I can study human relations . . . in order to live compatibly with my friends, family and neighbors. I must learn what the term humanitarian truly means.

And lastly, I can practice the Golden Rule. I can love others as myself. For by loving others, I will help, instruct and educate others to the democratic processes. I can exercise my responsibility to freedom. I must exercise my responsibility. I must not die with an unopen pill bottle full of freedom. I must uncap that bottle of freedom and understand it, use it and preach it, but most important of all, I must put it to work, it is my responsibility.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, March 16, 1972*

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us hold fast to the profession of our faith without wavering.—Hebrews 10: 23.

Eternal God and Father of us all, as the quiet splendor of a new day dawns upon us we stand before Thee opening our hearts to the light that never fades, the love that never falters, and the strength that never fails.

Quicken within us a vivid sense of Thy presence and endow our souls with a power which makes us strong and keeps us steady when we would waver by the way.

Give to us and to our people the spirit to see that Thou alone canst lead us safely through these troubled times and empower us to live and to labor faithfully for the good of all.

In the Master's name 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 SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3353. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the first U.S. International Transportation Exposition.

SUCCESS IN THE ARMY GAME

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to announce to the Members of the House that at 5 o'clock last night I received the documents which I have been after.

EXTENDING LIFE OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10390) to extend the life of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 23 of the Act entitled "An Act to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049, 1055), as amended (75 Stat. 92; 25 U.S.C. 70v), is hereby amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMISSION AND DISPOSITION OF PENDING CLAIMS

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of fifteen years from and after April 10, 1962, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records and files of the Commission in all cases in which a final determination has been entered shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States. The records and files in all other pending cases, if any, including those on appeal shall be transferred to the United States Court of Claims, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to adjudicate all such cases under the provisions of section 2 of the Indian Claims Commission Act; *Provided*, That section 2 of said Act shall not apply to any case filed originally in the Court of Claims under section 1505 of title 28, United States Code."

SEC. 2. Section 27(a) of such Act of August 13, 1946, as amended (25 U.S.C. 70w), is amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TRIAL CALENDAR

"SEC. 27. (a) The Commission from time to time shall prepare a trial calendar which shall set a date for the trial of the next phase of each claim as soon as practical after a decision of the Commission or the United States Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States makes such setting possible, but such date shall not be later than one year from the date of such decision except on a clear showing by a party that irreparable harm would result unless longer preparation were allowed."

SEC. 3. Section 27(b) of such Act of August 13, 1946, as amended (25 U.S.C. 70w), is amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 27. (b) If a claimant fails to proceed with the trial of its claim on the date set for that purpose, the Commission may enter an order dismissing the claim with prejudice or it may reset such trial at the end of the calendar."

SEC. 4. The Act of August 13, 1946, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 28. The Commission shall, on the first day of each session of Congress, submit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, a report showing the progress made and the work remaining to be completed by the Commission, as well as the status of each remaining case, along with a projected date for its completion."

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I understand my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, to say that he wishes to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill?

Mr. HALEY. We will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. HALL. May we ask, under the right of reservation, what the other body did to the House-passed legislation and thus I will give the gentleman an opportunity to explain his proposed amendment at this point.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida for that purpose.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, after H.R. 10390 was passed by the House, it was amended in the Senate by striking everything after the enacting clause and inserting new text which differed from the text of the House bill in three particulars:

First, the House bill extended the life of the Indian Claims Commission for 4 years, and the Senate amendment extended it for 5 years.

Second, the House bill required an annual authorization for the appropriation of funds to meet the administrative expenses of the Commission. The Senate amendment omitted this provision.

Third, both the House bill and the Senate amendment required the Commission to make annual reports, and although the substance of the requirement is the same the language used is slightly different.

The amendment to the Senate amendment which I propose accepts the Senate provision for a 5-year extension of the life of the Commission, instead of the 4-year extension originally passed by the House, and it adds the annual appropriation authorization provision of the original House bill. The Senate language for the reporting requirement, which is the same in substance as the House language, is also accepted.

I believe that if this amendment is passed by the House it will be acceptable to the Senate and a conference will be unnecessary.

I believe, if I may say to the gentleman from Missouri, that really there is not very much change. In other words, the House wanted 4 years, and the Senate wanted 5 years in their extension. We want this commission to come through the proper committees of Congress and justify their expenditures and their request to operate, and also we request a report on what they are doing from year to year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's clear and concise statement and his personal belief and comment. May I ask further if there is an increase in funding in connection with the additional year of life that has been given to this commission?

Mr. HALEY. In the oriignal instance there was no limitation. We have imposed a limitation.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate that, as the gentleman would understand. I recall, of course, that considerable legislative record was made when this passed this body the other day, to the intent that they were really going to bring the commission to a close in 4 years.

I have no personal objection to it being extended to 5 years, especially if there is a limitation on the funding and if it will then be brought to a complete close and will be one Commission we can do away with.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. Obviously, from his statement, the amendments of the body were germane to the House-passed action. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HALEY

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HALEY moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: Insert in lieu thereof the following: That section 23 of the Act entitled "An Act to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049, 1055), as amended (75 Stat. 92; 25 U.S.C. 70v), is hereby amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMISSION AND DISPOSITION OF PENDING CLAIMS

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of fifteen years from and after April 10, 1962, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records and files of the Commission in all cases in which a final determination has been entered shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States. The records and files in all other pending cases, if any, including those on appeal shall be transferred to the United States Court of Claims, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to adjudicate all such cases under the provisions of section 2 of the Indian Claims Commission Act: *Provided*, That section 2 of said Act shall not apply to any case filed originally in the Court of Claims under section 1505 of title 28, United States Code."

SEC. 2. Section 27(a) of such Act of August 13, 1946, as amended (25 U.S.C. 70v–1), is amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TRIAL CALENDAR

"SEC. 27. (a) The Commission from time to time shall prepare a trial calendar which shall set a date for the trial of the next phase of each claim as soon as practical after a decision of the Commission or the United States Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States makes such setting possible, but such date shall not be later than one year from the date of such decision except on a clear showing by a party that irreparable harm would result unless longer preparation were allowed."

SEC. 3. Section 27(b) of such Act of August 13, 1946, as amended (25 U.S.C. 70v–1), is amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 27. (b) If a claimant fails to proceed with the trial of its claim on the date set for that purpose, the Commission may enter an order dismissing the claim with prejudice or it may reset such trial at the end of the calender."

SEC. 4. The Act of August 13, 1946, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 28. The Commission shall, on the first day of each session of Congress, submit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, a report showing the progress made and the work remaining to be completed by the Commission, as well as the status of each remaining case, along with a projected date for its completion."

SEC. 5. Section 6 of such Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70e), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "There are authorized to be appropriated for the necessary expenses of the Commission not to exceed $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1973, and appropriations for succeeding fiscal years shall be made only to the extent hereafter authorized by Act of Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2097, DRUG ABUSE OFFICE AND TREATMENT ACT OF 1972.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2097) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman a question or two, if I might, pertaining to the conference report.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, what, if any, changes were made in the conference report affecting the Veterans' Administration hospitals that might be different than in the House-passed bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. None.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. There were no changes?

Mr. STAGGERS. No.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. You did not adopt the stronger Senate language?

Mr. STAGGERS. We took out the language of the Senate which did affect them in different ways and kept what we passed on the House side.

I am concerned that the veteran and veterans hospitals be protected.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Was Mr. SATTERFIELD, the gentleman from Virginia and chairman of the Hospital Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, satisfied with it?

Mr. STAGGERS. He was. He signed the report.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 15, 1972.)

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with so that I may explain the agreement reached in conference.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the House to adopt the conference report on S. 2097, the proposed Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are presently considering was recommended by the administration, and represents many hours of work on the part of our committee, as well as two Senate committees. Our Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment held 21 days of hearings on this bill and had 110 witnesses. They visited a number of facilities throughout the United States, and have studied the problem thoroughly.

Following conclusion of their hearings and executive sessions, the subcommittee recommended introduction of a clean bill, based on the provisions of S. 2097, as passed by the Senate, with a number of modifications. This is the bill which passed the House, and the conference agreement which we are considering today contains substantially all of the provisions of the bill as it was passed by the House.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement is the same as the bill passed by the House, with a number of added features which were contained in the measure as originally passed by the Senate. It is my belief that the measure we are considering today is an improvement over both the original Senate passed bill and the House substitute for the Senate bill. One problem which was of concern to many Members of the House, as reflected by the vote on the Teague amendment when the bill was under consideration is the extent to which the authority of the Director can be exercised with respect to the ongoing programs and activities of other Federal agencies. We intended in the House bill to give the Director of the Special Action Office the same powers with respect to funds and programs which fall within the definition "drug abuse prevention function" as the OMB has today. We intended that the Director could set overall policy for drug abuse prevention functions of Federal agencies, but the authority of the Director does not limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the operation of the Armed Forces, or the authority of the

Administrator of Veterans' Affairs with respect to furnishing health care to veterans.

The Senate bill was a 4-year bill, in general, with one of the programs a 5-year program. The measure we are today considering will extend through fiscal year 1975, so that as a practical matter this is a 3-year bill, plus 4 months remaining in fiscal year 1972.

An important feature contained in the Senate bill which was not in the measure passed by the House was a program of formula grants for the States to assist them in planning, establishing, maintaining, coordinating, and evaluating projects to deal with drug abuse. The House passed version was limited to planning and evaluation. The conference agreement is the same as the Senate bill, except that the authorization for fiscal 1976 has been eliminated and the formula for allotments among the States has been modified slightly.

In addition, the Senate bill authorized grants and projects for special programs with authorizations totaling $1,345,000,000 over 5 fiscal years. The House bill had no corresponding provision, and the conference substitute authorizes $350,000,000 through fiscal 1975.

The Senate bill provided that drug abusers who are suffering from emergency medical conditions shall not be refused admission or treatment by any private or public general hospital which receives Federal assistance with a suspension or revocation of Federal assistance for any hospital violating this provision. The conference agreement is the same as the Senate bill. The Senate measure contained a provision providing confidentiality of patient records and the conference agreement carries out this policy with revised language.

The Senate bill provided for the establishment of a committee to develop a comprehensive, coordinated, long-term Federal strategy for all drug abuse programs and activities, conducted, sponsored, or supported by the United States. The substitute we are considering today includes that feature of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill contains provisions protecting rights of Federal employees who are drug abusers. The conference substitute is a modification of the Senate passed version, and is the same with respect to drug abuse and Federal employees as existing law is with alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents many months of hard work by the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, and in my opinion will make significant contributions to our national effort to combat abuse. I urge the House to adopt the conference report.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the chairman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would be happy to yield to the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, not so long ago the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brought to the floor for your consideration the bill to create a special action office on the subject of drug abuse. We felt that we had worked out a very good bill. The urgent need for across-the-board coordination of Federal drug abuse programs is evident to everyone who observes the jumble of efforts now extant. This confusion pertains all the way down the line to local drug abuse programs. By making some sense out of the Federal efforts and giving direction to those efforts we will perforce influence the activities at all other levels, and this is to be greatly desired.

The bill which passed the House did create a special action office in the Executive Office of the President and gave to that Office the necessary authority to pull together Federal activities in the war against drug abuse. In addition there were authorities and funds for some additional research and training of personel. At the local level we tried to help by expanding an established program for the creation and operation of mental health centers. It seemed to us and you agreed that more and faster progress could be made in this manner where the Federal role was already clear and the line for both authority and funding already established.

The conferees went to the conference table facing a bill passed by the other body which differed in many ways as to the philosophy of drug abuse control, or at least as to the ways to approach it. The other bill was many times larger than the House bill in authorizing funds—in fact the Senate bill would have cost over four times what the House bill provided. A great deal of this difference lay in the differing approach to encouraging and assisting local efforts and drug abuse programs. The Senate bill contained authorizations for well over $1 billion for contracts and grants for the support of local drug abuse programs. The money was rather loosely directed at the whole spectrum of drug problems with which local governments are struggling. Compromise was most difficult because of the inevitable overlaps and crosscurrents of both authority and money between the two approaches. However, the need is too urgent not to work at it until a reasonable viable compromise on the issues could be reached. We did work at it and the conference version of the bill before you today is the result. It ends up with a total of just over $1 billion as compared with the House bill total of $411 million. Much of what is contemplated in the way of activity under the resulting bill will require close supervision and good judgment to make the best use of the money. Fortunately the main purpose of the bill is to create the entity to do just that.

What we hope we have accomplished by this conference bill can be best described in a short quotation from the report of the conferees which says:

> If SAODAP (the Special Action Office) is to play a constructive role, it must focus its activities on those areas directly related to its mission—assuring cooperation between departments and agencies on policy issues which cut across jurisdictional lines, providing and encouraging rigorous evaluation of existing programs, and fostering new and innovative approaches to the drug problem.

I recommend that the House accept the conference report.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would like to say that I feel the conference report is an excellent report. I feel that it will mount an extensive drive against drug abuse in this country, will give the tools that have been asked for to the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, and will put us in high gear so that we can fight drug abuse in this country.

Mr. Speaker, approval of this conference report will end the work of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment on a phase of legislation which we hope will become a milestone in the history of drug abuse in this country—a milestone that marks the beginning of the point when this country turned away from drug addiction.

Unfortunately, this point has yet to be reached, according to the latest figures. Statistics only recently released by the Department of Justice indicate a heroin population in the United States of approximately 560,000. When compared with the figure 350,000 suggested during testimony before our subcommittee only a few months ago, these figures are indeed shocking. They appear to indicate that despite reports to the contrary, heroin addiction is on the rise. For this reason, I believe that every penny of the $1 billion in this report is necessary and should be spent in the development of an all-out multimodality approach toward treatment and prevention of addiction to heroin and other hideous drugs.

Mr. Speaker, the report adopts the format of the House amendment concerning the powers and duties of the Special Action Office and includes virtually every provision contained in the bill that passed the House. It also adds some provisions developed by the other body. I believe it is a reasonable compromise, and a workable one, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am delighted to yield to our majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to take this moment to commend the able and distinguished chairman of the committee, and the ranking minority member of the committee, and also the chairman of the subcommittee, for producing this legislation, because it is so desperately needed. I believe the legislation has been well thought out, well considered, and if it makes a substantial contribution toward curing drug addiction and eliminating the drug traffic in this country, then it will be one of the most significant bills that we have had in this Congress.

So again I commend and thank these gentlemen.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, from its first days in office, the Nixon

administration has assigned top priority to a nationwide drive against trafficking in narcotics and dangerous drugs and to increased research into the causes and prevention of drug addiction.

Drug abuse in America today is of epidemic proportions. It is for that reason that what we are doing here in the House this afternoon takes on special significance, for the magnitude of the drug menace demands a total response from the Congress as well as the administration.

Last June the President established on an interim basis a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. That Office has already had an impact in the fields of drug abuse education, treatment, rehabilitation, and prevention. The Office is working to coordinate programs which are spread through nine Federal agencies and to develop a national strategy to guide these efforts. The Special Action Office also has stimulated new research, gathered valuable information, planned for a new drug training and education center, and helped in setting up a major program to identify and treat drug abuse in the Armed Forces.

Now that Congress is giving the Special Action Office the authority the President has requested for it, the Office will be able to do much more.

I commend the President; I commend the administration; and I commend the Congress for moving on this horrible problem of drug abuse. What we are doing is to put together a massive assault on drug addiction. We are coordinating present drug abuse control programs that are fragmented and are expanding them to cure insufficiencies.

The President has laid a far-reaching drug abuse control program before the Congress, and we are responding with a large-scale program to rehabilitate drug-addicted individuals and expanded and improved education and training programs in the field of dangerous drugs.

The Special Action Office will direct all Federal drug abuse prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, training, and research efforts under a central authority within the executive office.

The Special Action Office is developing overall Federal strategy for drug abuse prevention programs, is setting program goals, and is evaluating performance.

The increased cost of this broadened Federal effort will be just a fraction of the billions lost in drug addiction and crime. And the value of the lives lost to narcotics and dangerous drugs cannot be calculated.

With the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention we have in the Federal Government for the first time a watchdog committee to treating drug abusers and measuring the performance of Federal agencies operating in this field against standards of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention can achieve solid progress in a most difficult area, one which clearly has emerged as among the Nation's gravest ills.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to one of the special features of the legislation we are approving in final form today, a feature which I think holds great promise for success in our fight against drug abuse. I refer to the establishment of a special fund to be used by the Director of the Special Action Office to fund promising new concepts or methods for the treatment of drug addiction. These funds will encourage and promote research aimed at improving the treatment of drug addicts. These provisions establish clinical research facilities and a National Drug Abuse Training Center.

Drug addiction, particularly heroin, is costing this country $2.5 to $3 billion a year. In addition, it is estimated that about 50 percent of our violent street crime is traceable to heroin addiction—crime committed by addicts who steal to maintain their habit.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased by the overwhelming support given the President's initiative in establishing a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and I am gratified that the legislation we are approving here today has been so speedily enacted into law.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. 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 366, nays 0, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—366

Abbitt	Broyhill, Va.	Davis, Wis.
Abernethy	Buchanan	de la Garza
Abourezk	Burke, Fla.	Delaney
Abzug	Burke, Mass.	Dellenback
Adams	Burleson, Tex.	Dellums
Addabbo	Burlison, Mo.	Denholm
Anderson, Calif.	Burton	Dennis
Anderson, Ill.	Byrne, Pa.	Devine
Anderson, Tenn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Dickinson
Andrews	Byron	Diggs
Annunzio	Cabell	Dingell
Archer	Carey, N.Y.	Donohue
Ashbrook	Carney	Dorn
Aspin	Carter	Dow
Badillo	Casey, Tex.	Downing
Barrett	Cederberg	Drinan
Begich	Celler	Dulski
Belcher	Chamberlain	Duncan
Bell	Chappell	du Pont
Bennett	Chisholm	Eckhardt
Bergland	Clancy	Edwards, Ala.
Betts	Clark	Edwards, Calif.
Bevill	Clausen, Don H.	Eilberg
Biaggi	Clawson, Del	Erlenborn
Biester	Cleveland	Esch
Blackburn	Collier	Eshleman
Blatnik	Collins, Tex.	Evans, Colo.
Boggs	Conable	Evins, Tenn.
Boland	Conte	Fascell
Bolling	Conyers	Findley
Bow	Corman	Fish
Brasco	Cotter	Fisher
Bray	Crane	Flood
Brinkley	Culver	Flynt
Brooks	Curlin	Foley
Broomfield	Daniel, Va.	Ford, Gerald R.
Brotzman	Daniels, N.J.	Ford, William D.
Brown, Ohio	Danielson	Forsythe
Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Ga.	Fraser
	Davis, S.C.	Frelinghuysen
Frenzel	McEwen	Ryan
Frey	McFall	St Germain
Fulton	McKay	Sandman
Fuqua	McKevitt	Sarbanes
Gallagher	McKinney	Satterfield
Garmatz	McMillan	Saylor
Gettys	Macdonald, Mass.	Scherle
Giaimo	Mahon	Schmitz
Gibbons	Mailliard	Schneebeli
Gonzalez	Mallary	Schwengel
Goodling	Mann	Scott
Grasso	Martin	Sebelius
Gray	Mathis, Ga.	Seiberling
Green, Oreg.	Matsunaga	Shipley
Green, Pa.	Mayne	Shoup
Griffin	Mazzoli	Shriver
Griffiths	Meeds	Sikes
Gross	Melcher	Sisk
Grover	Metcalfe	Skubitz
Gubser	Michel	Slack
Hagan	Miller, Ohio	Smith, Calif.
Haley	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Iowa
Hall	Mills, Md.	Smith, N.Y.
Halpern	Minish	Snyder
Hamilton	Mink	Spence
Hammer-schmidt	Minshall	Springer
Hanley	Mizell	Staggers
Hanna	Mollohan	Stanton, J. William
Hansen, Idaho	Monagan	Stanton, James V.
Hansen, Wash.	Montgomery	Steed
Harrington	Moorhead	Steele
Harsha	Morgan	Steiger, Ariz.
Harvey	Morse	Stephens
Hastings	Mosher	Stokes
Hathaway	Moss	Stratton
Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.	Stuckey
Hays	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan
Hechler, W. Va.	Myers	Symington
Heckler, Mass.	Natcher	Talcott
Heinz	Nedzi	Taylor
Henderson	Nix	Teague, Calif.
Hicks, Mass.	Obey	Terry
Hicks, Wash.	O'Hara	Thompson, N.J.
Hogan	O'Konski	Thomson, Wis.
Hosmer	O'Neill	Thone
Howard	Patman	Tiernan
Hungate	Patten	Udall
Hunt	Pepper	Ullman
Hutchinson	Perkins	Van Deerlin
Ichord	Peyser	Vander Jagt
Johnson, Calif.	Pike	Vanik
Johnson, Pa.	Pirnie	Veysey
Jonas	Poage	Vigorito
Jones, Ala.	Podell	Waggonner
Jones, N.C.	Poff	Waldie
Jones, Tenn.	Powell	Wampler
Karth	Preyer, N.C.	Ware
Kastenmeier	Price, Ill.	Whalen
Kazen	Price, Tex.	Whalley
Keating	Purcell	White
Kee	Quie	Whitehurst
Keith	Quillen	Whitten
King	Railsback	Widnall
Kluczynski	Randall	Wiggins
Koch	Rangel	Williams
Kuykendall	Rarick	Wilson, Charles H.
Kyl	Rees	Winn
Kyros	Reid	Wolff
Landgrebe	Reuss	Wright
Latta	Rhodes	Wyatt
Leggett	Roberts	Wydler
Lennon	Robison, N.Y.	Wylie
Lent	Rodino	Wyman
Link	Roe	Yates
Lloyd	Rogers	Yatron
Long, Md.	Roncalio	Young, Fla.
Lujan	Rooney, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
McClory	Rooney, Pa.	Zablocki
McClure	Rosenthal	Zion
McCollister	Rostenkowski	Zwach
McCormack	Roy	
McCulloch	Roybal	
McDonald, Mich.	Ruppe	
	Ruth	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—65

Alexander	Dent	Horton
Arends	Derwinski	Hull
Ashley	Dowdy	Jacobs
Aspinall	Dwyer	Jarman
Baker	Edmondson	Kemp
Baring	Edwards, La.	Landrum
Bingham	Flowers	Long, La.
Blanton	Fountain	McCloskey
Brademas	Galifianakis	McDade
Brown, Mich.	Gaydos	Madden
Caffery	Goldwater	Mathias, Calif.
Camp	Gude	Mikva
Clay	Hébert	Miller, Calif.
Collins, Ill.	Helstoski	Mitchell
Colmer	Hillis	Nelsen
Coughlin	Holifield	Nichols

Passman	Riegle	Steiger, Wis.
Pelly	Robinson, Va.	Stubblefield
Pettis	Roush	Teague, Tex.
Pickle	Rousselot	Thompson, Ga.
Pryor, Ark.	Runnels	Wilson, Bob
Pucinski	Scheuer	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Ashley with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Madden with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Robinson of Virginia.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT 92–911

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92–924) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 557) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report 92–911, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 557

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed five thousand additional copies of the House Report 92–911 on H.R. 11896, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, for the use of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSTALLATION OF SECURITY APPARATUS FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE CAPITOL COMPLEX

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92–925) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 550) providing for the installation of security apparatus for the protection of the Capitol complex, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 550

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Committee on House Administration and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, is authorized and directed to procure and install security apparatus for the protection of the United States Capitol, including the procurement and installation of a video surveillance system, an intrusion detection system, and a parcel inspection system, in the Capitol Buildings, as such term is defined in section 16(a)(1) of the Act of July 31, 1946, as amended (81 Stat. 277; 40 U.S.C. 193m(a)(1)). The cost of the acquisition and installation of such security apparatus, not to exceed $3,000,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 550 is the culmination of a year's effort on the part of the House Committee on Administration, Special Subcommittee on Police, Capitol Police Force, Chief Powell of the Capitol Police, U.S. Secret Service and other agencies. It is a measure designed to provide electronic equipment in the Capitol to supplement our professional Capitol Police work force.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Capitol belongs to all of the American people and must be preserved as a bastion of freedom, freedom to come here and witness a democracy in action, enjoy the beauty and historic significance of the building. But at the same time, we, as elected Representatives have an obligation to preserve these historic buildings. We do not want a police state. We will not tolerate an armed camp, but the type of sophisticated equipment to be installed will not be repugnant to any visitor. The installation of the electronic equipment will be done under the jurisdiction of the architect of the Capitol and will preserve the esthetics of the buildings. This resolution authorizes a three-phase security program:

First. The installation of a series of strategically located closed circuit television cameras.

Second. The installation of motion detection devices to be used primarily after the buildings are closed. This equipment would notify a central control booth if an intruder should be in the building.

Third. Authorization of the purchase of X-ray equipment to inspect parcels and bags. At the present time, bags and parcels are being opened to the embarrassment and consternation of visitors and employees. X-ray machines will be installed at strategic locations and a person merely sets the bag down for 2 or 3 seconds and if any unauthorized contents are in the bag, the screening officer would be able to see it.

Mr. Speaker, the President has the responsibility of preserving security at the White House. This same equipment we are proposing for the Capitol building complex is now being used at the White House unnoticed and undetected by the millions who visit there each year. We have had the very fine cooperation of the Secret Service and feel that this is a minimum effort to provide adequate security at this time. This is a bi-partisan effort supported by our very outstanding chairman, Mr. HAYS, of Ohio, Mr. DICKINSON, of Alabama, the ranking minority member on the Special Committee on Police, and every other member of both the full committee and the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield to any Member who might have any questions regarding this matter.

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

Mr. GRAY. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would ask the gentleman from Illinois whether, to the gentleman's knowledge and aside from the proposal for electronic surveillance equipment, there is any plan to do anything about the security in the Chamber of the House of Representatives when the House is in session?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman from Iowa raises a very important question. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to give the gentleman any detailed information since that matter does not fall within the purview of our special subcommittee on police. However, the Speaker has appointed a special committee to look into the possibility of installing around the perimeter of the House balconies certain glass enclosures. I am sure that this committee wants to take this matter under very careful consideration because we do have the feelings of the American people to be considered as well as our own security. I do not know how far along they are in that particular study, but the study is being undertaken by a separate committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRAY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. In the acquiring of this sophisticated electronic equipment, would it be American made or would it be imported?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman raises another very important point. Certain proposals were submitted to our committee and we asked for the expertise of the Secret Service which has the jurisdiction of the protection of the White House. They agreed to help and graded all of the companies that made the proposals and the one that received the highest points is an American-made product.

So far as I am concerned personally, as chairman of the special subcommittee, I would insist that we install American-made equipment here in the Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman is aware that some of the equipment purchased by Congress has been produced in foreign countries.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is infinitely correct. We want to make sure that we not only have good quality equipment, but equipment that will be working all the time, and that the maintenance costs will not be prohibitive.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the ranking member of the House Committee on Administration, the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am asking for this time in order to create a little legislative history on this matter. Perhaps you may not be happy with the result.

Mr. GRAY. I am always happy with what my friend says.

Mr. DEVINE. I see that the expenditure involved in this legislation is about $3 million, and the purpose of this surveillance is to determine whether or not anyone may be prowling around in the halls of any of the office buildings or of the Capitol building, and primarily during nonbusiness hours.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEVINE. Will this result in a savings of personnel on Capitol Hill with reference to the police force and are we going to have less police because we have this electrical surveillance?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman raises a very important point.

I would like to explain where we are with our Capitol Police, if I could very briefly.

Last year the House authorized an additional 214 policemen. We have insisted on an all professional Capitol Hill police force. We are requiring very rigorous training for our policemen.

For that reason we still have almost 100 vacancies now on the Capitol Hill police force because we are screening the applicants very closely.

It is my personal opinion that once this system is operational, we will not need all of the additional 100 policemen that we have not recruited. It will require about three men to monitor the control booth.

I think it is very reasonable to assume that when this is in place, you will not need policemen at some of the camera locations.

Mr. Speaker, I personally believe it can be a means of saving to the taxpayer.

The total cost here is estimated at $3 million, but I anticipate that we will not spend that much money—possibly closer to $2½ million for the total package.

If we cut down 20 or 30 policemen, I think we can readily see that in a very few years' time we will recoup all of the costs of the installation of this system.

In addition, we will strongly strengthen the security of the Capitol. In direct answer to my friend, I would say that the end result is that there can be a saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. DEVINE. Does the gentleman happen to know at the present time how many Capitol Hill Police there are? Not including the Metropolitan Police Department and the Park Police around these buildings—how many are there who are monitoring Capitol Hill presently?

Mr. GRAY. On both sides of the Capitol buildings, we have authorized 1,000 men and we are up to about 900.

Mr. DEVINE. What is their jurisdiction, from a geographical standpoint?

Mr. GRAY. We have policemen on the House side and they have on the Senate side——

Mr. DEVINE. I mean geographically speaking about—do they cover just the Capitol grounds and the office buildings or do they go to the Library of Congress—how far do we go?

Mr. GRAY. They do not. They cover the Capitol building and the environs and by that I mean all of the buildings under the jurisdiction of the House and of the Senate; namely, the three House office buildings and the two Senate office buildings.

The Senate recently purchased the old hotel building where the police now have moved in to use as their headquarters. That, of course, is under our jurisdiction. But we do not have the Library of Congress or any of the other Capitol Hill buildings.

Mr. DEVINE. That is about 500 men over three shifts; is that correct?

Mr. GRAY. Yes, over three shifts. We think by having an all-professional police force, plus the fact that we have just graduated two canine classes and also have a good canine corps to sniff out bombs and that sort of thing, we feel, with the proposed electronic equipment, we will have beefed up the police force so that they can provide maximum security in the Capitol Hill complex.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I should like to state that I am law-enforcement oriented and have a law-enforcement-oriented background——

Mr. GRAY. If I may interrupt, the gentleman has been very helpful in the House Committee on House Administration.

Mr. DEVINE. I feel that we should, of course, take whatever steps are necessary to guard and preserve historic shrines such as the Capitol Building. However, I wonder if there might be a danger of our overreacting. We have had only one bombing incident, to my knowledge, since the time the British tried to burn the Capitol down. I have a kind of personal thing about overreacting by the GSA in Federal buildings.

I have in mind particularly my office building in Columbus, Ohio, a Federal building. The doors are kept locked. You can get in at only one place, and they shake you down. It seems to me that perhaps we are being intimidated by a few "nuts" who are running loose. It may be that we are overreacting. I question the wisdom of getting into a hypersecurity system because we have a few "nuts" loose.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman has made an important point. I have a few statistics I should like to state to the House. The General Services Administration has about 10,000 buildings under their administration. They testified before our Subcommittee on Public Grounds of the Committee on Public Works. Last year they lost $12 million in man-hours through the evacuation of buildings due to bomb threats. They also spent an additional $10 million to beef up their security force against, as the gentleman describes them, the so-called "nuts." That is a total of $22 million.

The Post Office has 38,000 buildings. They are costing the taxpayers even more in beefing up security. I think the gentleman can see that the $3 million maximum in this resolution is a small amount, indeed, compared to what the GSA and others are paying for security in Federal buildings throughout the country.

Also, we took a year to study this matter. The Secret Service, which now protects the White House, has said that this is a minimum—I repeat, a minimum—of what we should do in the Capitol. We have not overreacted. We have made the proposal in the light of the recommendations of the most prominent people who are engaged fully in this field, including the Secret Service, the Night Vision Laboratory of the Department of the Army, and we have consulted the FBI and everyone we could get who has great expertise in this field.

After the March 1 bombing, we had 31 bomb threats in the month of April. We have had an average of 6 to 10 a month since that time. So there are still these so-called "nuts" floating around. We want to make sure that we do our constitutional duty in providing maximum security and, if we ever have another unfortunate situation, we will know we have done our best.

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

Mr. GRAY. Yes, I yield to our distinguished chairman, who has been very helpful.

Mr. HAYS. I would merely like to say to the Members of the House that if we do not do anything and there would be a bombing or something of the kind and several Members or others lost their lives, then we would certainly be criticized for not having done this. We do not know whether we would be overreacting or not because the measure proposed is preventive. If nothing happens, we will not know whether we have prevented it or that it would not have happened anyway. But this is one of the most historic buildings in this country. It is the focus of more tourists than any other building in the United States. I think we are well advised to do whatever we can to protect the security not only of the building but the people who may be in it.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, let me commend the gentleman from Illinois and his subcommittee for their presentation of this matter to the House. It has been under long and active study, it seems to me. Of course, I do not believe the committee has overreacted or that we would overreact in supporting the committee. I might say we have not only a responsibility for the physical plant, but also for the American people who

visit here. But let us not overestimate the requirement and responsibility we have to protect our own staff and get our own work done. This Congress must proceed. I do not have to draw any diagrams on how easy it would be to stop the whole process. I think it is absolutely essential for us to do this.

May I ask the gentleman from Illinois, do I understand this is a first step in a series of programs the committee has under consideration?

Mr. GRAY. I would say to my friend the resolution we have before us would authorize the entire package. We would go forward in three increments. One, we would begin to phase in the closed circuit television system. We have bids from several different contractors to do this work. The motion detection devices would be installed throughout the areas. The X-ray equipment is available now.

But the answer to the gentleman's question is this resolution authorizes the entire package. The $3 million in my opinion—and we do not anticipate using all of it—would cover the entire cost. We will not be coming back and asking for more money. We think this is adequate to do the entire job.

Mr. FASCELL. I did not raise that question, but I appreciate the gentleman's comment. Will this be an integrated uniform system for the Capitol?

Mr. GRAY. It is indeed. I thank the gentleman very much for his helpful remarks.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, I cannot think of a more dramatic warning or a more dramatic expression of need for action than the fact of the bomb which was exploded in the Capitol of the United States. I do not believe the committee is overreacting. We have to take steps, I think, here, and I am glad the recommendation is being made which has been made here today.

I would like to ask about one thing, however. I think, perhaps, the gentleman from Illinois has touched upon it. I have been concerned in this whole matter that we have an adequate overall consideration in planning an interrelationship between the various agencies that are necessarily involved in the question of security in the Capitol, not only the committees of Congress, but also the FBI and the local police and the State police and the other agencies that would obviously be included. Is the gentleman satisfied—and I am not trying by any means to supplant the existing committees or anything like that—that there is an adequate interchange of information and also adequate overall supervision and investigation of security here?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman from Connecticut has raised a very important question. I also serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and we held public hearings. We heard the Chief Postal Inspector and the Secret Service and the FBI and the General Services Administration and all services involved. Based on that hearing, we obtained a great deal of valuable information. I have introduced a resolution that would set up a national security force merely in an advisory capacity, so we would coordinate our security proceduces on a Federal level for all agencies.

Mr. MONAGAN. That would not be limited to the Capitol?

Mr. GRAY. It would not be limited to the Capitol.

The gentleman has been very helpful. The gentleman's letter was included in our hearings.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois very much.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Police.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make several points and to raise a question. As the gentleman pointed out, I serve on the Subcommittee on Police. These police captains with the installation of the proposed equipment will have the ability to see in the dark, as we understand it.

Mr. GRAY. That is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. I understand also with the motion detection devices that will lock into the monitor when they are acitvated, when there is motion, they will be recorded on the TV screen and the camera will automatically record this on tape. Is this correct?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is correct. I am glad he brought that out. It is very important. If this motion device signals something is going on in quarters A, the camera can lock in on that, and in addition to the instant replay that can be used as evidence.

Mr. DICKINSON. That is true. Of course, I am in support of this.

Anything that would obviate the necessity for the guards looking into every parcel or package that comes into the building, to the chagrin and possibly the embarrassment of some people, would be highly desirable.

I should like to remind the Members it is possible, by going to this system, we can do away with the necessity for signing in, and for guests and staff people signing in to the building at night, because whoever comes in, you or your staff or your guests, to go to your office, no matter what time of night, just remember to smile, because, "You're on candid camera."

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is always tremendously helpful, but I want to make it absolutely clear that we are not installing a peeping device in the Capitol building. We are installing a device to protect the security of the building. No sound monitoring will be allowed.

Most of these cameras will be in areas which are inaccessible. When the bombing occurred on March 1 of last year it was in a very remote area, in a rest room that I did not know existed, and I have been here for almost 18 years. If we had had a camera back there we might have avoided the bombing last year and a saving of over $100,000 to the taxpayers.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The remarks of the gentleman from Alabama intrigue me. If it is proposed to mount one outside my office door for surveillance of those who come and go in the dead of night, I can only say, at my age, I thank you for the compliment.

Mr. GRAY. Let me point out something. These 99 locations will not be on Members' doors. They mostly will be in the Capitol building, and down in the subways and places where we have traffic. I can assure my friend from Iowa that there will be no camera on his door because I am his neighbor down the hall. He will not be on candid camera.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I commend the gentleman for bringing up this measure. If there is any single Member in this Hall today who doubts the need for the legislation, I would suggest that he go back to the rear of the Hall and take a look at that one open bullet hole right above the page section, and take a look at the bullet hole where the pages sit, and where the exit is from this Hall, and I suggest that he look at this table, where he will find the old bullet marks of that infamous day of March 1954, when four Puerto Ricans were seated up there and shot into the Hall and wounded five Members. Of those five Members there are only two alive today. One is Ken Roberts and the other is George Fallon.

We need this sort of protective measure. I do hope that this will be the first step in an accelerated program to protect this body.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I do not want the RECORD to indicate that all the shots were aimed at the Democratic side of the House Chamber. We have evidence on this table, likewise, where a shot was fired that ricocheted and also did damage to one or more of the Members.

I wholeheartedly agree that anything we can do in this regard is necessary. We have delayed too long. Do we have to have another crisis in order to move ahead?

I strongly urge that the recommendation be approved.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the concurrent resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL IMMIGRANT VISAS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 877 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 877

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause

7 of rule XIII to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9615) to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need, and at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 877 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 9615 providing for availability of additional immigration visas. Because there are no cost estimates provided in the report, points of order are waived for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XIII.

