Plan is available for new members within certain age limitations, and in varying benefit amounts; an Ahepa Hospitalization Plan is also available to the membership.

WHO ARE THE MEMBERS OF AHEPA?

The members of the Ahepa are men in all walks of life. They may be businessmen, professional men, educators, laboring men—but all are men of good moral character with a common goal of good fellowship and common understanding.

Many of our outstanding government leaders are or have been members of the Ahepa. The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt became a member while still Governor of New York, and maintained his membership faithfully. Former President Harry S. Truman is a member of the Ahepa, U.S. Vice President Spiro T. Agnew is also a member. Cabinet members, U.S. Senators and Representatives, state and local officials are members of the Ahepa.

Your average Ahepan is an individual who believes wholeheartedly in the principles of the fraternity. This average Ahepan has benefitted in many ways from his membership, through self-application to the Objects of the organization.

Ahepans are recognized in their own communities as men devoted to civic responsibility, as good neighbors, and as model family men.

The Order of Ahepa has only one axe to grind—and that is the improvement and betterment of our social, moral and family life. All programs of the Ahepa are designed towards this end.

SCHOOL MAY HAVE CHEATED VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am calling today for a full-scale investigation by the Wisconsin Educational Approval Board of a defunct veterans' approved computer school in Janesville, Wis., which is in my congressional district. I believe that this school may have cheated veterans and other students. After being approached by 11 former students and teachers of the school, I have written to the Educational Approval Board seeking an inquiry.

Since the problem of veterans' approved schools is important to all Members of the House, I am placing my letter in the RECORD for my colleagues' study.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1972.

Mr. WILLIAM BECHTEL,
Chairman, Education Approval Board,
Madison, Wis.

DEAR MR. BECHTEL: I am writing to you today in order to request a full scale investigation of a defunct veterans' approved computer school in Janesville which may have cheated veterans and others.

I have received complaints from eleven former Beloit and Janesville students and teachers of the now bankrupt Abacus Computer Learning Center in Janesville. According to these individuals, when the Abacus School ceased its operations in May 1972, it still owed course work and lessons to students who paid their tuition in full and in advance. It also owed job counseling to students who had completed their courses and still owed salaries to at least one of its

two teachers. The Abacus School also has not paid in full its rent to the landlord.

I believe the reports by these eleven individuals raise serious questions about the operation of the Abacus School in particular and VA approved schools in general.

When both veterans and non-veterans see that a school is VA approved, they often assume that the school is reputable and honest. Unfortunately, that did not appear to be the case here. I hope that the Board will investigate the whole system of certifying schools as VA approved as well as looking into the specifics of the Abacus case.

There is a possibility of criminal fraud here. The whole Abacus operation must be thoroughly investigated.

I also believe it is important to review the whole system of certifying VA approved schools because if the school is not sound and cannot provide a full course of instruction then the veteran has been cheated and so has the American taxpayer since it is his tax dollar paying for the veterans' tuition. Equally hurt is the person who digs into his savings to enter the school feeling secure that the school is sound because it is VA approved.

I want to know, and I think every citizen has a right to know, how the Abacus School was allowed to keep its doors open when it couldn't provide the services contracted for. And I want to know what is being done to prevent veterans and other citizens from being cheated by other schools.

I look forward to hearing from you about this investigation.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy this year, I wish to place the Board's report in the RECORD for the attention of our colleagues.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN.

The President of the Senate.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Gentlemen: Pursuant to Section 194 of Title 14 of the United States Code, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1972 Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

By the President of the Senate: Senator David H. Gambrell, Democrat of Georgia.

By the Senate Committee on Commerce: Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat of Washington (ex-officio); Senator Ernest F. Hollings, Democrat of South Carolina; and Senator Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Republican of Connecticut.

By the Speaker of the House: Representative John S. Monagan, Democrat of Connecticut; and Representative Robert H. Steele, Republican of Connecticut.

By the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee: Representative Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat of Maryland (ex-officio); Representative Frank M. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania; Representative Alton Lennon, Democrat of North Carolina; and Representative James R. Grover, Republican of New York.

A meeting of the 1972 Congressional Board of Visitors was held at the United States

Coast Guard Academy on 28 April 1972. Present:

CONGRESSIONAL VISITORS

Representative Alton Lennon of North Carolina, Chairman.

Senator Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. of Connecticut.

Representative John S. Monagan of Connecticut.

Representative James R. Grover of New York.

Representative Robert H. Steele of Connecticut.

Mr. Ernest Corrado, Counsel, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

REPRESENTATIVES OF COAST GUARD HEADQUARTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Rear Admiral Joseph R. Steele, Chief, Office of Personnel.

Captain Leslie D. High, Chief, Training and Procurement Division.

Captain John H. Bruce, Congressional Liaison Officer.

Captain Raymond H. Wood, Congressional Liaison Officer (Designated).

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF, COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Rear Admiral John F. Thompson, Superintendent.

Captain Hugh F. Lusk, Assistant Superintendent.

Captain Paul F. Foye, Dean of Academics.

Captain Malcolm J. Williams, Director of Admissions.

Captain Otto Graham, Director of Athletics.

Captain John B. Hayes, Commandant of Cadets.

Captain Malcolm E. Clark, Head, Dept. of Applied Science & Engineering.

Captain Edward D. Cassidy, Head, Department of Professional Studies.

Captain Carl W. Selin, Head, Department of Physical Education.

Captain Richard L. Brent, Senior Medical Officer.

Commander Roderick M. White, Associate Dean.

Commander John D. Costello, Comptroller.

Commander John R. Kirkland, Chief, Physical Plant Division.

Commander Jimmie D. Woods, Head, Department of Mathematics.

Commander Ronald A. Wells, Head, Department of Humanities.

Commander Louis K. Bragaw, Head, Department of Economics & Management.

Lieutenant Commander Wayne P. Stevens, Assistant to the Dean.

Lieutenant Edward H. Bonekemper III, Assistant Legal Officer.

Lieutenant John H. Hanna III, Director, Computing Center (Acting).

Mr. Paul H. Johnson, Librarian.

Mr. G. Philip Boeding, Registrar.

RECORDER

YN1 F. E. Dick.

The first meeting scheduled for the visiting members was a formal session with the Superintendent, representatives from Coast Guard Headquarters, and Academy staff officers. The following topics were presented by the Academy staff and discussed with the Board of Visitors:

- (1) Present Day Curriculum
- (2) Continuing Report on Research
- (3) Progress Report on Attrition Study
- (4) Report on Proposed Summer Program
- (5) Report from Physical Plant Division on Construction

As an integral portion of the first session, a slide presentation was made concerning the Academy and cadet life. Later, at the close of the afternoon session, in answer to Mr. Lennon's suggestion, a slide presentation was shown, entitled "Bigger Than Its Name". This presentation, in contrast to the earlier one, was devoted to the Coast Guard as a service.

At the Executive Session in the afternoon, the Members of the Congressional Board of Visitors decided that the following recommendations should be incorporated into the report on the Board of Visitors annual visit to the Academy:

(1) The Congressional Board of Visitors has long been concerned with what it considers to be an inadequate library plant and facilities at the Coast Guard Academy. To this end, the Board of Visitors in past years was instrumental in getting sufficient funds authorized and appropriated for the construction of a new library plant. These funds were held up for some time by the Bureau of the budgetary freezes on construction. However, the funds were released last year and construction was commenced on the new library. The members of the Board of Visitors were pleased and surprised to find that construction on the library building had proceeded to a state of completion beyond its expectations. It is expected that the library will be completed sometime this year.