The purposes of H.R. 9615 are to make additional special immigrant visas available annually to each country of the Eastern Hemisphere and to reduce the backlog in visa issuance to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

This is to remove two inequities which have developed since the inactment of the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The additional visas available annually to each of the countries would be 75 percent of the 1955–64 average of immigrant visas issued, less visas issued each year under the permanent provisions of the act, not to exceed 7,500 visas per country per fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the statements of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) are in accordance with my understanding of the rule, House Resolution 877.

When we were holding hearings in the Rules Committee, somebody referred to this as the O'Neill bill. I do not see his name as the principal author, but in any event I guess the gentleman is most interested in this particular measure.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments about H.R. 9615.

I suppose the bill will pass readily. We want to be bighearted and take care of everybody in the world, I guess, from birth to death. However, if you read today's morning paper or look at your mail, you find out that most every city is very desirous of Federal revenue sharing. The cities in my district, the county of Los Angeles and the State of California certainly are. We have a serious problem in the field of welfare, and our unemployment rate is more than 5 percent.

I am not certain that I can actually prove the figures, because it is a little hard to estimate, but I believe because of this bill there will be about 40,000 people a year coming into this country for the next 4 years, which will be a total of about 160,000 people. Now, maybe that is not very many people, but by the same token they will have to have jobs, and probably many of them are better workers than some of the people who work in stores and other places in the United States. They may replace them. So I do have some concern about this measure with the many problems that we have facing us in the United States today. Maybe we should give some thought to not having so many people come in here for the next year or so until we get some of our own problems settled.

I do not know that I can prove this statement that I am about to make, but it seems to me many Puerto Ricans come into New York every year and before too long they may be able to control one or two or three of the elections for congressional seats in that area. This is a statement that has been made to me.

Three gentlemen; namely, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. MAYNE, have filed separate views. They brought to the attention of the House the fact that this is for the purpose of uniting families. However, if you bring in a married daughter who has a husband and two or three children with the purpose of getting the daughter in here with her mother, or with her father and mother, or with the father, depending on which of them are living, you might be running into complications. If my understanding is correct, I think an amendment may be offered to confine this to unmarried children and brothers and sisters. Otherwise, you will not be uniting families, but will be bringing in an entirely new family.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I have no requests for time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9615) to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9615, with Mr. ADAMS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, in essence, this is a temporary measure and would permit primarily the entry into this country for a period of 4 years—the duration of the bill is 4 years—of about 16,000 Irishmen, at the rate of about 4,000 a year and about 28,000 Italians, at the rate of 7,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, if you examine the roster of the Members of this House you can easily discern that we have had some very fine and outstanding dedicated public servants, all representative of the races who are going to be helped by this bill—the Irish and the Italians. They have contributed greatly to the wealth and the welfare of this country. There need be no argument along those lines. The admission of such a paucity of people of those races, sturdy and hard working, is merely a ripple as it were upon the tremendous population of this country.

Mr. Chairman, 6½ years ago we enacted legislation abolishing the pernicious national origins quota system which formed the basis of our immigration policy for more than 40 years.

Under this system you may recall the number of immigrants admitted annually from each country was calculated as a percentage of the number of U.S. citizens of the same national origin in this country as recorded by the 1920 census.

This system was highly discriminatory, based largely on the erroneous assumption that immigrants from countries most highly representative of our population were somehow more easily assimilated into our culture.

It is some comfort in these troubled times to realize that there are some problems that we have outgrown. Largely as a result of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act amendments, our immigration policy is no longer based on the assumption that some people are more fit than others to come to the United States, because of their race or national origin.

H.R. 9615, the bill before us today, is aimed at the alleviation of hardships unfairly imposed on a few countries; namely, Ireland, Italy, Great Britain, Germany, and Poland by our immigration laws. The hardship, however, is not the result of a calculated policy. On the contrary, it is the completely inadvertent result of the sweeping changes brought about by the 1965 legislation. The legislation under consideration is of a temporary nature, as I have indicated, aimed at correcting the unfortunate inequities that arose in the process of transition from the national origins quota system to the system now used to

regulate annual immigration from Eastern Hemisphere countries.

The 1965 amendments replaced the quota system with an annual overall ceiling on Eastern Hemisphere immigration of 170,000 immigrant visas, of which no more than 20,000 could be used by any one country. Within these two numerical restrictions, the visas are distributed on a first-come, first-served basis according to a revised eight-category preference system aimed first at reuniting families, and second at providing admission for the professional and highly talented and for those seeking employment in occupations undersupplied by American labor.

The legislation provided for a 3-year transition period; all countries were still allotted their original quotas, but any unused numbers were pooled for use by other countries. For instance, under the quota system Great Britain had an annual allotment of 65,361 immigrant visas, of which only 30,560 were used in 1964. Since these numbers were nontransferable, they were actually lost, and went down the drain; during the pooling period unused quota numbers became transferable to other countries according to the new preference system.

It was hoped that by July 1, 1968, when the provisions of the 1965 act went into full effect, that the backlogs which had accumulated under the quota system would have been absorbed and that all countries would compete on an equal footing under the new system. This, in fact, was not the case; some old backlogs had not been absorbed, and some new ones had developed during the transition period, particularly in the work-related preferences. Italy, for instance, had a waiting list of over 100,000 brother and sister applicants when the 1965 law was passed. The pooling did little to ease this since Italy was restricted to 20,000 visas annually and, after the long years on the meager quota of 5,666 visas per year, most of these were used by applicants for the four preference categories preceding fifth-preference brothers and sisters.

Further, and most unexpectedly, several countries particularly well favored under the quota system, including Germany, Great Britain and Ireland, have had their immigration severely reduced by the new provisions. Ireland, for instance, used 6,328 immigrant visas in fiscal 1964 and 1,077 in fiscal 1971; Germany used 28,691 immigrant visas in 1964 and 6,028 in fiscal 1971. These dramatic reductions have not been voluntary. They have resulted in part from the disadvantageous position of applicants from high quota countries due to the backlogs in some of the preference categories at the close of the transition period. Moreover, natives of countries highly favored by the national origins quota system almost by definition are more apt to have ancestors buried here than close relatives who can petition for their entry. This has proved particularly true of the Irish, who came to this country in large numbers in the 19th century.

H.R. 9615 is aimed at correcting the two specific situations to which I have referred—the heavy backlog in the fifth preference brother and sister category, and the disadvantageous position of natives from certain countries which have been plunged from riches to rags as far as immigrant visas are concerned. Being human, we did less than a perfect job in 1965.

H.R. 9615 will correct an inequitable situation which has been pending too long. In 1965, everybody was assured that upon passage of the new immigration act all nationalities would be treated on an equal footing. History has taught us otherwise. The backlog of Italian immigrants was not cleared up by July 1, 1968 as we were led to believe it would. Irish immigrants were unable to qualify for visas under the new law and immigrants from that country have dwindled to a mere trickle. This is indeed unfortunate.

I support H.R. 9615 as a definite forward step in removing the last stumbling blocks to the complete integration of a discriminationless basis for immigration to the United States. To let this situation go uncorrected is a terrible slight to our many fine citizens of Italian and Irish heritage who rightfully want for their countrymen only what was promised—namely, the right to compete for immigrant visas on an equal basis with all other nationalities.

It is very significant that tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day—an auspicious time to grant this boon to our Irish friends.

Second, the passage of this bill would be a wonderful benefit to the Irish who are now in the throes not only of discomfort, but in the throes of despair as the result of an intolerant government, and as a result of centuries of religious strife. It would be very cheering indeed to the Irish, aside from the benefits that would occur to this country, to pass this bill.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 9615 that the committee brings before the House today has a long history.

Provisions of the bill have been discussed at length by the members of the Committee on the Judiciary. Numerous witnesses have appeared before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality unanimously voicing their appeals that the two objectives of the bill be approved by the Congress.

Permit me to backtrack for a moment in order that I may acquaint the House with the reasons why we should approve H.R. 9615.

In 1965, Congress abolished the arbitrary and unjust national origins quota system which had been in effect since the 1920's. Under this system, Ireland had a guaranteed annual quota of 17,756 immigrant visas, a comparatively high allotment reflecting the large proportion of the Irish in our national population when the quota system was drawn up. Of this number, they used an average of about 7,000 a year, leaving more than 10,000 potential visas unused. The immigration law prior to amendment was a perpetual story of feast and famine. The Italians, in contrast to the Irish, had an annual allotment of 5,666 and a waiting list of a quarter million. The gross inequity reflected in these figures, combined with the ineffectiveness of the system—two out of three immigrants were nonquota in the years preceding its abolition—led to its abandonment in 1965. This move was long overdue, and criticism of the system which replaced the national origins quota system does not imply a desire to return to the past. I would indeed like to return to the days when America's gates were open wide to the Irish, but not at the expense of closing them once again to the orientals and the Greeks, or keeping them barely ajar for the Italians and the French. This, fortunately, is not the choice before us.

There can be no question that the abolition of the national origins quota system was highly desirable. The system was a disgrace, particularly to a nation which rightly regards itself as a nation of immigrants. Neither can there be any question about the value of the basic principles of the 1965 amendments: the reunion of families and the protection of American labor.

It was most certainly not the intent of the 89th Congress to penalize Ireland, Great Britain, and Germany, and other countries which were the beneficiaries of high quotas. However, as the immigration statistics show, this, in fact, is what the Congress did, regardless of its intent. It now remains for Congress to correct its inadvertent errors of the past and the time is overdue.

Not until 1964, after four decades of subjection to the principle that some immigrants were more acceptable than others, was there a coordinated effort and sufficient leadership to pave the way for repeal of the national origins systems. The impetus in this direction was supplied by the late President Kennedy when he sent an Executive communication to the Congress in 1963.

The bill introduced as a result of the executive communication was a product of great study and sought to prevent problems before they occurred. To insure an orderly transition from the national origins system to a system based upon first-come, first-served, within preferences, a 5-year phaseout period was proposed which the departmental experts and statisticians concluded would relieve the backlogs that had accumulated in some preference categories for some countries. Furthermore, this bill called for a reserve of visas which the President could allocate to those countries which had enjoyed large quotas under the old system and which would be disadvantaged by the change. The proposal recognized that these countries could not initially compete equitably on a first-come-first-served basis; simply because there was never a need to establish priority dates and a place in line for a visa.

Unfortunately, by the time the bill was enacted, the 5-year phaseout period was reduced to a 3-year phaseout. The reserve of visas was deleted completely and a new feature—the labor certification requirement—became an integral part of the act.

Cautioned and warned of the problems that could arise, the Congress, in its haste to attain the target of repeal of the

national origins systems, cast probable problems aside.

Today, we suffer the result of casting aside those safeguards that were originally proposed in the executive communication. We find that the fifth preference, particularly with regard to Italy, is oversubscribed and has been oversubscribed, and the backlog was not eliminated as the drafters of the legislation anticipated.

We find that immigration from Western Europe, particularly Germany, Great Britain, and Ireland, dissipated to a mere trickle. These results certainly were not intended. Until these results are corrected, our immigration policy is harnessed by the deadweight of discouragement, frustration, and dismay.

H.R. 9615 is designed to correct the deficiencies resulting from the haste in approving the act of October 3, 1965. Before the Congress can build on that act and approve a worldwide immigration system with workable preferences, or any other legislation affecting immigration, we must backstep and put our immigration law in good order.

We have waited for 5 years to determine if the shortcomings of the law would correct themselves, but it is obvious now that these shortcomings will only manifest themselves in greater hardship and unfairness. The only corrective method is by legislation, legislation which I hoped would not be necessary but which experience has dictated has become very necessary.

This bill establishes a floor on immigration for each country by making special immigrant visas available equal to 75 percent of the 1955–65 average less visas issued under the permanent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended. No more than 7,500 special visas can be used by any country in each fiscal year.

The bill is temporary in nature, designed to correct a temporary problem and will automatically terminate after 4 years. After carefully reviewing the abundant material and statistics on the problems which the Irish and other Northern European aliens have experienced in competing for immigrant visas, it was concluded that this 4-year period would grant sufficient time for people from those countries to establish priority dates and thus eliminate the unintended inequities. That feature of the bill and the floor provision have been widely and thoroughly discussed, not only in the Congress, but by various interested organizations. I think that those of us on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality can stipulate to the fact that immigration from Northern Europe has been drastically curtailed. We also stipulate that this result is directly attributable to the shortcomings in the changeover from the national origins system to the first-come, first-served system. I believe that this temporary legislation will correct the deficiencies that have caused a decline in immigration from those countries which have traditionally sent immigrants to the United States.

The second thrust of the bill is directed at the backlog in the fifth preference—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—which was not eliminated by the time the landmark 1965 amendments became effective on July 1, 1968. It had been expected that the 3-year phaseout period 1965–68, would eliminate the backlogs which had accumulated under the repugnant national origins quota system. However, the fifth preference category, particularly in the case of intending Italian immigrants, was and remains heavily oversubscribed. Without remedial legislation, it may be many years before the brothers and sisters who qualify for the present fifth preference can be united with their U.S. citizen families. Therefore, this bill would authorize the issuance of special immigrant visas to all qualified brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who have petitions filed prior to July 1, 1971.

I believe that it is patently important that we solve the major outstanding inequities stemming from the 1965 amendments before we can attempt to solve any other problems in the immigration field.

Tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day and it is my sincere hope that the day's festivities will include celebration of our passage of the bill before us today. A rollcall of the Members of this House, now or at virtually any period in our past, is eloquent testimony to the debt our country owes to the sons of Ireland and the sons of Italy.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point an analysis of H.R. 9615 and several letters in support of this worthwhile legislation:

ANALYSIS OF H.R. 9615

This bill is temporary legislation designed to correct the inequities that resulted from the transition from the national origins concept, as a system for selecting immigrants, to one based on a "first-come, first-served" principle.

Congress intended, in enacting the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, that (1) no country would be disadvantaged by the transition to the new system and (2) all existing backlogs would be eliminated during the transition period.

However, this was not the result and immigration from Northern Europe—particularly Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany—was sharply curtailed since immigrants from these countries were unable to qualify under the new preference system which required a labor certification or were unable to compete on an equal basis with immigrants from other countries who had earlier registration dates, even if they did qualify.

The latter situation occurred because there were no immigration backlogs in the Northern European countries prior to the 1965 Act and immigrants from these countries were unable to compete fairly for visas with immigrants who had been on waiting lists for long periods of time.

Specifically, this bill would make special immigrant visas available annually to each country of the Eastern Hemisphere equal to 75 percent of the 1955 to 1965 average, less the number of visas issued during the preceding fiscal year. These special visas could not exceed 7,500 per country per fiscal year.

The bill would also reduce the backlog in visa issuance in the fifth preference category by providing additional visas for immigrants in this category—brothers and sisters of United States citizens.

This legislation would become effective the first fiscal year after enactment.

The number of special visas made available in any year to a particular foreign state under sections 1 and 2 of this bill will be dependent upon the number of visas issued to that state under the permanent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in the preceding fiscal year.

As an illustration, these sections of the bill would have authorized the issuance of 31,423 visas in 1971 and 32,877 visas in 1972.

Germany and Great Britain could have received 7,500 visas (the maximum) in each of these years. Ireland could have received 4,241 visas in 1971 and 4,096 visas in 1972. Poland could have received 2,724 visas in 1971 and 2,970 visas in 1972. Other countries which could receive visas under these sections of the bill are: Czechoslovakia, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and U.S.S.R.

Under sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this bill, a total of 39,764 visas would be available for issuance over the four-year life of the bill; or an annual average of 9,918 visas. Italy, the primary beneficiary of this section of the bill, could receive a four-year total of 28,680 visas; or an annual average of 7,170 visas.

Therefore, under all provisions of this bill, a maximum of 42,795 additional visas would have been available in fiscal year 1972. But, there is no way to predict how many applicants there would be for these visas.

NATIONAL COUNCIL,
STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., March 13, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have been informed that H.R. 9615, which would make additional visas available to certain immigrants has been cleared by the Rules Committee for debate and vote by the House, on Thursday, March 16, 1972.

We will appreciate your support and vote in favor of this bill.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. SUSSMANN,
National Chairman.

UNITED-ITALIAN AMERICAN
LABOR COUNCIL, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 14, 1972.

Hon. PETER RODINO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: Congress will be considering an emergency immigration bill which will bring additional visas to clear the back logs accumulated under the old law.

This bill bears the number H.R. 9615 representing the tens of thousands of workers in the needle trades. Also as President of the United Italian American Labor Council, I earnestly urge your support for this important piece of legislation, as it was originally introduced and without amendments.

Our members specifically oppose the Dennis Amendment which would eliminate from the present law, on a permanent basis the category of married brothers and sisters of United States citizens.

I am sure that you will exercise your good offices to the effect of having H.R. 9615, as introduced without amendments, adopted.

Respectfully yours,

E. HOWARD MOLISANI,
President and Executive Director.

JOINT COMMITTEE FOR
FAIR IMMIGRATION,
New York, N.Y., March 13, 1972.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: On March 16, 1972, H.R. 9615 will be scheduled to be voted on by the House of Representatives.

This Bill is a temporary measure designed to remove inequities resulting from the en-

actment of the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Bill would make special immigrant visas available to natives of certain countries who were adversely affected by the 1965 amendments, which became fully effective on July 1, 1968.

When the 1965 amendments were under consideration, certain provisions were present in the proposal which would have placed every country on an equal basis as of the effective date of the 1965 Act. However, before enactment, amendments were adopted which gravely altered the original design of the 1965 amendments. Consequently, when the 1965 Act became fully effective in July 1968, backlogs for previously oversubscribed preferences were not eliminated as originally intended and immigration from former high quota countries was severely affected.

In particular, immigration from Northern Europe, especially Ireland and Germany was drastically reduced, and the tremendous backlogs in the 5th preference for natives of Italy, which were present only because of the discriminatory nature of the old law towards Italy, was not eliminated.

H.R. 9615 will correct the injustices resulting from the 1965 Act, by assuring that each country will be able to compete fairly and equitably for visas. This Bill is a temporary measure, four years in duration, during which period the proper balance will be restored.

There are several proposed amendments which may be introduced during floor debate. These amendments would totally subvert the purpose of the Bill and must be defeated.

We urge you to vote favorably on H.R. 9615 and to vote against any amendments which would change its present form.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. SUSSMANN,
National Council of the Steuben Society.
REV. JOSEPH A. COGO, C.S.,
American Committee on Italian Migration.
JOHN P. COLLINS,
American Irish National Immigration Committee.

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

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate deeply the distinguished gentleman from New York yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the chairman of the full committee and to commend the gentleman in the well, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, and who is also chairman of the Council on European Migration. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is one of the experts in this House on dealing with immigration problems.

The bill before us today is landmark legislation. It carries out the policy of the Members of this House when they passed in 1965 the Immigration and Nationality Act, in which we forbid discrimination, we rejected the quota system, and said to the world that every man should be judged on his merits and his merits alone.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us now, on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, is popularly referred to as the Irish-Italian bill. The first of its two major provisions would be of primary benefit to would-be immigrants from Ireland, as well as to those from several other countries which have been hard hit by the impact of the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. These include Great Britain, Germany, and Poland. The second and more limited of the provisions would primarily benefit Italy. Both provisions are temporary and would expire 4 years after the enactment of this legislation. Both are responsive to hardships for tending immigrants which time has shown are unlikely to work themselves out without corrective legislation.

As a cosponsor of similar legislation, I want to point out that the need for its enactment is apparent from the discrepancy between the number of visas allotted certain countries in fiscal 1964, before the enactment of the 1965 amendments, and in fiscal 1971. Ireland received 6,328 visas in 1964 and 1,077 in 1971; Great Britain and Northern Ireland received 30,324 in 1964 and 8,708 in 1971; and Germany received 28,691 in 1964 and 6,027 in 1971. There was no intention on the part of Congress in enacting the 1965 amendments to so restrict immigration from these countries, and it is the hope underlying this provision that, given a 4-year grace period, the preference system will unskew itself as far as these and a few other countries similarly affected are concerned.

The second major provision of the bill is aimed at eliminating the backlog of fifth-preference applicants—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The waiting list for this preference is largest for Italy, which was limited to an annual quota of 5,666 visas a year for decades and, as a result, had a waiting list of 250,000 when the national origin quota system was finally terminated in 1965. More than 100,000 applicants were waiting for fifth-preference visas. While Italy has been using the maximum per-country allotment of 20,000 visas a year since 1965, most of the numbers have been going to the higher preferences, and there have also been additional increments in the fifth-preference waiting list. The bill before us would make a limited number of special immigrant visas available over the next 4 years for fifth-preference applicants on whose behalf petitions were filed prior to July 1, 1971.

I want the House to know that if it was not for the diligent efforts and persuasiveness of the distinguished chairman of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee—PETER RODINO—this most worthy and necessary legislation would not be before us today.

Many bills have been introduced in the last several years to give the sons of Ireland a fair chance to compete for immigrant visas to the United States. Other bills have long been pending to give relief to the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who are denied the opportunity to join their relatives in the United States because of the long waiting lists.

As one who has long advocated the reuniting of families under our immigration laws, I am pleased that H.R. 9615 has finally reached the floor for action. Passage of this bill would help achieve this objective and would correct some of the shortcomings of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9615 as it has been reported by the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9615. The 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act have had some bizarre and unlooked for effects, not the least of which has been the slowing of Irish immigration to a trickle. Tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day, and the Nation will pay tribute to the Irish in the only nationally observed holiday set aside to honor another nation's American descendants. The contribution of the Irish to our country cannot be overestimated. They have fought in wars, beginning with the Revolution. George Washington's army was bilingual, with Irish spoken as commonly as English. Lord Mountjoy told the British Parliament, "You have lost America by the Irish," a sentiment echoed in the Irish House of Commons: "America was lost to England by the Irish emigrants." The great famine in Ireland in 1846–47 sent the Irish here in waves to fight in our Civil War and build our roads and railways. The sons of Ireland have built and served our cities until the present day. And, not least, from Andrew Jackson, the son of an Irish exile, down to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, they have led our Nation as Presidents.

Under the 1965 amendments, immigration from all countries not in the Western Hemisphere is restricted to 170,000 a year, with a 20,000 per country limit. Within these numerical restrictions, intending immigrants compete on a first-come, first-served basis for entry. Entry is further regulated by an eight-category preference system, which places first priority on family relationships and second priority on needed skills and talents. However, the Irish immigrant has been typically young, unmarried, and unskilled. He has come to America alone to seek his fortune. The extent to which the Irish are ineligible for entry under today's immigration laws is graphically illustrated by the fact that 1,077 received immigrant visas in fiscal year 1971, as opposed to the average annual figure of 7,185 immigrant visas issued to Ireland during the 10-year period fiscal years 1956–65. A similar pattern is repeated for Germany and for Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Unquestionably, the goals of reuniting families and protecting American labor are highly preferable to the illusory one of freezing the ethnic balance in the United States at its 1920 status. However, regardless of the merit of its underlying rationale, there is something wrong with a system which so drastically and arbitrarily reduces immigration from the countries which built America.

The bill before us would put a guaranteed floor under the number of immigrant visas available to each country for a 4-year period. This figure would be based on the annual average number of visas used by a given country during the 10-year period 1956–65. The difference between the number received by a country under the permanent provisions of the immigration law and the guaranteed

annual floor would be made up by special visas issued outside of the overall ceiling of 170,000. Using 1971 as a base year, the State Department estimated that a maximum of 32,877 special visas would be made available during the first fiscal year this legislation was in effect. The bill exempts those receiving these visas from the labor certification requirement, and provides for their distribution as follows: 40 percent to applicants in the first through fifth preference classes; 30 percent plus fall down to sixth preference—skilled and unskilled labor; and 30 percent to nonpreference applicants.

The second major provision of the bill would facilitate entry of brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who have been waiting for fifth preference visas, and would be of primary benefit to Italy. The waiting list for this category, formerly fourth preference, at the time enactment of the 1965 amendments was over 100,000 for Italy, largely the result of her woefully inadequate annual quota of 5,666. The backlog for this preference for Italy and for several other countries was not absorbed during the transition period of 2½ years before the provisions of the 1965 act went into full effect on July 1, 1968, and there is no prospect of its elimination in the future without remedial legislation. The bill before us would provide for a specified number of special immigrant visas for fifth preference applicants on whose behalf petitions were filed prior to July 1, 1971, and would allow unused ones to drop down to sixth preference applicants. This, too, is a temporary provision, limited, in effect, to 4 years.

I am confident that this temporary legislation will eliminate the fifth preference backlogs. There is some question, however, about its long-term effect on the changed pattern of immigration from Ireland and other formerly favored countries such as Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Germany. This problem will certainly be kept in mind during the review of omnibus immigration reform legislation about to get underway by the immigration subcommittee. In the meantime, there is no question that temporary remedial action must be taken.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the gentleman from New Jersey's remarks. His credentials in connection with immigration are without parallel. I am cognizant of the lengthy deliberations he and his committee have given this particular problem. I congratulate the gentleman for the resolution he has offered to this problem by virtue of the legislation presented for our consideration today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for passage of this bill which would provide additional immigrant visas from Eastern Hemisphere countries and reduce backlogs in the fifth preference category.

The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act resulted in a drastic decline in the number of immigrants from Ireland, Germany, Italy, and other European nations. Additionally, it perpetuated the chronic backlog of the fifth preference applicants, particularly from Italy. These are the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The 1965 act only provided a 3-year phaseout period which created undue hardships on the formerly privileged countries of Northern Europe.

The bill we are considering now is a remedial measure. It would be in effect only for 4 years. By readjusting the formulas for allotting entry visas, it would correct the inequities that have created a grossly unfavorable situation for the European nations. Moreover, it would provide for a temporary period of additional visas to clear up the fifth preference backlog. While it does not go far enough for certain countries, such as Greece, it does improve the situation to a considerable degree.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I will oppose any amendment which will further restrict this measure. The proposal of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) is such an amendment. By attempting to limit the fifth preference category to unmarried brothers and sisters only, he would destroy any remedial effect the bill might have on the backlogs. The amendment should be defeated.

Arguments that this bill will have a negative effect on the U.S. employment situation are groundless. The total number of immigrants that will be admitted in any one year is 18,000. This figure includes the spouses and minor children of the principal applicants. A conservative estimate, then, of the actual number of immigrants entering the labor market is approximately 9,000. This is hardly a dent in the total labor force of 86 million workers. There is no threat either to the economic stability of the United States or the job security of the American worker.

Lest we forget, this country was founded by immigrants primarily from the European nations. Our tremendous growth and development in the 20th century is due in large part to the thousands of immigrants who came to this country from Europe in the late 1890's and early 1900's. My own mother and father came to this country as immigrants and worked hard to build up their new Nation. They had a commitment to their new fatherland as strong as any held by a native-born American.

The tradition of this country has been to welcome the poor, the weak, and the oppressed of other nations. It is so inscribed on the Statute of Liberty in New York Harbor. Are we going to cast aside this tradition and close our doors to the people of the world who seek our help? Are we going to ignore the cries of those who look to America for leadership in world peace and succor in a time of need?

I hope my colleagues will join with me in supporting this bill as it was reported from committee. It is a just and fair bill and deserves passage.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman in the well, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO). We are all mindful of the great leadership the gentleman from New Jersey has given to the amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act in years past. It is a further tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey that he has moved with dispatch, during this his first session as chairman of the subcommittee, to correct an unintended injustice that flowed from the earlier amendments to the immigration laws.

I am happy to have been a cosponsor of this legislation and to join in the effort to correct this situation.

As chairman of the Democratic Study Group, I was pleased to join with the chairman of our Task Force on Immigration and Naturalization in urging the DSG membership to support this legislation.

I am placing in the RECORD at this time the text of the DSG letter:

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1972.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are writing to ask your support for H.R. 9615, temporarily providing additional immigrant visas, when it is considered by the House on Thursday. This bill is a remedial measure to be in effect for four years only. Its sole purpose is to correct the inequities that have resulted from the unreasonably short transition period from the old national origins system of granting visas to the new "first-come-first-served" system. By providing a 3-year phaseout period rather than the 5-year period originally requested by President Johnson, the 1965 act has worked undue hardships on once privileged nations. This bill would ameliorate this hardship and ease the transition to the new system of granting visas which we whole-heartedly endorse. The bill would in no way return us to the old national origins preference system.

Specifically, the bill would make special immigrant visas available annually to each country of the Eastern hemisphere equal to 75% of the 1955-1965 average, less the number of visas issued during the preceding year. This would primarily benefit Ireland, Great Britain, Germany, and Poland. The bill would also provide additional visas for immigrants in the "fifth preference category" (brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens). This provision would primarily benefit Italian immigrants.

This bill was reported out of the Judiciary Committee by a voice vote following the defeat by a 27 to 6 margin of an amendment offered by Rep. Dennis. The Dennis amendment, which will be offered on the House floor, would limit the "fifth preference category" to unmarried brothers and sisters. The committee majority believes as we do that it is inappropriate to attach such a permanent change in the immigration law to a bill that is designed to be remedial and temporary. Consequently, we urge you to join us in support of H.R. 9615 and in opposition to the Dennis amendment.

Sincerely,

PETER RODINO,
Chairman, DSG Task Force on Immigration and Naturalization.
PHILLIP BURTON,
Chairman.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH).

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the subcommittee, for the fine work he has done on this and other immigration bills.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9615, a bill to correct certain inequities which have developed since the passage of the landmark Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965.

It is appropriate, I believe, that we are considering this legislation on the eve of St. Patrick's Day. The present law has inadvertently resulted in a drastic decline in immigration from previously favored nations, particularly Ireland. In fact, immigration to the United States from Ireland has dwindled from an average of 5,000 per year before 1965 to little more than 1,000 today. Germany and Poland also have been adversely affected and would benefit under H.R. 9615.

In this regard, I am pleased that the committee has seen fit to adopt provisions substantially similar to legislation I have cosponsored for the past 4 years. Under my bill and under section 1 of the pending measure, Ireland would be entitled to over 4,000 additional visas in each of the next 4 years. Visas available to Germans would amount to 7,500 annually, and Poles would receive almost 3,000.

Mr. Chairman, it is clearly against our national interest to discriminate, as we do under the present law, against the people of Ireland, Germany, and Poland, especially when one considers the outstanding contributions of these groups to our Nation. Science, religion, the arts and humanities, government and industry—all have benefitted immeasurably from the legacy of our country's Irish, German, and Polish immigrants. Surely we would have been the poorer if we had refused admission to immigrants blessed with such a high degree of ingenuity and initiative.

Another significant section of the pending bill would reduce the backlog of fifth preference applicants from Italy. These are brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who have been waiting for many years to join their relatives in this country.

I understand that an amendment will be offered on the floor to weaken this part of the bill. The amendment, if adopted, would alter the permanent immigration law by restricting the fifth preference to unmarried brother and sisters of U.S. citizens. As a substantive change in the basic law, this amendment has no place in a limited, temporary measure such as H.R. 9615 and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join in commending the chairman of the full committee for his eloquent statement in support of H.R. 9615, and I also wish to express my feeling of appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Inmmigration and Nationality for the leadership he has shown since assuming the chairmanship in bringing about within that subcommittee a consensus, which is reflected in the bill before us, in order to remedy unanticipated inequities which resulted from the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, which became fully effective on July 1, 1968.

The purpose of this bill is to remove two inequities.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 quite properly had the intended and laudable purpose of eliminating the obnoxious national origins quota system. Unfortunately, it had the unforeseen adverse effect of effectively barring immigration from a number of countries which have traditionally been sources of valuable seed immigration, such as Ireland, where there was a precipitate decline in immigration. It also failed to remove the fifth preference backlog—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The backlog continues to exist—mainly in in Italy.

This legislation is designed to overcome those inequities. I believe it is a fair, reasonable and workable bill which will make it possible to compensate for the failure to anticipate some of the consequences of the act of 1965.

It is also appropriate to note that we are acting upon this legislation the day before St. Patrick's Day.

At the time of the adoption of the 1965 amendments, the Department of State had submitted estimates that Ireland, for which the average immigration for the decade preceding fiscal year 1966 had been 7,185, would be able to qualify under the new law for about 5,200 places each fiscal year. However, this has not been the case. There was an immediate drastic decline, and since the act became fully effective on July 1, 1968, the number of preference and nonpreference visas issued to applicants born in Ireland was:

Fiscal year:	
1969	1,347
1970	1,151
1971	1,297
1972[1] (July 1, 1971–December 31, 1971)	674

[1] Estimated 1,200 for fiscal year 1972.

I include tables provided to me by the Department of State:

VISAS ISSUED, CONDITIONAL ENTRIES, AND ADJUSTMENTS OF STATUS GRANTED IMMIGRANTS BORN IN IRELAND

Year and place issued	Preference							Nonpreference	Nonquota	Immediate relative	Special immigrant	Total
	1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th					
Fiscal year 1965:												
Dublin			3	8				3,825	13			3,849
Elsewhere			1	3				1,481	44			1,529
Adjustments of status	1		1					183				185
Total	1		5	11				5,489	57			5,563
Fiscal year 1966 (July to November):												
Dublin				11				1,781	4			1,796
Elsewhere				1				557	21			579
Adjustments of status								72				72
Subtotal (July to November)				12				2,410	25			2,447
Fiscal year 1966 (December–June):												
Dublin	1	12	4		93			238		39	56	433
Elsewhere	1	6	1	1	44			142		48	20	263
Adjustments of status		1	1	1	21			21				45
Subtotal (December–June)	2	19	6	2	158			401		77	76	741
Total												3,188
Fiscal year 1967:												
Dublin	7	52	3	2	333	6		1,222		124	111	1,860
Elsewhere		7		5	108	2		561		77	45	805
Adjustments of status		9		1	59	4		78				151
Total	7	68	3	8	500	12		1,861		201	156	2,816
Fiscal year 1968:												
Dublin	4	40			464	1		1,658		117	92	2,376
Elsewhere	1	16		5	178			897		94	52	1,243
Adjustments of status	1	14			108	1		175				297
Total	6	70		5	748	2		2,730		211	144	3,916

VISAS ISSUED, CONDITIONAL ENTRIES, AND ADJUSTMENTS OF STATUS GRANTED IMMIGRANTS BORN IN IRELAND—Continued

Year and place issued	Preference 1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th	Nonpreference	Nonquota	Immediate relative	Special immigrant	Total
Fiscal year 1968:												
July:												
Dublin		1	2			15			127	12	4	161
Elsewhere						4			56	7	3	70
Total		1	2			19			183	19	7	231
August:												
Dublin			2			14			124	9	13	162
Elsewhere			1			10			56	10	4	81
Total			3			24			180	19	17	243
September:												
Dublin			1			28			121	6	11	167
Elsewhere			1			8			38	5	5	57
Total			2			36			159	11	16	224
October:												
Dublin			5			37			108	11	9	170
Elsewhere			2		1	14			59	8	1	85
Total			7		1	51			167	19	10	255
November:												
Dublin			7			20			81	7	7	122
Elsewhere						7			59	5	2	73
Total			7			27			140	12	9	195
December:												
Dublin		1	1			14			33	7	5	61
Elsewhere		1	2		3	6			66	14	7	99
Total		2	3		3	20			99	12	22	160
January:												
Dublin			3			32			99	14	11	159
Elsewhere			3			11			49	9	5	77
Total			6			43			148	23	16	236
February:												
Dublin						43			77	10	8	138
Elsewhere					1	6			64	4	1	76
Total					1	49			141	14	9	214
March:												
Dublin		1	4			39			62	12	4	122
Elsewhere			3			17			51	5	4	80
Total		1	7			56			113	17	8	202
April:												
Dublin			1			41			119	17	8	186
Elsewhere			2			29			57	10	3	10
Total			3			70			176	27	11	287
May:												
Dublin			3			46			230	5	4	288
Elsewhere			1			34			153	14	7	209
Total			4			80			383	19	11	497
June:												
Dublin		1	11			135	1		477	7	8	640
Elsewhere			1			32			189	3	10	235
Total		1	12			167	1		666	10	18	875
Total:												
Dublin		4	40			464	1		1,658	117	92	2,376
Elsewhere		1	16		5	178			897	94	52	1,243
Adjustments of status		1	14			106	1		175			297
Grand total		6	70		5	748	2		2,730	211	144	3,916
Fiscal year 1969:												
July:												
Dublin										10	13	23
Elsewhere			1			5				17	3	26
Total			1			5				27	16	49
August:												
Dublin		1	2							6	10	19
Elsewhere		1	2							10	5	18
Total		2	4							16	15	37
September:												
Dublin		1	1							11	17	30
Elsewhere			11	1		8	2			7	1	30
Total		1	12	1		8	2			18	18	60
October:												
Dublin			2			22				27	16	67
Elsewhere			7		2	46				9	5	69
Total			9		2	68				36	21	136

Year and place issued	Preference 1st	2nd	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th	Nonpreference	Nonquota	Immediate relative	Special immigrant	Total
Fiscal year 1969—Continued												
November:												
Dublin			4			27				13	19	63
E'sewhere			4			35	2			8	4	53
Total			8			62	2			21	23	116
December:												
Dublin		1	2			9				7	6	25
Elsewhere			6	1	1	30	13		8	16	2	77
Total		1	8	1	1	39	13		8	23	8	102

VISAS ISSUED, CONDITIONAL ENTRIES AND ADJUSTMENTS OF STATUS GRANTED IMMIGRANTS BORN IN IRELAND

	Preference 1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th	Non-preference	Immediate relative	Special immigrant	Total
Fiscal year 1969:											
January 1969:											
Dublin		8			16	2			5	9	40
Elsewhere		1			8	2			9	2	22
Total		9			24	4			14	11	62
February:											
Dublin		3		1	8	8			9	7	36
Elsewhere		3			13	9			6	1	32
Total		6		1	21	17			15	8	68
March:											
Dublin	1	12		6	17	19		1	7	6	69
Elsewhere		4		1	7	1		1	5	7	26
Total	1	16		7	24	20		2	12	13	95
April:											
Dublin		12		3	24	17		20	9	8	93
Elsewhere					10	3			10	4	27
Total		12		3	34	20		20	19	12	120
May:											
Dublin		7		1	24			44	16	8	100
Elsewhere		1			15			22	9	5	52
Total		8		1	39			66	25	13	152
June 1969:											
Dublin	2	5			41	9		155	10	8	230
Elsewhere		2			11			39	9	2	63
Total	2	7			52	9		194	19	10	293
Fiscal year, 1969, grand total:											
Dublin	6	58		11	188	55		220	129	127	794
Elsewhere	28		2	4	126	20		77	116	41	414
Adjustment of status	2	23			102	45		27			199
Total	8	109	2	15	416	120		324	245	168	1,407
Fiscal year 1970:											
July 1969:											
Dublin		1		1	29			11	9	12	63
Elsewhere		1			8	1		9	4	3	26
Total		2		1	37	1		20	13	15	89
August:											
Dublin		7			25	9		28	12	13	94
Elsewhere					16	1		48	10	4	79
Total		7			41	10		76	22	17	173
September:											
Dublin	1	7		4	26	10			13	14	75
Elsewhere		4			8	4			10	2	28
Total	1	11		4	34	14			23	16	103
October:											
Dublin	1	8		4	13	18		3	12	8	67
Elsewhere		3			9	4		4	16	7	43
Total	1	11		4	22	22		7	28	15	110
November:											
Dublin	1	11		1	9	10		1	8	3	44
Elsewhere		1			4	17		5	7	3	37
Total	1	12		1	13	27		6	15	6	81
December:											
Dublin	1	4			26			3	7	8	49
Elsewhere		2			17	8		7	8	2	44
Total	1	6			43	8		10	15	10	93
January 1970:											
Dublin	2	4			20	17		4	5	5	57
Elsewhere					11	17		3	5		36
Total	2	4			31	34		7	10	5	93

VISAS ISSUED, CONDITIONAL ENTRIES, AND ADJUSTMENTS OF STATUS GRANTED IMMIGRANTS BORN IN IRELAND—Continued

	Preference							Non-preference	Immediate relative	Special immigrant	Total
	1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th				
Fiscal year 1970 —Continued											
February 1970:											
Dublin		1			27	13		2	4	4	51
Elsewhere		1			8	6		7	6	2	30
Total		2			35	19		9	10	6	81
March:											
Dublin		5			34	4		3	8	4	58
Elsewhere					15	2		5	7		29
Total		5			49	6		8	15	4	87
April:											
Dublin	1	3			9	3		8	14	6	44
Elsewhere		2			15	4		16	7	3	47
Total	1	5			24	7		24	21	9	91
May:											
Dublin	1	9			8	1		2	8	10	39
Elsewhere		4		2	7	1		2	11	3	30
Total	1	13		2	15	2		4	19	13	69
June:											
Dublin	3	5			28	1		6	10	4	57
Elsewhere	1	1		2	22			12	10	2	50
Total	4	6		2	50	1		18	20	6	107
Fiscal year 1970, Grand total:											
Dublin	11	65		10	254	86		71	110	91	698
Elsewhere	1	19		4	140	65		118	101	31	479
Adjustments of status	2	27	2		185	51		40			307
Total	14	111	2	14	579	202		229	211	122	1,484
Fiscal year 1971:											
July:											
Dublin	1	5			27			6	13	13	65
Elsewhere		1			20	5		17	10	2	55
Total	1	6			47	5		23	23	15	120
August:											
Dublin		7			14	9		11	12	8	61
Elsewhere	1	1			17	4		6	10		39
Total	1	8			31	13		17	22	8	100
September:											
Dublin		8			34	6		10	11	13	82
Elsewhere		2			16	1		6	9	3	37
Total		10			50	7		16	20	16	119
October:											
Dublin	1	3			17	9		24	8	13	75
Elsewhere					11	8		11	4	3	37
Total	1	3			28	17		35	12	16	112
November:											
Dublin		3			12	7		16	3	11	52
Elsewhere		1			6	8		10	9	5	39
Total		4			18	15		26	12	16	91
December:											
Dublin		5			8	5		20	15	2	55
Elsewhere				1	6	7		7	7	7	35
Total		5		1	14	12		27	22	9	90
January:											
Dublin	1	4			12	3		16	6	5	47
Elsewhere		1			10	2		7	5	1	26
Total	1	5			22	5		23	11	6	73
February:											
Dublin	1				15	1		7	5	4	33
Elsewhere		1		1	15	9		7	9	2	44
Total	1	1		1	30	10		14	14	6	77
March:											
Dublin					21	14		3	5	3	46
Elsewhere		2			6	2		2	7		19
Total		2			27	16		5	12	3	65
April:											
Dublin	1	5			12	12		4	11	2	47
Elsewhere		4			1	1		5	4	3	18
Total	1	9			13	13		9	15	5	65
May:											
Dublin		2			20	1		16	11	3	53
Elsewhere	1	1			12	1		5	6	4	30
Total	1	3			32	2		21	17	7	83

	Preference							Non-preference	Immediate relative	Special immigrant	Total
	1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th				
Fiscal year 1971—Continued											
June:											
Dublin		4			13	1		30	10	8	66
Elsewhere					2			7	6	1	16
Total		4			15	1		37	16	9	82
Total 1971:											
Dublin	5	46			205	68		163	110	85	682
Elsewhere	2	14		2	122	48		90	86	31	395
Adjustments	2	23	1	8	364	83		55			536
Total	9	83	1	10	691	199		308	196	116	1,613
Fiscal year 1972 (July 1971–January 1972):											
July:											
Dublin	2	3			17	10		14	5	6	57
Elsewhere		1			4	8		4	13	1	31
Total	2	4			21	18		18	18	7	88
August:											
Dublin	1	3			12	7		12	16	7	57
Elsewhere		1			7	2		5	9	2	26
Total	1	4			19	9		17	24	9	83
September:											
Dublin	2	8			13	5		24	13	15	80
Elsewhere					8			8	5	4	25
Total	2	8			21	5		32	18	19	105
October:											
Dublin		5			14	3		6	5	4	37
Elsewhere		2	3		14	1		2	4	2	28
Total		7	3		28	4		8	9	6	65
November:											
Dublin		3			20			7	8	8	46
Elsewhere		1	1		8	5		4	10		29
Total		4	1		28	5		11	18	8	75
December:											
Dublin				4	14	3		7	4	7	39
Elsewhere		2		2	7	1		4	5		21
Total		2		6	21	4		11	9	7	60
January:											
Dublin		2			8	1		18	10	6	45
Elsewhere					3			5	3	2	13
Total		2			11	1		23	13	8	58
July–January:											
Dublin	5	24		4	98	29		88	60	53	361
Elsewhere		7	4	2	51	17		32	49	11	173
Adjustments		39	1		294	60		32			426
Total	5	70	5	6	443	106		152	109	64	960

Similar declines in immigration have affected several other countries as well—countries which were also traditional sources of young men and women intent upon making their lives in the United States, and thereby bringing new blood to this country. These include Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Norway, and Sweden.

In 1967, during the transition period from the old national origins quota system to the first-come, first-served system, I became aware of the drastic decline in immigration from countries which have supplied "new seed" immigrants throughout our history. After intensive study of the problem, it was determined that a special hardship was created by the new section of the law which required a labor certification for all applicants who were not eligible by reason of a family relationship or professional preparation. The "new seed" immigrant—the young man or young woman who had little opportunity for skill, education, or training but who was ambitious—had long been admitted to our shores to pursue the "golden dream." Under the new law, however, this opportunity had been denied most of these people.

On April 10, 1968, I introduced H.R. 16593—a bill which would make additional visas available to countries of the Eastern Hemisphere which had been disadvantaged by the new law. At that time there were 22 cosponsors of the legislation—22 Members who were sufficiently disturbed about this inequity in the immigration law to join me in trying to correct it. Although hearings were held on July 3, 1968, no action was taken in that Congress.

In the 91st Congress when I reintroduced my bill, then H.R. 165, with cosponsors, 76 Members joined me in sponsoring it. During 1969 another hearing was held on December 10, 1969. Fifteen Members submitted statements at the July 1968 hearings, and three more made statements at the December 1969 hearings; other witnesses included Governor-elect Cahill of New Jersey and representatives from the American Irish National Immigration Committee, the Steuben Society, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the American Radio Association, AFL–CIO, and the German-American Immigration Committee of New Jersey.

My bill, as originally introduced, set a floor under immigration. It provided that in any year, in which immigration from any country dropped below 75 percent of the average immigration from that country for the period 1956–65, additional visas would be supplied in the following fiscal year to that country to make up the difference between the number issued and 75 percent of the average for the base period. Today the bill, which we are considering, embraces the formula set forth in that legislation.

Section 1 of H.R. 9615 is based on two simple premises. One, the benefits which have accrued from the 1965 amendments to Southern European countries and the African and Asian nations should in no way be mitigated or diminished. Two, the adverse consequences which have resulted should be rectified.

Section 1 establishes a floor for every country. This floor is equal to 75 percent of the average immigration from that country for the decade 1956–65. When a country's emigration to the United States in a given year is less than this floor, that country may receive additional visas the next year in an amount equal to the difference between the actual emigration and the floor. In no case may more than 7,500 additional visas be issued for any one country.

In addition, section 1 of H.R. 9615 sets up an allocation as between preferences for these additional visas, and it eliminates the labor certification requirement of section 212(a)(14) as it applies to these added immigrants. The reason for eliminating this requirement lies in the fact that the seed immigration which is so beneficial to the United States is largely made up of young men and women who have not yet learned a skill sufficient to enable them to obtain this certification. This circumstance is the reason for the severe decline which Ireland has experienced. Labor certification erects a barrier which cannot be surmounted.

Now, let me illustrate with figures how the formula would operate. Suppose, for the decade 1956–65 country X had an average emigration to the United States of 6,000 people. Its emigration has fallen—in fiscal year 1970 to 2,000 and in fiscal year 1971 to 1,500.

The floor whereby the number of additional visas is determined is 75 percent of the average immigration for 1956–65—in the case of country X this means 4,500; for example, 75 percent of 6,000. Now, we subtract 2,000—the number of visas issued in fiscal year 1970—from 4,500 and arrive at 2,500 as the number of additional visas available for country X in fiscal year 1971. Thus, in fiscal year 1971, had H.R. 9615 been in effect, the immigration from country X could have amounted to 4,000—the 1,500 who came in under present provisions of the law, and the 2,500 additional admissible under the bill.

The chart in House Report 92–506 at page 5 shows all the countries which would have been—because their emigration declined—eligible for additional visas under H.R. 9615 and the maximum number of additional visas which they might have received if H.R. 9615 had been in effect in fiscal year 1971 and if applicants actually had applied for them.

Let me list what H.R. 9615 does and does not do.

What does section 1 do?

First. It offers a solution to a problem which is not going to disappear unless action is taken to resolve it.

Second. It enables those countries which have been injured by the 1965 amendments to receive some reasonable relief. At the same time it does not disadvantage any country which benefited by virtue of the 1965 act.

Third. It recognizes the sociological ebbs and tides of immigration from any given country. If 1 year there is no demand for visas, then it will not matter. If the next year, a demand appears, the low immigration the preceding year will enable a sufficient number of additional visas to be issued.

Fourth. It recognizes the value of seed immigrants, and gives them a chance to enter the United States, in limited numbers.

What does section 1 not do?

First. It does not open the door to uncontrolled, mass immigration. Keying the floor to the 1956-65 average, and then taking 75 percent of the average, and in no event more than 7,500, assures this.

Second. It does not disadvantage any country—such as Greece, Italy, Spain, or the Asian and African nations—which has benefited from the 1965 amendments.

Third. It does not revive the national origins quota system. The formula for the floor is based on the actual level of immigration during the base period. The formula is not based on the former national quota which a country had under the old law. It in no way impinges upon the 1965 amendments which effectively opened the door to immigration from those nations which previously were discriminated against. It merely brings equity into an unforeseen inequitable situation.

Section 2 of this bill sets an effective period of 4 fiscal years.

In addition, under section 1, it will be possible to relieve the pressure of the oversubscription of dependency areas such as Antigua, British Honduras, and the British Virgin Islands. Those areas will be able to benefit by the additional visas to which the mother countries would be entitled.

Sections 3 and 4 would make special visas available to those countries which have continuously experienced sizable backlogs in the fifth preference category, contrary to the purpose of the 1965 act, which was intended to wipe out existing backlogs. This objective was not achieved, and the present backlog of Italians in the fifth preference category is approximately 88,178. Under the bill, visas in an amount equal to 25 percent of the total fourth preference registration of any foreign state as of July 1, 1964, will be made available to aliens from the state who are the beneficiaries of the fifth preference petitions filed prior to July 1, 1971. The total number of visas to be made available during the 4-year period is 39,674, with 28,680 visas available to Italian applicants. Thus, 7,170 visas would be available to Italy for each of the 4 years.

I have long been concerned about the continuing backlog of fifth preference applicants and have introduced legislation (H.R. 1647) in this and previous Congresses to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers or sisters of the U.S. citizens.

H.R. 9615, which has the support of the American Irish National Immigration Committee, the American Committee on Italian Migration, the Steuben Society of America as well as the Joint Committee for Fair Immigration, among others, is the result of a several-year effort to find a legislative solution to the unanticipated effects of the 1965 act.

Credit for bringing the problem of reduced Irish immigration to the attention of the Congress belongs to the American Irish National Immigration Committee, and its chairman, John Collins, and its vice chairman, the Very Reverend Donald M. O'Callaghan. In 1967 and 1968 Members of Congress were apprised of the impending eclipse of Irish immigration by the work of the committee. Since then the American Irish National Immigration Committee has worked tirelessly to build support for remedial legislation. It has been joined in this effort by the American Committee on Italian Migration which under the leadership of the Reverend Joseph A. Cogo, C.S., has sought to make the 1965 act live up to its promise of eliminating the large fifth preference backlog in Italy. The dual thrust of this legislation is the culmination of the efforts of both groups which have also been joined by the Steuben Society of America.

I should like to express appreciation particularly to the following Members of Congress who in this or past Congresses have sponsored my original legislation:

LIST OF SPONSORS

Joseph P. Addabbo, Herman Badillo, Frank Annunzio, William A. Barrett, Mario Biaggi, Jonathan Bingham, Edward P. Boland, Frank T. Bow, Frank J. Brasco, James A. Burke, Phillip Burton, Daniel Button, James A. Byrne, Hugh L. Carey, Jeffrey Cohelan, Harold R. Collier, Dominick V. Daniels, James J. Delaney, John H. Dent, Edward Derwinski, Harold Donohue, John Dow, Thaddeus Dulski, Leonard Farbstein, Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Samuel N. Friedel, James G. Fulton, and Cornelius Gallagher.

Robert N. Giaimo, Jacob Gilbert, Henry Gonzalez, William Green, James R. Grover, Seymour Halpern, Margaret M. Heckler, Henry Helstoski, Louise Day Hicks, Charles G. Joelson, John C. Kluczynski, Edward I. Koch, Clarence D. Long, Allard K. Lowenstein, Torbert Macdonald, Richard McCarthy, Joseph McDade, Stewart B. McKinney, Martin B. McKneally, Ray J. Madden, Thomas J. Meskill, Abner Mikva, Joseph G. Minish, John S. Monagan, John M. Murphy, William T. Murphy, and Robert N. C. Nix.

Thomas P. O'Neill, Richard L. Ottinger, Edward J. Patten, Philip J. Philbin, Otis Pike, Bertram Podell, Adam Clayton Powell, Roman Pucinski, Henry S. Reuss, Ogden Reid, Daniel J. Ronan, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, Fernand St Germain, William St. Onge, Charles W. Sandman, James Scheuer, William Stanton, John Stanton, Robert Taft, Jr., Frank J. Thompson, Robert O. Tiernan, Joseph Vigorito, Lowell P. Weicker, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Lester L. Wolff, John W. Wydler, and Gus Yatron.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. Many Italians and Irish desire to come to this country.

Both groups have contributed enormously to this Nation.

I was a strong supporter of the elimination of the old discriminatory system but the new law has worked a hardship on these two groups and this bill to eliminate the unanticipated hardships is warranted.

It is special legislation. It is temporary. It is deserved recognition of the contributions of both the Italians and the Irish.

Considering the situation in Ireland it is also timely and perhaps even merciful. I hope the House will pass this bill.

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

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I rise in support of this bill. I am a member of the gentleman's subcommittee. I can certainly state for the RECORD that under his leadership the subcommittee worked long and hard

to wrestle with the problem of the transition from the old national origins principle to the principle which is now in the law.

This bill, as the gentleman from New Jersey so eloquently pointed out, is merely an effort to alleviate some of the undue hardships which have resulted for people caught up in that transition. In no way does it constitute a return to the national origins system, but rather it facilitates the movement away from that principle.

I should also like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG) who pointed out the impact of this on the labor situation in the United States is de minimis. When we consider there are 5 million people unemployed in this country and that last year we sent back to their countries of origin 400,000 illegal immigrants who had entered this country illegally, and probably this year will send back a like amount, it seems to me we ought to bring out the fact also that under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) the subcommittee has had extensive hearings on this whole problem of illegal immigration and will soon be considering legislation to tighten up the enforcement of the immigration laws.

If we really mean to do something about stopping immigration that has a real impact upon our unemployment problem in this country, we should concentrate on that rather than try to attack this very modest effort to correct inequities and eliminate hardships to individuals that resulted from the old national origins quota system.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because we have not yet had any discussion of the statement made by the Department of State opposing this bill. I do not think that has been pointed out to the Members of this body, for the precise reason that it represents a step backward toward a national origins quota system—a system which the Department continues to oppose. In view of the fact that you and others here have said it does not represent a step backward, would the gentleman care to explain why the State Department is taking a contrary position on this measure?

Mr. RODINO. I cannot imagine why the State Department is stating that it regards it as a step backward to the national origin system. This is not permanent legislation. This is a piece of legislation which is designed to correct the inequities resulting from the changeover from the national origins quota system. In enacting the 1965 amendments we failed to provide for just those things that are now occurring. In no instance does this bill revert to national origins.

Mr. CONYERS. May I point out to the gentleman in the report on page 12, in a letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, he states, and I quote:

In addition, these provisions establish "national origins quotas" and it will be necessary to maintain a control system for the allocation of the visas within each "quota."

It creates the anomalous situation of providing a special benefit for a number of fifth and sixth preference applicants chargeable to these dependent areas while providing no benefit whatever to people from these areas directly with regard to higher preference classification.

Mr. RODINO. I would answer the gentleman from Michigan by stating that the allegation on the part of the State Department that this is reverting back to national origins is without foundation. This is not legislation that is permanent in nature. Rather, it seeks to correct inequities that occurred as a result of the national origins quota system—a system whose repeal I had worked for strenuously, since I first came to the Congress. It was a great victory when this repugnant system was replaced in 1965 by the present first-come, first-served preference system.

I will continue to vehemently oppose any return to the old system, and I can assure you that this bill does not represent such a return. Once again, this is temporary legislation and nationality is not the sole criteria for determining eligibility for a special visa under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would like the RECORD to show that the reason why this bill is a good bill is because the State Department is against it, and the State Department has always been against anything that is good for America.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us essentially does two things. In the first place, it operates to permit additional immigrants and additional visas for and during a temporary 4-year period from certain countries which were disadvantaged immigrationwise by the changover in the basis of the immigration statutes which was accomplished here in 1965. Now, the bill does this in the following manner:

It provides that if in any fiscal year after June 30, 1970, the total number of immigrants admitted from any foreign state was less than three-quarters of the average annual number admitted from that state during a 10-year base period from 1956 to 1965, that in that case, and in the case of a country which finds itself in that situation, there shall, during the 4 years ensuing after the passage of the bill, be made available to immigrants from such a country an additional number of visas for the succeeding fiscal year which will be equal to the difference between the number of visas made available to them in the preceding year and three-fourths of their average in that base period.

For example, in the country of Great Britain the 10-year average in the base period was 27,574. Seventy-five percent of that figure is 20,680. Actually 8,719 were admitted in fiscal year 1971.

Now, there is a ceiling on this. The maximum you can get under the formula in any case is 7,500, and the difference there would be more. So, Great Britain, gets the maximum of 7,500.

But if you take Ireland, the average was 7,185 in the base period and 75 percent of that is 5,389. In fiscal year 1971 they only actually had 1,293 admitted. So, you subtract the 1,293 from the 75 percent of the average and you get 4,096 additional visas for Irishmen during fiscal year 1972.

As I say, this part of the bill is designed to correct a disadvantage which the changeover in 1965 operated to inflict on these countries, and they are basically countries from northern Europe.

The main beneficiaries of this section of the bill are Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, Poland, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, and the Russians, if they let them in.

I point out to the committee that these are all northern European people, or most of them are northern European people, from the stocks which have formed in the past a great part of the immigrants to this country, stock from which many of us have sprung, people who have rather readily been assimilated, and who have made good citizens of this country.

The second part of the bill seeks to correct another situation which is thought to present some inequity, and it does—this, again, over a 4-year period. It makes available to qualified immigrants from any foreign country additional special visas equal to 25 percent of the fourth preference, which we now call the fifth preference, registration for that state which was pending on July 1, 1964.

Now, that fifth preference is given to brothers and sisters of American citizens. We have a large potential backlog in some cases. The State Department estimates that, although they might not all ask for it, there probably are potentially 190,000 or 200,000 people who would be qualified under the fifth preference as brothers and sisters of American citizens but who were never able to be reached, or to come here, because the overall limitations or ceilings from these countries were exhausted before they were reached.

We have no legal obligation to clear up this backlog, but it is thought to be an equitable thing to do.

The second part of this bill provides for these additional visas, in number equal to 25 percent of such registrations as were pending on July 1, 1964, again over a 4-year period.

The chief beneficiaries of this part of the bill are the Italians, with the Greeks second, and after that I think the Portuguese and the Polish.

Under the first section of the bill, the part which deals basically with the northern European countries, it is estimated we would have something around 30,000 to 32,000 additional visas the first

year. And for those 4 years there will be about 30,000 per year; you cannot be sure about it, but for the 4 years you will get about 120,000 additionally under the first part of the bill.

Under the second part of the bill, the so-called Italian part, you get about 10,000 a year for the 4 years, or about 40,000 people. So altogether you get about 160,000 additional immigrants, 120,000 of whom will come under the first section, the northern European section, approximately 40,000 of whom will come under the second section. That is assuming that those visas which will be available are actually picked up. And out of that 40,000 approximately 28,000 would be Italians.

That is what the bill does, basically.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman in the well if he is suggesting that the figure of 120,000 is the figure for the quota for 1 year?

Mr. DENNIS. No; it is about 30,000 a year under the first part of this bill, which would make for the 4-year period 120,000; about 10,000 under the second portion of the bill per year, which would mean 40,000 for 4 years. So there would be a total of approximately 160,000 for the 4 years.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I am going to offer here at the appropriate time, to the second part of the bill, and that is simply to provide that in the future the fifth preference, which now covers all brothers and sisters of American citizens, shall be limited only to the unmarried brothers and sisters.

There are several reasons for that amendment. It seems to me, in the first place, that if we are going to clear up a backlog in the fifth preference, which there is no legal obligation to do, but if we are going to do it as a matter of equity, that it is a fair thing at the same time to take some step to help avoid the accumulation of this backlog again. And, of course, this would cut down, quite materially, the number of fifth-preference eligibles, and therefore it would tend to keep the backlog from occurring. And I might point out to the House that we have had at least three previous backlog cleanups, in 1959, 1961, and 1962. And the 40,000 people who would be admitted under this bill will not anywhere near clean up the backlog, or the potential backlog, at least, which exists.

So it seems fair, if you are going to give this relief, to do something at the same time to keep it from recurring.

This particular amendment is recommended as law, not necessarily as part of this bill, but as a part of an overhauling of the immigration laws, by the Immigration Department, and it is included in an overhauling bill of which my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is the author. So it is not a measure which I have dreamed up. It is a well-considered measure. And the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey—and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman in just one moment—contends, as I understand him—and I will give him a chance to speak for himself—that this type of reform should wait on an overall reform of the immigration law.

My answer to that is that if we are going to get special legislation to clean up the backlog it is perfectly legitimate and reasonable at the same time to legislate on the special point of keeping the backlog from recurring.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I would want to make the point clear, that I have considered and as a result of consideration have introduced legislation which is designed to be permanent legislation which would change the preference system and then we would provide for the limitation of brothers and sisters to the unmarried brothers and sisters category.

But that proposition is based on considering legislation permanent in nature. What the gentleman is suggesting in his amendment is to add permanent legislation onto a temporary measure and at the same time not provide for the needed change in the preference system.

Incidentally, as the gentleman knows, I have already scheduled hearings on the overall change in the preference system.

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. As the House may see, the distinguished gentleman and I are simply in disaccord and disagreement on that particular matter.

I can only say, again, that if you are going to pass special legislation to clean up this backlog, which we are under no obligation to do, it is a perfectly logical time to pass legislation to keep the backlog from coming back to plague us and lead to future legislation as has been the case in the past.

Moreover, I think it is fair to point out to the committee in this connection that the amendment which I will propose and which will in the future limit the fifth preference to unmarried brothers and sisters only is consistent with the thrust of the immigration law, which is to reunite families.

Those people who are married have families of their own. They have formed another family unit and they do not need to come in, to be consistent with our statute. But they do, by virtue of having large families of their own, bring a great many more people in than I think the statute ever intended.

I would like to point out, further, in connection with this amendment, that it is so reasonable that, in fact, it was adopted after full debate by a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary in the first instance.

So, I am really supporting the committee's original views. But the gentleman from New Jersey is such a persuasive member of that committee that he got them to change their minds. So I am giving this committee a chance to change it back.

Now I say to the House, this bill is a corrective bill to correct an injustice both in the first part of the bill, the northern European part, and in the second part of the bill. If my amendment is included, it will also be, additionally, a remedial bill in that it will not correct these injustices but it will, to some extent, prevent some of them from recurring.

I would like to point out also that the amendment does not affect the amount or number of special visas made available under this legislation. It does not affect the overall ceiling as to any country. It merely applies, in the future, to those who will be admitted under the fifth preference; that is, unmarried brothers and sisters of American citizens.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman does not wish to mislead the Members, in any way, that the subcommittee charged with the responsibility of considering this bill was under any pressure.

I am sure that what the gentleman refers to as the maximum number of persons that might be admitted, he does not mean to say that we came under pressures from Germany, where there is an excellent employment situation, or from Poland, where we doubt very much these people could possibly leave, or from Great Britain and so many other places around the world.

The fact of the matter is that we were concerned primarily with the Irish and the Italian situation, and if you take those numbers, they are insignificant compared with the maximum numbers that the gentleman mentioned in the well a moment ago.

Mr. DENNIS. I will say to the gentleman, I do not think I said anything about any pressures from any place. I have made a statement about what the provisions of the bill will do, which I believe to have been an accurate statement, and I submitted to the House that this is a legitimate, corrective bill in both of its phases. I intend to support the bill. But it is a much better bill if we take action to prevent the recurrence, at least in some measure, of the problem which we face in section 2.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. Right along the lines of the discussion prior to the gentleman's last statement in summation, why are there extra visas made available to some 27 countries under the first section of this bill when we seem to be informed and advised here on the floor that this is not only a St. Patrick's Day project but is designed to favor our traditional friends from Ireland, England, and Italy in the second section? Why make these extra visas available when there is no indication that they might come in?

Mr. DENNIS. The argument is made that perhaps they will not all be asked for. My personal opinion is that that has to be speculation, pretty much. We drew the bill so there will be a certain number of additional visas available for those countries. Whether they will be picked

up or not, and used, of course, is somewhat of a different proposition. But the legislation is general, and that is what it provides and permits.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I have one other question that I think is pertinent. My position is well known in this regard. I made a statement on the floor of the House in a special order on January 18, 1972. I did not support the original Public Law 89-236 when it was debated on the floor before. But be that as it may, how do we justify admitting more than 32,000 a year for the next 4 years, as the gentleman has pointed out, without even the requirement of Labor statistics, when we have such high unemployment that the majority party rails against regularly?

Mr. DENNIS. The gentleman, of course, has raised one of the controversial points in the bill. I would rather agree with the gentlemen who have spoken before who would say that the rather small numbers here involved and the fact that, according to hearings we have been having that I have been attending, many of the types of jobs which might be filled here are those which, even today, are very difficult to fill with American citizens, and yet the jobs are there and people need them to be done, this is a partial answer.

Over and above that we merely have to weigh the unemployment situation, for whatever it may be worth, against a correction of the injustice to which this particular measure is aiming.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I would merely say to that that we are correcting the wrong error. Maybe we have undermined the will to work of the people of America by too much subsidization and too much security and too much Federal legislation. But why is it that there is a negative report from both the Department of Labor and the Department of State, as well as the FBI and the CIA as far as the passage of the bill is concerned?

Mr. DENNIS. I would not disagree with the gentleman from Missouri, as I think he knows, about the fact that we have discouraged the work ethic and the will to work too much in this country, but perhaps it would not hurt anything if we got a few good Irishmen in here who were willing to work.

Mr. HALL. Particularly if one's name was "Dennis" and the other's name was "O'Neill."

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the gentleman. I support the bill and urge its adoption, particularly if my amendment is put on it, which will make a fairly good bill into a rather good bill.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a very important legislative proposal in that it offers an opportunity for this Nation to once again illustrate its humane character.

The bill (H.R. 9615) would correct the unforeseen inequities in the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act. The 1965 act, which became fully effective in 1968, repealed the national origins quota system and substituted a ceiling on Eastern Hemisphere immigration on a first-come, first-served basis, within various preference categories. Unfortunately, it has resulted in the drastic decline of immigration from Ireland and increased the backlog of fifth-preference applicants, the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, from Italy. This situation developed as a result of amendments which were added to the 1965 bill before its enactment.

H.R. 9615 is designed to correct the inequities resulting from the act of October 3, 1965. In fact, the dual thrust of the bill carries out the intent and purpose of the 1965 amendments to allow each country an opportunity to compete fairly and equitably for visas by creating a temporary floor on immigration based upon a 10-year average and by the partial, but reasonable, elimination of the backlog in the fifth preference. It was agreed in 1965, and it is no less important today, that the inequities of, and the deficiencies in, our immigration law, must be eliminated before the United States can fully embark on a fair, reasonable, and an equitable immigration policy. This bill does not in any way reinstate the national origins concept for selecting immigrants.

Mr. Chairman, as I said initially, this is an opportunity for us to illustrate our humane character. In 1965 many of us, and I for one, sincerely believed we were correcting the inequities of our previous immigration laws. We did, in part, correct those inequities. Experience under that act has shown, however, that all the then-existing problems have not been solved. As a consequence of the 3-year phaseout period of the old system, the backlogs in some oversubscribed preferences were not eliminated as intended by the proponents of the legislation and immigration from the former high-quota countries was adversely affected. This bill, as reported from the committee, should help correct that situation.

I know that efforts will be made to amend the bill. The amendments would be most detrimental to attaining the true purpose and be contrary to the original purposes of the act.

I most strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill as reported by the committee, rejecting all amendments.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for those generous remarks about the Irish and, of course, he speaks the truth as he always does.

I would like to point out, without plowing the same ground which has already been gone over, we ought to stress the fact that this is temporary legislation designed to correct inequities that resulted from transition from the old national origins plan to the new first-come-first-served plan. The legislation would expire after 4 years and would not be part of the permanent legislation on immigration. Congress intended, when it enacted in 1965 the amendments to the Immigration and Naturalization Act, that no country would be disadvantaged by the transition to the new system, and that all existing backlogs would be eliminated during the transitional period.

This has not been the case, and this legislation before us today is designed to try to carry out that objective. Immigration from Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, Germany, and some other countries has been sharply curtailed since immigrants from these countries were unable to qualify under the new preference system which required a labor certification or were unable to compete on an equal basis with immigrants from other countries who had earlier immigration dates.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the comment made by the gentleman from Missouri about the opposition of the State Department. I think we have to recognize there is a built-in propensity on the part of some Government agencies to resist change, and this may have a great deal to do with the opposition of the State Department to this proposal.

During hearings, the State Department did, however, indicate that they could work out the administrative problems incidental to the first section of this bill if it were enacted.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE), a Member of the committee.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee for his excellent presentation of just what is involved in this bill, and particularly to express my support of the very beneficial amendment that the gentleman has described to us. I will speak on that in more detail when it is actually offered.

I do not like to have what I consider the unfortunate and intemperate remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) about the Department of State go unchallenged in this RECORD. I really hope that on reflection the gentleman will agree that he went a great deal further in his blanket condemnation of the State Department than the facts warrant. I would suggest to the gentleman that the many loyal and dedicated American citizens who work in that Department deserve much fairer treatment from his hands or from other Members of this Congress than were expressed in his outburst.

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

Mr. MAYNE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois in just a moment.

Mr. Chairman, I personally know many hard-working Americans both in and out of this country who have performed and continue to perform distinguished service in the Department of State, some under conditions of real hardship and danger, even to the risk of life itself. Some State Department personnel in the performance of duty have been killed within the last year in foreign countries. I must take strong exception to the remarks of the gentleman

from Illinois, as I strongly feel that those of us in the legislative branch of the Government can find no justification for being so self-righteous as to find no merit whatsoever in the work of this most senior of all our executive departments. In November of 1970 it was my privilege to visit 15 African countries with other members of the House Committee on Agriculture on official business. I was very favorably impressed with the high caliber of performance of our Foreign Service officers in each of the countries visited, and found the enthusiasm, ability, and dedication of our younger officers most inspiring.

It is my own observation based on personal experience that our Foreign Service officers' performance of duty in the field compares very favorably with the performance of many Congressmen.

I would also say that in asserting the position the State Department has taken on this bill and opposing a return to the national origins quota system, the State Department is following the lead of every American President from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to Richard Nixon, Republican and Democrat alike. When the gentleman from Michigan said that this bill was retrogressive, that it was a slipping back to the national origins quota system by singling out specific countries for favored treatment, he was precisely correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, yielding. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join a number of other Members of this body in criticizing the State Department because there is no department of the Government that is so sacrosanct that it cannot be criticized. I was not attacking the employees of the State Department, merely the policy.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to have the gentleman from Illinois make clear that he has no criticism of the personnel of the State Department, because those are the people I am interested in, the human beings who make its work possible, the thousands of dedicated professionals who labor long and hard, sometimes in the most unfavorable circumstances to carry out the historic mission of that Department.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, if I could carry a tune I would get up here and, rather than say anything, sing, "When Irish Eyes Are Smiling" or a verse of "O Solo Mio," because this is a great day. Unfortunately, I cannot sing.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9615 which would remove two inequities which have developed since the passage of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1965 and oppose the so-called Dennis amendment.

One problem created by the new law is the unfortunate situation which has been created for formerly privileged countries. When the 1965 act was first formulated, a 5-year phaseout period was contemplated in order to give the privileged countries a realistic opportunity to adjust to the new system. The phaseout period instead was reduced to 3 years and, as a consequence, immigration from former high quota countries has been affected adversely. For example, immigration from Ireland has dwindled from an average of 5,000 before 1965 to little more than 1,000 at present. To correct this inequity, immigrants from previously undersubscribed countries would be allocated additional visas.

The second problem that the 1965 act failed to correct is the huge backlog in some oversubscribed preferences. Contrary to the intent of the proponents of the 1965 legislation, these backlogs in the fifth preference in particular have been reduced by an insignificant amount.

Under the legislation we are now considering, this problem would be remedied somewhat, with the issuance of additional visas for this category. Primary beneficiaries would be Italy, Greece, Poland, and Portugal.

The need for corrective legislation is clear. This bill would only accord to those countries immigration benefits intended for them but which were denied them because of the amended version of the 1965 legislation.

I earnestly hope that my colleagues will join me in approving this temporary measure which will eliminate some of the inequities in our present immigration policies.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, in the short time I have I wish to extend my congratulations to the entire subcommittee for what I believe is a fine bill that they have presented us the opportunity of acting on today.

For myself, not being on the committee, and having to do a good deal of work to study what was at stake, I also want to thank an outside group, the American Committee on Italian Migration, who have done a great deal of research work in this area under the leadership of Reverend Cogo, who I believe has made a real contribution to my being able to affirmatively support this legislation.

Particularly what I should like to say is I hope this legislation, when we do vote on it, is passed in its present form and without an amendment that would be in many ways crippling to this bill. Our many fine Italian and Irish Americans in this country deserve better treatment than the Dennis amendment would give them. I will vote for the bill and against the amendment.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I came into this Chamber today prepared to endorse this bill enthusiastically, until I heard the speech of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) who called my attention to the fact that in his opinion this was a retreat to the national origins system.

Then I read in the committee report the statement of the Department of State, which is quite clear, and which states their opinion of what we are doing here.

In looking over the bill, it is apparent that there is a built-in prejudice, that we are looking to assist two countries, which may be all right, but I believe we ought to recognize, at least, what we are doing.

I notice that the Department of Labor stands opposed to this.

I notice, in addition, that the Immigration and Naturalization Service was not even invited to appear at the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the bill may be all right. Who can argue about opening up additional opportunities for people to enjoy this great and wonderful country of ours? On the other hand, one would wonder why we have to go back to a kind of preference system on which we have turned our back previously, and which we profess is not what we really want.

The lack of labor certification, at a time of high unemployment, causes many problems as well, for I hear continued moans from the other side of this Chamber about that unemployment situation, and about the continuing needs for new programs. Of course, lacking labor certification, we will get additional unemployment in this country.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID) for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. REID. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding. I highly commend the committee for its efforts on this legislation and rise in strong support of H.R. 9615.

It is entirely fitting that today, the eve of St. Patrick's Day we are considering a bill which will be of primary benefit to two nationalities which have contributed so much to our country—the Irish and the Italians.

When the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 was passed, it repealed the national origins quota concept as a system for selecting immigrants and replaced it with a system of preferential admissions based on the advantages to this country of the skills of the immigrants and the close family ties which existed between those desiring to come to the United States and those already here as citizens and permanent residents. It was the intention of the act that no group would be disadvantaged by this law and that all countries would be able to compete on an equal basis for immigrant visas. However, as a result of amendments added to the bill before it was enacted, various inequities resulted, affected most severely those from Northern Europe and the Italians. H.R. 9615 is remedial legislation, designed to correct these inequities the 1965 law unwittingly created.