In examining the Academy's affairs, the Board of Visitors was extremely concerned over the question of adequate staffing, books for the library, and maintenance. We have a new building on the way, but that is only half the job. It is apparent to the Board of Visitors that the library at the Coast Guard Academy always has been staffed well below the average of college level libraries. The new building should provide the necessary better service if it is properly staffed. Presently, the library is far short of the necessary volumes and certain other library systems and devices which are necessary for a successful library program. The Board of Visitors is aware that the library deficiencies, in staffing, volumes and systems, in due to inadequate funding. Unfortunately, the library in past years operated with extremely inadequate budgets or no budget at all. It is noted that the average price increase since 1967 computes to approximately 144%. The Academy's library budget in 1968 was \$38,200, and the 1972 budget is \$38,000. The Board of Visitors notes that these figures are not computed on a per student basis but are flat figures. The library budget is actually less than four year ago in the face of staggering price increases. However, it is noted that the budgetary figures relate to a cadet corps enrollment of 825 in 1968 and 925 in 1972. The Board of Visitors was chagrined to learn that library expenditures per student at the Coast Guard Academy are considerably lower than library expenditures per student at the other military academies and other colleges. For example, the library expenditure per student at the Coast Guard Academy is \$94, at the US Naval Academy \$211, at the US Military Academy \$146, at the US Air Force Academy \$174, and at Wesleyan University \$335. (Lib. Stat. of Col. & Un. Fall 1969, p. 68)

In light of these facts and figures, which reflect a serious lack in library resources to assure adequate staffing, volumes and systems, the Board of Visitors recommends in the strongest possible terms that the ranking officials of the Coast Guard take steps to assure that the new library will be adequately staffed and have the necessary volumes and library facilities. The Board of Visitors does not feel this can be accomplished if the library funds come out of a general funding for the Academy or for the Coast Guard, and that in this event the funding may be minimal or nothing. The Board of Visitors recommends that a sufficient amount of money for these goals be earmarked separately and appropriated. Obviously, the Coast Guard's present budgetary system is ineffective for this goal. This must be so when funds were drawn away for keeping the Kodiak base open. The base in Kodiak, Alaska, was operated jointly by the Navy and Coast Guard. This year the Navy closed out its

operations at the Kodiak base and the Coast Guard was faced with either pulling out, too, or operating the base itself. The latter alternative raised budgetary problems for the Coast Guard. The Board of Visitors realizes the necessity of keeping this base operative, but it does not think funds should be drawn away from the Academy for this or any other purpose. Unless practices such as this can be remedied, the Board of Visitors also would recommend that the GAO look into the general Coast Guard budgetary process with a view toward eliminating such inimical budgetary practices.

Although the Board of Visitors deplors this shifting of funds to the detriment of such worthwhile academic institutions as the library, it is aware that the other Service Academies are budgeted in the same manner, but it has reason to believe that the operational budget at the other service academies has not been adversely affected by the withdrawal of allocated funds or budgetary shrinkage. The funding for the other Academies for operation and maintenance is set out under a heading designated "Training Funds" and not as a line item. The funding for West Point for example, is included in this general category and if a crunch should develop, money could be pulled out of funding for West Point for other purposes.

The Board of Visitors regards this library situation as a good example of budgetary shrinkage and shortages which occur in many other areas of the Coast Guard Academy operations.

(2) The Board of Visitors was impressed with certain audio-visual aspects of the presentation of the Academy program and situation at its visit to the Academy. With this in mind, the Board of Visitors recommends that the Academy make a presentation to the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Transportation Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. The Members also felt that all Members with Coast Guard facilities in their district should be invited to this presentation. The presentation would consist of the showing of slides and movies with appropriate commentary which shows the operation of aspects of the Academy and its relation to the entire Coast Guard program. This was felt to be necessary by the Board of Visitors in order to give Congressmen, especially new Members to the Coast Guard Subcommittee, a full understanding of how Coast Guard authorizations and appropriations they are voting on related to the Coast Guard, its Academy, and its operations.

The Board of Visitors is aware that the Subcommittee on Coast Guard held an oversight hearing on December 1971 on Coast Guard operations pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1970. The Board of Visitors recommends that this audio-visual presentation might properly precede the next oversight hearing, which will be either later this session of the 92nd Congress or early in the next Congress.

(3) The Congressional Board of Visitors discussed somewhat in depth the fact that the Board of Visitors, appointed by the Chairman and the Speaker, goes up to the Academy for one day, sometime in late April or early May, and then does nothing after that. The Board of Visitors recommends that the Board of Visitors be more expeditiously appointed and that it should be more active in the future, and that it should continue this activity throughout the year it is appointed by having at least several meetings a year, both in Washington and at least a follow-up trip to the Academy in New London.

(4) The Board of Visitors was told that the statutory monthly pay of a cadet is \$265.35, from which federal income and social security taxes are deducted monthly. The cadet also receives a daily ration allowance

of \$1.63. This works out to \$11.41 a week and \$45.64 per month for food. These figures are just for the purchase of food and do not take into account service costs and other costs related to the purchase, preparation and serving of meals to the cadets. The Board of Visitors considers that this meal ration is somewhat low and recommends that consideration be given to raising the meal ration so that the quality of the food may be improved. There were some complaints that the food is not as good as it used to be. The Board of Visitors was assured by the Coast Guard that it would make available to the cadets an opportunity to be heard and to make suggestions, with respect to the quality of the meals.

(5) The Board of Visitors received some complaints from the cadets both this year and last year to the effect that they would like a little more time home with their families, especially during the summer break. The Coast Guard Academy now allows two weeks at home at Christmas, ten days in the spring, and three weeks at the end of the summer. While the Board of Visitors recognizes the desires of the cadets for increased time at home at the end of the summer, the Board feels that it should be kept in context of home leave at the other service academies. In this connection, the Board of Visitors noted the following leave at the other service academies:

First class		Days
Coast Guard	-----	59
Annapolis	-----	59
West Point	-----	55
Air Force	-----	53
Second and third class		Days
Coast Guard	-----	52
Annapolis:		
Second	-----	55
Third	-----	60
West Point	-----	51
Air Force	-----	46
Fourth class		Days
Coast Guard	-----	31
Annapolis	-----	25
West Point	-----	16
Air Force	-----	25

(6) The Board of Visitors expressed concern over the teaching of the humanities at the Academy and its position in the curriculum. The Board of Visitors last year decided that a report should be made by a reliable contract agency concerning the entire curriculum of the Academy and how it relates to the present and future operations of the Coast Guard. With this in mind, the Board of Visitors wrote Secretary Volpe immediately after its visit asking that such a study be contracted out. The present Board of Visitors was shocked to learn that the contract has just been let, and this is one year later. The report is now due next March, but the Congressional Board of Visitors recommends that in the interim period the Academy do all possible to assure a viable humanities program.

Following the Executive Session, the Congressional Board of Visitors were honored by a parade review by the Corps of Cadets, and later were guests of the Superintendent for dinner in the Officers' Mess before departing the Academy.

ALTON LENNON,
Chairman, Representative from North Carolina.

LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.,
Senator from Connecticut.

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Representative from Connecticut.

JAMES R. GROVER,
Representative from New York.

ROBERT H. STEELE,
Representative from Connecticut.

STERLING SNYDER: A CREDIT TO HIS COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, Sterling Snyder is a man who cares about his country and his community, Echo Park in Los Angeles, Calif. It is a pleasure to have as a constituent such a man who has demonstrated his talents and contributed in many ways—through his work at the Bank of America, through membership in the Kiwanis Club and the chamber of commerce, through his writings, and through a variety of other activities for community betterment.

Today I rise to congratulate Sterling Snyder on his retirement this week from the post of manager of the Bank of America, Sunset-Echo Park Branch of Los Angeles. He started his banking career in 1925 with the Northwestern National Bank in Minneapolis, Minn. In November of 1928 he joined the Bank of Italy, later the Bank of America. His other activities in the banking community include membership in the Bank-America Club, and membership in the American Institute of Banking, from which he holds a graduate certificate. Mr. Snyder also serves as chairman of the Sunset-Silverlake savings bonds committee.

Sterling Elwin Snyder was born in Minnesota. He and his wife Mary have three children—Sterling Eugene, Jan Steven, and Judith Paulette Snyder. Since coming to California, Mr. Snyder has become a most valued citizen of Echo Park, and in December of 1971 he was honored for his long service in the community by being named "Mr. Echo Park." He served in that capacity as grand marshal of the Echo Park community "Winter Wonderland Parade."

Mr. Snyder is an elder in the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints, South Pasadena Ward, and formerly a member of his Church Bishopric. He has been a member of the Echo Park Coordinating Council for many years. He holds a certificate in real estate. He studied creative writing and journalism and is a graduate of Los Angeles City College. He has written numerous short stories and articles, many of which have been published in local newspapers; one of these received worldwide distribution, and many were read on radio. He received a George Washington Honor Award Medal for his patriotic writings from the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge.

Mr. Snyder has been very active in the Echo Park Chamber of Commerce, as a charter member and as director. He is currently serving as Secretary. He is the recipient of their outstanding community service award.

His activities and responsibilities in the Kiwanis Club have been extensive. He is a charter member and past president, and has also served as secretary, of the Kiwanis Club of Sunset-Echo Park. He has also been public relations chairman for the Sunset-Echo Park Kiwanis Club

for the past several years, and is currently public relations chairman for Division 3 of the California-Nevada-Hawaii District for Kiwanis International, a position he has held in the past. He is also the past lieutenant governor of Kiwanis International for the three-State District. In 1966 he received the Citation of Service Gold Award from Kiwanis International for outstanding community service rendered, and he was honored again in 1972 with the Kiwanis District Award for outstanding work in recruiting new members. He has also been chairman of the California Nevada-Hawaii District Club Bulletin, Committee for Kiwanis International.