The first provision of the law would allocate additional visas to immigrants from previously undersubscribed countries, particularly Ireland. It would place a floor under the number of immigrant visas available annually to any given country, guaranteeing every country 75 percent of the average number of visas it used annually between 1956 and 65,

but not to exceed 7,500. The need for this provision is apparent when we examine the immigraton statistics from a country such as Ireland which received 6,328 visas in 1964 and 1,077 in fiscal 1971. Congress did not have the intention of restricting immigration from Northern Europe when it passed the 1965 act and it is the hope of those of us supporting this legislation that this provision will lead to an unskewing of the preference system insofar as the countries involved are concerned, countries which have contributed so many of our citizens in the past.

The second provision has as its purpose the reduction of a substantial backlog of brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who are presently awaiting fifth preference visas. This legislation would have primary benefit for Italy and the dependencies. As written it would provide over a period of 4 years approximately 28,000 additional immigrant visas for the fifth preference backlog.

As with the first provision affecting Northern Europeans, the need for this provision as well is most apparent. At the moment a desperate situation exists with those registered under fifth preference from Italy, for visas are being issued only to those qualified applicants whose petitions were filed prior to June 1970. This lengthy waiting period works extreme hardships on families who have already been separated for long periods of time. One of the chief purposes of our immigration laws written in 1965 was the reuniting of families and I have always believed that this should in fact be a main objective.

An added advantage of this provision is that applicants for sixth preference—skilled and unskilled labor in short supply—and nonpreference visas, currently unavailable in Italy, would also benefit since the net effect of the provision would be to eliminate the bottleneck at fifth preference thus freeing visas for use by sixth preference and nonpreference applicants.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about the amendment which will be proposed by Mr. DENNIS. This amendment would make a permanent change in the law by eliminating from the fifth preference category "married" brothers and sisters of American citizens. The rationale behind this amendment is that fifth preference will always be oversubscribed and that this change is the only way to alleviate the situation. Mr. Chairman, I categorically oppose this amendment.

First, the intent of our law is the reuniting of families and marriage does not severe blood relationships.

Second, since 65 percent of the present fifth preference applicants are married brothers and sisters, the practical effect of this amendment would be a substantial reduction in the number of immigrants who could come in under fifth preference.

Third, if we are going to address ourselves to a redefinition of the preference system, then this should be done during a general discussion on the revision of the entire act. To single out one preference category in this manner is totally injust since it is targeted at the Italians.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I urge this House to accept H.R. 9615 without amendment. This legislation is entirely equitable, it is reasonably written and is entirely remedial in nature. It does not, as some have suggested, return to a natural origins system. Rather, it corrects once and for all the inequities of discrimination which were created by the old law and which the 1965 act aimed at correcting.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 1 minute to reply to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL)?

Mr. DENNIS. I would like, if the gentleman from Ohio does not mind, to use my own time, because I do not have very much.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. DENNIS, Mr. SHOUP was allowed to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD).

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering a bill which would allow increased immigration into this country at a time when increased immigration is something we can ill afford.

Our country is suffering the throes of economic change, moving from a war-oriented economy to a peace-time one. We are beginning to increase employment—but only beginning—we are facing constant social change and upheaval. Yet at this time of great social and economic change we are also being asked to increase the number of visas to immigrants—to bring more optimistic hope-filled people into a land not all that ready for them.

But there is more here than just the raising of the numbers of visas to persons wishing to move to this country. Our current program of immigration and work force balance is approaching the absurd.

In a simplified way, while the State Department and Immigration Service are working to increase immigrants—while they stand with their proverbial outstretched arms welcoming all who would come to the land with streets paved with gold—the Labor Department is frantically trying to keep the unemployment rate down, find jobs for those who have none, and make room in the American work force for American youth.

The Department of Labor and Department of State are at odds, burning the candle at both ends, so to speak, not bothering to watch what the other is doing, with the Immigration Service holding the candle in the middle.

All three, Mr. Chairman, are very close to getting burned and severely so. The following information will underscore my point.

Canadian Nationals are often given special work visas along the northern tier of States, particularly Montana and North Dakota, as specially trained individuals needed for seismograph and survey crew work. Whole teams of Canadian Nationals have been given such visas when only one or two men in a five-man crew is indeed a specially trained worker. While we have substantial unemployment along the Canadian border, with plenty of men needing work and willing to work at the tasks available on such crews, the Bureau of Immigration is stamping approvals on more and more Canadian National work permits every day.

Especially in the case of Canadian workers, we have seen abuses which point out how lackadaisical the control of alien workers is. Some of the oil field workers have been working in Montana, making very substantial wages on special, supposedly short-term permits for 3 years. Whenever their temporary permits become outdated, they simply go back north for 30 days, get a new permit and come back down. Practically to the same job they left.

Mr. Chairman, another aspect of this situation, that is especially distressing to me, is the situation involving foreign students. When a foreign student enters this country, he or she signs an affidavit stipulating that he or she has the resources needed to live and study in this country for the entire time he or she is entering, yet the policy of allowing foreign students to work part or full time while in this country has been extremely lenient.

This practice is definitely adverse to our own students in need of work, and to our returning Vietnam veterans who need employment.

Also, many of our college youth are faced, this summer, with a summer of no income—of no jobs. Our student youth, many of whom depend on summer jobs to stay in school, can find none and many probably will not be able to return to school next fall because of the lack of income this summer. Rather than being in school, they will be standing in line to get unemployment checks. Not a very good prospect for the student-youth of the most prosperous country on earth.

So, Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing enlarging the number of immigrants to this country, while we are getting ready to open our arms up once again to legions of people full of hope, but destined to being confronted with the frustrations of not finding the streets of America actually paved with that proverbial gold—the Department of Labor, the Department of State, and the Immigration Service have evidenced that they simply do not know what is going on within their own areas of immigration.

They are so split up and buried in their internal dispute responsibility over the immigration problem, especially the special permit worker and student workers, that the bureaucrats themselves are perplexed and confused by it all.

We must, Mr. Chairman, take care of our own first—then take care of the rest of the world. The regulation of immigrants is at best a haphazard affair. For that reason I am voting against H.R. 9615 and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DENNIS. Will the Chairman ad-

vise me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I regret that I have less time than I would be glad to extend to those on both sides, but in reiteration of what I said before I support this bill. I think this is a better bill if my amendment is adopted, which, incidentally, as I stated before, is in accordance with the views of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I think the employment matter is rather de minimus, as my learned legal friends over here have said. I also think such additional Irishmen as we get in here under this bill will be useful citizens. They will have jobs. The same with the additional Italians. Also they will not interfere with the work of any American who really wants to work.

I urge the support of the bill and of the Dennis amendment.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of Italians wishing to emigrate to this country so that they may be reunited with family and friends. There is an estimated backlog of 22,000 Italian immigration requests. This huge backlog is the result of previous discrimination against Italian immigration under the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952 and earlier immigration laws.

We have before the House a bill, H.R. 9615, which would, once and for all, correct the inequities against Italian immigration as well as some other immigration problems. It would extend a relatively small number of special immigration visas for brothers and sisters of American citizens for a short period of time.

We are faced today with attempts to limit the effectiveness of H.R. 9615. In particular the Dennis amendment would permanently bar the married brothers and sisters of American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would bar 65 percent of those in the fifth preference category. By so doing, we would establish a malicious and permanent pattern of discrimination against Italians and only Italians.

In the name of reducing unemployment, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) is challenging the just and legal immigration of the relatives of American citizens. It is false to place the blame for unemployment on legal Italian immigrants.

I am also afraid that the current furor about illegal aliens will have an adverse effect on H.R. 9615 and on Italian immigration. The information we have so far seems to show that the illegal alien problem has a major impact on our large unemployment problem. Unfortunately, the contribution of illegal aliens to unemployment of Americans has led some people to react negatively to all immigration. As you know, most illegal aliens arrive from Mexico; so there is no reason why the illegal alien problem should even indirectly be related to Italian immigration.

Why make the immigrant relatives of Italo-Americans the innocent victims of an unemployment problem they are not responsible for?

Of the total 22,000 potential Italian immigrants, only a small part are potential workers; most of the 22,000 are wives and children. Very often these new immigrants will be bringing skills to this country which are in demand and for which jobs go begging now.

In any case, the number of new Italian immigrants allowed by H.R. 9615—only a few thousand a year—will have a very minor effect in our labor market of almost 90 million workers. The great benefits of family reunification which would result from the immigration of Italians under H.R. 9615 surely outweigh the unlikely possibility that unemployment will increase.

If passed intact, without any changes, H.R. 9615 will mean much to many families I represent and many other Italo-American families throughout the country.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a bill similar to H.R. 9615, and am very pleased at this opportunity, on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, to vote for it and to comment on its merits.

In 1965, in the rush of Great Society legislation, Congress passed major amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. The 1965 amendments abolished the national origins quota system, which for decades had guaranteed countries highly represented in our population in 1920 many more visas than they could use. Ireland, for instance, had an annual quota of 17,756, of which she used an annual average of about 7,000. Italy, on the other hand, had an annual quota of 5,666, which was far from adequate. The national origins quota system heavily favored the countries of Western and Northern Europe at the expense of other countries in the Eastern Hemisphere. Under the current eight-point preference system, the situation has been reversed. Congress has robbed Peter to pay Paul.

The system with which Congress replaced the national origins quota system in 1965 was widely hailed as a model of fairness. It is not. It is as discriminatory in its own way as the national origins quota system. We no longer say you can only come here if your ancestors were here in 1920; now we say you can only come here if your relatives are here now. We no longer say, "Give me your tired, your poor"—as long as they come from the right countries. Now we say, "Give me your skilled, your rich"—and pat ourselves on the backs for opening our gates to all the world.

Under the provisions of the 1965 amendments, immigration from Eastern Hemisphere countries is restricted to 170,000 a year, with a 20,000-per-country limit. The immigrant visas are distributed according to an eight-category priority or preference system, with each preference allotted a certain percentage of the total. First preference is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens; second preference to the spouses and children of permanent resident aliens; third preference to members of the professions and the exceptionally talented; fourth preference to married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens; fifth preference to the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; sixth preference to workers in short supply; seventh preference—conditional entry—to refugees; and nonpreference, any unused numbers, to those meeting the labor certification requirement or those not coming here to work.

Reuniting families and protecting American labor are admirable goals. However, any immigration law which drastically reduces immigration from the countries of Western and Northern Europe, from our closest allies, from the countries whose people made America great, has something very wrong with it. For example, immigration from Ireland fell to 1,077 in fiscal 1971 and will continue downward unless something is done.

Mr. Chairman, John Kennedy's great grandfather could not have come into this country under the current preference system, and I doubt if the great grandfathers of many Members of this House could have either. Patrick Kennedy had no close relatives here, and there has never been a shortage of tenant farmers so he would have been ineligible for labor certification. The only preference Patrick Kennedy might have entered under would be seventh preference refugees, limited to 6 percent. He with millions more, left Ireland in the wake of potato blight, which might have qualified as "a catastrophic natural calamity." Refugees from the conflict in Northern Ireland, which recently claimed its 268th life, are not eligible for entry under the refugee preference category. We only accept refugees fleeing on account of persecution or the fear of persecution because of race, religion, or political opinion from Communist dominated or Middle Eastern countries. We do, however, accept those permanently uprooted by catastrophic natural calamities from any Eastern Hemisphere country.

The bill before us contains two major provisions, the first of which provides a temporary solution for the unintentional drastic reduction of immigration from among others, Ireland, Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Germany. For the next 4 years, the life of this legislation, special immigrant visas would be made available to any country which would otherwise receive less than 75 percent of the average number of visas it received annually during 1956–65. These visas would be supplied in addition to the 170,000 ceiling on Eastern Hemisphere immigration; countries such as Italy which do not need this protection would not have the total number of visas available to them reduced by it. The bill provides that labor certification would not be required of applicants receiving special visas. The first 30 percent would go to the first through fifth preferences; 30 percent plus fall down would go to sixth preference—skilled and unskilled labor—applicants; and 30 percent plus fall down to nonpreference applicants.

The primary purpose of the second provision of H.R. 9615 is to clear up the backlog of Italian brothers and sisters

of U.S. citizens waiting for fifth preference visas. Some of them have been waiting a long time, and there is no end in sight without corrective legislation. As a result of her inadequate quota, Italy had a waiting list of close to a quarter million in 1965 when the national origins quota system was abolished. Of these, more than 100,000 were waiting for fifth preference visas. Some have received them, of course, but the majority of the visa numbers have been going to the four higher preferences. The bill before us would provide for special immigrant visas equal to 25 percent of the number of people registered under the fourth preference, the former brother and sister preference, as of July 1, 1964. These would be made available over a period of 4 years to fifth preference applicants on whose behalf petitions had been filed prior to July 1, 1971. Any unused visas would drop down to sixth preference beneficiaries of petitions filed by the same date.

The bill before us is much-needed and long-awaited remedial immigration legislation. I hope that it becomes law well before the end of this Congress.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 9615. I commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for his leadership in bringing this proposal to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, in 1965, just 7 years ago, we enacted sweeping amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, abolishing once and for all the discriminatory national origins quota system that had been in effect for over 40 years. Under this system, each country had been entitled to an annual quota equal to one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of U.S. citizens of the same national origin in 1920. The result of this arbitrary system was that in the year 1964, Great Britain and Northern Ireland's quota was 65,361, of which Great Britain used less than half; Ireland's was 17,756, of which she used less than one-third. On the other hand, Italy had a quota of 5,666, France 3,069, and Greece 308. The Alien Pacific Triangle provisions of the law, relating to orientals, were probably the most shameful. Regardless of place of birth, any alien whose ancestry was 50 percent oriental was assigned to one of the quotas of the Asian or Pacific area, most of which were 100 per year. The law was amended in 1965 to provide for equal treatment of aliens of oriental ancestry. They are now charged to their country of birth.

In 1965, we rightfully deplored a discriminatory law that restricted immigration from certain countries on the grounds that some foreigners are more foreign than others because their ancestors had not been here in large numbers in 1920. Since the provisions of the 1965 act have been in effect, it has become increasingly apparent that we are now faced with a curious turnabout. The bill before us today represents an effort to check the drastic reduction in immigration from the countries that helped to build America.

According to the figures recently released by the Department of State, Ireland received 1,077 immigrant visas in fiscal 1971. Irish immigration in fiscal 1966, just after enactment of the 1965 amendments, fell from 5,378 to little over 3,000. When the 1965 amendments went into full effect in fiscal 1969, it dropped again to 1,208. Following this downward trend, Irish immigration should fall below 1,000 during the current fiscal year. And the pattern I have described for Irelands has been repeated for other formerly highly favored nations, most notably Germany and Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, the discrimination decried in the national origins quota system was a matter of policy and politics. The system became a permanent part of our law in 1924, despite the objections of many of our colleagues, among them the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. The discrimination in our immigration laws today is, fortunately, inadvertent, making it considerably easier to correct. It was certainly not our intention to reduce immigration from Ireland and other countries in northern and western Europe dramatically. This has been an unforeseen and unexpected result of the 1965 amendments.

From the vantage point of hindsight, the decrease in Irish immigration appears to be largely the result of the new preference system—a system that emphasizes the reunification of families—and of the stricter labor certification requirements. As I said in comments on a similar bill in 1969:

> The Irish fall through the seven-category preference system like water through a sieve. The categories are not applicable to most Irishmen who want to come to America today.

John P. Collins, chairman of the American Irish National Immigration Committee, discussed this before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee in 1969:

> Ireland's immigrants to the United States have traditionally been of the non-preference, unskilled variety. Had the present law been in effect some years ago, many of the Members of Congress would not be present in the United States today. Analyzing Irish families, one finds that a few brothers and sisters from the family emigrate, while others remain at home. The mother and father remain at home. The Irish emigrant is generally young, unmarried, and hence brings no spouse or children. It is the rare case in recent times when a whole Irish family emigrates to the United States. Thus, Ireland's sociological pattern of immigration does not permit it to compete equally with some other nationalities for family preference.

I would like to add that the inapplicability of the family reunification categories to the Irish is also the result of the fact that most Irish families here were reunited many, many years ago. The Irish came to this country in great numbers earlier in this century—does this make them ineligible for entry now? The answer at the present appears to be, yes, it does.

The first provision—sections 1 and 2—of the bill before us is an amended version of a bill offered in previous Congresses by the Honorable WILLIAM F. RYAN—a bill that I have cosponsored. I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity to vote for it today. Briefly, it would lay down an annual floor for the number of visas available to any given country, based on the average annual number of visas issued to that country during the 10-year period from 1956 through 1965. Every country would be guaranteed 75 percent of that annual average, not to exceed 7,500. As an example, Ireland averaged 7,185 visas a year during that period, and therefore would be guaranteed 5,389 visas, instead of the 1,077 she received last year. The special visas in excess of those granted through the permanent provisions of the immigration law would be provided in addition to the annual ceiling of 170,000 visas per year for Eastern Hemisphere countries, so countries not in need of this safeguard would not be restricted by it. The bill in its entirety is temporary legislation, scheduled to end 4 fiscal years after its enactment. I would have preferred open-ended legislation, such as the Ryan bill, but there is reason to believe that this is the only form in which the bill could be brought to the House floor for a vote. I assume we will have the opportunity to vote on additional immigration reform bills before the 4-year life of this legislation expires.

The bill's second major provision, sections 3 through 6, is addressed to still another problem that we have been concerned about for a number of years—the long waiting list for visas for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens applying under the fifth preference category. Unlike the Irish, Italians emigrate in family groups and, also unlike the Irish, they have been burdened with a grossly inadequate quota under the national origins system. The result was a waiting list of close to a quarter of a million applicants in 1964, of whom more than 100,000 were applying as brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. Unlike most backlogs that accumulated in the past, this one did not come close to being absorbed during the 2½-year transition period between 1966 and mid-1968. Italy's immigration rose immediately from 5,666 to the maximum per-country limit of 20,000, but the majority of the available visas are used by the higher preferences, and the backlog for fifth preference continues to accumulate. The purpose of the second provision of the bill before us is to complete the work not finished during the transition period: absorb the backlog so that applicants for fifth preference visas can compete in all countries on an equal footing, unhampered by the backlog resulting from 40 years of an insufficient quota.

The bill would make a specified number of special visas available to fifth preference applicants in whose behalf petitions were filed prior to July 1, 1971. Unused special visas will be made available to applicants for sixth preference, workers in short supply in the United States, in whose behalf petitions were filed prior to the same date. In countries where there is a fifth preference backlog, sixth preference and nonpreference visas have become completely unavailable. This provision would allow visas to be-

come available for these lower priority categories.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9615 to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. This legislation is based on a bill which I cosponsored in order to correct inequities in connection with the decline of immigration from Ireland and to reduce the backlog of fifth preference applicants from Italy who are brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

When I cosponsored this legislation in its original form, I did so because of the unanticipated results of the 1965 amendments to the immigration law and the affect of those amendments on immigration from Ireland, Italy, Germany, Poland, Great Britain and Scandinavian countries. This bill while a compromise version of the original provides needed relief from the unexpected results of those changes by placing a floor under immigration. The floor is based upon 75 percent of the number of visas issued during the base period of 1956 through 1965. Under the new formula authorized by this legislation. Ireland will receive at least 5,389 visas as contrasted with the actual number of 1,297 issued in fiscal year 1971.

In addition to the impact of the bill upon immigration from Ireland the legislation will have an important effect upon the backlog of applications from Italy. The current backlog from Italy in the fifth preference category is more than 88,000. The proposed changes will make available 7,170 visas each year for 4 years to applicants from Italy. This is particularly important because these applicants are brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens and the change will carry out the intent of Congress expressed in the 1965 amendments, of reunification of families. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9615 and to vote against any amendments to this bill which might present obstacles to the reunification of families by applying the new change only to unmarried brothers and sisters.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I urge the favorable vote of each of my colleagues on H.R. 9615, a bill devised to correct inequities in the present immigration law which were carried over from the old discriminatory national origins quota system. H.R. 9615 is a temporary measure which would make special immigrant visas available to natives of certain countries who were adversely affected by the 1965 amendments, which became fully effective on July 1, 1968.

When the 1965 amendments were under consideration, certain provisions were present in the proposal which would have placed every country on an equal basis as of the effective date of 1965 act. However, before enactment, amendments were adopted which gravely altered the original design of the 1965 amendments. Consequently, when the 1965 act became fully effective in July 1968, backlogs for previously oversubscribed preferences were not eliminated as originally intended, and immigration from high quota countries was severely affected.

In particular, immigration from northern Europe, especially Ireland and Germany, was drastically reduced and the tremendous backlogs in the fifth preference for natives of Italy, which were present only because of the discriminatory nature of the old law toward Italy, were not eliminated.

H.R. 9615 will correct the injustices resulting from the 1965 act by assuring that each country will be able to compete fairly and equitably for visas.

Immigrants from previously undersubscribed countries such as Ireland, Germany, and England would be allocated additional visas based upon the average number of visas available to these countries in the period preceding the 1965 act. Visa numbers would not exceed 7,500 per year for any such foreign state.

Special immigrant visas would be available for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens where backlogs are present as a result of the discriminatory nature of national origins quota system.

The labor certification provision of the law would not be applicable to any visas issued under H.R. 9615.

The bill is a fair proposal which is essential to place each country on equal footing, as the drafters of the 1965 act had originally intended. The total number of additional visas is approximately 72,500, which would be allocated over a 4-year period. An annual increase of 18,000 immigrants per year for a period of 4 years could easily be absorbed within the United States and would have virtually no effect on our economy.

Enactment of H.R. 9615 is particularly important to natives of Italy, who are prejudiced under the present system. Because of the tremendous backlog in the fifth preference by the time the new law went into effect, there is a lengthy waiting list. For the month of March 1972, visa numbers were available for natives of Italy who registered in the fifth preference as brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens by June 1, 1970.

This is a backlog of approximately 2 years. Because of this backlog, Italians use a numerical limitation of approximately 20,000 each year for a portion of the fifth preference. Consequently, there are no numbers available for the sixth and nonpreference Italians. This has caused grave problems for many employers who usually hire skilled Italian workers such as master tailors, stone masons, cutters, specialty cooks. There are no numbers available for natives of Italy in the sixth preference which is for skilled workers in short supply in the United States.

As of July 1, 1968, immediately prior to the new law becoming effective, the Department of State estimated there were approximately 114,000 fifth preference Italians registered to come to the United States. This means that for the fifth preference only, if no one new registered, it would have taken the entire 20,000 numbers per year available to natives of Italy until the present time to wipe out the backlog. However new people did register at a rate of approximately 7,500 per year. This means that only about 4,500 people had worked off the backlog each year. With the original backlog of over 100,000, it would take many years to exhaust it if only 4,500 were eliminated each year. However, many persons have dropped off the list. Some have in the meantime made other plans or have migrated to other countries. Some have died and many have just lost interest. As of July 1, 1971 there were 86,000 Italians on the list. However, of the 86,000, 64,000 have already been reached on the waiting list as of January, 1972. Although their turn had been reached, they did not drop off the list since registrations are valid until formally canceled. Since the 64,600 persons could have come to the United States and did not, one must assume that they did not desire to come any longer. This higher than usual rate of fallout among applicants is due, in part, to the high level of unemployment and a turndown of the economy in the United States. Even if all 21,000 persons who are registered whose turns have not yet been reached decided to come to the United States when offered the opportunity, it would take several years to make the fifth preference current since only about 4,500 numbers per year are used to eliminate the old backlog. Therefore, within the near future there will continue to be a backlog in the fifth preference and no numbers will be available to the sixth preference.

Enactment of H.R. 9615 will eliminate this problem by making the fifth preference current.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation, increasing the flow of immigrants from certain foreign countries. The chief justification for the legislation, as I understand it. is to correct inequities perpetrated by the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. I have no judgment as to accuracy of the allegations that inequities do exist. My reasoning for opposition to the legislation makes the presence of such alleged inequities irrelevant and immaterial. My position, therefore, should not be interpreted as a bias toward those nationalities purported to be benefited by passage of the proposal, that is, Irish, Italians, British, and Germans.

The demography and ecology experts have been telling us for years of the dangers of overpopulation and of the steady movement toward that end. Our present unemployment rate approaches 6 percent and has been hovering around that figure now for about 3 years. Our Natien has manifold problems that are inherent in overpopulation and underemployment. It just does not make sense at this time to exacerbate these problems by now increasing the number of immigrants to be permitted entry to our Natien. This is just another area in which we need to give more attention to our country's problems, rather than solving those of other countries.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, today, the House of Representatives has before it legislation which, if enacted, will offer significant relief to thousands of people who are presently being denied visas to this country. The bill to which I refer, H.R. 9615, would establish a floor under immigration so that, according to the

bill's formula, up to 7,500 additional visas could be issued to any one country in a particular fiscal year. The bill, as an emergency and temporary immigration measure, is designed to correct remaining inequities in the Immigration Act of 1965 for an effective period of 4 fiscal years.

Mr. Chairman, the 1965 Immigration Act unwittingly produced a situation of serious disadvantage for formerly privileged countries whereby the originally proposed 5-year period of adjustment to the new system was reduced to 2½ years. As a result, immigration from these countries has dwindled considerably; Ireland, in particular was affected, issuing barely 1,000 visas last year.

In addition, backlogs, especially for fifth preference visas, which had accumulated as a result of discrimination prior to the 1965 act, still exist. By providing for special visas for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who qualify as fifth preference immigrants, this legislation will eliminate the backlog and do much to alleviate the distress of families who have been separated for want of a visa.

When this legislation was considered by the Judiciary Committee, an amendment was considered and rejected that would have limited fifth preference consideration only to unmarried brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. Clearly, this discriminatory provision would have worked to perpetuate the family separations and hardships which this bill seeks to eliminate. Therefore, should such an amendment be presented for consideration on the floor today, I would urge that it be defeated on the grounds that its inclusion would seriously undermine the very essence of H.R. 9615.

As an original cosponsor of the legislation, I am particularly concerned that we act at once to terminate the hardships we have caused by so severely limiting visas to those countries which formerly enjoyed preferential status. Over the past months, Americans have expressed their deep dismay over the continued hostilities in Northern Ireland and many have petitioned the government there to end its discriminatory practices. I, myself, have spoken out on numerous occasions to oppose discrimination on any front and to urge the government of Northern Ireland to correct the prevailing inequities. I believe H.R. 9615, by opening the door to America for many of those who wish to escape this tyranny, can be a positive statement of our Nation's concern for the Northern Ireland minority.

Similarly, there are many Italian-Americans in this country who have been separated from their friends and families because the existing immigration law limits so severely the number of visas available. Mr. Chairman, Italy has long been the subject of discriminatory policies where our immigration laws have been concerned. Prior to 1965, under the so-called national origins quota system, Italy accumulated a backlog of nearly 22,000 visas. Then, when we revised our immigration standards with the 1965 act, no provision was included to correct this glaring inequity and Italian immigration since 1965 has slowed to a near halt. Today, the Congress has the opportunity to rectify this tragic situation; H.R. 9615 would provide additional visas to accommodate nearly all this backlog.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 9615 is, I believe, a fair and realistic approach to immigration to the United States. It recognizes and corrects past inequities in the law that have worked needlessly to prevent immigration to the United States and it accommodates as well as the realities of the future by placing a 4-year limitation for distribution of the additional visas. Thus, we have before us a bill that would serve to equalize, during its period of effectiveness immigration opportunities for those who have formerly been denied and will as well facilitate conversion to the new policy as provided in the 1965 Immigration Act. For these reasons, I therefore urge my distinguished colleagues to join with me in voting for passage of this important legislation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr Chairman, it is with great enthusiasm and gratitude to the members of the House Judiciary Committee that I rise this day before St. Patrick's Day in full support of H.R. 9615 as reported from the committee and in vigorous opposition to any weakening amendments. I might add that I made a special trip down from my district today, leaving behind a tense political situation, in order to be sure to be on the floor to oppose any attempts to weaken the bill and to vote for its final passage

Our consideration today of H.R. 9615 is the fruit of a long and arduous effort of myself and other concerned Members of the House to correct the unintended and unjust inequities resulting from the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act, particularly the drastic reduction in immigration from Ireland and the growing backlog of fifth preference applicants—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—from Italy. The critical reduction in Irish immigration was of special concern to me as a representative from the New York City area, because New York especially has benefited greatly from its talented and hard working Irish immigrants who have done so much to build this country and make it prosper. In light of this, it would be highly unjust and ungrateful of our Nation to allow Irish immigration to be reduced to a trickle. This does not mean we should return to the national origins concept of immigration, but it means we should remedy the present system's inequities and prevent further unfortunate declines in immigration from those countries severely disadvantaged under the terms of the 1965 act.

Since this problem with the 1965 act became apparent in 1968 when its provisions became fully effective, I have sponsored and cosponsored numerous bills—H.R. 16593 in 1968, H.R. 165 in 1969, and H.R. 165 and H.R. 9321 in 1971—delivered speeches on the House floor and elsewhere, and written letters to the chairman and members of the House Judiciary Committee toward the goal of ending this injustice to potential Irish immigrants. H.R. 9615 is the result of this effort and it does provide a hopefully lasting solution to this problem.

The amendments to the U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act, which became law in 1965 and fully effective in 1968, were clearly designed to make our Nation's immigration policies more equitable by ending the national origin quota system that discriminated against southern and eastern Europeans and Asians. The old system was replaced with a new one providing a ceiling on Eastern Hemisphere immigration and the issuance of visas on a first-come, first-served basis, within various preference categories based on family relationships and job skills. When this law passed, it was thought by most of us in Congress that the transition from the national origins system to the new system would not disadvantage any particular country or area. This proved not to be true, and the country which suffered most severely was Ireland. While total immigration to the United States has increased significantly since 1965, Irish immigration has been choked to a mere fraction of what it was in 1965 and before. From fiscal years 1965 to 1967, total immigration to the United States increased from 292,000 to 326,000, while immigration from Ireland fell from more than 4,000 to less than 2,000. By fiscal year 1970, the total number of Irish immigrant admissions to this country had fallen to 1,178, and the figures for the last fiscal year, 1971, were not much better—1,293. Section 1 of H.R. 9615, which incorporates similar provisions of legislation I have sponsored and cosponsored on this subject, corrects this unintended inequity by establishing a floor under immigration from any country. That floor, or minimum, amounts to 75 percent of the average yearly number of immigrant visas issued from a given nation during the 10-fiscal-year period—1956–65—before enactment of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act. If in any fiscal year after June 30, 1970, visas issued to natives of any country fall below this minimum, then additional special visas will be issued in the following fiscal year to make up the difference between that minimum and the number of visas issued the previous fiscal years under the provisions of the 1965 act. The number of additional special visas is not to exceed 7,500 for any one country. Under this formula the total number of visas available to Ireland annually will be at least 5,389, as compared with 1,293 for fiscal year 1971. I must add that section 2 of H.R. 9615 sets an effective period for its provisions of 4 fiscal years. I sincerely hope that this will allow sufficient time for correction of all the inequities of the 1965 act and complete the transition smoothly from the old national origins immigration systems to the new, more equitable system.

Correction of the Irish immigration injustice alone merits passage of H.R. 9615, but this worthy legislation also attempts to solve another unforeseen difficulty with the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act—the growing backlog of fifth-preference applicants—brothers

and sisters of U.S. citizens—from certain countries, notably Italy. The reuniting of families in the United States is one of the principal aims of our Nation's immigration policy. Because of the previous quota system and the ceiling on the immigration of brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, countries like Italy who have a great many eligible immigrant applicants in this category have experienced sizeable backlogs in such applications. By July of 1964, the backlog of Italians in this brothers and sisters category reached the astounding figure of 114,717. Under sections 3 and 4 of H.R. 9615, special visas in an amount equal to 25 percent of the total of the brothers and sisters preference registration of any foreign state as of July 1, 1964, will be made available to aliens from the state who are the beneficiaries of the fifth-preference petitions filed prior to July 1, 1971. The total number of visas to be made available during the 4-year period provided in H.R. 9615, is 39,674, with 28,680 visas available to Italian applicants. Thus, 7,170 visas would be available to Italy for each of the 4 fiscal years.

In addition, H.R. 9615, would relieve the pressure of the backlog of immigrant visa applications of natives from the dependency areas such as Antigua, British Honduras, and the British Virgin Islands, because those areas will be able to benefit from the additional visas to which Great Britain and other mother countries would be entitled under section 1 of this bill.

H.R. 9615 has the support of the American Irish National Immigration Committee and the American Committee on Italian Migration, and represents the best legislative solution achievable under present circumstances to the unanticipated effects of the 1965 act. I would like at this time to commend the very able Chairman of the House Judiciary's Immigration subcommittee (Mr. RODINO) and subcommittee member (Mr. RYAN) for their dedication and leadership in developing this legislation and in bringing it successfully out of the Committee for House floor consideration; and I strongly urge all the Members of the House to vote for passage of H.R. 9615 without amendments.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering legislation to improve our immigration laws by reducing the hardships placed on many of our families. Specifically, the pending bill, H.R. 9615, democratizes the system further by making special immigration visas available to natives of certain countries who were adversely affected by the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The 1965 amendments spelled the end of the national origins quota system, which was to be phased out in favor of a more desirable "first come, first served" system. Unfortunately, the 1965 amendments provided for a 3-year phase-out period which was not long enough. As a result, the backlogs of some oversubscribed preference categories were not eliminated as originally intended, and immigration from the former high quota countries was adversely affected. Immigration from Northern Europe, especially Ireland, was reduced tremendously, and the backlog in the fifth preference category—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—particularly in the case of Italy, was not significantly reduced.

The problems have not straightened themselves out, and we can now see that the only way to correct the present inequities is to adopt remedial legislation. Today's bill, H.R. 9615, is a temporary emergency measure to make special immigrant visas available annually to each country of the Eastern Hemisphere equal to 75 percent of the 1955–65 average visas issued, less the number of visas issued each year under the permanent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, but not exceeding 7,500 visas per country per fiscal year.

In addition, H.R. 9615 should reduce the backlog in visa issuance to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The legislation would have the effect of being an extension of the transition period to the first come, first served basis for immigration regulation. In no way does the legislation return us to the primitive and undesirable national origins quota system. An amount of fairness would be instilled into our immigration policies. Primary benefits would be to Ireland, Great Britain, Germany, Poland, and Italy, who were adversely affected by the 1965 enactment.

Mr. Chairman, a number of my constituents have encountered separation from immediate family members overseas who are locked out of this country, so to speak, by the inequitable provisions of the existing law. The 1965 amendments were designed to alleviate backlogs, but the final version of the bill resulted in a situation contrary to what was intended. In order to adjust the law to the intent of the legislation we must endorse this remedial legislation.

The question has been raised in these times of economic focus whether an increase in immigrants would cause job displacement or other domestic economic difficulties. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I would be the last one to support a bill detrimental to our economic or employment situation. Our justification for this legislation is that the additional number of immigrants permitted is relatively small and the measure is only temporary in effect to correct the present inequities.

It is imperative that this legislation be adopted without crippling amendments so that our immigration system works as it should. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to give this legislation their full support.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9615, a bill which is long overdue. During the 7 years since we enacted the Immigration Reform Act of 1965, American immigration law has visited upon thousands of earnest hard-working immigrants an unnecessary inequity.

Prior to 1965, Irish citizens immigrated to this country at an average of 7,000 per year. As a result of the Immigration Reform Act of 1965, however, that average trickled to a mere 1,000 immigrants per year. Similarly, in 1965, there were 100,000 Italian brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens on the waiting list for visas. Seven years later, there remains a backlog of 88,000.

H.R. 9615 would correct this inequity by seeking to eliminate over the next 4 years the backlog developed since the 1965 act went into effect. Thus, emigrants from Ireland, Great Britain, and Poland would be entitled to approximately 33,000 visas and 40,000 visas would also be issued to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, primarly to Italian emigrants.

This legislation would not open up the floodgates to the poor and helpless of other countries—although I should note that some of America's greatest businessmen, doctors, scientists, and jurists came from such ranks. We need not expect that the number of persons on welfare would be increased. The waiting emigrants we would be admitting all have skills or would be vouched for by relatives now in the United States. Thus we can expect that they would quickly become self-supporting and contributing residents of the communities in which they settle.

This bill is temporary corrective legislation and would repair the inequity caused by the unfortunate provisions in the 1965 Immigration Reform Act. We have already been urged to wait too long to determine whether, as the committee put it, the "shortcomings of the 1965 amendments would correct themselves. It is obvious now that these shortcomings will only manifest themselves in greater hardship for many intending immigrants."

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to give their strong support today for this legislation.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of legislation authorizing the availability of additional visa numbers of those countries from which average immigration has significantly declined as a result of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act, I am very pleased to rise in support of the measure we are considering this afternoon.

The 1965 act marked an important milestone in U.S. immigration policy. This measure abolished the archaic and highly discriminatory national origins quota system and was a major contribution toward returning this country to a more humane and meaningful manner of selecting persons allowed to emigrate to our shores.

Although the 1965 act removed many gross inequities and represented the first major overhaul of the immigration law in over 40 years, there are still many loopholes which must be filled and a number of inequities and inadequacies which must be corrected. I believe H.R. 9615 will be most important in providing essential relief by temporarily removing certain biased portions of our immigration law.

When President Johnson called upon the Congress to revise the immigration laws he requested that the transition or phase-out period from the national origins quota system be 5 years. Unfortunately, the Congress only provided for a 3-year period and this has worked an exceptional hardship on a number of countries, including some Eastern Hem-

isphere nations, such as Ireland, which had traditionally been large sources of immigrants. In attempting to achieve equality for those countries which had previously suffered various forms of discrimination, the new law subsequently proved to discriminate against others by drastically curtailing the level of immigration. The formula contained in H.R. 9615 establishes a floor under immigration and makes special immigrant visas available to each Eastern Hemisphere country equal to three-quarters of the 10 year, 1955–65, average, minus the number of visas issued in the preceding year. This temporary 4-year provision will assure that every country will be permitted to compete justly and equitably for visas. It should also remove current backlogs and restore a proper balance in the issuance of visas.

One of the primary aims of the 1965 act was to reunite families and, generally, it has facilitated bringing families together. However, the fifth preference position for Italy has long been oversubscribed and the brothers and sisters of American citizens have been forced to wait for countless years. It is inhuman for this needless and cruel separation of families to continue and is certainly inconsistent with our basic traditions and values. The relief provided by H.R. 9615 should permit further family reunions and remove most of the present large backlogs, particulary in the case of Italy which is currently 21 months in arrears. Also, it would be senseless to limit this special consideration to only unmarried brothers and sisters—particularly on a permanent basis—and we should firmly resist any ill-conceived efforts to amend this measure.

I have carefully examined this legislation and, in light of its temporary 4-year nature, am satisfied that it will not return this Nation to the national origins quota system. We are still suffering repercussions from this odious feature of an earlier—and in terms of our immigration policies, darker—era and I am certain that the Congress would not repeat such a mistake by even suggesting a return to the quota system. Further, contrary to the views of some of our colleagues, I do not believe that the liberalizing provisions of H.R. 9615 will open any floodgates and I know of no substantive data which would indicate that permitting additional aliens to come to this country will have an adverse effect on our employment situation. Certainly our domestic labor market must be afforded all reasonable protection but the issuance of an additional number of visas during 4 years should not result in the displacement of more workers or be generally detrimental to the labor force.

Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged that we are finally taking steps to remove barriers to persons desiring to emigrate to this country and I especially commend the efforts of our colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN). BILL RYAN has been tireless in his efforts to achieve these urgently needed reforms and his years of dedication and hard work are now bearing fruit. He certainly deserves our gratitude for his initiative in this field and I am pleased to support him in this effort.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, that today's action signal the first step in a realistic examination of our immigration policies and a thorough reassessment of our procedures for selecting immigrants. Further legislative action is required to banish present discriminatory practices, which amount to nothing more than a standing affront to millions of our citizens and friends overseas, and to demonstrate to the world our dedication to equal and just treatment of immigrants.

I very strongly believe the next priority must be the removal of the highly discriminatory annual limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration. It is well known that the imposition of the Western Hemisphere ceiling was a poorly considered, last minute addition necessary to insure Senate approval of the 1965 act. I am certain it was not the intention of the Johnson administration to establish any such ceilings and this unnecessary restriction has certainly not helped our image overseas. It has also led to hard feelings on the part of many Latin American nations.

The ceiling of 120,000 placed on this hemisphere by the Congress has caused incredible personal hardship and has had very serious effects on business and commercial relations. Not only are families heartlessly separated and commercial activities disrupted but this Western Hemisphere quota unfortunately recalls the era of the national origins quota system and the reprehensive Asia-Pacific Triangle quota. Although these two outmoded and discriminatory aspects of earlier immigration policies were abolished some 7 years ago, the question as to "where were you born" still has not yet been eliminated from the questions which Latin Americans must answer in establishing their eligibility for immigration.

It is perfectly obvious that positive action must be taken to remove this highly undesirable feature of the immigration law—one which simply exacerbates already strained relations with many of our Latin American neighbors. A clear indication that such action is both necessary and desirable was the enactment in the last Congress of a measure which exempted certain business and managerial personnel from the Western Hemisphere limitation. Also, I remind this body that the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, established by the 1965 law, recommended against imposing the ceiling but no legislative action was taken and it became effective in June 1968.

Latin Americans are also the victims of discriminatory treatment by the current provision of the immigration law which denies them the opportunity to adjust their status on the same basis as aliens from other lands. I have sponsored legislation repealing this offensive section of the Immigration and Nationality Act and again urge that we move for its prompt enactment.

I am pleased that the distinguished chairman of the House Immigration Subcommittee (Mr. RODINO) has scheduled hearings on this issue in May. I am hopeful some positive action will be taken to abolish these offensive provisions of the immigration laws and that prospective immigrants from South and Central America and the Caribbean will finally be accorded just and unprejudiced consideration. In the coming weeks I will be offering specific legislation to remove the Western Hemisphere limitation and return our country to our traditional ideals by giving no one area or group special consideration. Further, my proposed legislation will revise the present labor certification requirement in an effort to preclude numerous inequities in this area. Also, it will establish a Board of Visa Appeals in the Department of State responsible for reviewing the denials of immigrant visas to relatives of American citizens or permanent residents.

The foregoing are just a few of the features of a measure I will introduce to facilitate and assist persons to emigrate to our country, rather than to make it virtually impossible in many instances, and to end present discriminatory features, especially against our Latin neighbors.

Passage of H.R. 9615 today must be just the first step in a further comprehensive reform of our immigration laws and policies. I welcome and support its enactment and hope we will soon see the implementation of additional revisions.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of this legislation sponsored by my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO). The Immigration and Nationality Act as amended in 1965 eliminated the same kind of inequities that this legislation is designed to rectify. The 1965 amendments repealed the national origins concept as a system for selecting immigrants. With a 3-year phaseout, existing backlogs for immigrant visas or oversubscribed preferences were expected to be eliminated and a more equitable immigration system was anticipated.

However, the 3-year phaseout did not produce the desired results and we are now faced with a situation that is at least as inequitable as that which occurred prior to the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. H.R. 9615 corrects this problem and will allow the 1965 amendments to perform as originally hoped for. H.R. 9615 recognizes that the present backlogs in the fifth preference are a carryover of the backlog existing when the 1965 amendments went into effect. The passage of this amendment will be of particular importance to Italian-American families all over America. These citizens have been victimized by an unfortunate situation that existed prior to the 1965 amendments and one which will continue unless H.R. 9615 is enacted. The fifth preference, brothers and sisters of American citizens, is clearly a workable concept. It is working in virtually every country except Italy. There is no reason to believe that the fifth-preferance system cannot also work in Italy if only the sys-

tem can be inaugurated when all countries are on an equal immigration footing. A prime goal of our American immigration policy is the reuniting of families. This legislation is totally in accord with that guiding principle and will allow many American families of Italian descent the long-awaited chance to reunite with loved ones now barred from the United States. I certainly hope that we are able to enact this important and necessary measure. It certainly has my complete support.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as the sponsor of identical legislation, I most earnestly hope and urge that the great majority of our Members, here, will accept and approve this pending bill, H.R. 9615, which will temporarily provide additional visas for prospective immigrants from certain foreign countries.

I think it should be emphasized that this proposal is, in substance, a remedial measure to be in effect for only 4 years and with the sole purpose of correcting the inequities that have obviously resulted from the too-short transition period of change, 1965 to 1968, from the old national origins system of granting visas to the new "first-come-first-served" system.

We have come to realize that however well meant certain amendments were as attached to the basic 1965 immigration act, the accumulation of visa requests in some heavily used preference classifications was not eliminated as a result of the amendments and prospective immigrants from former high quota countries, such as Ireland and Germany have had undue and practically discriminatory hardships visited upon them.

Passage of this bill before us will go a long way toward insuring that the countries that were denied the expected benefits of the 1965 Immigration Act due to the amendments will now receive them. Under the provisions of the bill, special immigration visas would be available annually for 4 years to each country of the Eastern Hemisphere. The number of available visas would be equal to 75 percent of the 1955–65 average of immigrant visas issued, less the number of visas issued during the preceding year. The bill would also provide additional visas for immigrants in the "fifth preference," the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this measure is not in any way intended to return us to our former National Origins Preference System; it will correct hardships that were inadvertently imposed upon once priviliged nations and it will serve to wholesomely unite unhappily separated family members and relatives. It is a just and rightful extension of our traditional immigration policy and I hope it is given the speedy and resounding approval of the House that I believe it eminently merits.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this bill because it removes two major inequities that have developed since we passed the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Although this is a temporary measure which will be in effect for 4 years, it will provide relief to a substantial number of Irish and Italian aliens desiring to join their families who already are citizens of this country. During the past few years I have personally encountered situations for which the present law provides no remedy despite the merit of these cases.

I am particularly pleased that the bill will provide special visas for those seeking American citizenship, including spouses and children in a manner that is both fair and orderly under our immigration policy.

It should be pointed out that the vast majority of immigrants from the two countries most affected, Italy and Ireland, have an enviable record in the performance of their responsibilities of citizenship over a period of many years. They have contributed substantially to the economic and cultural growth of our Nation.

The Committee on the Judiciary should be commended for taking legislative action to remove the iniquitous situations which have culminated as a direct result of the discriminatory national origins system which provided disproportionate national quotas to govern the admission of immigrants without full regard to the reunification of families.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, seldom does a day pass but what some liberal arises on the House floor or inserts his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD complaining about unemployment in this country.

However, these shouting liberals will have no trouble today adjusting to support of this bill, H.R. 9615, which will permit at least 40,000 Europeans to immigrate to this country each year for the next 4 years to compete for jobs and swell the ranks of the unemployed. That is a total of 160,000 immigrants and these are in addition to the normal flow of foreigners from all parts of the world who are permitted to take up residence in this country each year.

Mr. Chairman, the United States, faced with the twin problems of overpopulation and unemployment, ought to be restricting immigration instead of expanding it, and if a rollcall vote is not taken on this legislation let the record show that I am opposed to it.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we can take a big step today toward reducing the discriminatory barriers against immigration for people throughout the Eastern Hemisphere who have been adversely affected by the current immigration laws.

In 1965 Congress approved an immigration act which provided for the phasing out over a 3-year period of the old national origins system of granting visas. At the time, many members shared my concern that this transition period should have been at least 5 years. Unfortunately, the fears expressed then have materialized with the result that thousands of people in Europe and elsewhere have been made to wait for years with no hope of receiving a visa.

In many cases which have been brought to my attention, families have been separated because the law was not flexible enough to apply to their situation. It is my hope that these long years of waiting will soon be over.

I would remind my colleagues that H.R. 9615 does not mark a return to the national origins system. It simply recognizes the inequities of the present first-come first-served system with regard to those countries who formerly enjoyed preferential status. As I said when I introduced similar legislation last year, we should not replace one inequitable system with another.

The measure before the House today is temporary and will expire in 4 years. It is intended to alleviate the present backlog, and it will result in a truly fair and balanced system for immigration.

I would also emphasize the fact that the economic impact of the bill will be minimal. It is aimed not at increasing the number of immigrants but at making the system of allocation of visas more equitable for those who were adversely affected by the 1965 act.

I urge the adoption of this legislation as a positive response to a very real hardship.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the numerical limitations in sections 201(a), 202(a), and 202(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, if in any fiscal year after June 30, 1970, the total number of immigrants admitted, or aliens who were adjusted to permanent resident status in the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act, from any foreign state under paragraphs (1) through (6) and paragraph (8) of section 203(a) of such Act was less than three-fourths of the average annual number of such visas made available to immigrants from such foreign state under such Act during the ten-fiscal-year period beginning July 1, 1955, there shall be made available to immigrants from such foreign state an additional number of visas for the succeeding fiscal year equal to the difference between the number of visas made available to them under paragraphs (1) through (6) and paragraph (8) of section 203(a) of such Act in the preceding fiscal year and three-fourths of such average number, except that the number of such additional visas made available in any fiscal year to immigrants from such foreign state shall not exceed seven thousand five hundred. The additional visas authorized by the preceding sentence for immigrants from such foreign state shall be made available as follows:

(1) Forty per centum of the additional visas shall be made available to immigrants entitled to a preference status under paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no more than 8 per centum of the additional visas may be made available to immigrants entitled to a preference status under any one of the paragraphs.

(2) Thirty per centum of the additional visas plus any visas not issued under paragraph (1) shall be made available to immigrants entitled to a preference under paragraph (6) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(3) Thirty per centum of the additional visas plus any visas not issued under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be made available to immigrants who are not entitled to a preference under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

In the case of immigrants entitled to a pref-

erence under paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the additional visas authorized by this subsection shall be issued in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204 of such Act. In the case of immigrants not entitled to a preference under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, such visas shall be made available in the chronological order in which such immigrants qualify. The provisions of section 212 (a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not apply in the determination of an immigrant's eligibility to receive any visa authorized to be issued under this Act.

SEC. 2. No alien shall be issued a visa under the first section of this Act, nor have his status adjusted to that of a permanent resident alien under such first section, after the expiration of the four-fiscal-year period beginning with the first fiscal year commencing on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. That, notwithstanding the numerical limitations in sections 201(a), 202(a), and 202(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, there shall be made available to qualified immigrants from any foreign state, additional special visas equal to 25 per centum of the fourth preference registration from such foreign state pending on July 1, 1964.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of State is authorized to make reasonable estimates of the anticipated numbers of special visas to be issued under section 3 during each of four fiscal years, and, based upon such estimates, not more than 25 per centum of such visas may be issued in each of the four fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year commencing on or after the date of enactment of this Act. The visas authorized to be issued under section 3 shall be made available to eligible immigrants specified in sections 5 and 6 in the order in which petitions in their behalf were filed with the Attorney General under section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 5. The additional special visas authorized to be issued under section 3 for each foreign state shall be made available, during a four-year fiscal period beginning with the first fiscal year commencing on or after the date of enactment of this Act, to any alien eligible for a preference status under the provisions of section 203(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, on the basis of a petition filed prior to July 1, 1971, and the spouse and children of such alien if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided*, That upon his application for an immigrant visa and for his admission to the United States, the alien is found to have retained his relationship to the petitioner, and status as established in the approved petition.

SEC. 6. The special visas authorized for each foreign state in each fiscal year under section 3 not used by aliens eligible for visas under section 5 of this Act, shall next be available to aliens from each such foreign state who have qualified for a preference under section 203(a)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the basis of a petition filed prior to July 1, 1971, and the spouse and the children of such alien if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 7. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the definitions contained in section 101 (a) and (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall apply in the administration of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be held to repeal, amend, alter, modify, affect, or restrict the powers, duties, functions, or authority of the Attorney General in the administration and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act or any other law relating to immigration, nationality, or naturalization.

Mr. RODINO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENNIS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENNIS: On page 5, after line 20, insert the following new sections as follows:

"SEC. 7. Section 203(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be amended to read:

(5) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 24 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (4), to qualified immigrants who are the unmarried brothers or unmarried sisters of citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 8. The amendments made by section 7 of this Act shall not apply with respect to any alien who is eligible for immigrant status under a paragraph of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to the effective date of this amendment.

And redesignate the following sections accordingly.

Mr. EILBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I merely would like to say as the gentleman begins his explanation that various references have been made to organizations supporting this bill and not supporting it. I would like the committee to know the following international unions support the bill as it is:

Service Employees International Union, International Longshoremen's Association, International Transport Workers Union, International Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers, Radio Officers Association, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Central Labor Council of New York, New York State AFL–CIO, Building and Construction Trades Council of Greater New York, and Building and Construction Trades Council of Greater New York; and various locals throughout the United States.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is the amendment which I have discussed previously.

It merely adds one word to the immigration law, the word "unmarried."

The effect of it is that, henceforth, what we call the fifth preference, rather than giving a preference to all brothers and sisters of American citizens, will confine that preference to the unmarried brothers and sisters of American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, the thrust of this amendment and the thinking behind it is this: What we are trying to do in our immigration statutes is to unite families. We are not trying to put a great big hole in the immigration law so that everyone and his cousins can come into this country.

Unmarried brothers and sisters of an American citizen are properly members of the family unit here. Married brothers and sisters, very possibly, have very large families of their own and are not members of the American citizen's family unit.

It was never the intention of the law to blanket them all into this type of coverage—perhaps, 10, 12, or 15 people in a family under this fifth preference.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Charles Gordon, General Counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, testified before our Immigration Subcommittee on August 6, 1970, and he said:

> Third, we support modification of the fifth preference to limit it to the unmarried brothers and sisters of a U.S. citizen, if the citizen is at least 21 years of age. The fifth preference is intended to promote family unity, and it seems correct to conclude that in granting a preference to married brothers and sisters, the present law is not actually unifying families, but in many cases is sanctioning the entry of new families.

It is an appropriate time to take this matter up because in this bill, out of the goodness of our hearts, out of the desire to correct an inequity, and not through any legal compulsion, we are attempting to clear up the fifth preference backlog.

As I pointed out a minute ago, we have already done that three times before with special legislation. We do not provide enough extra visas at this time in this bill to clear up the backlog. It seems quite reasonable, particularly when it is in consonance with the purpose of the immigration statute, to tackle this particular problem—to take a modest action to try to prevent this backlog from accumulating again.

Now, all of the basic overhauls of the immigration laws which have been proposed, including that offered by my friend from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), include this provision, but they say it should await a general overhaul of the law.

I say if we are going to pass such backlog clean up legislation, there is no reason why this correction I propose should wait.

This is such a reasonable amendment that the Judiciary Committee adopted it in the first instance, but reversed itself due to the persuasive powers of my friend from New Jersey.

I submit to this House that this is a better bill, a more equitable bill, and a bill which ought to appeal more to the membership of this body if this amendment is adopted, so that we would not only correct existing inequities but would also do something about preventing them from accumulating in the future.

I point out, again, that the amendment in no way decreases the extra visas provided by this legislation and it in no way affects the overall basic country ceilings existing in the present law. It simply defines the limits and extent, in a reasonable way and for the future, of the fifth preference.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for his authorship and fine work in bringing out this excellent bill. I want to join with him as strongly as I can in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS). I feel that we have a good bill; it has been given a lot of thought by the gentleman from New Jersey and his committee. A great deal of work has gone into this legislation, I therefore do not think that we should dilute it now by passing this amendment. I hope the amendment is soundly defeated.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey in opposition to the amendment, and to commend the gentleman for this bill.

Moreover, is it not a fact that 65 percent of the present fifth preference is comprised of married brothers and sisters? And if this amendment were to carry we would significantly dilute the essential opportunity of reuniting families, and of bringing brothers and sisters, of whom there are some 28,000 allegedly, into this country?

Mr. RODINO. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. REID. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) would really cripple that part of the bill which goes to the Italian section. There has been an injustice created over a period of years as a result of the national origins quota system, in where Italians were being discriminated against in attempting to immigrate to our country and limited to about 5,600 a year. The backlog that existed was a result of that system. What we are seeking to do—and this is what we must not lose sight of——

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

Mr. RODINO. I will yield to the gentleman in just one moment.

What we must not lose sight of is that this amendment is permanent in nature while it amends a measure that is temporary in nature.

I have stated time and time again that while I might agree with the thrust of the amendment, nonetheless we cannot consider it in that very narrow viewpoint; we must consider the whole preference system. It is for this reason that I prepared a general revision bill after long deliberation. I was a member of the subcommittee on immigration when we provided for the elimination of the national origins quota. But what we are seeking to do now is to merely reduce the backlog that exists—not to divide married brothers and sisters from unmarried brothers and sisters, and, therefore, violate the very basic philosophy we employed when we eliminated national origins: to reunite families. We are seeking now to correct these inequities through this temporary measure, hoping that when the bill runs its course that things will be equal, and things will be just again.

But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) will do just the opposite. He would break up the family. He would initiate a permanent measure of preference in an area where we have not yet actually studied the full impact. Therefore I would hope that this amendment would be soundly defeated, because it would do violence to the very thing that we are seeking to cure.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I simply cannot understand how my distinguished friend can seriously say that this amendment does violence to what we are attempting to do in the gentleman's bill, for the simple reason that the gentleman's bill extends additional visas to fifth-preference people who filed a petition prior to July 1, 1971, whereas my amendment applies only to petitions filed after the date of the amendment. It is perspective only, it has nothing to do with the people whom this bill affects.

Mr. RODINO. There would still be the question of the married brothers and sisters who, as the gentleman from New York indicated, make up 65 percent of the problem.

Mr. DENNIS. Only in the future, not to the backlog brothers and sisters; they are not affected.

Mr. RODINO. I have reiterated time and time again to the gentleman, and I know he is sincere in trying to bring forth an amendment that he thinks would cure future buildings. I, too, must confess that I introduced such a bill distinguishing unmarried brothers and sisters from married brothers and sisters.

But I have done this only on the basis that we change the preference system in permanent legislation. The committee has not addressed itself to this issue as yet. It is for that reason that I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Dennis amendment. This amendment is not in any way designed to kill this bill. It is designed for the future to prevent the kind of problem that this bill thrusts upon us from recurring, and it is a very salutary amendment for that reason.

This amendment is designed to correct a serious weakness in the bill in its present form. This weakness is that it fails to include any provision to prevent future backlog buildups similar to the present condition which section 3 through 6 of the bill are designed to clean up.

In this day of severe unemployment in the United States, it is highly questionable whether we should provide for the admission of more than 160,000 immigrants—over a 4-year period—as does this bill, H.R. 9615, in addition to the regular 170,000 annual numerical ceiling for the Eastern Hemisphere.

That is the Eastern Hemisphere alone. Of course, these figures are in addition to the 120,000 a year from the Western Hemisphere. A backlog clean-up can only be justified if coupled with provisions to prevent its recurrence.

The backlog buildup occurred in the fifth preference by reason of unlimited qualification standards which are in conflict with one of the basic objectives of our immigration policy—that is, family reunification.

A family, first and foremost, is made up of the head of the family and the unmarried children in it and not of a lot of married relatives who have families of their own.

Testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary indicates that the majority of fifth preference registrants—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—are married. Repeatedly since 1968, the State Department and Immigration and Naturalization Service witnesses have recommended that the fifth preference be limited to unmarried brothers and sisters. The Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Miss Barbara Watson, testified on this point on August 5, 1970; stating that the number of new registrations under the fifth preference would increase markedly if the backlog in the fifth preference were eliminated. She stated:

> As you know, the law, as it is presently written, makes no distinction between married brothers and sisters or unmarried brothers and sisters. It has its own built-in increments, so that as soon as you get rid of a backlog there is the incentive for new applicants. This is why we feel possibly it would be wiser to limit fifth preference to unmarried brothers and sisters. Then, too, married brothers and sisters do not really come to the home of the petitioner so that. in a sense it is not family reunification. They usually are an entire family unit and set up their own household. It would be more in the spirit of the law, we would consider, if you restricted it to the unmarried brothers and sisters.

The administration's omnibus immigration bills in the 91st and 92d Congresses provide for such a limitation of the fifth preference. So do bills which have been introduced by the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman of the subcommittee now handling this bill.

It is my opinion that this legislation which is essentially cleanup legislation will be greatly strengthened by the Dennis amendment which gives some assurance that the need for such periodic cleanup legislation will not occur again in the future. This amendment provides for a limitation upon fifth preference unmarried brothers and sisters and will definitely improve the bill. This amendment is a limitation for the future. I want to emphasize that this will not in any manner reduce or affect the number of special visas made available to any country under this bill since the amendment specifically provides that the pro-

posed limitation to the married brothers and sisters will not apply to petitions filed prior to the effective date of this legislation. Nor will such amendment reduce the maximum number of regular visas available to any one country—which is 20,000 per year—in the future.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS), to the effect that qualified immigrants under section 203(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, be the unmarried brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

This amendment is completely in line with the testimony of the General Counsel of the Immigration and Nationality Service before the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on August 6, 1970, who pointed out—

> The fifth preference is intended to promote family unity, and it seems correct to conclude that in granting a preference to married brothers and sisters, the present law is not actually unifying families, but in many cases is sanctioning the entry of new families.

I cannot agree with those who might object to this amendment on the grounds that it discriminates against any particular nationality. It would not prevent the acceptance of any number of immigrants of any number of immigrants of any nationality up to the maximum, who were unmarried members of that national group. Certainly those who are unmarried have but one family, while those married have a second one, which indeed demands a greater loyalty and attention than the original family unit. This amendment upholds the purpose of the fifth-preference category; the promotion of primary family unity. It seems to me that this should have greater importance than secondary, or multifamily unity.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I sincerely believe that the Dennis amendment is needed to help bring our immigration into closer agreement with the demand and historic basic objectives of our Nation's immigration policy.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the best argument against the Dennis amendment was made by the author himself when he said that it "has nothing to do with the people this bill affects."

That statement by Mr. DENNIS is true, and it signifies the importance of putting his amendment in perspective. The substance of the Dennis amendment should be considered when we consider, as the subcommittee will, a revision of the whole preference system. But to single out at this point one of the preferences would, of course, change the entire basic policy which we enacted in 1965. It would also have the effect of singling out one particular group of people where the backlog is most severe, and that is, the people of Italy. To restrict eligibility for the fifth preference category to unmarried brothers and sisters would do violence to the concept of reunification of families—a basic objective of the 1965 act.

At this point it would be unwise to adopt the Dennis amendment which is aimed at only one category.

The sensible way to legislate is to examine the whole question of whether or not there should be revisions in the preference system established in 1965. The place to do that is in the subcommittee and the full committee—after full hearings.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. I should like to point out to my friend from New York that this section deals with one specific preference only, the fifth preference, and all I am doing by this amendment is not affecting at all his attempt to deal with this so-called backlog. I am simply—and I submit it is very germane—trying to keep the backlog from again occurring, this being the fourth time we have had special legislation for that very purpose. All I suggest is that if we are going to do that, we ought to do something about the future.

Mr. RYAN. It is a piecemeal change, and the important point is that we ought to deal with the whole preference system at one time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the subcommittee, and I rise in opposition to the Dennis amendment. Mr. DENNIS' argument reminded me a little bit of a saying of Plato: "One way to raise your standard of living is to reduce your consumption." The way to solve the problem, if there is a problem of backlog of Italian immigrants, is not just to arbitrarily redefine the definition that would otherwise admit them to this country. Unfortunately for his argument, that is not what his amendment does.

As the gentleman from New York so ably pointed out, and as Mr. DENNIS himself said, his amendment would not affect the people who should come in under the fifth preference under this bill, which is purely temporary legislation, but instead is aimed at making a permanent piecemeal revision of our immigration laws, one segment of the preference system. You cannot, however, do an intelligent job of revising the preference system unless you look at the whole system. So I think he effectively has argued against his own amendment.

I would like to address myself to a point that was raised by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL). Despite the fact that the State Department has opposed this legislation on the basis that it was a return to the national origin system, just merely saying it does not make it so.

The fact is that at the time the 1965 act was passed, there was a backlog of 115,000 applications from Italy resulting from the unfair and discriminatory restrictions of the national origins system. At that time it was pointed out that unless arrangements were made for cleaning up that backlog, there would be some great inequities done by virtue of this discrimination resulting from the old system. The arrangements were not made at the time that act was passed to clean up the backlog. What we are trying to do now is belatedly correct a failure in the 1965 act. It is not by any conceivable argument a return to the national origins system. It is temporary in nature, it lasts only 4 years, and it is merely an effort to correct these past inequities.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague on the subcommittee a brief question. Do you agree with me, that during consideration of this bill—during which time we were so ably led by the chairman of the subcommittee—was it not decided that this bill deals not only with one or two countries, but also deals worldwide with the problems we are considering? Is it not highly doubtful that any maximum number would be used? It is dealing with the Italian and the Irish situations. My question is, Are not we dealing with what has become a red herring when we talk about 160,000?

Mr. SEIBERLING. The practical result of this bill will be a much smaller figure admitted, but since it is general legislation, it has to be broadly written and cover all countries affected.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this point to state I am in favor of this bill, and I join the gentleman in his remarks. I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS). It is not only injurious to the purposes and intents of the bill itself, but also, it should not even be considered as part of the bill. This amendment has been debated at length in the subcommittee and in the full committee, and it was defeated in both places.

The amendment seeks to restrict the fifth preference category to unmarried brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. At present, the law applies simply to brothers and sisters, whether married or not. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) then seeks a permanent change in the immigration law which is clearly not consistent with the temporary nature of this bill.

The amendment would work a particular hardship on those wishing to immigrate from Italy who have brothers and sisters in this country. That nation has the most serious backlog in the fifth preference category. If the amendment is adopted, it would virtually destroy one of the principal objectives of the bill—to reunite families.

It has been argued here today that

there has been an effort on three different occasions to eliminate the backlogs prior to the enactment of the 1965 immigration and nationality bill, and that is true. But the purpose of the 1965 bill was to eliminate backlogs. It was not accomplished. That is the reason for this bill today. Instead of a 5-year phase-in period, it was a 3-year phase-in period. Instead of a situation without quotas, there were quotas. Hence the backlog did develop.

There have been arguments that this bill as written would not curb or prevent the recurrence of backlogs in the future, and that backlogs will recur. The State Department figures indicate that the additional visas provided in the bill are sufficient to clear up the "live" backlog and provide a few extra visas for the sixth preference category. Future allotments should be sufficient to handle any new immigrants.

The overwhelming vote of the committee against this amendment was a sound one, and it should be sufficient testimony to the efficacy of their position and of the opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, is not the main thrust against this amendment the fact that it is permanent legislation on a temporary measure?

Mr. BIAGGI. Yes. I have indicated that in my remarks, Mr. Chairman. It is permanent legislation attached to a temporary measure. It would survive this particular bill, after the bill outlives its existence, after 4 years.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) in support of the bill as written by the committee.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. I want to join in the remarks of our distinguished colleague from New York, and I also join in congratulating the chairman of the subcommittee, who handled the bill and who has had extensive hearings on it.

At this time I believe it would be unwise to amend the work of the committee. Therefore, I shall oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. CAREY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman made in connection with the amendment and the bill, and to indicate that in a sense the adoption of the amendment would be disastrous to the intent of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9615, a successor bill to the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act which I cosponsored.

This is an emergency immigration measure devised to correct unforeseen injustices in the 1965 act. As a result of these inequities there has been an increase in the backlog of fifth preference applicants—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—from Italy as well as a drastic decline of immigration from Ireland.

This bill, which is endorsed by the American Committee on Italian Migration and the American Irish National Immigration Committee, is the culmination of years of work to arrive at a solution to the unanticipated effects of the 1965 act.

H.R. 9615 provides for the issuance of special immigrant visas for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, from any country whose registrations were pending on July 1, 1964, who qualify as fifth preference immigrants under section 203(a)(5) of the Immigration Act of 1965 and for whom petitions have been filed with the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1971.

According to the Visa Office of the State Department, the total Italian fifth preference registration as of July 1, 1971, is 86,054. The visa office also advises that 64,000 of these have been reached by the American Consulates as of January 25, 1972. On that date, in fact, the cutoff date for Italian fifth preference was March 1, 1970. The "live" Italian backlog, therefore, is about 22,000. The difference between the figure 86,054—the backlog on the books—and the figure of 22,000 is the mortality rate.

The realistic backlog, then, is 22,000 and H.R. 9615 is more than adequate to bring up to date the Italian fifth preference and to grant some numbers also to the Italian sixth preference which has been closed for years.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by Mr. DENNIS would drastically change the preference system of the 1965 act under which the existing fifth preference is for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The Dennis amendment would restrict the fifth preference to unmarried brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

The rationale behind this amendment is that the fifth preference would otherwise be perpetually oversubscribed. But this fear of the recurrence of backlogs is completely unjustified by all available evidence.

At present in the Eastern Hemisphere only Italy and the Philippines have a backlog in the fifth preference, as I have indicated. The Philippine problem stems from the fact that all 20,000 numbers are preempted by the first three preferences. The Italian problem is caused by the huge backlog existing when the new law went into effect. It must also be noted that this backlog was accumulated over years of discrimination under the 1952 Walter-McCarran Act.

Mr. Chairman, the Dennis amendment would be contrary to one of the original purposes of the act—the reunification of families.

I believe that this is an equitable bill. The legislation also provides that immigrants from previously undersubscribed countries; that is, Ireland, England, and so forth, would be allocated additional visas to the extent of 75 percent, less the numbers issued during the previous fiscal year, of the average number of visas available to these countries in the 10-year period from 1955 to 1965. The visa numbers to be issued would not exceed 7,500 for any such foreign state.

Mr. Chairman, the 1965 act has unwittingly produced a situation of disadvantage for formerly privileged countries. When the 1965 act was first formulated, a 5-year phaseout period was contemplated in order to give the privileged countries a realistic opportunity to adjust to the new system. The phaseout period, instead, was reduced to 2½ years.

Consequently, immigration from Ireland, for example, has dwindled from an average of 5,000 before 1965 to little more than 1,000 at present.

I believe this bill is also realistic. The total number of additional visas is 72,531. A temporary annual increase over 4 years of 18,000 immigrants can hardly be considered to threaten either the economic stability of the United States or the job security of the American worker. It must be pointed out that this figure of 18,000 includes spouses and minor children of the principal applicants. Therefore, a conservative estimate of the actual number of immigrants who will enter the labor market is approximately 9,000. In a total labor force of 86 million, an increase of 9,000 is minimal.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that H.R. 9615 be passed without amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dennis amendment. I should like to raise and support the chairman of the subcommittee, who brought the bill to the floor.

I strongly endorse the provisions of H.R. 9615, to amend the Immigration Reform Act of 1965. In 1965 the Congress acted to end the harsh and inequitable national origins system for admitting immigrants, and in its place, a system which admits immigrants on a first-come-first-served basis was established. However, under this new system, certain countries, including Italy, Ireland, and Germany, have inadvertently been discriminated against, and so this new act will provide additional immigrant visas to correct these injustices.

I am especially pleased that this bill will provide additional fifth preference visas, which are granted to foreign nationals whose brother or sister is a U.S. citizen. For those who have a brother or sister living in their native country who would like to come to the United States, this change will mean that these families can once again be united. Those of Italian descent will particularly benefit under this section, because 28,680 additional fifth preference visas will be granted to Italy, thereby ending the backlog which has built up over the years.

People of greatly diverse origins have

come together in this country, and the richest part of our heritage has been our ability to work together for a strong America under which all prosper. The legislation before us today reaffirms that proud heritage, and so I urge its enactment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate with great interest. I am not a member of the committee, and I am of course, not a member of the subcommittee. However, it has become quite apparent to me during this debate that the bill is temporary legislation which is designed to correct an inequity.

The Immigration and Nationality Act was amended in 1965. At that time it was not supposed to adversely affect any country. During the transition period from the concept of national origins to first-come first-served the backlog of each country was supposed to be absorbed into this country. However, this has not occurred.

I believe this temporary legislation is much needed. The subcommittee and the committee are to be commended for reporting it out. I believe we should pass this bill as it is, and then wait for the permanent legislation to be reported out by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, today the House will undoubtedly pass a very important piece of legislation—H.R. 9615—to grant additional immigrant visas to certain foreign countries. I support this measure and urge its passage.

This bill removes two inequities which have been present since the enactment of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act. While the 1965 act eliminated the national origins quota system, and rightly so, it also had the unfortunate side effect of barring immigrants from a number of European countries which had been a great source of immigration in the past—they could no longer qualify under the new preference system. They did not qualify, because either they were unable to compete on an equal basis with immigrants from other countries who had earlier registration dates, or because they lacked labor certification. The second inequity was its failure to remove the fifth preference backlog, which relates to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

The additional visas will be available annually to a number of countries, but will particularly affect Ireland and Italy, and will be 75 percent of the 1955–64 average of immigrant visas issued, less visas issued each year under the permanent provisions of the act, not to exceed 7,500 visas per country per fiscal year. Primarily, the bill will permit entry into the United States of about 16,000 Irish immigrants at the rate of about 4,000 a year and about 28,000 Italian immigrants, at the rate of 7,000 a year. It is to be noted that this is a temporary measure, permitting entry into this country for a period of 4 years to correct the present inequitable situation.

For a nation, made up of immigrants, it would be a disgrace not to pass this measure. It will correct certain injustices perpetrated against countries which have been responsible for so many of our good and indeed great citizens. Benefiting most under this bill will be Ireland and Italy. However, there are other countries, also assisted, including Poland, England, and Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

On a division (demanded by Mr. DENNIS) there were—ayes 21, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAMS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9615) to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 87, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODINO. 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 and also that I may be permitted to include extraneous matter after my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962; APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous concent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3054) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3054

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2620) is amended by striking out the colon and the following: *"Provided,* That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, 1972".

SEC. 2. That all real property of the United States which was transferred to the United States Postal Service and was, prior to such transfer, treated as Federal property for purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), shall continue to be treated as Federal property for such purpose for two years beyond the end of the fiscal year in which such transfer occurred.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERKINS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3054 and substitute in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11570, as passed, as follows:

That section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2620) is amended by striking out "1972" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill, as amended, 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.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11570) was laid on the table.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to S. 3054 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, DANIELS of New Jersey, MEEDS, QUIE, and ESCH.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. In response to the distinguished minority leader, we have completed the program for this week. I shall ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday next when we adjourn today.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day, to be followed by the following four suspensions:

H.R. 8395, to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act;

H.R. 4174, to amend the Uniform Time Act;

H.R. 11948, participation in the Hague Conference on Private International Law; and

House Joint Resolution 984, U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

Tuesday is the call of the Private Calendar to be followed by H.R. 13120, Modification in Par Value of the Dollar, the so-called gold bill, subject to a rule being granted.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, the program is as follows:

H.R. 11896, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, also subject to a rule being granted; and

The legislative appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. SPEAKER, would the gentleman from Michigan yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Is not the consideration of H.R. 13120 also contingent upon a report being filed?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes; as I recall, I said that.

Mr. GROSS. As I understood the gentleman from Louisiana, the gentleman said subject to a rule being granted, but as far as I can determine there is no report available on that bill.

Mr. BOGGS. That report has been filed by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN). It is Report No. 92-912.

It is likely that one day next week the conference report on S. 18, Radio Free Europe, will also be called up.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions, duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business scheduled for Calendar Wednesday on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR INVESTMENT IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-193)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and 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:

The ability of the American people to harness the discoveries of science in the service of man has always been an important element in our national progress. As I noted in my most recent message on the State of the Union, Americans have long been known all over the world for their technological ingenuity—for being able to "build a better mousetrap"—and this capacity has undergirded both our domestic prosperity and our international strength.

We owe a great deal to the researchers and engineers, the managers and entrepreneurs who have made this record possible. Again and again they have met what seemed like impossible challenges. Again and again they have achieved success. They have found a way of preventing polio, placed men on the moon, and sent television pictures across the oceans. They have contributed much to our standard of living and our military strength.

But the accomplishments of the past are not something we can rest on. They are something we must build on. I am therefore calling today for a strong new effort to marshal science and technology in the work of strengthening our economy and improving the quality of our life. And I am outlining ways in which the Federal Government can work as a more effective partner in this great task.