In other community activities, Mr. Snyder has worked as a member of the finance committee for the Boy Scouts of America, Los Angeles Area Council, Pueblo District. He has been very active in support in local elementary school projects. Mr. Snyder is currently the president of Rampart Booster Association, Inc., a community sponsored youth activity. He served as the community advisory chairman for Westlake-Elysian area for the Citizen's Committee for School Bonds. In May of 1967 he received an award from the Affiliated Teacher Organizations of Los Angeles for his contribution to the welfare of children and youth, recommended by eight local schools.

Mr. Snyder is also the past secretary of the Echo Park Committee for Senior Citizens Affairs. He was one of the pioneers for off-street parking, tree planting, and better lighting in the Echo Park area. Earlier this year he served as a judge in the NWLA Lions Club speech contest. He is a member of the Queen of Angels Clinic and Research Foundation, and for several years in the past has been a member of the advisory committee of "Over Thirty-five" projects of the Queen of Angels School of Nursing.

At my recommendation as a member of the California State Senate in 1967, that body passed a resolution honoring Sterling Snyder for outstanding community service. He also received an honorary award in the form of a resolution for services to his fellow men, community service activities in the Echo Park area, and interest in school projects. In 1966 he received an honorary award by resolution of the county of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, signed by Supervisor Ernest Debs, for outstanding service in the Echo Park area. He has also received a meritorious award from the American Red Cross in fundraising for Red Cross work.

It is my pleasure today to pay tribute to Sterling Snyder, an active and dedicated citizen who is a credit to his community.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. EDWARD ZIGLER, FORMER DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Dr. Edward Zigler as Director of the Office of Child Development

and Chief of the Children's Bureau is a great blow to all who care about children in the United States.

Dr. Zigler has not only a deep understanding of children but a genuine commitment to enriching their lives.

As House sponsor of the comprehensive child development bill which Congress passed last year but which President Nixon vetoed, I know personally of Dr. Zigler's invaluable contribution to the shaping of this legislation.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I noted with great interest that, in his letter of resignation, dated June 30, 1972, to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Elliot Richardson, Dr. Zigler set forth what he described as the "several principles" which he believes, "should form the basis for children's programs."

It is, I think, most significant that all these principles were contained in the comprehensive child development bill which President Nixon last year vetoed.

Among these principles are: First, that healthy social, emotional, and physical development are as important as intellectual achievement; second, that different children have different needs and, therefore, require individual services; third, that children of all socioeconomic groups should have the opportunity to share in the same programs; fourth, that parents are the most important single factor in the development of the children, and that every effort, therefore, should be made to help parents improve the development of their children; and that fifth, because human development is a continuous process, programs for children should begin at conception and continue to the early years of school.

I might also, Mr. Speaker, draw attention to Dr. Zigler's expression of concern that—

Thousands of children today receive the kind of day care which does not enhance a child's development and which in many instances may be seriously harmful.

What those of us in both the House and Senate who have been working on comprehensive child development legislation have been endeavoring to do is to write precisely the kind of legislation that embodies the principles and concerns of which Dr. Zigler has been speaking and of which he has been so great a champion.

I am confident that the time will soon come when Congress will again pass a child development bill and that a President will sign it into law. On that day, we shall recall with gratitude Dr. Zigler's tenacious and dedicated efforts on behalf of America's children.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of the letter of resignation of Dr. Zigler to which I have referred:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

Washington, D.C., June 30, 1972.

HON. ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, today I submitted to the President my resignation

as Director of the Office of Child Development and Chief of the Children's Bureau. At the time of my appointment I made a commitment to serve as the first director of the Office of Child Development for a period of two years. Having fulfilled that commitment, I now wish to return to my research and teaching at Yale University.

When this Office was created, there was uncertainty among many of those concerned about children as to how significant this new organization would be in influencing Federal Government activities affecting the lives of children and their families. I believe that it is now recognized that OCD is an agency committed to high quality programs and is an effective advocate for children.

A number of factors have contributed to the success of the Office. Because of the special interest which you have displayed, as well as OCD's organizational position as part of the Office of the Secretary, children's needs have not been subordinated to those of more vocal and organized groups.

The functions assigned to this Office—advocacy, coordination, and the administration of Head Start—have been mutually reinforcing. Involvement with Head Start families has provided information about the needs of children; in turn, Head Start has been a vehicle for the demonstration of new approaches to services, advocacy, and coordination both at the Federal level and in communities.

Those who staff the Office of Child Development in Washington and in the Regional Offices have performed with remarkable skill and dedication. They are knowledgeable, effective, and deeply committed to improving the quality of life for all children and families.

Because of these factors, the past two years have been marked by several major achievements. The quality of Head Start has been improved, and new services such as Health Start, Home Start, and Parent and Child Advocacy Centers have reasserted Head Start as the nation's most innovative program for disadvantaged preschool children and their families. The Office of Child Development has conducted major social action research and demonstration programs in the areas of emergency services for families in crisis, foster care and adoption, and day care, to mention but a few. Through the Federal Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research, OCD has led the first successful effort to coordinate all Federally funded research on the first eight years of life.

The Office has addressed the national need for personnel trained to care for children by creating a new profession, the Child Development Associate, in which certification will be based upon measured competence in caring for children rather than solely upon traditional academic degrees.

An OCD achievement with great potential significance has been the preparation of the 1972 Federal Day Care Requirements as well as the planning or quality day care services which would be made available under pending legislation. The Federal Day Care Requirements of 1972, which I have been deeply involved in designing, would help ensure that all children in Federally subsidized day care would be provided with educational and social experiences, health, nutrition, and other services essential for healthy development.

All of these efforts by the Office of Child Development are intended to reflect several principles which I believe should form the basis for children's programs: (1) healthy social, emotional, and physical development are as important as intellectual achievement; (2) individual children have different needs which require individualized services; (3) children of all socioeconomic groups should be able to participate together in programs; (4) parents are the most significant single

determinant in the child's development, and every effort should be made to aid parents in enhancing their children's development; (5) human development is a continuous process, and programs for children at developmental risk should begin at conception and continue through the early school years.

While our current and planned efforts have moved us towards the kind of child care system that I envisioned, much remains to be done in the future.

I am concerned about the absence of continuity between programs directed at children of different ages. The lack of coordination of Federal child development programs with each other and with state and local efforts is a serious problem for which answers have proved elusive.

Very little has been done in our programs to bring about a mixture of children from various socioeconomic strata. So long as there are poor children who remain unserved, it is appropriate to direct our efforts to them. However, the idea that children of all social groups should share early experiences has become widely accepted, and I look forward to the achievement of this goal as funds and manpower become available.

I am also very much concerned about the fact that thousands of children today receive the kind of day care which does not enhance a child's development and which in many instances may be seriously harmful. Much of this care is subsidized by the Federal Government. Implementing and enforcing the 1972 Federal Day Care Requirements is a matter of highest priority.

On balance, I am pleased with what OCD has been able to accomplish in two years and am glad to have had this opportunity to play a role in shaping OCD and its approach to programs for children. I will watch legislative activity in this area with great interest in the months to come. It has been a privilege to work with you, and I shall always be available to be of assistance to you and to OCD in the future.

Sincerely,

EDWARD ZIGLER,
Director, Office of Child Development.

WOMEN WANT GREATER ROLE IN CREDIT UNION WORK

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this age of women's lib it is gratifying to see that women are pushing for more representation in the business world.

To seek greater involvement in the credit union movement, a group headed by June Majors, treasurer of Western Electric Federal Credit Union in Syracuse, have formed the Association of Credit Union Women as a part of the Credit Union National Association.

The organization was formed because as June Majors puts it:

I don't see any women at the top of any credit union organizations, on any of the national boards. We don't want to see just women behind the desks and counters. We want to see them out front and up top.

June Majors noted that at a recent advisory meeting of the National Credit Union Administration in Washington she was the only woman among 72 speakers. She hopes that the growth of ACUW will reverse this trend.

The July issue of the Credit Union magazine carries an extremely interest-

ing article about the need for more representation by women in the credit union movement and discusses in detail the formation of ACUW. I am including the article in my remarks since it shows that the credit union movement is indeed a viable, forward-looking commitment to the future and a movement that provides publicity for worthwhile causes such as those of the ACUW rather than ignoring such important work.

The article follows:

WOMEN SEEK GREATER VOICE THROUGH ACUW—STEEPED UP RECRUITMENT IS UNDERWAY

(By Patricia J. Estevez)

There are women who want some doors opened, doors that lead to full career participation in the credit union movement. And they're not standing around waiting for a gentleman to come along. They've organized to get those doors opened.