The importance of technological innovation has become dramatically evident in the past few years. For one thing, we have come to recognize that such innovation is essential to improving our economic productivity—to producing more and better goods and services at lower costs. And improved productivity, in turn, is essential if we are to achieve a full and durable prosperity—without inflation and without war. By fostering greater productivity, technological innovation can help us to expand our markets at home and abroad, strengthening old industries, creating new ones, and generally providing more jobs for the millions who will soon be entering the labor market.

This work is particularly important at a time when other countries are rapidly moving upward on the scientific and technological ladder, challenging us both in intellectual and in economic terms. Our international position in fields such as electronics, aircraft, steel, automobiles and shipbuilding is not as strong as it once was. A better performance is essential to both the health of our domestic economy and our leadership position abroad.

At the same time, the impact of new technology can do much to enrich the quality of our lives. The forces which threaten that quality will be growing at a dramatic pace in the years ahead. One of the great questions of our time is whether our capacity to deal with these forces will grow at a similar rate. The answer to that question lies in our scientific and technological progress.

As we face the new challenges of the 1970's, we can draw upon a great reservoir of scientific and technological information and skill—the result of the enormous investments which both the Federal Government and private enterprise made in research and development in recent years. In addition, this Nation's historic commitment to scientific excellence, its determination to take the lead in exploring the unknown, have given us a great tradition, a rich legacy on which to draw. Now it is for us to extend that tradition by applying that legacy in new situations.

In pursuing this goal, it is important to remember several things. In the first place, we must always be aware that the mere act of scientific discovery alone is not enough. Even the most important breakthrough will have little impact on our lives unless it is put to use—and putting an idea to use is a far more complex process than has often been appreciated. To accomplish this transformation, we must combine the genius of invention with the skills of entrepreneurship, management, marketing and finance.

Secondly, we must see that the environment for technological innovation is a favorable one. In some cases, excessive regulation, inadequate incentives and other barriers to innovation have worked to discourage and even to impede the entrepreneurial spirit. We need to do a better job of determining the extent to which such conditions exist, their underlying causes, and the best ways of dealing with them.

Thirdly, we must realize that the mere development of a new idea does not necessarily mean that it can or should be put into immediate use. In some cases, laws or regulations may inhibit its implementation. In other cases, the costs of the process may not be worth the benefits it produces. The introduction of some new technologies may produce undesirable side effects. Patterns of living and human behavior must also be taken into account. By realistically appreciating the limits of technological innovation, we will be in a better position fully to marshal its amazing strengths.

A fourth consideration concerns the need for scientific and technological manpower. Creative, inventive, dedicated scientists and engineers will surely be in demand in the years ahead; young people who believe they would find satisfaction in such careers should not hesitate to undertake them. I am convinced they will find ample opportunity to serve their communities and their country in important and exciting ways.

The fifth basic point I would make concerning our overall approach to science and technology in the 1970's concerns the importance of maintaining that spirit of curiosity and adventure which has always driven us to explore the unknown. This means that we must continue to give an important place to basic research

and to exploratory experiments which provide the new ideas on which our edifice of technological accomplishment rests. Basic research in both the public and private sectors today is essential to our continuing progress tomorrow. All departments and agencies of the Federal Government will continue to support basic research which can help provide a broader range of future development options.

Finally, we must appreciate that the progress we seek requires a new partnership in science and technology—one which brings together the Federal Government, private enterprise, State and local governments, and our universities and research centers in a coordinated, cooperative effort to serve the national interest. Each member of that partnership must play the role it can play best; each must respect and reinforce the unique capacities of the other members. Only if this happens, only if our new partnership thrives, can we be sure that our scientific and technological resources will be used as effectively as possible in meeting our priority national needs.

With a new sense of purpose and a new sense of partnership, we can make the 1970's a great new era for American science and technology. Let us look now at some of the specific elements in this process.

STRENGTHENING THE FEDERAL ROLE

The role of the Federal Government in shaping American science and technology is pivotal. Of all our Nation's expenditures on research and development, 55 percent are presently funded by the Federal Government. Directly or indirectly, the Federal Government supports the employment of nearly half of all research and development personnel in the United States.

A good part of our Federal effort in this field has been directed in the past toward our national security needs. Because a strong national defense is essential to the maintenance of world peace, our research and development in support of national security must always be sufficient to our needs. We must ensure our strategic deterrent capability, continue the modernization of our Armed Forces, and strengthen the overall technological base that underlies future military systems. For these reasons, I have proposed a substantial increase for defense research and development for fiscal year 1973.

In this message, however, I would like to focus on how we can better apply our scientific resources in meeting civilian needs. Since the beginning of this Administration, I have felt that we should be doing more to focus our scientific and technological resources on the problems of the environment, health, energy, transportation and other pressing domestic concerns. If my new budget proposals are accepted, Federal funds for research and development concerning domestic problems will be 65 percent greater in the coming fiscal year than they were in 1969.

But increased funding is not the only prerequisite for progress in this field. We also need to spend our scarce resources more effectively. Accordingly, I have moved to develop an overall strategic approach in the allocation of Federal scientific and technological resources. As a part of this effort, I directed the Domestic Council last year to examine new technology opportunities in relation to domestic problems. In all of our planning, we have been concentrating not only on *how much* we spend but also on *how* we spend it.

My recommendations for strengthening the Federal role in science and technology have been presented to the Congress in my State of the Union message, in my budget for fiscal year 1973, and in individual agency presentations. I urge the Congress to support the various elements of this new Federal strategy.

1) We are reorienting our space program to focus on domestic needs—such as communications, weather forecasting and natural resource exploration. One important way of doing this is by designing and developing a reusable space shuttle, a step which would allow us to seize new opportunities in space with higher reliability at lower costs.

2) We are moving to set and meet certain civilian research and development targets. In my State of the Union Message, my Budget Message and in other communications with the Congress, I have identified a number of areas where new efforts are most likely to produce significant progress and help us meet pressing domestic needs. They include:

—Providing new sources of energy without pollution. My proposed budget for fiscal year 1973 would increase energy-related research and development expenditures by 22 percent.

—Developing fast, safe, pollution-free transportation. I have proposed spending 46 percent more in the coming fiscal year on a variety of transportation projects.

—Working to reduce the loss of life and property from natural disasters. I have asked, for example, that our earthquake research program be doubled and that our hurricane research efforts be increased.

—Improving drug abuse rehabilitation programs and efforts to curb drug trafficking. Our budget requests in this critical area are four times the level of 1971.

—Increasing biomedical research efforts, especially those concerning cancer and heart disease, and generally providing more efficient and effective health care, including better emergency health care systems.

3) We will also draw more directly on the capabilities of our high technology agencies—the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Bureau of Standards in the Department of Commerce—in applying research and development to domestic problems.

4) We are making strong efforts to improve the scientific and technological basis for setting Federal standards and regulations. For example, by learning to measure more precisely the level of air pollution and its effects on our health, we can do a more effective job of setting pollution standards and of enforcing those standards once they are established.

5) I am also providing in my 1973 budget for a 12 percent increase for research and development conducted at universities and colleges. This increase reflects the effort of the past 2 years to encourage educational institutions to undertake research related to important national problems.

6) Finally, I believe that the National Science Foundation should draw on all sectors of the scientific and technological community in working to meet significant domestic challenges. To this end, I am taking action to permit the Foundation to support applied research in industry when the use of industrial capabilities would be advantageous in accomplishing the Foundation's objectives.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The direction of private scientific and technological activities is determined in large measure by thousands of private decisions—and this should always be the case. But we cannot ignore the fact that Federal policy also has a great impact on what happens in the private sector. This influence is exerted in many ways—including direct Federal support for such research and development.

In general, I believe it is appropriate for the Federal Government to encourage private research and development to the extent that the market mechanism is not effective in bringing needed innovations into use. This can happen in a number of circumstances. For example, the sheer size of some developmental projects is beyond the reach of private firms particularly in industries which are fragmented into many small companies. In other cases, the benefits of projects cannot be captured by private institutions, even though they may be very significant for the whole of society. In still other cases, the risks of certain projects, while acceptable to society as a whole, are excessive for individual companies.

In all these cases, Federal support of private research and development is necessary and desirable. We must see that such support is made available—through cost-sharing agreements, procurement policies, or other arrangements.

One example of the benefits of such a partnership between the Federal Government and private enterprise is the program I presented last June to meet our growing need for clean energy. As I outlined the Federal role in this effort, I also indicated that industry's response to these initiatives would be crucial. That response has been most encouraging to date. For example, the electric utilities have already pledged some $25 million a year for a period of 10 years for developing a liquid metal fast breeder reactor demonstration plant. These pledges have come through the Edison Electric Institute, the American Public Power Association, and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. This effort is one part of a larger effort by the electrical utilities to raise $150 million annually for research and development to meet

the growing demand for clean electric power.

At the same time, the gas companies, through the American Gas Association, have raised $10 million to accelerate the effort to convert coal into gas. This sum represents industry's first-year share in a pilot plant program which will be financed one-third by industry and two-thirds by the Federal Government. When it proves feasible to proceed to the demonstration stage, industrial contributions to this project will be expected to increase.

APPLYING GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED TECHNOLOGIES

An asset unused is an asset wasted. Federal research and development activities generate a great deal of new technology which could be applied in ways which go well beyond the immediate mission of the supporting agency. In such cases, I believe the Government has a responsibility to transfer the results of its research and development activities to wider use in the private sector.

It was to further this objective that we created in 1970 the new National Technical Information Service in the Department of Commerce. In addition, the new incentives programs of the National Science Foundation and the National Bureau of Standards will seek effective means of improving and accelerating the transfer of research and development results from Federal programs to a wider range of potential users.

One important barrier to the private development and commercial application of Government-sponsored technologies is the lack of incentive which results from the fact that such technologies are generally available to all competitors. To help remedy this situation, I approved last August a change in the Government patent policy which liberalized the private use of Government-owned patents. I directed that such patents may be made available to private firms through exclusive licenses where needed to encourage commercial application.

As a further step in this same direction, I am today directing my Science Adviser and the Secretary of Commerce to develop plans for a new, systematic effort to promote actively the licensing of Government-owned patents and to obtain domestic and foreign patent protection for technology owned by the United States Government in order to promote its transfer into the civilian economy.

IMPROVING THE CLIMATE FOR INNOVATION

There are many ways in which the Federal Government influences the level and the quality of private research and development. Its direct supportive efforts are important, but other policies—such as tax, patent, procurement, regulation, and antitrust policies—also can have a significant effect on the climate for innovation.

We know, for instance, that a strong and reliable patent system is important to technological progress and industrial strength. The process of applying technology to achieve our national goals calls for a tremendous investment of money, energy, and talent by our private enterprise system. If we expect industry to support this investment, we must make the most effective possible use of the incentives which are provided by our patent system.

The way we apply our antitrust laws can also do much to shape research and development. Uncertain reward and high risks can be significant barriers to progress when a firm is small in relation to the scale of effort required for successful projects. In such cases, formal or informal combinations of firms provide one means for hurdling these barriers, especially in highly fragmented industries. On the other hand, joint efforts among leading firms in highly concentrated industries would normally be considered undesirable. In general, combinations which lead to an improved allocation of the resources of the Nation are normally permissible, but actions which lead to excessive market power for any single group are not. Any joint program for research and development must be approached in a way that does not detract from the normal competitive incentives of our free enterprise economy.

I believe we need to be better informed about the full consequences of all such policies for scientific and technological progress. For this reason, I have included in my budget for the coming fiscal year a program whereby the National Science Foundation would support assessments and studies focused specifically on barriers to technological innovation and on the consequences of adopting alternative Federal policies which would reduce or eliminate these barriers. These studies would be undertaken in close consultation with the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce and other concerned departments and agencies, so that the results can be most expeditiously considered as further Government decisions are made.

There are a number of additional steps which can also do much to enhance the climate for innovation.

1) I shall submit legislation to encourage the development of the small, high technology firms which have had such a distinguished pioneering record. Because the combination of high technology and small size makes such firms exceptionally risky from an investment standpoint, my proposal would provide additional means for the Small Business Investment Companies (SBICs) to improve the availability of venture capital to such firms.

a. I propose that the ratio of Government support to SBICs be increased. This increased assistance would be channeled to small business concerns which are principally engaged in the development or exploitation of inventions or of technological improvements and new products.

b. I propose that the current limit on Small Business Administration loans to each SBIC be increased to $20 million to allow for growth in SBIC funds devoted to technology investments.

c. I propose that federally regulated commercial banks again be permitted to achieve up to 100 percent ownership of an SBIC, rather than the limited 50 percent ownership which is allowed at present.

d. To enhance risk-taking and entrepreneurial ventures, I again urge passage of the small business tax bill, which would provide for extending the eligibility period for the exercise of qualified stock options from 5 to 8 or 10 years, reducing the holding period for non-registered stock from 3 years to 1 year, and extending the tax-loss carry-forward from 5 to 10 years. These provisions would apply to small firms, as defined in the proposed legislation.

2) I have requested in my proposed budget for fiscal year 1973 that new programs be set up by the National Science Foundation and the National Bureau of Standards to determine effective ways of stimulating non-Federal investment in research and development and of improving the application of research and development results. The experiments to be set up under this program are designed to test a variety of partnership arrangements among the various levels of government, private firms and universities. They would include the exploration of new arrangements for cost-sharing patent licensing, and research support, as well as the testing of incentives for industrial research associations.

3) To provide a focal point within the executive branch for policies concerning industrial research and development, the Department of Commerce will appraise, on a continuing basis, the technological strengths and weaknesses of American industry. It will propose measures to assure a vigorous state of industrial progress. The Department will work with other agencies in identifying barriers to such progress and will draw on the studies and assessments prepared through the National Science Foundation and the National Bureau of Standards.

4) To foster useful innovation, I also plan to establish a new program of research and development prizes. These prizes will be awarded by the President for outstanding achievements by individuals and institutions and will be used especially to encourage needed innovation in key areas of public concern. I believe these prizes will be an important symbol of the Nation's concern for our scientific and technological challenges.

5) An important step which could be of great significance in fostering technological innovations and enhancing our position in world trade is that of changing to the metric system of measurement. The Secretary of Commerce has submitted to the Congress legislation which would allow us to begin to develop a carefully coordinated national plan to bring about this change. The proposed legislation would bring together a broadly representative board of private citizens who would work with all sectors of our society in planning for such a transition. Should such a change be decided on, it would be implemented on a cooperative, voluntary basis.

STRONGER FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS

A consistent theme which runs throughout my program for making

government more responsive to public needs is the idea that each level of government should do what it can do best. This same theme characterizes my approach to the challenges of research and development. The Federal Government, for example, can usually do a good job of massing research and development resources. But State and local governments usually have a much better "feel" for the specific public challenges to which those resources can be applied. If we are to use science and technology effectively in meeting these challenges, then State and local governments should have a central role in the application process. That process is a difficult one at best; it will be even more complex and frustrating if the States and localities are not adequately involved.

To help build a greater sense of partnership among the three levels of the Federal system, I am directing my Science Adviser, in cooperation with the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, to serve as a focal point for discussions among various Federal agencies and the representatives of State and local governments. These discussions should lay the basis for developing a better means for collaboration and consultation on scientific and technological questions in the future. They should focus on the following specific subjects:

(1) Systematic ways for communicating to the appropriate Federal agencies the priority needs of State and local governments, along with information concerning locally-generated solutions to such problems. In this way, such information can be incorporated into the Federal research and development planning process.

(2) Ways of assuring State and local governments adequate access to the technical resources of major Federal research and development centers, such as those which are concerned with transportation, the environment, and the development of new sources of energy.

(3) Methods whereby the Federal Government can encourage the aggregation of State and local markets for certain products so that industries can give Government purchasers the benefits of innovation and economies of scale.

The discussions which take place between Federal, State and local representatives can also help to guide the experimental programs I have proposed for the National Science Foundation and the National Bureau of Standards. These programs, in turn, can explore the possibilities for creating better ties between State and local governments on the one hand and local industries and universities on the other, thus stimulating the use of research and development in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public services at the State and local level.

WORLD PARTNERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The laws of nature transcend national boundaries. Increasingly, the peoples of the world are irrevocably linked in a complex web of global interdependence—and increasingly the strands of that web are woven by science and technology.

The cause of scientific and technological progress has always been advanced when men have been able to reach across international boundaries in common pursuits. Toward this end, we must now work to facilitate the flow of people and the exchange of ideas, and to recognize that the basic problems faced in each nation are shared by every nation.

I believe this country can benefit substantially from the experience of other countries, even as we help other countries by sharing our information and facilities and specialists with them. To promote this goal, I am directing the Federal agencies, under the leadership of the Department of State, to identify new opportunities for international cooperation in research and development. At the same time, I am inviting other countries to join in research efforts in the United States, including:

—the effort to conquer cancer at the unique research facilities of our National Institutes of Health and at Fort Detrick, Maryland; and

—the effort to understand the adverse health effects of chemicals, drugs and pollutants at the new National Center for Toxicological Research at Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

These two projects concern priority problems which now challenge the whole world's research community. But they are only a part of the larger fabric of cooperative international efforts in which we are now engaged.

Science and technology can also provide important links with countries which have different political systems from ours. For example, we have recently concluded an agreement with the Soviet Union in the field of health, an agreement which provides for joint research on cancer, heart disease and environmental health problems. We are also cooperating with the Soviet Union in the space field; we will continue to exchange lunar samples and we are exploring prospects for closer cooperation in satellite meteorology, in remote sensing of the environment, and in space medicine. Beyond this, joint working groups have verified the technical feasibility of a docking mission between a SALYUT Station and an Apollo spacecraft.

One result of my recent visit to the People's Republic of China was an agreement to facilitate the development of contacts and exchanges in many fields, including science and technology. I expect to see further progress in this area.

The United Nations and a number of its specialized agencies are also involved in a wide range of scientific and technological activities. The importance of these tasks—and the clear need for an international approach to technical problems with global implications—argues for the most effective possible organization and coordination of various international agencies concerned. As a step in this direction, I proposed in a recent message to the Congress the creation of a United Nations Fund for the Environment to foster an international attack on environmental problems. Also, I believe the American scientific community should participate more fully in the science activities of international agencies.

To further these objectives, I am taking steps to initiate a broad review of United States involvement in the scientific and technological programs of international organizations and of steps that might be taken to make United States participation in these activities more effective, with even stronger ties to our domestic programs.

Finally, I would emphasize that United States science and technology can and must play an important role in the progress of developing nations. We are committed to bring the best of our science and technology to bear on the critical problems of development through our reorganized foreign assistance programs.

A NEW SENSE OF PURPOSE AND A NEW SENSE OF PARTNERSHIP

The years ahead will require a new sense of purpose and a new sense of partnership in science and technology. We must define our goals clearly, so that we know where we are going. And then we must develop careful strategies for pursuing those goals, strategies which bring together the Federal Government, the private sector, the universities, and the States and local communities in a cooperative pursuit of progress. Only then can we be confident that our public and private resources for science and technology will be spent as effectively as possible.

In all these efforts, it will be essential that the American people be better equipped to make wise judgments concerning public issues which involve science and technology. As our national life is increasingly permeated by science and technology, it is important that public understanding grow apace.

The investment we make today in science and technology and in the development of our future scientific and technical talent is an investment in tomorrow—an investment which can have a tremendous impact on the basic quality of our lives. We must be sure that we invest wisely and well.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 16, 1972*

INSISTENCE ON COMPLETE LIST OF ALL PRISONERS HELD BY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE, VIETCONG, AND PATHET LAO

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 18, Spec5c. James M. Ray will begin his 5th year as a prisoner of the Vietcong. Specialist Ray is only 22 years old and was only 18 when captured.

I received a letter from his father today which sums up better than I ever could the suffering and torment our captured servicemen must endure every day. It also points out the suffering of the prisoners' families, especially the families of those men who are listed as missing in action. Even though the Vietcong have never acknowledged the capture of Specialist Ray, a fellow prisoner who

escaped in 1969 told his family that Jimmy was alive. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Jimmy's father points out the need for our Government to insist on a complete list of all prisoners held by the North Vietnamese, Vietcong, and Pathet Lao. The letter is as follows:

ENCINO, CALIF.,
March 15, 1972.

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONTGOMERY: March 18, 1972 will mark the beginning of my 22-year old son's fifth year as a prisoner of war. Our family has not forgotten him neither will we allow Madame Binh and the National Liberation Front to do so.

By day he is chained to a tree, at night he is kept in an underground pit. His diet consists of one cup of rice a day and medical care is minimal. For the past four years the Viet Cong have refused to acknowledge him or the many other men they hold captive—even though a prisoner escaped from his camp in April, 1969. He indicated my son was one of the three healthiest in the group, both mentally and physically; despite the fact that the National Liberation Front has refused him the basic requirements of the Geneva Convention. The Viet Cong treat Specialist 5 James M. Ray as an American and a serviceman—but not as a human being.

Courage, brotherhood and faith will never become just words to him. Jimmy will bring back memories of men striving to pull a fellow prisoner from the depths of despair and depression. He'll understand that kinship which emerges from one human being's concern for another.

Also, he will have learned, all too well, of man's inhumanity to man. The Viet Cong have disregarded every civilized rule set down through the ages. If this is the sort of cruelty he went over there to alleviate, then it was worth it. Perhaps Jimmy's suffering may prevent his son from having to undergo years of living hell. Someday the world may realize that brotherhood and humanitarianism are not just words—they are commitments.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. RAY.

U.S. ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN CAMBODIA

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, at 11:30 last night there was knock at the door of my house in Washington.

A State Department official entered from the dark of night bearing photocopy of an extraordinary document signed Richard M. Nixon.

The timing of my midnight visitor's visit was no coincidental.

On February 9, 1972, I wrote a letter, as chairman of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, requesting the country field submissions for Cambodia for the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 and mentioned the section of the Foreign Assistance Act which provides that in the event of denial of information to the Congress money for that foreign aid program will cease 35 days after such request unless the President himself invokes the doctrine of Executive privilege.

That 35-day period expired at midnight last night.

Thirty minutes before the deadline, my midnight visitor delivered to me a photocopy of the document whereby Mr. Nixon asserted this doctrine.

The Committee on Government Operations, through its duly-constituted subcommittee with jurisdiction over U.S. economic assistance programs abroad, is now unable to comply with our mandate from the House of Representatives to study the economy and efficiency of such government activities at all levels.

On March 3, I advised Secretary of State Rogers of the possible implications of withholding information from Congress on the Cambodian aid program. I said at that time:

> This position can only raise questions in the minds of Members of Congress and the public that the Executive Branch is trying to hide something it is either ashamed of or unable to defend.

Now that this action to deny Congress this information actually has been taken, I feel impelled to raise a question.

"Could it be that the administration is trying to cover up the possible diversion of economic assistance funds for military uses when these funds were specifically appropriated by Congress to support the civilian economy with essential commodity imports?"

Others might logically ask whether there is any connection between this refusal and the new dictatorship which has been established in Cambodia?

I think the American public and Congress have a right to know the answers.

We have never been refused this document—the country field submission—under the past three administrations until now. We always have respected the proper security classifications. Since 1964 we have examined at least nine Country field subcommissions for East Asia and numerous others for other nations in other parts of the world.

So what is so special about the documents for Cambodia? What is it that the White House cannot share with the Congress—the duly-elected representatives of the American people?

I include a copy of the President's memorandum at this point in the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1972.

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Director, United States Information Agency

As you know, by a memorandum of August 30, 1971 to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, I directed "not to make available to the Congress any internal working documents which would disclose tentative planning data on future years of the military assistance program which are not approved Executive Branch positions." In that memorandum, I fully explained why I considered that the disclosure of such internal working papers to the Congress would not be in the public interest.

I have now been informed that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee have requested basic planning documents submitted by the country field teams to the United States Information Agency and the Agency for International Development, and other similar papers. These documents include at USIA Country Program Memoranda and the AID fiscal year 1973 Country Field Submission for Cambodia, which are prepared in the field for the benefit of the agencies and the Department of State and contain recommendations for the future.

Due to these new requests for documents of a similar nature to those covered by my August 30, 1971 directive, I hereby reiterate the position of this Administration so that there can be no misunderstanding on this point.

My memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, dated March 24, 1969, set forth our basic policy which is to comply to the fullest extent possible with Congressional requests for information. In pursuance of this policy, the Executive Departments and Agencies, have provided to the Congress an unprecedented volume of information. In addition, Administration witnesses have appeared almost continuously before appropriate Committees of the Congress to present pertinent facts and information to satisfy Congressional needs in its oversight function and to present the views of the Administration on proposed legislation.

The precedents on separation of powers established by my predecessors from first to last clearly demonstrate, however, that the President has the responsibility not to make available any information and material which would impair the orderly function of the Executive Branch of Government, since to do so would not be in the public interest. As indicated in my memorandum of March 24, 1969, this Administration will invoke Executive Privilege to withhold information only in the most compelling circumstances and only after a rigorous inquiry into the actual need for its exercise.

In accordance with the procedures established in my memorandum of March 24, 1969, I have conducted an inquiry with regard to the Congressional requests brought to my attention in this instance. The basic planning data and the various internal staff papers requested by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee do not, insofar as they deal with future years, reflect any approved program of this Administration, but only proposals that are under consideration. Furthermore, the basic planning data requested reflect only tentative intermediate staff level thinking, which is but one step in the process of preparing recommendations to the Department Heads, and thereafter to me.

I repeat my deep concern, shared by my predecessors, that unless privacy of preliminary exchange of views between personnel of the Executive Branch can be maintained, the full frank and healthy expression of opinion which is essential for the successful administration of Government would be muted.

Due to these facts and considerations, it is my determination that these documents fall within the conceptual scope of my directive of August 30, 1971 and that their disclosure to the Congress would also, as in that instance, not be in the public interest.

I, therefore, direct you not to make available to the Congress any internal working documents concerning the foreign assistance program or international information activities, which would disclose tentative planning data, such as is found in the Country Program Memoranda and the Country Field Submissions, and which are not approved positions.

I have again noted that you and your respective Department and Agency have already provided much information and have offered to provide additional information including planning material and factors relating to our foreign assistance programs and international information activities. In implementing my general policy to provide the fullest possible information to the Congress, I will expect you and the other Heads of Departments and Agencies to continue to make available to the Congress all information re-

lating to the foreign assistance program and international information activities not inconsistent with this directive.

RICHARD NIXON.

OIL ASSOCIATION PRICE PLEA PROBED

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the body to an article which appeared in March 14 Washington Post, entitled "Oil Association Price Plea Probed."

According to the article, the Independent Petroleum Association of America last Friday wrote a letter to the Price Commission to urge an increase of about 25 percent in the price of crude oil. The involvement by a trade association in pricing matters has always been considered a violation of our antitrust laws.

I am dismayed that this apparent violation was aimed at effecting an increase in fuel prices. Consumers throughout the country, and especially those in the Northeast, are already paying an unconscionable amount for fuel. Yes, our consumers are suffering; and as they suffer, the oil producers continue to grow rich.

The oil producers already wield unparalleled political pressure in this country. I have taken this floor many times to point out that the Congress and the administration, under both Democratic and Republican leadership, have given the oil producers every break imaginable. Oil import quotas and State agency regulation of production keep the supply down and thereby force prices up. Tax loopholes prevent the return of a fair share of the profits to the Treasury. The Justice Department has chosen to ignore the anticompetitive acquisition by the oil companies of other energy sources, such as coal and uranium.

And now we have the IPAA, a powerful trade association, attempting to influence the Price Commission's decisions with respect to crude oil.

The Post article reports that the Justice Department is investigating IPAA's involvement as a possible violation of the antitrust laws. I hope, for the sake of our consumers, that the Justice Department has indeed decided to take action. I urge the Department to spare no effort in pursuing this matter and I hope my colleagues will join me in this appeal.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR HEALTH PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, this body will, during the next few weeks, be considering the various appropriations bills that will provide funds for operating the Federal Government during fiscal 1973. Substantial amounts for health programs will be included in these measures.

According to a study of "The Budget of the United States" which I have just completed, obligations for the numerous health programs administered by the executive branch totaled $21,412,218,000 during fiscal 1971 and are estimated at $24,887,482,000 during fiscal 1972. The President has requested $26,716,189,000 for fiscal 1973, which begins in a little over 3 months. These sums do not include health funds that are not separated from nonhealth funds in the budget.

More than $21.3 billion, the bulk of the $26.7 billion asked for 1973, has been earmarked for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Congress will soon have the opportunity to work its will on the appropriations bill that provides funds for that Department—along with the Department of Labor—as well as on the various funding measures that provide money for health programs outside the jurisdiction of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the previously mentioned study, which I will place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, should interest those of my colleagues who are convinced that the Federal Government is not spending enough on health, as well as those who feel that there is a good deal of fat in some of the programs. In any event, I hope they will take a good look at the figures contained in the study, and bear in mind that the money to finance the numerous health programs can come from only one source—the taxpayers.

The study follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

[In thousands of dollars]

Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Coordination of drug abuse programs		2,850	6,556
Change in selected resources		150	300
Total obligations		3,000	6,856

The Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention was established to focus the resources of the Federal Government and bring them to bear on solving the drug abuse problem in the Nation.

The Special Action Office is developing a national strategy for the reduction of drug addiction and drug abuse in the United States. The Office will develop drug abuse programs, set program objectives and priorities, develop guidance, policies, and standards for operating agencies, and evaluate all Federal drug abuse programs.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

[In thousands of dollars]

Appalachian regional development programs	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Demonstration health projects	36,372	55,129	48,000

Grants are made for the construction, equipping, and operation of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic or treatment centers, and other facilities. Emphasis will be given to programs for child development and nutrition and to continued operational assistance for health activities in selected demonstrations within the Appalachian region.

[In thousands of dollars]

Number of projects (cumulative)	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health operations	198	258	293
Construction	77	95	103
Child development	41	65	75
Annual obligations	40,540	55,129	48,000

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

International development assistance	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Informational foreign currency schedules:			
Financing activities related to maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and problems of population growth	1,782	14,052	8,428
Financing activities related to animal or plant pest control	527	14,800	500

Portions of the foreign currencies from the sale of agricultural commodities under Public Law 83-480 are allocated to the Agency for International Development to finance activities related to maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, population growth, and plant or pest control.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

[In thousands of dollars]

Economic opportunity program	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health and nutrition	167,322	179,200	152,000

In 1973, the health services program will continue the exploration of more effective ways of organizing, delivering, and financing comprehensive health care in poverty areas. Efforts will be made to make fuller use of allied health personnel in order to increase efficiency and to prepare members of low-income groups to assume leadership and management responsibilities. Family planning activities will be continued, as will emergency food and medical services projects for Indians and migrants only. As needed other emergency food and medical services outreach will continue the phase-over to Agriculture's food stamp program begun in 1972. Drug rehabilitation will be expanded, extending a program to be increased significantly during 1972. Funds will be used to support diverse approaches to treatment in cooperation with the special action office on drug abuse programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity will have a major role in undertaking specialized research and demonstration projects conducted in conjunction with a nationwide evaluation program of Federal drug abuse activities.

The request for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reflecting transfer of responsibility, includes $21,000,000 to extend comprehensive health projects, $10,000,000 for family planning projects, and $3,000,000 for a drug rehabilitation project currently administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research:			
Research and development on the eradication of narcotic-producing plants		2,100	2,100
Coordination of departmental and interdepartmental activities related to pests and their control	64	158	158
Plant and animal disease and pest control:			
Plant disease and pest control	38,781	12,899	
Animal disease and pest control	56,311	32,725	
Pesticides regulation	2,453		

Research and development on the eradication of narcotic-producing plants. Research under this activity was started in 1972. The research conducted under this activity is directed toward the development of technology for the detection and destruction of illicit growth of narcotic-producing plants without adverse ecological effects. The development of this eradication technology is carried out in cooperation with research institutions in foreign countries.

Coordination of departmental and interdepartmental activities related to pests and their control. The 1973 estimates provide for the availability of $158,000 for the use by the Secretary to meet emergency situations relating to the safe use of pesticides. The project provided for coordination with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other agencies of the Federal Government in development of measures to protect the public health, producers, and resources.

Plant and animal disease and pest control. The regulatory and control activities previously carried out under this subappropriation item by the Agricultural Research Service were transferred to the Animal and Plant Health Service which was established effective October 31, 1971. Narrative statements describing the programs and performance of these activities are included under Animal and Plant Health Service. The level of costs, financing, and outlays relating to obligations incurred under these activities prior to October 31, 1971, are included under this account.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Plant and animal disease and pest control	2,382	808	
Miscellaneous trust funds:			
Expenses and refunds, inspection, certification, and quarantine of animal products	22	4	
Expenses, feed, and attendants for animals in quarantine	216	46	
Miscellaneous contributed funds	1,253	706	301
Prior year advances returned	10	9	
Total program costs, funded	1,501	765	301
Change in selected resources	−9	8	−26
Total obligations	1,492	773	275

The following services are financed by fees and miscellaneous contributions advanced by importers, manufacturers, States, organizations, individuals, and others.

Expenses and refunds, inspection, certification, and quarantine of animal products and byproducts not intended for human food, and for other purposes, moving in interstate and foreign commerce primarily to prevent introduction and spread of animal diseases. Fees are paid in advance for services to be rendered.

Expenses, feed, and attendants for animals in quarantine are paid from fees advanced by importers.

Miscellaneous contributed funds received from States, local organizations, individuals, and others are available for work under cooperative agreements on miscellaneous farm, utilization, and marketing research activities, plant and animal quarantine inspection, and cooperative plant and animal disease and pest control activities.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Plant disease and pest control		31,079	42,231
Animal disease and pest control		38,863	57,783
Construction of facilities			1,600
Contingencies		1,500	1,500
Total program costs, funded		71,442	103,114
Change in selected resources		278	780
Total obligations		71,720	103,894

The Service was established on October 31, 1971. The programs of the Service were formerly conducted by the Agricultural Research Service.

The major objective of the Service is to protect the animal and plant resources of the Nation, through a series of plant and animal disease and pest control programs, and through cooperation with States and local agencies and foreign governments. Costs, financing, and outlays relating to obligations incurred prior to October 31, 1971, are included under Agricultural Research Service; related level of activity data are included below for comparative purposes.

Plant disease and pest control. Programs are designed to keep out of this country by inspection at ports of entry those harmful insects, plant diseases, nematodes, and other pests that cause great damage abroad. Working with the States, programs are conducted to eradicate or prevent spread of crop pests that become established in this country. Assistance is given to the States to suppress incipient and emergency outbreaks of crop pests. The 1973 program includes an increase for agricultural quarantine inspection and pest management.

Animal disease and pest control. Programs are conducted to keep communicable diseases of foreign origin from entering this country and to prevent the spread of disease through interstate shipments of livestock or distribution of impure or impotent veterinary biologics. Other programs are directed at the control and eradication of livestock diseases. The animal welfare program is concerned with the humane care and handling of approximately 40,000,000 warm-blooded animals. The 1973 estimates propose a program to detect and combat African swine fever. The estimates propose increases for a cooperative screw-worm eradication program in Mexico, animal welfare, veterinary biologics, and a decrease in the hog cholera eradication program.

The level of activities for the major control programs on animal diseases and pests is as follows:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Brucellosis:			
Certified free States, plus Virgin Islands	23	28	30
Modified certified States, plus Puerto Rico	28	24	22
Herds tested (thousands):			
Blood tests	253	240	225
Milk ring tests	1,122	1,100	1,050
Hog cholera:			
Hog-cholera-free States	21	40	52
Suspicious outbreaks reported	4,647		
Outbreaks confirmed	418		
Tuberculosis:			
Modified accredited States, plus Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands	51	51	52
Cattle tested (thousands)	3,800	3,800	3,800
Scabies:			
Sheep inspected (millions)	8	7	6
Cattle inspected (millions)	23.2	22.0	22.0
Screw worm:			
Sterile flies released (millions)	7,051	7,100	7,000
Cases in United States outside of barrier	15	140	20
Cases in United States part of barrier	157	400	400
Cases in Mexico part of barrier	5,328	10,000	7,000
Salmonella: States with cooperative rendering plant programs, plus Puerto Rico	51	51	51
Ticks: Cattle inspected (millions)	1.5	1.5	1.5
Veterinary biologics:			
Serials produced	11,844	12,000	12,000
Serials potency tested	2,181	2,200	2,200
Serials sterility test	3,922	4,000	4,000
Public stockyards inspection: Animals inspected (millions)	37.1	36.8	36.4

The level of activities for animal inspection and quarantine is as follows:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Import inspection, animals (thousands)	1,104	1,100	1,150
Animal welfare:			
Research facilities inspected	11,291	13,145	22,500
Laboratory animal dealers inspected	2,886	3,250	9,600
Wholesale pet dealers inspected		1,950	7,800
Zoos inspected (public)		400	1,080
Zoos inspected (private)		2,400	9,600
Circuses, carnivals, and exhibitions inspected		400	1,680
Horse shows inspected		50	287

Construction of facilities. The 1973 program provides increases for planning an offshore animal quarantine station and a veterinary biologic facility. Construction of an animal import center at Floyd Bennett Field, Brooklyn, New York, is planned for 1973.

Contingencies. Of the total annual amounts provided under this appropriation, $1,500,000 is apportioned for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, and animal diseases to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions.

[In thousands of dollars]

Animal quarantine station	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Construction of facilities		50	471
Change in selected resources		80	−80
Total obligations		130	391

Public Law 88-592 authorized the sale of the Animal Quarantine Station at Clifton,

New Jersey, to the city of Clifton, and application of the proceeds of sale to the planning and construction costs of a new station in the New York-New Jersey port and airport area. A sales contract between the Department and the city of Clifton was executed at the appraised value of $527,000. An additional $1,500,000 was provided in 1970 under the subappropriation Plant and animal disease and pest control, now redesignated Animal and Plant Health Service, for the remainder of the total cost of $2,027,000 for the new station.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Plant and animal disease and pest control	2,043	3,121	
Miscellaneous services to other accounts	20	22	
Agency for International Development	71	106	
Total obligations	2,134	3,249	
Miscellaneous trust funds:			
Expenses and refunds, inspection, certification, and quarantine of animal products	16	20	
Expenses, feed, and attendants for animals in quarantine	129	189	
Miscellaneous contributed funds	693	656	
Prior year advances returned	11		
Total programs costs, funded	849	865	
Change in selected resources	15	−14	
Total obligations	864	851	

The following services are financed by fees and miscellaneous contributions advanced by importers, manufacturers, States, organizations, individuals, and others.

Expenses and refunds, inspection, certification, and quarantine of animal products and byproducts not intended for human food, and for other purposes, moving in interstate and foreign commerce primarily to prevent introduction and spread of animal diseases. Fees are paid in advance for services to be rendered.

Expenses, feed, and attendants for animals in quarantine are paid from fees advanced by importers.

Miscellaneous contributed funds received from States, local organizations, individuals, and others are available for plant and animal quarantine inspection, and cooperative plant and animal disease and pest control activities.

FOREST SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Construction and land acquisition: Pollution abatement	3,905	16,569	26,690

To provide for bringing water and air pollution control at existing recreation, research, fire, and administrative facilities to the quality standards adopted pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, the Clean Air Act, as amended, or as prescribed pursuant to Executive Order 11507 (1970).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PROMOTION OF INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

[In thousands of dollars]

National Industrial Pollution Control Council	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Administrative expenses	294	307	301
Change in selected resources	4	3	9
Total obligations	298	310	310

The National Industrial Pollution Control Council advises on programs of industry relating to the quality of environment. In particular, it surveys and evaluates the plans and actions of industry in the field of environmental quality; identifies and examines problems of the effects on the environment of industrial practices and the needs of industry for improvements in the quality of the environment, and recommends solutions to those problems; provides liaison among members of the business and industrial community on environmental quality matters; encourages the business and industrial community to improve the quality of the environment; and advises on plans and actions of Federal, State, and local agencies involving environmental quality policies affecting industry which are referred to it by the Secretary of Commerce, or by the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality through the Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Operation and maintenance	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Army National Guard: Medical support	33	969	1,088

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Operation and maintenance	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Air National Guard: Medical support	560	700	730

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Operation and maintenance	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Informational foreign currency schedule value of goods and services provided by the Berlin Magistrat (for occupation costs and mandatory expenditures): Medical activities	1,021	588	725

Note: A great deal of money is provided for "Medical" under "Department of Defense—Military" that is not isolated from other budget items.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

[In thousands of dollars]

Air Force stock fund	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical-dental	57,060	58,015	56,953

[In thousands of dollars]

Defense stock fund	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical and dental material	182,460	190,000	192,000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

[In thousands of dollars]

Soldiers Home	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operation and maintenance:			
Medical care	4,863	5,109	5,076

A hospital operated as part of the Home cares for the daily average patient loads shown below. In addition, certain members will receive specialized care at other hospitals.

THE PANAMA CANAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Operating expenses	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health and sanitation:			
Hospitals and clinics	14,743	15,765	16,812
Other public health services	2,787	2,982	3,224

Hospitals and clinics. Two general medical and surgical hospitals, with outpatient clinics, are maintained and operated to furnish medical care to eligible civilian and military personnel. A neuropsychiatric and domiciliary hospital and a leprosarium also are operated and maintained.

AVERAGE NUMBER OF INPATIENTS PER DAY

[Excluding newborns]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
General hospitals	269.3	271.9	271.9
Canal Zone Mental Health Center	149.1	146.2	155.5
Palo Seco Hospital (leprosarium)	57.0	52.0	48.0
Total number of inpatients (daily average)	475.4	470.1	475.4

Other public health services. This provides for communitywide public health services, sanitation, and quarantine work in the Canal Zone and for ships calling at its ports and transiting the Canal, inspection of food processing establishments, and facilities for animal care and quarantine.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

[In thousands of dollars]

Civil functions	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Public areas and facilities:			
Construction of seweage pollution controls		400	750
Health and sanitation:			
Replace and add equipment	365	531	354
Hospitals and clinics: improvements and rehabilitations to health facilities	93	817	542
Prior year projects	232	60	

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

[In thousands of dollars]

Food and Drug Administration	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Food, drug, and product safety:			
Foods	41,247	43,363	57,510
Drugs and devices	41,113	40,767	45,157
Product safety	6,500	18,738	32,178
Program direction and management services	7,452	7,258	9,179
Total program costs, funded	96,312	110,126	144,024
Change in selected resources	−8,866		
Total obligations	87,446	110,126	144,024

The Food and Drug Administration enforces laws which are designed to protect the public from dangerous, misbranded, and adulterated foods, drugs, and cosmetics, and from unnecessary exposure to man-made sources of radiation. Other products regulated by FDA include medical devices, toys, and hazardous substances.

Foods. FDA is responsible for insuring the safety, quality, and nutritional adequacy of the country's food supply. The agency conducts intramural and extramural studies to evaluate health and nutrition factors, sets standards for classes of foods, and reviews industry petitions for the use of additives and establishes tolerances to these substances. FDA defines good manufacturing practices and works to receive voluntary compliance with these guidelines. In addition, FDA inspects food establishments to insure that products are manufactured and distributed properly, collects and analyzes samples of food products to verify that the items are safe, wholesome, and properly labeled, and takes regulatory actions when necessary to obtain compliance with the law. Research and training grants are awarded to universities, qualified nonprofit organizations, and State agencies to identify and evaluate harmful properties in food, and to develop and improve methods to detect and prevent food contamination.

The 1973 request will fund expanded domestic and imported food inspection programs, complete teratogenic and mutagenic tests for numerous additional substances currently identified as generally recognized as safe, initiate major comparative pharmacology studies, and develop new methods and techniques to detect and evaluate problems associated with substances such as mycotoxins, heavy metals, and industrial chemicals.

Drugs and devices. FDA's responsibilities are to insure that drugs and therapeutic devices are safe and effective for their intended uses. The agency evaluates all new human and veterinary drugs prior to marketing, reviews reports from industry and the medical profession to learn about adverse reactions or other problems associated with marketed drugs and devices, and conducts intramural and extramural research to identify new problems. FDA inspects manufacturers, analyzes samples, and takes necessary regulatory action to insure compliance with legal requirements.

The 1973 request will enable FDA to develop criteria for measuring the safety and efficacy of a number of classes of nonprescription drugs, continue the classification of medical devices, and implement a national drug monitoring system. The agency will conduct research on the effects of several new drug classes in producing residues in meat.

Product safety. FDA utilizes research, surveillance, regulatory actions, and cooperative efforts with industry to minimize hazards associated with toys, household chemicals, cosmetics, and other consumer products, and to eliminate unnecessary exposure to man-made sources of radiation. Surveillance of firms and products and mandatory and voluntary standards are directed toward achieving an adequate national product safety control program. Also, research and training grants are awarded to universities and other eligible institutions to detect harmful ingredients in consumer products, identify products most often associated with accidents, identify radiation problems, and evaluate exposure to radiation.

The 1973 request will enable FDA to establish product standards and to conduct an increased number of inspections and sample examinations. The agency will be able to review and investigate more injury and poisoning reports, and will expand its capability to collect, process, and analyze product safety data. FDA will enforce radiation emission performance standards for several products, expand efforts to improve X-ray equipment and use procedures, and conduct research to determine the effects of RF-microwave radiation exposure.

Program direction and management services. This activity includes FDA's executive and administrative functions: the establishment of policy, the formulation and promulgation of agencywide plans and directives, the allocation and control of resources, the evaluation of program performance, the maintenance of liaison with other Government agencies, the coordination of FDA's international activities, and the support of FDA's operating units in the areas of financial management, mail and records, printing and distribution, facilities management, supply management, management services, personnel, and training.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Laboratory construction		16,500	
Repairs and improvements	56	2,997	5,000
Total program costs, funded	56	19,497	5,000
Change in selected resources		2,000	
Total obligations	56	21,497	5,000

This appropriation provides funds for continuing projects related to the planning, construction, repair, and improvements of all buildings and facilities of the Food and Drug Administration.

A major effort in 1973 will involve the renovation and improvement of facilities at the National Center for Toxicological Research to significantly increase laboratory space and test animal holding areas.

REVOLVING FUND FOR CERTIFICATION AND OTHER SERVICES

[In thousands of dollars]

Operating costs, funded	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Certification services:			
Antibiotics	3,511	3,601	3,662
Color additives	632	644	655
Insulin	77	79	82
Establishment of tolerances:			
Pesticides	113		
Total operating costs	4,333	4,324	4,399
Capital outlay, funded:			
Purchase of equipment	80	93	93
Total program costs, funded	4,413	4,417	4,492
Change in selected resources	22		
Total obligations	4,435	4,417	4,492

The Food and Drug Administration certifies batches of antibiotics, insulin, and color additives for use in foods, drugs, or cosmetics; it also lists color additives for use in foods, drugs, and cosmetics. Their services are financed wholly by fees paid by the industries affected.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and Reimbursements: Food, drug, and product safety	326	624	66

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

Mental health	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research:			
Grants	74,134	97,400	101,400
Direct operations	22,964	42,151	43,268
Total research	97,098	139,551	144,668
Manpower development:			
Training grants and fellowships	98,406	120,050	105,050
Direct operations	4,561	10,353	9,141
Total, manpower development	102,967	130,403	114,191
State and community programs:			
Community mental health centers:			
Construction	17,913	5,200	9,800
Staffing	79,150	135,100	135,100
Narcotic addiction	29,291	78,523	93,431
Alcoholism:			
Project	7,921	38,297	48,193
Grants to States		30,000	30,000
Mental health of children		10,000	10,000
Direct operations	2,778	6,816	7,239
Total, State and community programs	128,053	303,936	333,763
Rehabilitation of drug abusers	16,851	13,323	13,926
Program support activities:			
Field activities	2,616	3,739	4,015
Scientific communication and public education	4,496	5,803	5,798
Executive direction and management services	5,306	5,775	5,769
Total, program support activities	12,418	15,317	15,582
Total program costs, funded	357,387	602,530	622,130
Change in selected resources	64,055		
Total obligations	421,442	602,530	622,130

Research. Grants. There are two major grant programs included in this subactivity. First, the regular research grants program provides support on a project basis for behavioral, clinical, psychopharmacology, and applied research. The 1973 increase will support grants in areas of special interest such as drug abuse, alcoholism, child mental health, minority mental health, crime and delinquency, and services development research. Approximately 1,485 grants will be supported in 1973, including 455 grants for the special interest areas. Second, the hospital improvement program supports project grants to State mental hospitals for improvement in the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of patients. This program will support 71 projects in 1973. $6,000,000 formerly included in this category for drug abuse research grants are now included in

Direct operations (the next paragraph) for drug abuse research contracts.

Direct operations. The funds in this subactivity will support laboratory and clinical research in the behavioral and biological sciences; for example, psychiatry, socioeconomic studies, health problems of narcotic addiction, alcoholism, neuropharmacology, and clinical psychopharmacology. This subactivity also supports Institute staff who are responsible for the planning, development, and administration of the grant programs identified in the preceding paragraph. A portion of the funds is used to support research on a contract basis. One such activity is the marihuana contract program designed to determine the behavioral and biological effects of marihuana. Payments to the National Institutes of Health management fund are also supported in this subactivity. For 1972 and 1973, funds to operate the Clinical Research Center at Lexington, Kentucky, formerly presented in Rehabilitation of drug abusers will be included here.

Manpower development. Training grants and fellowships. Training grants are made in the key mental health disciplines such as psychiatry, behavioral sciences, psychiatric nursing, and social work, as well as in auxiliary and related areas. In 1973, the Institute will support a total of 1,700 awards with priority consideration to training programs which stress child mental health, crime and delinquency, alcoholism, and drug abuse, and training of mental health paraprofessionals. Fellowships are awarded to individuals who are committed to research careers relative to mental health and who propose to undertake full-time research training. A total of 657 fellowships will be supported in 1973.

Direct operations. The funds in this subactivity support Institute staff who are responsible for planning and administration of the national mental health manpower program, including mental health manpower studies and the development of training programs for paraprofessionals. Contracts to train individuals to work with drug abusers will be supported. A portion of the funds also supports a program for training psychiatrists for careers in the Federal Government.

State and community programs. Community mental health centers. Construction. Grants provide matching support to local, State, and private agencies for the construction and renovation of public and nonprofit community mental health centers. Funds are allocated to the States on a formula basis. Funds appropriated in 1972 will be obligated in 1972 and 1973.

Staffing. Grants are awarded to community mental health centers for partial support of the salary costs of professional and technical personnel. In 1973, 22 new projects will be funded bringing to 562 the total number of centers funded of which 422 will be operational.

Narcotic addiction and Alcoholism. The funds in these activities support a variety of programs to assist communities to prevent and control narcotic addiction and alcoholism. They are as follows:

Staffing grants. These awards provide support for a portion of the salary costs of professional and technical personnel to staff comprehensive community centers for the treatment of alcoholism, narcotic addiction, and drug abuse.

Special projects. These support the development of training programs or materials relating to the provisions of public health services for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and narcotic addiction; training personnel to administer such services; conducting surveys and field trials to evaluate the adequacy of alcohol and narcotic addiction programs; and programs for treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and drug abusers which the Secretary determines are of special significance.

Service projects for narcotic addicts. These grants provide support on a matching basis to public and nonprofit agencies to meet the costs of detoxification services, institutional services, or community based aftercare services.

Drug abuse education. Funds in this subactivity are used to provide grants and contracts for the development of educational programs, materials, and manpower in the area of drug abuse and its prevention, and to coordinate program activities among participating agencies, departments, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with respect to the health education aspects of drug abuse.

Planning and initiation grants. These support projects are awarded to plan or develop narcotic addiction, drug abuse, and alcohol treatment services in a particular area.

Consultation services. These grants support the salaries of professional and technical personnel who will be providing consultation services in narcotic addiction and alcohol treatment centers.

Alcohol formula grants. These grants are given to States to enable them to plan, establish, and maintain more effective prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs to deal with alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

Mental health of children. This activity supports grants which will improve the quantity and quality of services to children through staffing and training grants. Funds will provide staffing support to existing community mental health centers for establishment or expansion of children's services. Prevention activities are also emphasized.

Direct operations. This subactivity supports Institute staff who administer the community mental health centers program, and the mental health study center. This subactivity also supports the staff costs of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

Rehabilitation of drug abusers. The funds in this activity support National Institute of Mental Health staff who administer the Institute's narcotic addiction and drug abuse program. Included are activities authorized by the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, which provides treatment and rehabilitation to narcotic addicts through contract arrangements with community agencies. Beginning in 1972, funds are included in Research—Direct operations to operate the Clinical Research Center at Lexington, Kentucky.

Program support activities. Field activities. The funds in this subactivity support the National Institute of Mental Health staff located in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regional offices and the headquarters staff responsible for coordination of regional programs and the Institute's relationships with other Federal agencies, professional societies, and State and community organizations.

Scientific communication and public education. Included in this activity is the National Clearinghouse for Mental Health Information which collects and disseminates scientific and technical information in the mental health field, and the National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information which gives the public a central office within the Federal Government to contract for information and assistance concerning this social problem. Other public information and education activities are also supported, including a program directed toward increasing public knowledge about alcohol and alcoholism.

Executive direction and management services. The funds in this subactivity support salaries and related costs of staff responsible for the program planning and evaluation, biometric services, and administrative management of the Institute.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Clinical and community services, total program costs	45,500	50,094	56,166
Unfunded adjustments to total program costs: property, services, or capital assets transferred in without charge	150	150	150
Total program costs, funded	45,350	49,944	56,016
Change in selected resources	36	161	156
Total obligations	45,314	49,783	55,860

Saint Elizabeths Hospital provides treatment and care for the mentally ill who are either beneficiaries of the Federal Government or residents of the District of Columbia. Programs of the hospital are financed by Federal appropriations covering treatment and care of Federal beneficiaries and by reimbursements made to the hospital for services rendered other patient groups, principally residents of the District of Columbia. Federal appropriations to the hospital are of the indefinite type, under which the hospital receives, in appropriated funds, the difference between the amount of reimbursements actually received during the year, for patient care provided by the hospital, and total program costs approved by the Congress for the year.

Treatment programs of the hospital operate on both an inpatient and outpatient basis. Saint Elizabeths operates a security treatment facility and a community mental center, which serves approximately 175,000 persons representing the population of that portion of the southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia which is located south of the Anacostia River.

The hospital conducts a clinical research program for the purpose of obtaining a better understanding of the causes of mental disorders. and of the factors bearing upon their development, treatment, and possible prevention. Saint Elizabeths also provides multidisciplinary clinical training for professional and ancillary personnel engaged in or interested in mental health activities.

Inpatients at Saint Elizabeths Hospital have decreased from 3,547 in 1971 to an estimated 3,150 in 1973 and outpatients have increased during the same period from 2,523 to an estimated 2,750. Also, the community mental health center has had an increase of about 20% in its patient load over the last two years. The center will serve 2,773 patients in 1973.

HEALTH SERVICES PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health services research and development:			
Grants and contracts	39,105	56,118	58,018
Direct operations	4,869	5,898	6,325
Comprehensive health planning:			
Planning grants			39,800
Direct operations			1,833
Regional medical programs:			
Grants and contracts	45,408	140,656	125,100
Direct operations	7,395	5,462	5,103
Medical facilities construction:			
Construction grants	89,755	87,192	175,221
Interest subsidies		5,000	22,800
District of Columbia medical facilities	7,463	38,967	
Direct operations	2,606	2,883	3,267

HEALTH SERVICES PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Program direction and management services	2,917	2,663	2,650
Total program costs, funded	199,518	344,839	440,117
Change in selected resources	124,503		
Total obligations	324,021	344,839	440,117

This appropriation includes activities which focus on planning and demonstrations aimed at improving the Nation's health care delivery system. The major areas of emphasis are utilization, distribution, quality, and cost of care. These are accomplished through the following programs:

Health services research and development. The National Center for Health Services Research and Development has been established as the principal organization within the Health Services and Mental Health Administration to improve the organization, delivery, and financing of health services by stimulating and supporting research, development, demonstrations, and related training. The major problems in the health care delivery system that are given priority in the National Center's research and development program are: Rising costs of medical care, unequal distribution and utilization of health services, inadequate data for health services planning and decisionmaking at local and national levels, and relative shortages or maldistribution of professional health personnel.

Grants and contracts. Research and development. Grants and contracts are awarded to public or private agencies, academic, and other research organizations to conduct analyses of economic, social, and technological factors which affect the organization, financing, and utilization of health services. Large-scale research and development projects are directed primarily at containing the rate of increase of medical care costs, developing community-based systems for delivering health services, improving the availability, utilization, and quality of care, and developing a cooperative Federal-State-local health statistics system.

Research and development training. Grants and contracts are awarded to institutions and to qualified scholars for supporting research and managerial training in the health services field. A major emphasis in 1973 will be the development of training programs and opportunities in health services planning, implementation, and operation.

Direct operations. This activity provides the staff required to design and direct the National Center's strategic program of research and development. The staff obtains high-level evaluation of all proposals, closely monitors contracts, reviews results, informs the professional community of significant progress, and identifies the next steps in research and development.

Comprehensive health planning. Planning grants. State formula grants. Grants are awarded to States according to a formula based on population and per capita income with no State receiving less than 1% of the total. The purpose is to provide a framework in which health needs and resources can be analyzed and alternative courses of action recommended. Federal financial participation cannot exceed 75% of the costs. Agencies have been established in each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and five territories.

State planning agencies have been involved in promoting the development of areawide health planning agencies within their jurisdictions and will continue to work with them toward cooperative accomplishment of mutual objectives. The strengthening and coordination of the work of existing areawide agencies becomes increasingly important as the number of areawide agencies involved in operational planning increases.

The continuing close ties of the State comprehensive health planning programs to the State political, economic, and social systems will facilitate the adoption by the States of recommended planning priorities and recommended alternatives for solution of their problems.

In 1973, the increase of $2,325,000 will allow State agencies to increase professional staffs by approximately 25%. Primary emphasis will be for State agencies to become substantially more involved in assisting the development of new areawide planning agencies and to provide for the establishment of State agency assisted planning councils in rural areas. In addition, continuing emphasis will be placed upon working with areawide agencies toward a joint accomplishment of mutual objectives.

Areawide project grants. Through project grants to public or private nonprofit groups, areawide health planning agencies are established. A community thus has the opportunity to work toward a more coherent and efficient areawide health system aimed at meeting the needs of all segments of the population. Such groups as private health practitioners, hospitals, medical schools, voluntary health agencies, health departments, local governments, consumers, and specialized planning groups, as well as urban or regional general planning agencies, now work through an institutionalized forum to reach agreement on local priorities for facility, service, and manpower development. Federal support cannot exceed 75% of the costs.

The 1973 increase would provide $6,800,000 for the 172 agencies expected to be in operation at that time and $5,100,000 for the support of approximately 100 new agencies and about 30 State assisted comprehensive health planning councils in rural areas. Agencies will be located in areas in which 80% of the Nation's population reside. The increase for the 172 agencies would enable the hiring of over 180 new professional employees, an increase of some 25% over the then expected 700 professionals on agency staffs, and a more than comparable increase in planning operations.

Training project grants. These grants provide support for both long- and short-term training of health planners and consumers.

The increase of $575,000 would enable the graduate programs to increase the level of technical assistance to be provided to the State and areawide agencies and would be directed in part to further emphasis on development of planning for innovative systems for the delivery of health care. In addition, the increase would enable the continuation of demonstration graduate projects and 35 continuing education projects (including consumer projects). About 1,750 health professionals and consumers would receive short-term training and over 400 graduate students would receive long-term training, with approximately 240 expected to graduate with advanced degrees in the spring of 1973.

Direct operations. This activity provides the staff required to direct and administer: Formula grants for State comprehensive health planning; project grants for areawide comprehensive health planning; and project grants for training, studies, and demonstrations for comprehensive health training. The number of areawide planning agencies has increased very rapidly. This increase has been coupled with an escalation in the responsibilities of these agencies. The requested personnel increase would enable the staff to be more responsive to both the State and areawide agencies in providing technical assistance and consultation.

Regional medical programs. Grants and contracts. Through grant awards and direct staff activities, the 56 regional medical programs promote and sustain the development of regional cooperative arrangements among the Nation's health professions and institutions for: Improvement of regionalization of health resources and services and enhancement of the capabilities of providers of care at the community level. These activities are aimed at improving the quality of health care and strengthening the health care system generally throughout the Nation and specifically to improve personal health care for persons threatened by heart disease, cancer, stroke, kidney disease, and related diseases.

In 1973, emphasis will be placed on: Manpower development and utilization programs. Training aimed at enabling existing health manpower to provide more and better care and training of new kinds of health manpower. A significant portion of the 1973 request would be used for these activities including a major new initiative in support of area health education centers.

New techniques and innovative delivery patterns. Activities aimed at improving the accessibility, efficiency, and quality of health care. Through their provider linkages, the regional medical programs will act as catalytic agents for the planning and development of health maintenance organizations, ambulatory and emergency medical care services, particularly for rural areas, and for the application of new technologies, including automated systems and centralization of laboratory facilities.

Regionalization activities. Provider initiated activities leading to greater sharing of health facilities, manpower, and other resources. These activities will include support for comprehensive interregional kidney disease projects.

Development and implementation of quality of care guidelines and performance review mechanisms. Such guidelines and mechanisms are necessary to the development of the new and more effective comprehensive systems of health services such as health maintenance organizations, rural health delivery systems, and emergency health care systems.

Development, demonstration, and application of biomedical and management techniques. Activities aimed at increasing productivity of providers and extending specialized services to areas not currently covered.

Direct operations. This activity provides the staff required to review, process, and award grants and contracts; provides leadership to the regional medical programs to insure that their activities are consistent with national goals; and provides technical and professional assistance for the 56 regional medical programs.

Medical facilities construction. Federal funds are provided by grants or guaranteed loans with interest subsidies to assist States, other public agencies and nonprofit organizations in the construction and modernization of hospitals and other health facilities.

Construction grants. Funds appropriated for construction grants would be used to construct ambulatory care facilities including outpatient facilities, rehabilitation facilities, community mental health centers, facilities to house health maintenance organizations and for comprehensive health care centers which include programs in maternal and child health, family planning, drug abuse prevention and care, and alcoholic rehabilitation. The ambulatory care facilities are needed to reduce the use of expensive hospitalization (and thereby the need for the more costly inpatient facilities) and achieve a better balance of community health care facilities. The $85,000,000 requested for 1973 would generate approximately $340,000,000 worth of health facility construction in more than 240 ambulatory care facility projects. The primary thrust of the program would be

to relate service delivery and funding support from other Health Services and Mental Health Administration programs to community health care facilities supported by Hill-Burton wherever possible. Correlation of multiprogram project support involving staffing and service funds with capital funding for facilities would be of the highest priority.

Interest subsidies. Federal support for construction of inpatient health facilities, such as hospitals and long term care centers, would be available through guaranteed loans with interest subsidies for private nonprofit hospitals, and direct Federal loans for facilities owned by public agencies. The $2,500,000 requested for 1973 would, when added to carryover from previous appropriations, permit $605,000,000 worth of loans being guaranteed resulting in 83 projects adding or modernizing over 12,000 acute care or long-term care beds. The amount requested would also permit continued subsidy payment on loans guaranteed in prior years. Funds appropriated for interest subsidies are transferred to the loan guarantee and loan fund from which interest subsidies, direct loans, discharge of guarantee obligations, and other authorized expenses would be paid.

District of Columbia medical facilities. Authorization for this program expires at the end of 1972.

Direct operations. This activity provides the staff required to direct and administer the medical facilities construction program. State agencies are provided technical assistance in determining additional facilities required and developing programs to meet the indicated needs. State plans are reviewed for conformance with planning criteria and guidelines. Assistance is provided to States and communities in the planning, designing, and functioning of hospitals and other health facilities, and proposed projects are reviewed to determine eligibility and compliance with the law and regulations. Project application procedures and policy determinations are coordinated with other HSMHA programs which provide planning, health care delivery, and staffing grants to health care facilities. In addition, the program provides program management assistance and consultation to health facility construction projects assisted under the Federal Housing Administration loan guarantee program and under Sections 202 and 214 of the Appalachian Redevelopment Administration and to rehabilitation facilities assisted under Section 12 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Program direction and management services. This activity provides for overall executive direction, planning, evaluation, and administrative management of the health planning and development programs.

HEALTH SERVICES DELIVERY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Comprehensive health services:			
Planning grants	22,865	25,000	
Grants to States	76,481	90,000	90,000
Health services grants	61,100	158,213	116,200
Migrant health grants	11,525	17,950	23,750
Direct operations	11,921	19,002	18,862
Maternal and child health:			
Grants to States	53,864	121,522	125,678
Project grants	38,450	92,008	101,330
Research and training	6,650	21,106	21,392
Direct operations	2,986	4,078	4,148
Family planning:			
Project grants and contracts	5,492	94,815	137,024
Direct operations	1,148	1,438	1,987
National Health Service Corps		14,117	14,803
Patient care and special health services:			
Inpatient and outpatient care	87,349	89,640	96,303
Coast Guard medical services	4,593	4,802	5,105
Federal employees	3,976	4,487	4,498
Payment to Hawaii	1,200	1,200	1,200
Regional office central staff	4,072	5,287	5,281
Program direction and management services	5,021	5,341	6,314
Total program costs, funded	398,693	770,006	773,875
Change in selected resources	208,741		
Total obligations	607,434	770,006	773,875

This appropriation includes activities which support the provision of personal health care services directly to Federal beneficiaries or indirectly through grants to medically underserved areas. This is accomplished through the following programs:

Comprehensive health services. Grants to States. These bloc grants to State health and mental health authorities assist the States in attacking those health problems they consider of most immediate importance. The State plan for carrying out these programs must be in accord with the overall plans developed by the State comprehensive health planning agency. By statute, at least 15% of these funds must support mental health activities. Additionally, 70% of all funds are to go toward the provision of health services at the local level.

State health and mental health agencies have utilized their funds to assist in the support of a broad range of basic health programs provided at the State and local level. Among these ongoing activities that provide health services to both the general population of the States and to high risk groups within the States are communicable disease control, environmental health programs (including food and drugs, radiological health, sanitary engineering, and vector control), laboratory services, vital statistics, nursing services, and a variety of community mental health services. Some States have used the flexibility of these funds to support new approaches to the delivery of these health programs, others have expanded into new areas of services for their State health agencies, such as family planning, dental, and medical care clinics.

Health services grants. These project grants, awarded to public and nonprofit agencies, provide an effective means for upgrading and expanding the capacity of the ambulatory health services delivery system. This activity permits the Federal Government to be more responsive to health needs of limited geographic scope or of special regional or national significance, and to initiate new health service programs and related training. The programs are directed at two prime underserved areas: Urban poverty neighborhoods and remote rural areas.

Emphasis in 1973 will be placed on improving the management of existing comprehensive health centers and improving the quality of health care. These centers and component projects provide primary ambulatory care services to an estimated 850,000 persons covering an eligible population of approximately 2,700,000.

The 1973 increase provides $20,000,000 for neighborhood health centers formerly funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Migrant health grants. Grants supported under this activity provide primary health care services to migrant agricultural laborers and seasonal farmworkers and their families. The objective of the program is to raise the health level of migrants to that of the general population, and to assure that migrants have access to quality health care services.

In 1973, the program will focus on upgrading at least 50 existing projects strategically located along the migrant streams to maximize their quality and utilization. In areas where provider organizations exist, the program will include funds which can be used in a third party arrangement to assure that the migrants would receive care. In addition, the program will initiate a reporting system to collect information on the extent of health services obained by migrants and seasonal farmworkers and their families.

Direct operations. This activity provides professional and technical assistance to States, communities, providers of health services, and medical and health organizations in the administration and operation of the grants to States; health services project grants which include comprehensive health centers and family health centers; migrant health projects; and health facility survey improvement programs. This activity participates in the development, strengthening, and revision of Medicare standards.

In 1972, a major effort will be initiated to improve the Nation's nursing homes. Major activities will include an accelerated program of university-based training courses for State health facility surveyors and a program of short-term training courses for approximately 21,000 professional and ancillary health personnel providing services for nursing home patients.

In 1973, the emphasis of this activity will be directed toward aiding the comprehensive health centers in achieving a significant degree of financial independence through the garnering of additional third party reimbursements.

Material and child health services. This program has as its major goal the provision of health services to mothers and children especially in rural areas or areas suffering from severe economic distress. Through assistance to States, localities, and nonprofit groups it directs primary attention to: Reducing infant mortality and otherwise promoting the health of mothers and children; and locating, diagnosing, and treating children who are suffering from crippling or handicapping illnesses.

Significant contributions to recent reductions in the Nation's infant mortality rate have been made through the maternal and child health program and the comprehensive maternity and infant care projects. For the Nation as a whole, infant mortality decreased almost 24% during the period 1960 to 1970. Almost three-fourths of that decrease occurred during the four-year period 1966 to 1970. Especially significant reductions are occurring in large cities in which maternity and infant care projects are located.

National infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births per calendar year: 1965—24.7, 1966—23.7, 1967—22.4, 1968—21.8, 1969—20.7, 1970 provisional—19.8.

Grants to States. Formula grants are made to States for health as noted below. One-half of the amount appropriated must be matched by the States and the remainder is distributed in proportion to the financial need of the States, except that not more than 12.5% of the appropriation may be used for special project grants.

Maternal and child health services. Funds are used by States for the extension and improvement of health services for mothers and children. In 1973, approximately 400,000 women will receive prenatal and postpartum care in maternity clinics, and 1,500,000 children will attend well-baby clinics.

Crippled children's services. States utilize funds for casefinding, diagnosis, and treat-

ment of children who are crippled or who are suffering from conditions leading to crippling. It is estimated that 500,000 children will receive physicians' services under this program in 1973 and 78,000 children will receive hospitalization services.

Project grants. Grants are made to specified agencies to meet up to 75% of the costs of comprehensive health care in three major areas as follows:

Maternity and infant care. State and local health agencies or other public or nonprofit private organizations operate projects to help reduce infant and maternal mortality and the incidence of mental retardation and other handicapping conditions associated with child-bearing. The 56 existing projects are also serving a demonstrated need to improve the quality and quantity of maternity services to women in low-income areas. In 1973, 152,000 mothers and 53,000 infants will be admitted to maternity and infant care projects, compared with the 144,000 mothers and 49,000 infants admitted in 1972.

Children and youth. State or local agencies, medical schools, and teaching hospitals conduct comprehensive health care projects for children and youth, particularly in areas where low-income families are concentrated. The number of children served is expected to increase from 504,000 in 1972 to 547,000 in 1973.

Dental health of children. State and local agencies and other public or nonprofit groups are eligible to conduct comprehensive dental care projects for children. Approximately 10,000 children are expected to benefit from the funds made available in the program's first year of operation, 1971. In 1972 and 1973 it is expected that 21,000 and 22,000 children, respectively, will receive comprehensive dental care.

Research and training. Training. Grants are made to public or nonprofit institutions of higher learning, including university-affiliated mental retardation centers for training personnel for health care and related services for mothers and children.

Research. The focus of this program is to support research which shows promise of substantial contribution to the advancement of maternal and child health or crippled children's services and to study the effectiveness of such programs through research grants, contracts, or jointly financed cooperative arrangements.

Direct operations. This activity provides for the administration of medical care service and construction to States, localities, and organizations for the conduct of maternal and child health programs.

Family planning activities. One of the most effective measures for reducing infant and maternal mortality and for improving the physical and mental health of families is through the provision of family planning services which enable families to decide the number and spacing of their children. Thus, the Child Health Act of 1967 specified that not less than 6% of the amounts appropriated for maternal and child health should be available for family planning.

In July 1969, the President set a goal of providing adequate family planning services within five years to all those who want them, but cannot afford them. The passage of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970 gave specific congressional support to the President's proposal. The following programs administered by the National Center for Family Planning Services are designed to accomplish this goal.

Project grants and contracts. Services delivery. Project grants for the provisions of family planning services are made to State and local health agencies or other public or nonprofit organizations under Title V of the Social Security Act and under Title X of the Public Health Service Act. Approximately 2,200,000 women will receive family planning services from funds awarded in 1973 as compared to 1,500,000 in 1972 and 700,000 in 1971.

Training and education. Project grants and contracts are awarded for the short-term training of health personnel for service in family planning clinics, to educate and inform families of the benefits of voluntary family planning, to develop improved training programs for family planning workers, and to develop improved family planning education and information materials. Approximately 2,200 family planning personnel will be trained with project grant and contract funds awarded in 1973 for work in family planning clinics.

Services delivery improvement. Project contracts are awarded for studies designed to improve the delivery of family planning services, for technical assistance to encourage the utilization of improved family planning services delivery methods, and for program planning and evaluation.

Direct operations. This activity supports the decentralized services delivery project grant program in 10 regions and the development and operation of training, education, and services delivery improvement programs of the National Center for Family Planning Services.

National Health Service Corps. The program provides for the assignment of commissioned officers and civil service personnel of the U.S. Public Health Service to communities where health services are inadequate due to a critical shortage of health personnel. It is anticipated that in 1973, about 50% of the program costs will be financed by reimbursements from the communities and from patients being served. The request would continue to support the 100 to 150 communities to which health personnel were assigned in 1972 and would also provide for assignment of personnel to an additional 75 communities, thus providing support for a total of 175 to 225 communities with a total population of approximately 700,000 to 900,000 people.

Patient care and special health services. In 1973 this program will provide direct and contract medical care to the legal beneficiaries of the Public Health Service. Major beneficiary groups are American seamen, Coast Guardsmen and their dependents, Bureau of Employees' Compensation cases, and persons afflicted with leprosy. The largest single category of beneficiaries is American seamen. In 1972, American seamen will comprise about 50% of the inpatient workload in PHS general hospitals. On a reimbursable basis, medical care is also provided to foreign seamen and beneficiaries of other Federal agencies in PHS hospitals, and to Federal employees in PHS health units. In addition, Coast Guard personnel are provided medical and dental services at various Coast Guard locations.

Inpatient and outpatient care. Eight general hospitals and the National Leprosarium at Carville, Louisiana, operate under this activity. When PHS facilities are not accessible, beneficiaries receive care in other Federal and non-Federal facilities.

In addition to providing direct health care services, the hospitals are actively participating in the improvement of health services in the local community. Over 600 professional and subprofessional employees and 2,400 individuals from the community receive clinical training both in these facilities and through affiliations and auxiliary training programs. Emphasis is given to training of disadvantaged groups. Community involvement has increased through sharing available medical capabilities and health care resources where reimbursements or reciprocal services are received from the communities.

The system has been experiencing a continuing decline in inpatient workloads and is now operating at less than maximum capacity. The facilities have, however, become important community health resources. Recognizing the potential of further increasing the value of these facilities to the communities and to assure maximum utilization, the administration is conducting studies to determine the feasibility of converting them from Federal to local control. This will permit communities more latitude in utilizing the excess capacity to meet local needs. During 1973 efforts will be made to begin converting some of these facilities to community control in line with local health care needs and resources.

A supplemental estimate will be submitted for the current year requesting budget authority to finance the continued operation of PHS hospitals and clinics through 1972.

Coast Guard medical services. This activity provides PHS personnel to staff infirmaries, dispensaries, and sick bays at shore stations, air stations, and on board vessels. Contract care is also provided in civilian or other Federal facilities, when PHS hospitals are inaccessible. Programs are being established to provide both detection and rehabilitation of personnel with problems related to drug abuse. Facilities to deal with the rehabilitation of personnel with minor psychological disorders are being established at the two major recruit training centers located at Cape May, New Jersey, and Alameda, California. As an adjunct service related to the continuing goal of providing the best possible health care to Coast Guard personnel, this activity is also initiating programs in industrial, underwater, and aviation medicine, and in environmental sanitation.