They are the charter members of the Association of Credit Union Women.

Informally organized at the 1971 session of CUNA School, the association elected officers and adopted bylaws at its first national meeting held in conjunction with the CUNA meetings in May in Madison.

June Majors, treasurer of Western Electric Federal Credit Union in Syracuse, and a director of the New York League, was elected chairman. The association is her brainchild, conceived "after years of observing the lack of upward mobility by women in every level of credit union work."

Working with Ms. Majors to reverse this trend are the following regional representatives: Frances Sugarman, president, Boston Chapter, Malden, Mass., northeast region; Virginia Harris, manager, Madison Telco Credit Union, Madison, Wis., midwest region; Alma Neel, manager, Houston Telephone Federal Credit Union, Houston, Texas, southwest region; and Rosie Schultz, assistant manager, Washington State Employees Credit Union, Seattle, far west region.

All other regions of the country will be served by two directors-at-large, Louise Herring, manager of Post and Times-Star Credit Union and the Concora Credit Union, Cincinnati, Ohio, and Mrs. Elizabeth Wells, manager, Central Area Federal Credit Union, Seattle.

During an informational session for prospective members at the annual meeting, Ms. Majors talked about necessity for the organization. "I don't see any women at the top of any credit union organizations, on any of the national boards. We don't want to see just women behind the desks and counters. We want to see them out front and up top."

She stressed that in order for the organization to succeed, women would have to join and support it wholeheartedly.

Ms. Herring, who was one of the original signers of CUNA's charter at Estes Park, Colorado in 1934, was quick to agree with Ms. Majors on the need for the association. She said, "I think this is a great idea! Why, right now there are no women department heads in any of the organizations in the movement. We need them, and not just because they are women but because they are competent and capable."

She reminded the group that she had written in *The Credit Union Magazine's* August 1971 "Page of Opinion" that the movement is in the hands of "elderly, affluent, white males."

Ms. Herring emphasized the danger of older people failing to make way for younger people to move up into positions of responsibility. She told the group "We have to fight 'lip service' given to minority groups. Those in charge do not really want women, blacks,

youth and other minorities involved because the boards do not wish to give up their positions of power."

Ms. Majors concurred, adding "there will be no future in the movement for women and other minorities unless we make it ourselves."

Right now the association is attempting to make itself known to women through regional representatives and distribution of the quarterly newsletter "The Broadview."

The leaders see it assuming a lead in the credit union education of women by making them aware of how they can advance, what workshops and seminars are available in their areas. They would like those women who are happy and satisfied with clerical work to be encouraged to stay in the credit union field. They would like to see women who want to assume other types of responsibility to have the chance to move up as far as their potential will take them.

Even though right now it is more or less in the conscious-raising stage, eventually the association would like to have the resources to offer its own educational programs, with chapters operating on a local and state level.

Until that is possible it will continue to have meetings in conjunction with the other credit union organizations having women members. For example, women in the Credit Union Executives Society were invited to a breakfast meeting of the association held during the Society's conference last month in Las Vegas.

Membership is open to any women involved in any type of credit union activity—volunteer or paid, clerical or professional. Dues are \$10 annually, with an additional \$25 for charter membership.

Three special honorary memberships have been awarded. Mrs. Roy Bergengren, widow of the credit union pioneer, was given this honor at the May meeting. The other honorary members are Herb Wegner, CUNA's managing director; and Richard H. Grant, chairman of the National Credit Union Board and treasurer-manager of Pease Air Force Base Federal Credit Union, New Hampshire.

Ms. Majors is optimistic about the association's future growth. "I think," she stated, "we should sign up 10 per cent of the women managers in the coming year."

She noted that at the March advisory meeting of the National Credit Union Administration in Washington, D.C., she was the lone woman among 72 speakers. She hopes to have greater feminine representation the next time around.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION HELPS CREDIT UNIONS HIT BY RECENT FLOODS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods in South Dakota and those resulting from Hurricane Agnes caused not only extensive damage to homes and businesses but also damaged a number of credit unions.

The impact of a credit union being flooded out could have had a serious economic impact on the credit union members, but it appears that due to the work of the National Credit Union Administration, the flooded credit unions will suffer only short interruptions in service to their members.

Fortunately, only one Federal credit union suffered extensive damage as a result of flooding in South Dakota, but

unfortunately Agnes was not as charitable. Some 40 federally chartered or federally insured credit unions in the Boston and Harrisburg Federal credit union regions were damaged by the flood waters of Hurricane Agnes.

In order to assist these credit unions, the National Credit Union Administration set up emergency offices in Wilkes-Barre and in addition sent supplies to affected credit unions on an emergency basis. Because of the work of the National Credit Union Administration and the dedication of credit union workers in the various damaged credit unions, most of the credit unions were able to reopen a few days after the storm hit.

The following letter from National Credit Union Administrator Herman Nickerson shows the type of assistance that was provided by NCUA as a result of the hurricane.

Although such emergency assistance is fortunately only needed on rare occasions, it is gratifying to know that when such emergencies do arise that NCUA is prepared to act quickly.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION
ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., July 7, 1972.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,

Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: As you know, Tropical Storm Agnes created disaster and tragedy over a wide area of the northeast and especially hard hit by the torrential rains and resultant flooding were sections of the States of Virginia, New York and Pennsylvania.

I am outlining below a "condition report" and a "remedial action" report for your information.

No damage to Federal credit unions in Regions III (Atlanta, Georgia), IV (Toledo, Ohio) and VI (San Francisco, California).

Region V (Austin, Texas):

One Federal credit union lost a building through flood damage. This was the structure used by the Black Hills Employees Federal Credit Union in Rapid City, South Dakota. The credit union loss of the building and office equipment approximates \$25,000.

Region I (Boston, Massachusetts):

Five Federal credit unions in the Corning, New York, area sustained varying amounts of damage.

Three of these credit unions are now back in operation.

Two suffered severe damage to records and equipment. These two credit unions have relocated their offices. Records are being dried and one of these Federal credit unions is back in operation.

Heaviest damage was sustained in the Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, area with lesser damage in Richmond, Virginia.

A total of 29 Federal credit unions suffered damage to equipment and records with 6 federally insured state-chartered credit unions also sustaining water damage. Records are being dried and these state-chartered credit unions are now partially operational.

I have established an emergency office in the Mackin Elementary School in Wilkes-Barre in an effort to render all possible assistance to credit unions and credit union members. This office was in operation on June 28, staffed by the National Credit Union Administration Regional Director, in addition to several examiners. Congressman Dan Flood visited this office and appeared pleased to see us "in the field."

As you know, many of the Federal credit

union records were under water. Contact between the National Credit Union Administration personnel and credit union officials had been next to impossible. On June 29, I sent a letter to the affected credit unions, advising them of our emergency office. A copy of this letter is attached. The Regional Director had already made many spot announcements on 14 radio stations and 2 TV stations in the Wilkes-Barre area.

My examiners in Wilkes-Barre have been successful in retrieving records from a number of credit union treasurers' homes and from the flooded rooms which had been occupied by credit unions when the storm hit. Record retrieval has been exceedingly difficult, what with several inches of slime, mud, human waste, decayed food and other matter occupying many flooded offices.

In more than one instance, credit union members' currency has been located intact inside a water tight safe in a credit union treasurer's home.

Our examiners, in collecting the various water-damaged records, have taken these documents to their own homes to dry. Office supplies were nonexistent in the flood zone, so I took steps to send a truck load of necessary supplies and equipment from the NCUA warehouse, located in Alexandria, Virginia, direct to the emergency offices. The supplies were hand delivered by our examiners to the credit union offices requiring them so that the credit unions might remain in operation for the benefit of their members. A supply depot was established in our emergency office and area credit union officials were notified of this so they could make arrangements to drop by and pick up the supplies they required.

I am offering NCUA funds to all Federal credit unions and to federally insured state credit unions, at a favorable rate of interest, so that credit union members may obtain short-term cash loans through their credit unions to meet current emergency bills, such as food, clothing and other necessary items, and to allow share withdrawals.

As of this date, all but 12 Federal credit unions are operational and are providing varying degrees of day-to-day service to their membership. Eight of these twelve credit unions will be operational in a few days. Three of them are located in flood areas where industrial plants have either been severely damaged or totally destroyed. One of these credit unions field of membership is city school employees, but the school was completely destroyed by the flood.

I can assure you I will continue to assist these credit unions until all their problems have been solved.

Sincerely,

HERMAN NICKERSON, Jr.,
Administrator.

THE OUTSTANDING CAREER OF MAJ. GEN. LEO C. LEWIS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that an outstanding military officer from my congressional district has recently been honored with the Distinguished Service Medal. This is but one of many important milestones in the fine career of a very able officer.

He is Maj. Gen. Leo C. Lewis, son of my long-time friend Frank E. Lewis. Both are from Pensacola in Florida's first and finest district. General Lewis distinguished himself as vice commander of the Eighth Air Force at Guam. In this role, he flew many missions for SAC

over Southeast Asia. Instrumental in bringing about important equipment modifications through Air Force Headquarters, General Lewis, through the use of the equipment, was able to achieve a 99.8-percent primary target reliability for the aircraft under his command. Under his leadership, three Eighth Air Force maintenance squadrons out of a possible four were named most outstanding squadrons of their type in SAC.

General Lewis was born in Pensacola and graduated from Pensacola High School. Entering the Air Force in February 1942, General Lewis went on to fly 25 combat missions over Europe in the B-17 and later he flew 27 combat missions in the B-29 against Japan. In 1948, he joined SAC and since that time, through force of personality and outstanding qualities of leadership, has given that important arm of our national defense and patriotic and dedicated service.

Currently, General Lewis is vice commander of the 15th Air Force headquartered at March Air Force Base, Calif. There he is continuing to fill an important mission for our Nation and the entire free world.

The award of the Distinguished Service Medal for his work in Southeast Asia is but the latest of a significant series of medals and decorations to his credit. In addition, he wears the Legion of Merit with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Distinguished Flying Cross with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Air Medal with eight Oak Leaf Clusters, the Presidential Unit Citation Emblem with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award Ribbon with two Oak Leaf Clusters.

He is a rated navigator and command pilot with more than 8,500 hours flying time including over 4,000 hours in jets.

The distinguished career of General Lewis is a credit to the Air Force and to his Nation. It is a source of pride and pleasure to his family, to the people of his hometown of Pensacola who have followed his career with close interest, and to those for whom he has provided an example of courageous and able leadership throughout the military services.

COOPERATIVE APARTMENT ELIGIBILITY UNDER SECTION 216 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, before the House adjourned, I introduced H.R. 15837 to amend the Internal Revenue Service Act of 1954 to include corporations and other associations in the definition of the term "tenant stockholder" for the purposes of determining eligibility under section 216. This section allows "tenant stockholders" to deduct their pro rata share of interest and taxes paid by the cooperative housing corporation; before these deductions are allowed, however, the cooperative must demonstrate that 80 percent or more of its gross income is from "tenant stockholders."

Presently, a "tenant stockholder" is defined in section 216(b)(2) as "an individual who is a stockholder in a cooperative housing corporation, and whose stock—is attributable to the house or apartment which such individual is entitled to occupy." H.R. 15837 would simply change the word "individual" to "person" in the two places it appears in section 216(b). "Person" is defined in section 7701(a)(1) of the code as including individuals, corporations, trusts, et cetera.

The need for the change I am proposing became evident in the decision handed down by the U.S. Court of Appeals on December 10, 1971, in *Eckstein against United States*. The case involved a newly formed coop in my congressional district which was trying to qualify as a "cooperative housing corporation." The "sponsor" of the project had provided that if any of the apartments were not sold by a certain time, it would procure nominees to accept the liabilities of "tenant stockholders." Eighty of the 101 units were sold and 21 were assigned to the president of the "sponsor" corporation who took them as nominee for the "sponsor." Commercial rents were scheduled to be less than 20 percent.

The court held that the income from the nominee was not income from a "tenant stockholder" since the nominee represented the "sponsor" who was the actual holder of the stock; the "sponsor" was a corporation and thus was not an "individual" within the meaning of the statute.

The court's decision disallowed a deduction by the 66 tenant stockholders in that cooperative for the taxable year in question—not because of an unacceptable percentage of commercial rents, but rather because some of the apartments had not been sold and even though the liabilities for these apartments had been accepted by the nominee of the "sponsor."

The amendment I am proposing to the code would make a difference for most cases only in the first few years of a coop's existence since the remaining apartments are eventually sold. It would simply remove the present penalty for the initial tenant stockholders in a new coop. Furthermore, there will always be instances in which apartments in cooperatives may be bought by corporations to be used by visiting or relocating employees. It is reasonable that income from these corporate held apartments qualify as income from "tenant stockholders."

At this time, I insert for printing in the RECORD, the text of H.R. 15837:

H.R. 15837

A bill to amend section 216 of the Internal Revenue Service of 1954 to include corporations and others within the definition of the term "tenant-stockholder" for purposes of the provisions relating to cooperative housing corporations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 216(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining the term "tenant-stockholder" in the case of cooperative housing corporations) is amended by striking out "an individual" and inserting in lieu thereof "a person", and by striking

out "such individual" and inserting in lieu thereof "such person".

TO EXTEND OUR COMMITMENT TO THE ELDERLY

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest failures of our country has been its neglect of the needs and rights of our senior citizens. In New York City 12 percent of the population, 947,878 persons, are over 65. Our older citizens are experiencing a difficult time meeting their everyday minimum financial needs, and they are especially hard hit by inflationary food prices, escalating medical costs, and rising rents.

I am happy to see that today the House is considering H.R. 15657, Amendments to the Older Americans Act of 1965, which would extend, strengthen, and modify present grant programs. The accomplishments of this program thus far have been significant. Group meals and home delivered meals were provided to thousands of older persons to help solve the nutritional problems of the elderly. In many cases these meals were prepared and delivered by older persons. Transportation services enabled the elderly to keep doctor's appointments, to go to health clinics and food stamp offices, to make trips at a distance and visits to senior citizen centers. Visiting nurses and in-home health aides were provided for the home-bound elderly and for the handicapped. Senior citizen centers were created offering recreation, volunteer services, adult education, and job training opportunities. Such successful programs as the foster grandparent program and the retired senior volunteer program originated as part of this act.

These amendments now before us would strengthen the administrative apparatus of the Administration on Aging and the State agencies on aging. In addition, it will establish a National Information and Resource Center and will provide for the construction of additional multipurpose senior centers. Present programs will be extended in order to reach a much greater number of needy senior citizens. The Older Americans Act of 1965 began this country's serious commitment to assist the elderly, and I know my colleagues here in Congress will follow through on this commitment and enact these most important amendments.

In connection with this legislation, I would like to discuss three other bills which I have introduced to help relieve the income restrictions now imposed on older Americans now pending before congressional committees:

H.R. 844

One of the first bills I introduced in this Congress was H.R. 844 to eliminate the income limitation for those receiving social security benefits. Because of the low-income eligibility levels written in our present law, we are, in fact, committing our senior citizens to a standard of living no better than the poverty levels established by both the Office of Economic Opportunity and the

Bureau of the Census. The present law now sets a maximum income from wages of \$1,680 per year for those eligible for social security benefits up to age 72. Income earned in excess of \$1,680 up to \$2,880 is reduced \$1 for every \$2 earned. If a person's income exceeds \$2,880, he or she receives no social security benefits. This limitation applies regardless of how many dependents the individual has. H.R. 844 is designed to correct this unfair situation. It is unfair for two primary reasons:

First, money which is included within this income restriction under social security is limited only to wages. It does not include income received from other sources such as bonds, and other investments. This hits at those who must work, and who do not have savings, investments, or other forms of supplementary income.

Second, the incentive to work is reduced because an elderly person is penalized if he or she works in order to supplement a meager earning.

H.R. 13190

A number of my senior citizen constituents who are widows or widowers have complained that the present provision in the social security law terminating or reducing widow's or widower's benefits upon remarriage has the effect of chilling, for financial reasons, the desire to remarry. Let me explain what they mean. Under the present law, a widow receives 71.5 percent of her husband's benefits upon reaching the age of 60 and receives 82.5 percent of these benefits at age 62, and the widower receives 82.5 percent of his wife's benefits at age 62. Once the widow or widower remarries, however, these benefits are reduced to 50 percent, provided he or she is over 60. If the widow or widower is under 60 upon remarriage, the benefit eligibility is terminated entirely. Thus, in effect, these laws compel senior citizens to live lives of loneliness or to have relationships without the benefit of marriage.

What my bill would do would be to eliminate those provisions in the social security laws whose effect is to terminate or reduce the widow's or widower's benefits upon remarriage.

H.R. 13839

Most of us know from personal family experience how elderly persons are often frustrated in their desire to work. They want to work not only to supplement their minimum social security benefits but also to continue to be active and productive citizens. Unfortunately, senior citizens are too often shunted aside and find it difficult to find employment.

I have introduced the Senior Citizens Job Corps Act of 1972, H.R. 13839, to provide 50,000 jobs for persons of low income who are 62 years and older. It authorizes the Secretary of Labor to enter into contracts, with public and nonprofit agencies, to hire on a part time basis elderly citizens to be paid at a rate not less than the Federal minimum wage. Members of this Senior Citizens Job Corps could work as many hours as they want, as long as the total amount does not exceed the level at which social security benefits are reduced.

The great historian Arnold Toynbee once said:

Society can be measured by the respect and care given to its elderly citizens.

I ask whether the discrimination, forgetfulness, and lack of care now afforded our senior citizens gives our country a very good "measure"? I think not. The situation must be changed, and I intend to do whatever I can to truly make the "Golden Years" golden—instead of filled with despair.

THE COURT AND CONGRESS

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I indicated in remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1972, at page 23881, that the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, was preparing a special report containing the full text of the decisions of the Supreme Court on June 29, 1972, in the Brewster and Gravel cases. (*United States v. Brewster*, 40 U.S.L.W. 4996 (U.S. June 29, 1972); *Gravel v. United States*, 40 U.S.L.W. 5053 (U.S. June 29, 1972).)

This report, as part of the joint committee's continuing series of reports on "Court Proceedings and Actions of Vital Interest to the Congress," was distributed to the office of every Member on Saturday, July 8, 1972.

It is my hope that, with the text of these decisions now available, every Member will give his or her serious attention to this latest interpretation by the Supreme Court of the speech or debate clause of the Constitution—article I, section 6, clause 1—which provides that—

For any Speech or Debate in either House, they (the Senators and Representatives) shall not be questioned in any other place.

This past weekend, in a two-part editorial devoted to "The Court and Congress," the Washington Post commented on these decisions. I believe this editorial rightly alerts the public to the potential impact of these decisions on their relationships with their elected representatives. It urges every Member of Congress, as well, to consider how these decisions may seriously affect the operations of the Congress.

The editorial, which appeared in the Washington Post on July 15 and 16, 1972, follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1972]

THE COURT AND CONGRESS (I)

In its decisions in the Gravel and Brewster cases, the Supreme Court has drawn a picture of Congress which many congressmen and many of their constituents will find neither accurate nor appealing. At issue in both cases was the scope of the constitutional guarantee of legislative freedom from executive harassment, set forth in the clause providing that "for any speech or debate in either house, they [senators and representatives] shall not be questioned in any other place." While this clause is not a grant of blanket immunity from criminal prosecution—it does not shield congressmen from prosecution for such things as tax evasion and perjury—the protection has historically covered things which members of Congress

generally say and do in the process of enacting legislation. Now, however, the court has defined that process in ways which not only show little grasp of the real workings of the modern congress but may also expose important aspects of the legislative business, as it is practiced day to day, to considerable partisan mischief and incursions by federal investigators, prosecutors and grand juries.

In the case involving Senator Mike Gravel, the central issue was whether the speech and debate clause prohibits a grand jury from questioning the Senator or his staff about the "Gravel edition" of the Pentagon Papers, which the Senator read into the record of a subcommittee hearing and which was later privately printed. The court first ruled sensibly that staff aides to congressmen "must be treated as the latter's alter ego," with all the immunity which members themselves enjoy. But the court here then proceeded to limit that immunity to matters which "must be an integral part of the deliberative and communicative processes by which members participate in committee and House proceedings" on legislation. Since the publication of the Pentagon Papers by Beacon Press "was in no way essential to the deliberations of the House [of Congress]," the court's majority said, the grand jury may inquire into that and into every other facet of the matter except the subcommittee meeting itself—including the source of the papers and any "third-party crimes" that might be involved.

This decision is extremely troubling because it declares, in effect, that the only communications essential to the legislative process are those among congressmen. This relegates to a lesser realm the constant, churning traffic in ideas and opinions between congressmen and citizens. Yet this communication is central to the idea and functioning of representative government, not peripheral as the court seems to think.

We have previously expressed concern about the low value which the present court appears to assign to the free flow of information to and from citizens. The Gravel decision may seriously retard that flow, just as may the decision denying newsmen a privilege to hold certain information in confidence. If senators and congressmen may publish controversial material with impunity only in the small print of committee hearings and the Congressional Record, many segments of the public simply will never learn important facts, dissenting views, and the countless small bits of legislative work which travel unreported by the media. To the extent that it may squelch congressional minorities and mavericks, the Gravel decision buttresses the already alarming command of public opinion enjoyed by the executive branch and the dominant factions in Congress.

The decision may also severely crimp the flow of information from citizens to their representatives. If congressmen may no longer shield their sources from the scrutiny of grand juries, those sources are far less likely to bring in the elusive, enlightening snatches of sensitive material on which valuable Capitol Hill investigations and actions often hinge. A civil servant or an "ordinary citizen" of modest means and no particular influence is far less likely to raise pertinent questions about public policy if his communications with his congressman can no longer be kept confidential. The newsmen's privilege cases will be costly to the country in terms of the stories that will never be written; the Gravel decision will be equally expensive in terms of the legislative probes never launched, bills never enacted, and citizens never aroused to cope with abuse of executive authority, misuses of federal funds, unprosecuted felonies, and other ills which an effective Congress ought to remedy.

The real, intricate, unorderly process of legislating does not begin or end when con-

gressmen convene in a chamber or hearing room to deliberate among themselves. By drawing the boundaries of the speech and debate clause at the doors of those chambers and hearing rooms, a majority of the court has grossly demeaned the essential role of public opinion and—as we will discuss further in connection with the Brewster case—has placed in jeopardy even the most honest types of accords between representatives and those they represent. The concept of Congress displayed in these decisions is a simplistic, perhaps wishful one which bears little resemblance to the ways a legislature either does function or should serve.

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1972]

THE COURT AND CONGRESS (II)

In the Gravel case, as we have noted, the Supreme Court drew the boundaries of the speech and debate clause at the doorways of congressional chambers and hearing rooms, suggesting that business transacted inside those doorways is protected from executive or judicial scrutiny and business outside is not. In the case involving former Senator Daniel B. Brewster, the Court had an opportunity to decide how sweeping an immunity Members of Congress enjoy within the legislative sphere—in this instance, whether the Justice Department could prosecute Mr. Brewster for allegedly accepting a bribe to influence certain votes and actions on postal rate legislation. Instead of dealing with that general question, however, the Court embarked on a skewed line of reasoning which leads to a vast realm of new problems for congressmen and their constituents.

When the matter of congressional immunity from criminal prosecution was posed in the case involving Rep. Thomas F. Johnson in 1966, the Court held that the speech and debate clause "generally forecloses" executive or judicial inquiries into a congressman's legislative actions, including floor speeches and votes, or the motivations behind such conduct. At that time, however, the Court expressly "left open for consideration" the constitutionality of a prosecution which, although it might involve legislative acts, was "founded upon a narrowly drawn statute" enacted by Congress to regulate its members' conduct.

We—and almost everyone else—had thought the Brewster case raised that question squarely, but the Present Court avoided it in a dazzling display of something which passes for logic. The Court managed to decide in favor of prosecution not by extending the legal arm into the legislative arena, but by plucking the bribery out. "The illegal conduct," Chief Justice Burger wrote for the majority of the Court, "is taking or agreeing to take money for a promise to act in a certain way. . . . It does not matter whether the promise . . . was for the performance of a legislative act," because the act itself became irrelevant.

This overly clever distinction between promise and performance raises enormous, unnecessary difficulties. As Justice White wrote in a strong dissent, the decision will not promote the goal of legislative freedom from intimidation: "It will be small comfort for a congressman to know that he cannot be prosecuted for his vote, whatever it may be, but he can be prosecuted for an alleged agreement even if he votes contrary to the asserted bargain."

More broadly, the zeroing in on "promises" offers politically energized prosecutors lush new fields in which to fling about aspersions on the conduct of congressmen. Has a representative promised to vote for certain tax preferences? Has a senator pledged to follow a union's (or a business group's) line? Find a related campaign contribution (readily located, if it exists, under the new disclosure law) and seek an indictment. By the time the evidence or lack of it has been explored, the

damage to the legislator's reputation will have been achieved—regardless of what he actually did.

The possibility of such slanderous sport is not likely to promote honesty on Capitol Hill, but instead to drive venality further underground. As Justice White suggested in a dissent excerpted for the Record elsewhere on this page, it is likely to inhibit the legitimate, if often mysterious, interplay of pressures and promises which fuels and drives the real workings of Congress. It is also likely to generate new public mistrust of a political system which is already ethically gray and suspect enough.

Through these decisions, then, the Court has created a setting in which congressmen are insulated from prosecutions only when they are isolated from the people—a Congress which is only protected when it talks to itself. By this peculiar reading of the speech and debate clause, the Court has inhibited candid speech and vigorous public debate, precisely those qualities that clause was designed to protect because those are the most vital attributes of a truly representative legislature. It should not take Members of Congress very long, regardless of their personal feelings about Senator Gravel or Mr. Brewster, to recognize the far-reaching institutional challenges which the Court has flung across the street.

[From the dissenting opinion of Justice White in U.S. v. Brewster]

FOR THE RECORD: JUSTICE BYRON WHITE ON CONGRESSIONAL CONDUCT

Ours is a representative government . . . Campaigns are run on platforms which include statements of intention and undertakings to promote certain policies. These promises are geared, at least in part, to the interest of the congressman's constituency . . . It has never been thought unethical for a Member of Congress . . . not only to listen to the petitions of interest groups in his state or district, which may come from every conceivable group of people, but also to support or oppose legislation serving or threatening those interests . . .

(A legislator) must also keep in mind the potential effect of his conduct upon those from whom he has received financial support in the past and those whose help he expects or hopes to have in the next campaign . . . Constituent contributions to a congressman and his support of constituent interests will repeatedly coincide in time or closely follow one another. It will be the rare congressman who never accepts campaign contributions from persons or interests whose view he has supported, or will support, by speech making, voting or bargaining with fellow legislators.

All of this, or most of it, may be wholly within the law and consistent with contemporary standards of political ethics. Nevertheless, the opportunities for an executive, in whose sole discretion the decision to prosecute rests . . . to claim that legislative conduct has been sold are obvious and undeniable. These opportunities, inherent in the political process as it now exists, create an enormous potential for executive control of legislative behavior by threats or suggestions of criminal prosecution—precisely the evil which the speech or debate clause was designed to prevent.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE IMPROVING

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Chris Brady, our congressional liaison representative from the U.S. Postal Service,

informed me today of some of the progress being made by the new system in recent months. When the change was made from Government supervision to private ownership I received a great number of complaints from my congressional district as to the delay in synchronizing the new operation and changes in the supervision which resulted in inefficient mail operation throughout the Nation.

I am glad to report that the long-delayed completion of construction of new post offices, including my district, has been terminated and action on the part of the Postmaster General will begin the building of new post offices throughout the nation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate with my remarks a report submitted to me by Mr. Brady:

POSTAL REPORT

The U.S. Postal Service has just observed its first anniversary as an independent corporation. During this period, it has registered some significant improvements in mail service and operational procedures, and these offer real encouragement that even greater advances are on the way. A list of some of the more important improvements achieved in the 1972 Fiscal Year follows:

I. Rural Free Delivery was extended to 100,000 more families, bringing the grand total to nearly 13 million.

II. City delivery was extended to about one million families, increasing the total to about 54 million families.

III. Ninety-five percent of all local-area mail is now being delivered the day after it is deposited in the post office. This is a major improvement indeed.

IV. More than 95 percent of all airmail originating within the continental United States is being delivered within 48 hours. The same percentage of airmail destined for cities within a 600-mile radius is being delivered overnight.

V. A nationwide economy program designed to hold the line on costs and avoid the necessity for a \$450 million postage rate increase scheduled for January 1973 has been instituted by Postmaster General Ted Klassen.

VI. Construction was started on two additional bulk mail facilities—at Chicago and Washington—that will be part of a nationwide network designed to expedite the damage-free, timely delivery of parcels. The network is expected to be completed by 1975.

VII. Plans were announced to install high-speed electronic mail-processing systems in 40 additional post offices, raising the total to 190; 44 air taxi routes were added—there are now 151, a record number, and 42 surface routes were inaugurated to supplement the 32 that already were in operation. The objectives here, of course, are to effect still greater improvements in delivery schedules.

VIII. Downtown-to-downtown express mail service between 33 major cities was introduced. It provides a money-back guarantee on overnight service between selected post offices in these cities.

IX. The Postal Service signed with its employee unions a historic agreement—the first labor contract in the history of the Federal Government to be achieved through collective bargaining.

X. Environmental improvements were started in 895 post offices from coast-to-coast to give employees and customers more effective facilities in which to work and transact business.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Ted Klassen and his staff for a job well done. I am sure that there will be no let down in the efforts of the Postal Service to provide the American

people with the finest mail service that is humanly possible.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. CAROLINE COOPER

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate to have in my constituency a most unusual woman, one who is perhaps unique. Yet, in a way she is part of a trend—a trend toward broader interests and more active participation by our senior citizens in the affairs of society. All of us benefit from the interest and valuable experience of the men and women who have had full careers and who, after retirement, enter upon new careers, new lives perhaps nearer to their hearts' desires. Such a woman is Mrs. Caroline Cooper.

Mrs. Cooper was graduated from California State University at Fresno this past June. So were a lot of young people. But Mrs. Cooper began her college education at the age of 76. This remarkable woman had spent most of her adult life as a cook in other people's homes. Many of her friends and neighbors asked why she, a Negro woman well into her seventies, would choose to seek a college degree. Her answer was that she wanted to enter the world of ideas and knowledge that only education could open to her.

She chose the oft-neglected field of classical studies—and undaunted by a heart attack, operations for eye cataracts, and leg problems that finally made it necessary for her to use a wheelchair—she went on to graduate last month at the age of 82, receiving her bachelor's degree to the resounding applause of the commencement audience. But that is not the end of the story. Mrs. Cooper is looking forward to continuing her studies for a master's degree. She believes that education is its own reward, and is eager to go on to new levels of understanding.

I think there is an example and a lesson for us all in this fine woman's courage and achievement. There is no cutoff point for enlargement of the spirit. Elder Americans such as Mrs. Cooper are blazing new trails, entering upon new lives—refusing to recognize any boundaries of service and satisfaction in living.

In recognition of Mrs. Cooper's achievement, the Fresno Bee on June 10, 1972, published the following editorial which admirably sums the matter up:

THE EDUCATION OF CAROLINE COOPER

When Mrs. Caroline Cooper was graduated from Fresno State University this week everyone talked about what a remarkable thing she had done in spite of her age. That is accurate enough. How many people start their college education at 76 and complete it at 82—and then make plans to study for a master's degree?

However, it is just a little patronizing to dwell solely on age. Mrs. Cooper has long since transcended the limitations of her years—a heart attack which put her on the sidelines briefly, operating for eye cataracts, leg problems which finally consigned her to a wheelchair. She has demonstrated in the academic field what has been demonstrated in other fields—that old age need not be a shriveling, lonely time when nothing can be accomplished.

Just as important as her age is Mrs. Cooper's extraordinary drive to learn for learning's sake.

"All the years I was cooking in someone else's house I longed so to read, to get an education," she says. Not necessarily as a ticket to something better but as a way of expanding her world, of making sense out of where we have been and where we are.

So she finally took classical studies at FSU, a field which so many would contemptuously dismiss—in the jargon of our times—as "irrelevant."

Mrs. Cooper knows better. More than a geriatric success story, her graduation is a symbol for those who still believe an education need not be vocationally centered to be worthwhile.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MITCHELL (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from 2 p.m. until close of business today, on account of emergency at the Maryland Penitentiary in Baltimore.

Mr. POEHL (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for week of July 17, on account of illness.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and Tuesday, July 18, on account of official business.

Mr. RYAN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today through Friday, July 28, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WARE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYMAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 30 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. LENNON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIELSON, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PRICE of Illinois, his remarks on the bill, H.R. 14537, during the Consent Calendar today.

Mr. SIKES and to include extraneous matter in five instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. BEGICH to extend his remarks on H.R. 5621, Consent Calendar, today.

Mr. ROGERS to extend his remarks after the vote on the Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972.

Mr. SCHMITZ and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding an estimated cost of \$437.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WARE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. KING in five instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. WIDNALL in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHMITZ in 10 instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. BELL.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. STEELE.

Mr. HEINZ.

Mrs. DWYER in four instances.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. PEYSER in five instances.

Mr. McDADE.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. EILBERG in 10 instances.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.

Mr. WALDIE in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. DOWNING.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. BEGICH in two instances.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. JOHNSON of California

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1497. An act to authorize certain additions to the Sitka National Monument in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Kenneth J. Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2499. An act to provide for the striking of medals commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the launching of the United States frigate Constellation; to the Committee Banking and Currency.

S. 3772. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution relating to the XXVth Congress of the Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers to be held in Washington, D.C., the week of August 7, 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4679. An act for the relief of Amparo Coronado Vieuda de Pena and her three minor children: Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena;

H.R. 9410. An act to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 1 year (until June 30, 1973) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder;

H.R. 11774. An act to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15390. An act to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month"; and

S.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages and to extend laws relating to housing and urban development.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 1, 1972 present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4494. An act for the relief of Mrs. Latife Hassan Mahmoud;

H.R. 4679. An act for the relief of Amparo Coronado Vieuda de Pena and her three minor children: Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena;

CXVIII—1515—Part 19

H.R. 9410. An act to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 1 year (until June 30, 1973) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder;

H.R. 11774. An act to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14734. An act to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15259. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15390. An act to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15507. An act to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 to provide for Federal guarantees of obligations issued by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, to authorize an increased contribution by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15585. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 1234. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1238. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 18, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

(Pursuant to the Order of the House on June 30, 1972, the following report was filed on July 1, 1972)

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 13152. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory animals; to establish a program of research concerning the control and conservation of predatory animals; to restrict the use of toxic chemicals as a method of predator control; and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2133. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal

year 1973 to aid the victims of Tropical Storm Agnes (H. Doc. 92-325); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2134. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the 4-year limitation of additional active duty that a non-Regular officer of the Army or Air Force may be required to perform on completion of training at an educational institution; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2135. A letter from the Director, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment during the quarter ended June 30, 1972, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2136. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1971, through April 1972, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2137. A letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council, transmitting the annual report of the Council, pursuant to section 715 of Public Law 92-261; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2138. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on foreign credits by the U.S. Government as of June 30, 1971, pursuant to section 634(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2139. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Secretarial Determination 72-3, pursuant to section 620(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2140. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a quarterly report for the period ended December 31, 1971, on the programing and obligation of contingency funds, pursuant to section 451(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2141. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in dockets Nos. 18-E and 58. Bay Mills Indian Community, Sault Ste. Marie, Arthur Lawrence Labian, Daniel Edwards and John L. Boucher, and Ottawa and Chippewa Indians of Michigan, et al., Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2142. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 233. The Swinomish Tribe of Indians, Plaintiff v. The United States of America, Defendant, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2143. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the complete report of a comprehensive 10-State nutrition survey conducted from 1968 through 1970, pursuant to the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2144. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual reports for fiscal year 1971 from the components of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2145. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the first annual report of the National Institute

on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, pursuant to section 102(1) of Public Law 91-616; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2146. A letter from the Director, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the first special report on alcohol and health, pursuant to section 102(1) of Public Law 91-616; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2147. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board for fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2148. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a map entitled "Major Natural Gas Pipelines, December 31, 1971"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2149. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the first annual report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, pursuant to section 7(c)(2) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2150. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of May 31, 1972, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2151. A letter from the Executive Officer, National Academy of Sciences, transmitting the semiannual report of the Academy's Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 91-604; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2152. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting a copy of the proceedings of the meeting of the Judicial Conference held in Washington, D.C., on April 6-7, 1972, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331 (H. Doc. No. 92-326); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2153. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according to certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2154. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2155. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2156. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2157. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act of September 11, 1957, pur-

suant to section 13(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2158. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2159. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2160. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report of guidelines relating to the economic, social, and environmental effects of highway projects, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 109(h); to the Committee on Public Works.

2161. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army, transmitting proposed guidelines for effect assessment of civil works projects, pursuant to section 122 of the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

2162. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing the construction of a courthouse and Federal office building and parking facility in Anchorage, Alaska, pursuant to Public Law 92-313; to the Committee on Public Works.

2163. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the automatic guarantee of mobile home loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2164. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of the reports issued or released by the General Accounting Office in June 1972, pursuant to section 234 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2165. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the opportunities to increase the effectiveness of the long-term, full-time training programs for civilian employees in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2166. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on how improved foreign market analyses by the Department of State and the Department of Commerce can increase U.S. exports; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2167. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements needed in the District of Columbia's policy for establishing regulatory fees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2168. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an assessment of the Teacher Corps program, as administered by the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2169. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the functioning of the Florida system for reviewing the use of medical services financed under medicaid program administered by the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 15869. A bill to extend for 90 days the time for commencing actions on behalf of an Indian tribe, band, or group; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 15870. A bill to provide compensation to U.S. commercial fishing vessel owners for damages incurred by them as a result of an action of a vessel operated by a foreign government or a citizen of a foreign government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for adoption fees and related costs incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H.R. 15872. A bill to provide additional relief to victims of Hurricane and Tropical Storm Agnes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15873. A bill to amend section 125 of title 23, United States Code, relating to highway emergency relief to authorize additional appropriations necessary as a result of recent floods and other disasters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 15874. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to allow food stamps to be used to obtain meat and meat products which are imported into the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15875. A bill to prevent lawless and irresponsible use of firearms, by requiring national registration of firearms, by establishing minimum standards for licensing possession of firearms, and to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, possession, or transportation of handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15876. A bill to permit collective negotiation by professional retail pharmacists with third-party prepared prescription program administrators and sponsors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 15877. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to enforcement of employee responsibilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15878. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 15879. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States for improved educational services for handicapped children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. ROE, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 15880. A bill to limit the authority of States and their subdivisions to impose taxes with respect to income on residents of other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 15881. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products produced or sold under contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 15882. A bill to provide additional relief to victims of Hurricane and Tropical Storm Agnes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POFF (for himself, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. McKEVITT, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 15883. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for expanded protection of foreign officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15884. A bill to delay the effective date of the provisions of the Education Amendments of 1972 relating to eligibility of guaranteed student loans for interest subsidies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 15885. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15886. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise certain requirements for approval of new animal drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 15887. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assure that whenever there is a general increase in social security benefits there will be a corresponding increase in the standard of need used to determine eligibility for aid or assistance under State plans approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 15888. A bill to permit collective negotiation by professional retail pharmacists with third-party prepaid prescription program administrators and sponsors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 15889. A bill to provide that no interest shall be payable on a refund of corporate income tax where such refund is attributable to a retroactive election made by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.R. 15890. A bill to provide additional relief to victims of Hurricane and Tropical Storm Agnes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 15891. A bill to provide confidential sources of news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15892. A bill to protect the public interest in fair and impartial execution of the antitrust laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 15893. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans by providing improved job counseling, training, and placement service for veterans; by providing an employment preference for disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era under contracts entered into by departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the procurement of goods and services; by providing for an action program within the departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the employment of disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era; by providing a minimum amount that may be paid to ex-servicemen under the unemployment compensation law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 15894. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 20 per-

cent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 15895. A bill to establish an Emergency Medical Services Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist communities in providing professional emergency medical care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 15896. A bill to extend and improve the Federal highway safety program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 15897. A bill to amend section 125 of title 23, United States Code, relating to highway emergency relief to authorize additional appropriations necessary as a result of recent floods and other disasters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 15898. A bill relating to the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15899. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 15900. A bill to appropriate funds for advanced relocation of a road and bridge in connection with the Onaga Reservoir project, Kansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 15901. A bill to grant a Federal charter to the American Golf Hall of Fame Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 15902. A bill to authorize the enrollment of qualified Klamath minors in Bureau of Indian Affairs residential schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15903. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to engage in certain export expansion activities, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.J. Res. 1255. Joint resolution to make all citizens of the United States eligible for the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 1256. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of September 24 through 30, 1972, as "National Multiple Births Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.J. Res. 1257. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for the annual contributions by the United States for the support of the International Agency for Research on Cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.J. Res. 1258. Joint resolution: Authorization of the President of the United States to approve an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. BURTON):

H.J. Res. 1259. Joint resolution: Authorization of the President of the United States to approve an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union

of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

406. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a Federal Jobs Corps center for the rural counties of northern California; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

407. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to an accounting of all prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

408. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to jurisdiction over natural gas produced and consumed within one State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

409. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, requesting the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

410. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana relative to changing the method of selection of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 15904. A bill for the relief of Edwin G. Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 15905. A bill for the relief of Barry Gray; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. Res. 1040. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 11939) entitled "A bill for the relief of Farmers Chemical Association, Incorporated" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

253. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Governor of Florida and his cabinet, relative to funding of the educational programs for the children of Federal Government employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

254. Also, petition of Dennis J. King, Tracy, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on House Administration.

255. Also, petition of Orville L. Cain, Nevada City, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

256. Also, petition of Alexander Kamenea, Huntingdon, Pa., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

257. Also, petition of Richard Richeson, et al., Joliet, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

258. Also, petition of the 23d Saipan Legislature, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to extending Federal-aid highway programs to the trust territory; to the Committee on Public Works.

259. Also, petition of Mrs. Esther Angelini, New Haven, Conn., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.