Federal employees. This activity provides, upon request, surveys of and consultation to Federal agencies, Federal executive boards and associations, and Federal employee organizations on the establishment and evaluation of Federal employee health activities. Occupational health programs are provided, on request, to Federal agencies on a reimbursable basis. In 1973, an estimated 160,000 Federal employees will be able to avail themselves of health services in 95 health units operating under this activity.

Payment to Hawaii. Grants are made to Hawaii to defray the cost of care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy. The average daily patient load is expected to be 158 in 1973, as compared with 164 in 1972, and 166 in 1971.

Regional office central staff. This activity supports the regional health directors and their central staffs which are concerned with the coordination and interrelation of the various program activities of HSMHA and the implementation of those programs in the regional offices. The major components of the staff are: A comprehensive health planning unit that provides leadership in the development and operation of programs for the conduct and improvement of comprehensive State and areawide health planning; a grants management unit which provides centralized support activities for all HSMHA project and formula grants that have been decentralized to the regions; and a special projects unit which manages an information system which provides data on areas of special interest to each paricular region.

Program direction and management services. This activity provides for overall executive direction, planning, evaluation, and administrative management of the health services delivery programs.

PATIENT CARE AND SPECIAL HEALTH SERVICES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Inpatient and outpatient care supplemental		5,610	

This request will provide funds to finance the continued operation of the Public Health Service hospitals and clinics at the 1971 level.

PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Disease control			
Infectious diseases:			
Research grants	827	2,144	2,215
Project grants		2,000	39,300
Direct operations	34,023	33,544	35,826
Nutritional and chronic diseases		3,423	5,658
Laboratory improvements	7,392	7,805	9,870
Community environmental management:			
Grants	485	6,500	23,500
Direct operations	4,449	4,724	4,837
Occupational health:			
Grants	3,875	3,875	4,414
Direct operations	13,742	21,258	23,903
Environmental control	19,888		
Program direction	1,778	3,545	4,299
Total program costs funded	44,020	88,818	153,822
Change in selected resources	2,617	−2,000	
Total obligations	46,637	86,818	153,822

This program provides facilities and services for the investigation, prevention, and suppression of diseases and occupational injuries by direct development, advancement, and demonstration of knowledge and techniques, through research grants, and through prevention of the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign countries.

Disease control. Infectious diseases. Research grants. Research grants are awarded to organizations, institutions, and individuals for research concerned with epidemiology, prevention, laboratory diagnosis, and treatment of infectious diseases at the community level. Approximately 52 research projects would be supported in 1973 as compared to 50 in 1972 and 48 in 1971.

Project grants. Project grants are awarded to States which meet established eligibility criteria. Grants are made in five areas: Venereal diseases, tuberculosis, RH factor, rubella, and immunization other than rubella. The national effort to control the spread of venereal diseases consists of both project grants and direct operations. The project grant program places primary emphasis on the interruption of the transmission of venereal diseases through case finding, tracing of contacts of infectious cases, and venereal diseases education. At the request of States, personnel and vaccines are furnished in lieu of cash.

Direct operations. Activities are focused directly on the national goal of improvement of the health care system through emphasis on prevention rather than treatment. Efforts toward this goal are channeled through three areas of operations: Investigations, surveillance, and control.

In the area of investigations, professional competence is afforded to the States through the staff of the Epidemic Intelligence Service which is constantly alert to epidemic situations in the country. These EIS officers provide a wide range of service, including epidemic aid, epidemiological field investigations, consultations in infectious disease control, surveillance of infectious diseases, and collaborative field and laboratory research.

Surveillance activities directed at national disease problems are supported on a continuing basis. The concept of surveillance has contributed to the decrease in incidence of diseases such as diphtheria, encephalitis, measles, poliomyelitis and tetanus. Certain visa applicants are examined in order to determine those who are excludable for physical or mental reasons. Inspections (persons and importations) are made to prevent the introduction into the United States of quarantinable and other infectious diseases. Basic workload data include:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Vessels cleared	24,862	24,116	23,393
Aircraft cleared	126,268	132,581	139,210
Total persons inspected	152,977,620	157,215,482	161,732,799
Visa applicant medical examinations	160,682	144,614	115,691
Animal importations inspected	380,674	418,750	460,600

As basic knowledge is acquired, diagnostic techniques developed, and preventive methods developed for a disease, control efforts are initiated and maintained. Ongoing control programs are supported for tuberculosis and venereal diseases.

Tuberculosis. Studies are conducted in epidemiology, prevention, detection, diagnosis, and therapy of tuberculosis. This research is conducted in cooperation with State and local health departments, tuberculosis hospitals, private investigators, and others. The results of the applied research are made available to the States and integrated into tuberculosis control programs by means of demonstrations, consultative services, operational studies, and training activities.

Venereal diseases. Direct operations in venereal diseases provide for research and evaluation activities directed toward maintenance of uniformly satisfactory nationwide serologic services; development and introduction of new syphilis diagnostic tests; development of immunizing agent for syphilis; improvement of diagnostic techniques for gonorrhea; evaluation of more effective methods of therapy; and the improvement of control procedures. Scientific and general information about venereal disease for both professional and lay groups is disseminated through State agencies.

One facet of all control programs is training of State and local health workers in specific control techniques or methodologies. An estimated 11,000 trainees will participate in 486 courses conducted by the Center for Disease Control in both 1972 and 1973.

Nutritional and chronic diseases. Research and evaluation activities are directed to the identification of specific factors which cause nutritional diseases, the relationship of nutrition to other health problems, and to the determination of the extent of nutritional problems. Corrective action and prevention of nutritional diseases is sought through the conduct of demonstrations, and provision of technical assistance to State and local health departments and other public and private organizations. These funds also support the smoking and health activity aimed at preventing health problems resulting from cigarette smoking by stimulating and supporting National, State, and local activities to help those who wish to stop or curtail their smoking and by encouraging youth not to begin smoking.

Laboratory improvements. A comprehensive national laboratory improvement program is administered through research for improving and standardizing laboratory methodology and through evaluation techniques, materials, and reagents used in public health laboratories. Individuals are provided experimental vaccines and special immune globulin is distributed to control laboratory infections. States are also provided consultation, training, and in laboratory techniques. The program provides for upgrading the performance of the Nation's clinical laboratories and for the licensure and evaluation of clinical laboratories engaged in interstate commerce.

Community environmental management. Grants. Grants are made to communities to provide support for a comprehensive approach to rat control and the control of lead-based paint poisoning in children.

Lead-based paint poisoning in children. Grants and technical assistance in the amount of $9,500,000 will be awarded in 1973 to initiate programs in several hundred communities to screen approximately 1,500,000 children currently at risk of having or acquiring lead poisoning and to support the development of community organization and public education to reduce the extent of the problem in the future. Screening and deleading of hazardous dwelling units are emphasized through voluntary community action and local management of the housing stock.

Rat control. Under the Federal rat control program, project grants in the amount of $15,000,000 will be continued in 28 cities and initiated in six new project cities for a total of 34 cities in 1973. In 1973, it is anticipated that the premise prevalence for external rat signs will be further reduced to 7% from the 9% in 1972. Since the inception of the program in 1971, five project cities have been completely phased out having reached an acceptable maintenance level of rat infestation and causative conditions.

Direct operations. States and communities are assisted in applying a systematic management approach for identifying environmental health hazards, setting priorities, developing and implementing plans for the solution of health problems, motivating and securing the support of community residents, and coordinating community services and programs of other Federal agencies for effective local action. Program field activities called human health ecology centers concentrate on understanding and controlling the special health problems and priorities of the specific geographic area in which they are located.

Occupational health. Grants. Grants are made to public agencies and institutions to conduct research for developing criteria for standards to protect the safety and health of the Nation's work force and to provide research training programs for future scientific investigators in the field of occupational safety and health.

Direct operations. Program activities are designed to provide technical service and assistance to other agencies and to industry to reduce the direct and indirect cost of occupational hazards and diseases and to raise the health status of workers. Emphasis is focused on the preventive aspects of occupational safety and health and the improvement of the productivity and employability of workers. This is accomplished through the development of criteria for standards necessary for the successful implementation of a safe and healthy workplace.

Program direction and management services. This activity provides for overall program management of preventive health service programs.

NATIONAL HEALTH STATISTICS

[In thousands of dollars

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
National vital and health statistics	9,481	14,827	17,652
Program direction and management services	771	1,017	1,007
Total program costs, funded	10,252	15,844	18,659
Change in selected resources	90		
Total obligations	10,342	15,844	18,659

National vital and health statistics. The program of the National Center for Health Statistics comprises the major activities of the Public Health Service in the measurement of the health status of the Nation and in developing and applying optimum technical methods for the collection, processing, and analysis of health statistics. It includes: The collection, compilation, analysis, and dissemination of statistics on birth, deaths, fetal deaths, marriages and divorces, and other health data related to these basic vital events; continuing surveys and special health statistics studies on the amount, distributions, and effects of illness and disability in the United States, and the services received for or because of such conditions; studies of health survey methods with a view toward their continued improvement; technical advice and assistance on the application of statistical methods in the health and medical fields; and provision of leadership for the implementation of a cooperative Federal-State-local statistical system which will have the capability of producing uniform health data for local, State, and national use in the planning and evaluation of health care programs.

Program direction and management services. All of the program activities of the National Center for Health Statistics are centrally directed and managed. The Office of the Director establishes program priorities for the Center and provides centralized administrative management support. The Office of Program Planning and Evaluation reviews program plans and periodically evaluates overall effectiveness of program activities.

RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Dependents' medical care	10,173	11,460	11,913

This activity provides funds for care in non-Public Health Service facilities for dependents of PHS beneficiary members of the uniformed services and retired personnel in accordance with the Dependents' Medical Care Act, as amended. Care provided directly in PHS facilities is financed under the appropriation Patient care and special health services.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Center for Disease Control		3,343	448
Federal Health Programs Service	710	483	2,603
National Institute of Mental Health:			
Saint Elizabeths Hospital	1,043	4,276	5,600
Other	80	450	1,500
Subtotal, National Institute of Mental Health	1,123	4,726	7,100
Total program costs, funded	1,833	8,552	10,151
Change in selected resources	1,169	1,100	9,306
Total obligations	3,002	9,652	19,457

This appropriation includes all proposed direct construction items of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration except construction of Indian health facilities. It also includes certain health-related facilities transferred from the former Environmental Health Service in 1972.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Management and central services	10.968	12.359	12.590
Change in selected resources	64		
Total obligations	11.032	12.359	12.590

This activity provides a central staff needed in planning, directing, and administering the broad scope of program activities in the Health Services and Mental Health Administration. Staff assistance is provided the Administrator in formulating policy in the areas of grant-in-aid, contract administration, financial management, personnel, and general services.

In 1973, the Office of the Administrator will continue to give strong guidance and leadership to the HSMHA programs with special emphasis on the development of local government and nongovernmental organizations in the conduct of federally sponsored health programs. The operational planning activity as set forth in the 1972 objectives will continue in 1973. Staffing studies of the major HSMHA headquarters components will be conducted. These studies will determine the impact that decentralization to the regions has had on workload both at headquarters and in the field.

An operations analysis function will be implemented which will organize and analyze data concerning the operations and accomplishments of HSMHA programs. The results of this analysis will be used for decisionmaking by the Administrator. This function will become operational during 1973, building on the initial phase implemented in 1972.

During 1973, further steps will be taken to systematize the HSMHA planning process. The capacity of the Office to perform special studies and analyses relating to HSMHA programs will be strengthened. These analyses will include systems analyses of the health care system which will form an analytical base for improving the planning of HSMHA programs.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patient care	89,785	107,722	112,36
Field health services	31,611	43,889	47,54
Administration	2,330	2,475	3,27
Adjustment of prior year costs	−51		
Total program costs, funded	123,675	154,086	163,179
Change in selected resources	3,216		
Total obligations	126,891	154,086	163,179

This program provides medical care and public health services for Indians and Alaska native people. The following table provides pertinent examples of the level of effort and accomplishments of the program.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Infant mortality per 1,000 births	[1] 26.3	25	24.1
Tuberculosis mortality per 100,000 population	[1] 9	7.6	6.4
Number of new active tuberculosis cases	693	607	593
Percent of Indian women ages 15 to 44 rendered family planning services each year	19	20	21
Birth rate per 1,000 women ages 15 to 44	[1] 182.8	181.7	178.2
Indian homes provided complete or improved sanitation services	5,748	13,552	14,000

[1] Provisional.

Patient care. This activity consists of the operation of 49 general hospitals and their outpatient clinics and two tuberculosis sanatoria and medical care under contract with non-Federal hospitals, clinics, private physicians, and dentists, as well as contractual arrangements with State and local health organizations.

The 12% reduction in the inpatient load in hospitals of the Indian Health Services from 1971 to 1973 will result in an improved ratio of staff to patient and higher quality of care.

Workloads for the total program are expected to be as follows:

Direct care n Federal hospitals and clinics	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Inpatient average daily patient load by type of patient:			
General patients	1,564	1,485	1,402
Tuberculosis patients	63	45	33
Total average daily inpatient load	1,627	1,530	1,435
Total GMS admissions (excluding births)	70,275	69,914	70,483
Average days of stay, general patients	8.1	7.8	7.3
Outpatient visits to hospital facilities	1,202,027	1,333,000	1,459,000
Contract care:			
Inpatient average daily patient load by type of patient:			
General patients	390	442	442
Tuberculosis patients	50	36	36
Neuropsychiatric patients	110	130	130
Total average daily inpatient load	550	608	608
Total GMS admissions (excluding births)	23,725	25,678	25,608
Average days of stay, general patients	6.0	6.3	6.3

Field health services. These include programs in sanitation, health education, nutrition, maternal and child health, school health, tuberculosis and other communicable disease control, medical social services, public health nursing, oral health, family planning, and mental health. The services are provided through health centers, clinics, and other field health units operated directly by the Indian Health Service, as well as through contractual arrangement with State and local health organizations.

An additional $10,000,000 for Indian health programs was provided in 1971 by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These programs will continue to be funded by these three agencies in 1972 and 1973.

The 1973 request reflects an increase of funds to contract with Indian tribal enterprises for health services.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Hospitals:			
New and replacement	204	1,280	2,176
Modernization and repair	499	1,647	778
Outpatient care facilities	1,648	1,197	177
Grants to community facilities	200	393	214
Sanitation facilities	13,689	31,620	34,839
Personnel quarters	821	200	23
Total program costs, funded	17,061	36,337	38,207
Change in selected resources	6,124	−4,230	4,777
Total obligations	23,185	32,107	42,984

Sanitation facilities. In 1972, the Indian Health Service, in conjunction with other Federal and tribal housing authorities, will provide sanitation or technical services to 8,575 new and improved units of housing.

Concurrently, services to 4,977 units of existing housing will be provided as well as an additional phase of the Kotzebue water and sewer systems. In 1973, sanitation or technical services will be extended to 8,500 new and improved units of housing in cooperation with other Federal and tribal housing authorities. In addition, 1,500 existing homes near these construction sites and 4,000 existing homes in other communities will be furnished water and/or waste disposal facilities.

EMERGENCY HEALTH

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical stockpile	6,491	1,333	1,333
Community preparedness	1,435	1,472	1,524
Program direction and management services	1,299	1,299	1,343
Total program costs, funded	9,225	4,104	4,200
Change in selected resources	−4,152	163	68
Total obligations	5,073	4,267	4,268

Medical stockpile. The goal of this activity is to provide essential medical material for civilian needs in time of disaster. Medical supplies and equipment have been assembled into emergency packaged disaster hospitals which are located throughout the United States in affiliation with local community hospitals. In 1973, 2,217 such packaged disaster hospitals will be pre-positioned throughout the Nation. Selective medical supplies have been placed in community hospitals to meet heavy disaster medical care workloads. The estimate for 1973 supports a program to maintain the medical stockpile inventories and to excess certain materials that are no longer required.

Community preparedness. Programs are inaugurated and maintained to support the preparation of national emergency health and medical plans, and the development of preparedness action projects to achieve a continuity of health services necessary to meet all conditions of a national emergency. The estimate for 1973 provides for a moderate program to assist States and communities during disaster situations, continue the development of plans and operational capability for civilian health manpower as well as utilization and distribution of health resources, develop and initiate emergency medical care services, and continue the operation of training programs at the State and local level.

Program direction and management services. Total program control is provided for the organization and planning of programs that will afford adequate medical care for individual in medical emergencies. The estimate for 1973 provides for a continuing activity that furnishes program direction, coordination, and management services to carry out the total emergency health preparedness program. Working relationships are to be maintained with professional organizations and other Government agencies for the development of an effective disaster readiness program for the civilian population.

MEDICAL FACILITIES GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operating costs, funded:			
Interest subsidies		5,000	22,800
Capital outlay funded: Loans		30,000	90,000
Total obligations		35,000	112,800

A Loan guarantee and loan fund for medical facilities is established in the Treasury, without fiscal year limitation, to discharge responsibilities under guarantees; for payment of interest subsidies on the loans to nonprofit sponsors which are guaranteed; for direct loans to public agencies which are sold and guaranteed; for payment of interest subsidies on direct loans which are sold and guaranteed; and for repurchase of direct loans which have been sold and guaranteed.

In 1973, the Medical facilities guarantee and loan fund would be capitalized at $52,800,000 of which $30,000,000 would serve as a revolving fund from which direct loans to public agencies are made and $22,800,000 would provide interest subsidies on direct and guaranteed loans.

The Medical facilities guarantee and loan fund is capitalized with transfers from activities under the Medical facilities construction appropriation, and no request is made for direct appropriation to the fund.

SERVICE AND SUPPLY FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operating costs, funded:			
Supply distribution sales: Cost of services	2,493	2,931	2,971
Data management services: Cost of services	1,361	3,577	4,031
Fiscal services: Cost of services	953	939	1,103
Publications storage and distribution services: Cost of services	84	113	174
Parklawn services: Cost of services	718	2,342	2,493
Total operating costs	5,609	9,902	10,772
Capital outlay funded:			
Supply distribution sales: Purchase of equipment		10	10
Data management services: Purchase of equipment	4	30	10
Fiscal services: Purchase of equipment		6	6
Publications storage and distribution services: Purchase of equipment		1	7
Parklawn services: Purchase of equipment	1	80	6
Total capital outlay	5	127	39
Total program costs, funded	5,614	10,029	10,811
Change in selected resources	45	34	−2
Adjustment in selected resources (donated working capital)	−25		
Total obligations	5,634	10,063	10,809

This fund finances medical supply and service operations of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration. It is reimbursed from the appropriations supporting the programs benefited.

Budget program. The principal activities of the fund are carried out at: the Supply Distribution Sales Center, which maintains inventories of medical stock and supplies to meet, in part, the requirements of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration and requisitions of other Government organizations; the data management services which develops agencywide systems for the Office of the Administrator and manages the HSMHA computer center; fiscal services which provides fiscal and accounting services to HSMHA headquarters offices; and the Parklawn services which provides a wide range of centralized services to the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare offices occupying the Parklawn Building, Rockville, Maryland. Of major importance among these services are printing and reproduction, telecommunications, procurement, mail and messenger, building and space management, shipping and receiving, surplus property utilization, and building safety and security. This fund is reimbursed from applicable appropriations or funds available when services are performed or stock furnished on the basis of rates which shall include estimated or actual charges for personal services, materials, equipment (including maintenance, repairs, and depreciation), and other expenses.

[In thousands of dollars]

Advances and reimbursements	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health services delivery	1,634	1,900	10,821
Health services planning and development	31	27	27
Preventive health services	8,520	12,315	12,282
National health statistics	174	300	300
Office of the Administrator	591	74	
Emergency health	2,548	2,395	698
Consolidated working fund	1,077	941	821
Research grants	1,223	1,770	1,228
Total program costs funded	15,798	19,722	26,177
Change in selected resources	−132		
Total obligations	15,666	19,722	26,177

[In thousands of dollars]

Public Health Service trust funds	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients' benefits	57	56	57
Gifts	76	57	46
Special statistical work	5	15	15
Construction and maintenance of Indian sanitation facilities	435	689	762
Total program costs, funded	573	817	880
Change in selected resources	95	192	134
Total obligations	668	1,009	1,014

Gifts to the Public Health Service, some of which are limited to specific uses by the donors, are expended for the benefit of patients at PHS hospitals, and for research of other activities of the Service. Donations are also received by Saint Elizabeths Hospital and used for patients' benefits as provided by the donors.

Contributions are made by Indians and others to be served, toward the construction, improvement, extension, and provision of sanitation facilities.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The National Institutes of Health is the primary arm of the United States Government in the support of biomedical research, education, and communications. The mission of the NIH is investigating basic life process, advancing the capability for the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease, and providing support to strengthen health research, educational, and communications resources. NIH consists of 10 national research institutes, three program divisions, the Bureau of Health Manpower, the National Library of Medicine, and the Office of the Director.

In 1973, the NIH research institutes will initiate or expand activities in several high-priority programs. The National Cancer Institute will expand its efforts in all areas of cancer research, to continue the administration's cancer research program. The National Cancer Act of 1971 authorizes a national cancer program which will be initiated during 1972 and further developed in 1973 by the National Cancer Institute. A description of the specific activities of the National Cancer Institute can be found in the detailed presentation that follows. The National Heart and Lung Institute will increase research in sickle cell anemia, arteriosclerosis, hypertension, thrombosis, and pulmonary diseases.

The National Institute of Dental Research will enhance the goals of the national caries program through increased research grant funding. The National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases will give special emphasis to research in the area of digestive

diseases—peptic ulcer, ileitis, and diseases of the liver, gallbladder, and pancreas. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke will provide increased support for research in the fields of stroke, acute spinal cord injury, Parkinsonism, and communicative disorders. The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases will give increased attention to research concerning cellular and clinical immunology, hepatitis, the biology of the gonococcus, and to allergic diseases. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will strengthen its research programs in the areas of family planning, child health, and aging. The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences will increase research efforts in areas such as chemical mutagenesis, teratology, pesticides, food toxicants, air pollutants, and physical factors such as noise. The National Institute of General Medical Sciences will support research in the basic medical sciences. The National Eye Institute will continue its research efforts in the diseases and disorders of the eye.

The activities of the research institutes and divisions are carried out through extramural grant programs and through operations conducted directly by NIH and through contracts. Extramural grant programs are of three types:

Research grants—the principal activity of the institutes—are awarded to individuals for health-related research projects which are chosen on the basis of their scientific merit.

Fellowships are awarded to promising individuals preparing for research careers in the biomedical sciences.

Training grants are awarded to academic or research institutions which have demonstrated the ability to design and conduct successful training programs in the biological sciences.

In addition to grants, the NIH research institutes and divisions support biomedical research through direct operations which include the following componets:

Laboratory and clinical research is conducted in the institutes' laboratory facilities and in the commonly shared clinical center facility.

Research and development contracts are conducted by NIH researchers in collaboration with other Federal and non-Federal institutions and are strongly oriented toward the solution of specific health problems where the state of knowledge is sufficiently advanced to permit a more directed approach.

Research management and program services provides such operational requirements as program direction, review, and approval of grants, and intramural training programs.

Other activities under direct operations include biometry, epidemiology and field studies, biologics standards, and international research.

The Bureau of Health Manpower Education provides a national focus for health manpower activities and supports programs designed to increase the number of qualified health personnel. A description of the Bureau's activities can be found in the detailed presentation of health manpower programs that follows. The National Library of Medicine serves as a national resource for biomedical information and as a focus for national planning to improve communications in the health sciences. Appropriations for Buildings and facilities support construction, renovation and maintenance of NIH laboratory, clinical, and administrative facilities, while those for Office of the Director support salaries and expenses for the staff of the Director's office, NIH.

A distribution of the budget authority for NIH follows:

RESEARCH INSTITUTES AND DIVISIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	571,391	666,486	693,595
Fellowships	45,421	44,152	44,031
Training	121,593	121,832	121,832
Subtotal grants	738,405	832,470	859,458
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	90,491	93,245	94,729
Research and development contracts	83,108	110,895	127,678
Other	46,490	60,081	61,347
Subtotal direct operations	220,089	264,221	283,754
Total research institutes and divisions	958,494	1,096,691	1,143,262
Bureau of Health Manpower Education	432,212	677,599	536,655
National Library of Medicine	21,436	24,086	28,104
Buildings and facilities		3,565	8,500
Office of the Director	8,903	11,054	11,526
Scientific activities overseas	28,944	25,545	25,619
Subtotal	1,449,989	1,838,540	1,753,616
National Cancer Institute	233,132	337,670	430,000
Total budget authority	1,683,121	2,176,210	2,183,616

[In thousands of dollars]

Biologics Standards	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and development contracts	2,627	2,100	2,100
Biologics standards	7,356	7,039	7,197
Change in selected resources	−706		
Total obligations	9,277	9,139	9,297

Research and development contracts. This activity represents that portion of the total biologics standards program aimed at the acquisition of knowledge for the improvement of standard utilizing the contract method.

Biologics standards. Functions include establishment of standards for preparation of biologics, testing of vaccines and their preparation, and research related to development, manufacture, testing, and use of vaccines and analogous products.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	98,400	126,719	160,874
Fellowships	4,067	3,548	4,750
Training	11,807	12,874	15,750
Total grants	114,274	143,141	181,374
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	19,894	19,443	21,624
Research and development contracts	81,802	122,303	137,787
Collaborative research and support	21,137	27,542	29,882
Research management and program services	4,893	9,276	10,539
Total direct operations	127,726	178,564	199,832
Construction		16,000	49,000
Total program costs funded	242,000	337,705	430,206
Change in selected resources	−9,144		
Total obligations	232,856	337,705	430,206

The National Cancer Institute conducts, fosters, and assists research and training directed toward preventing, diagnosing, treating, and controlling cancer in man. The National Cancer Institute will strengthen the cancer research center program. Expanded research of viruses and chemicals will be effected for the ultimate prevention of cancers in man. Cancer therapy methods will be expanded to utilize to a greater extent those drugs and combinations thereof that have proved effective in the treatment of cancer; and application of knowledge gained in treatment of fast growing tumors to the slow growing ones such as breast, lung, color, bladder, prostate, and pancreas. Task forces will be emphasized in order to concentrate on the causes and prevention of cancers.

Grants. Research. Approximately 1,574 regular research grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 1,268 in 1972 and 979 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for cancer research centers (clinical centers and program centers), leukemia research support centers, large bowel and bladder task forces, general research support grants, and cancer control competitive demonstration projects.

Fellowships. Approximately 224 postdoctoral and special fellowships will be supported in 1973 as compared to 151 in 1972 and 191 in 1971. Also, some 100 career award and career development fellowships will be supported in 1973 as compared to 78 in 1972 and 82 in 1971.

Training. Grants are awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction in the curriculum; clinical training grants are awarded for training in such fields as surgery, pathology, radiobiology, radiotherapy, and internal medicine; and grants are awarded to research training centers for individual traineeships. The following table summarizes those grants:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Graduate training	86	90	102
Cancer clinical training	85	102	113

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research includes laboratory research in the fields of biology, biochemistry, and physiology; and clinical research in the fields of surgery, immunology, radiation, dermatology, pathology, and metabolism.

Research and development contracts. This activity includes the funds for that portion of the research programs described under "Laboratory and Clinical Research" and "Collaborative Research and Support," utilizing the contract mechanism.

Collaborative research and support. Research is conducted in the areas of etiology and chemotherapy. Several task forces, for example, breast cancer and lung cancer, are also included within this activity. This activity contains the research effort carried on directly in Government laboratories and clinical facilities for these integrated programs. The programs are focused on the causes of cancers and their occurrence patterns and prevention, as well as funding the best methods of treating cancer through the screening, testing, and clinical evaluation of drugs. That portion of the effort of these targeted programs conducted through the contract mechanism is included in the above activity Research and Development Contracts.

Construction. Cancer research centers will be constructed which are a critical component of the expanded cancer research program. Etiology research facilities will be constructed for the expansion of carcinogenesis and viral oncology research. Plans are being developed for the addition of outpatient and laboratory facilities.

NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	108,370	133,794	141,628
Fellowships	5,094	7,371	7,371
Training	15,630	17,643	17,643
Total grants	129,094	158,808	165,642
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	16,927	17,721	18,132
Research and development contracts	21,872	46,497	59,374
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	1,215	1,506	1,582
Research management and program services	5,861	7,603	8,686
Total direct operations	45,875	73,327	87,774
Total program costs funded	174,969	232,135	254,416
Change in selected resources	19,857		
Total obligations	194,826	232,135	254,416

Grants. Research. Approximately 1,470 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 1,472 in 1972, and 1,447 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for special research centers and the heart cooperative drug study.

Fellowships. Approximately 345 awards will be supported in 1973 as compared with 345 in 1972 and 340 in 1971.

Training. Funds will provide for 250 grants for cardiovascular and pulmonary research and clinical training for 1,000 trainees. Comparable numbers of grants and trainees are 365 and 996 in 1972, and 366 and 1,000 in 1971. The pulmonary academic award was instituted in 1971 to four trainees. It will be continued at this level in 1972 and expanded to 60 trainees in 1973.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research encompasses work which aids in the understanding of the cardiovascular and pulmonary systems and their diseases, with emphasis in therapeutic agents, diagnostic instrumentation, surgery, and clinical medicine.

Research and development contracts. Funds will support programs in the research and development of the application of cardiovascular and pulmonary medical devices, in myocardial infarction, blood resources, sickle cell diseases, lipid research, respiratory diseases, and clinical trials in hypertension and in multiple-risk factors.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. This activity conducts and supports therapeutic evaluations, epidemiological, and biometrics research. National Institute of Dental Research.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	15,746	21,504	22,152
Fellowships	1,455	1,601	1,601
Training	5,225	5,270	5,270
Total grants	22,426	28,375	29,023
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	6,192	6,751	6,745
Research and development contracts	795	5,500	5,500
Collaborative research and support	260	314	339
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	666	938	977
Research management and program services	1,154	1,382	1,492
Total direct operations	9,067	14,885	15,053
Total program costs funded	31,493	43,260	44,076
Change in selected resources	3,718		
Total obligations	35,211	43,260	44,076

Grants. Research. Research grants support fundamental clinical and applied research studies in such areas as dental caries, periodontal disease, oral-facial growth and development, and dental restorative materials. Support is furnished for studies designed to advance scientific frontiers and exploit emerging research opportunities, including: investigation of the interplay of host, dietary, and microbiotic factors in dental caries; development of more effective therapeutic and preventive measures in periodontal disease; development of treatment procedures and determination of preventive measures for oral-facial anomalies; and work on the immediate problems of dental treatment through development of new and improved restorative materials and clinical methods.

The activity in support of dental research institutes (centers) in university settings, now entering its fifth year and requiring support at the current level of $6,200,000, continues to close the gap between dental and other biomedical research, and is significantly influencing the progress of dental education.

The recently initiated Special Dental Research Award program is designed to help newly trained investigators remain active in research during the formative stages of their careers, and thereby assure a vital input to the dental investigator pool. Emphasis will continue to be in the basic and clinical problem areas of dental caries, periodontal and mucosal diseases of the mouth, oral-facial defects of development and dental pain.

Approximately 248 project grants will be supported in 1973, compared wtih 249 in 1972 and 217 in 1971.

Fellowships. Funds for fellowships are used for support of clinical and basic research training. Applications under this program are for special fellowships, postdoctoral fellowships, and career development and career awards. In 1973, 91 fellowships will be supported compared with 96 in 1972 and 95 in 1971.

Training. Training funds are the principal means of meeting the need for dental research and academic personnel in the dental schools to teach clinical and basic sciences, and to conduct research. Increased costs per grant will make it necessary to support only 81 grants in 1973, compared with 85 in 1972 and 93 in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Laboratory and clinical research studies conducted in Institute facilities are concerned with the causes, treatment, control, and prevention of such dental diseases and disorders as caries, periodontal disease, oral-facial anomalies, and oral cancer. Three primary approaches are used: basic research directed at the acquisition of new knowledge as a means of solving dental health problems; field studies and clinical trials of new therapeutic and prevention concepts coming out of basic research; and further studies on the definition and distribution of oral-facial diseases and disorders on an epidemiologic or geographic basis. Much of this research will make direct contribution to the recently initiated National caries program.

Research and development contracts. The programs in this activity involve contracts with public and private research and development organizations. Primary objectives include support of the National caries program and the development of new and improved dental restorative materials.

Collaborative research and support. This activity provides administrative, contract, and clerical personnel necessary to administer the research and development contracts supported by this Institute.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. This activity is concerned with the planning, conduct, and analysis of epidemiological and field investigations concerning such matters as prevalence of oral disease, and effectiveness of new or improved methods of diagnosis, control, and prevention. A number of the studies conducted will be integral parts of the National caries program.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	85,252	101,917	105,903
Fellowships	5,470	5,740	5,740
Training	15,060	15,072	15,072
Total grants	105,782	122,729	126,715
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	18,460	18,235	19,052
Research and development contracts	4,693	5,954	6,224
Collaborative research and support	843	1,128	1,213
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	860	1,146	1,298
Research management and program services	3,069	3,776	3,892
Total direct operations	27,925	30,239	31,679
Total program costs funded	133,707	152,968	158,394
Change in selected resources	4,240		
Total obligations	137,947	152,968	158,394

Grants. Research. Approximately 2,167 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 1,957 in 1972, and 1,880 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants and clinical research centers.

Fellowships. Approximately 323 fellowships will be supported in 1973 as compared to 342 in 1972 and 357 in 1971.

Training. During 1973 it is estimated that 246 grants will be awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction. This compares to 260 grants in 1972 and 276 grants in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is conducted in the fields of arthritis, rheumatism, diabetes, and other metabolic disorders, as well as studies in the major disciplines including pharmacology, physiology, biochemistry, nutrition, chemistry, pathology, endrocrinology, physical biology, molecular biology, chemical biology, gastroenterology, hematology, and biomathematics.

Research and development contracts. Projects are conducted under contract with individuals and institutions primarily in support of the artificial kidney/chronic uremia, the digestive diseases and nutrition, and the hormonal development programs.

Collaborative research and support. Comprehensive programs are conducted in methods to improve hemodialysis and to develop simpler, more economical, and less cumbersome artificial kidneys; in the preparation and distribution of hormonal substances; in the analysis and evaluation of Institute programs; and in scientific communications, such as the preparation of abstracts on specific areas of research interest.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. Research and epidemiological studies are conducted on arthritis, diabetes, cholecystitis, iodine metabolism, and hyperuremia in special population groups, primarily long range studies in the southwestern United States.

Research management and program services. General direction, coordination, and administration of the resources of the total Institute are provided by the Institute Director, his immediate staff, and the office of administrative management including contract negotiations and awards. The review and approval of grants functions includes review for scientific merit and program relevance and maintenance of surveillance over each grant project. Scientific information functions are also conducted under this activity.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES AND STROKE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	56,543	69,460	69,763
Fellowships	2,523	2,782	2,782
Training	12,696	14,300	14,300
Total grants	71,762	86,542	86,845
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	11,474	10,654	10,846
Research and development contracts	5,800	8,219	8,285
Collaborative research and support	6,550	7,936	8,004
Research management and program services	2,809	3,168	3,318
Total direct operations	26,633	29,977	30,453
Total program costs funded	98,395	116,519	117,298
Change in selected resources	5,050		
Total obligations	103,445	116,519	117,298

Grants. Research. Approximately 1,250 grants will be supported in 1973 compared to 1,377 in 1972 and 1,258 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for specialized research center grants.

Fellowships. Approximately 147 fellowships will be supported in 1973 compared to 148 in 1972 and 190 in 1971.

Training. Approximately 187 graduate training grants will be supported in 1973 compared to 198 in 1972 and 221 in 1971. These grants are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to train teachers and clinical investigators in neurology and otology. Also, approximately 144 traineeships will be awarded to individuals for specialized postgraduate training in 1973 compared to 153 in 1972 and 195 in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is being conducted on disorders of the brain, spinal cord, and peripheral nerves, such as epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, apoplexy, and Parkinson's disease; on communicative disorders and neuromuscular disorders, such as muscular dystrophy.

Research and development contracts. Contracts for directed research are used for collaborative and intramural programs including epilepsy, head injury and sensory prosthesis, and other neurological disorders.

Collaborative research and support. These studies include the coordination and central service activities for the collaborative perinatal project on cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and other neurological and sensory disorders of childhood. Also included are the Institute's research programs on head injury, spinal cord injury, epilepsy, cerebral death, and sensory prosthesis research. In sensory prosthesis research, the goal is to develop devices using suitable sensors, data processors, and stimulating electrode arrays implanted against the brain of a blind or deaf person to permit the subject to abstract meaningful information from his environment.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	56,097	62,986	65,589
Fellowships	3,291	3,579	3,579
Training	8,323	8,922	8,922
Total grants	67,711	75,487	78,090
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	18,275	17,717	18,304
Research and development contracts	7,879	11,050	10,928
Collaborative research and support	2,055	2,153	2,198
Research management and program services	2,144	2,326	2,387
Total direct operations	30,353	33,246	33,817
Total program costs funded	98,064	108,733	111,917
Change in selected resources	3,989		
Total obligation	102,053	108,733	111,917

Grants. Research. Grants are awarded to universities and to other institutions on a project basis to conduct research needs which have been identified as of national importance. Funds available for 1973 will support approximately 1,271 awards compared to 1,185 awards in 1972 and 1,154 awards in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research centers, and international centers for medical research and training.

Fellowships. Funds for fellowships are used to train professional researchers in research areas within the categorical interests of the Institute. The program supports postdoctoral, special, career development fellowships, and career awards. An estimated 206 awards will be made in 1973 and 1972, compared to 205 actual awards in 1971.

Training. Funds in 1973 will provide approximately 153 grants to train 918 individuals in allergy and immunology and infectious diseases in 1973 and 1972, compared to 151 grants and 906 individuals in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Laboratory and clinical research in microbiology and immunology, in its broadest sense, nourishes the entire field of biomedicine and affects the programs of all the other Institutes. The Institute research effort embraces both basic and applied research. Laboratory scientists and clinical investigators at NIH and field installations are directing their efforts to the discovery and exploitation of new knowledge leading to the eventual prevention and treatment of diseases caused by infection with micro-organisms or abnormal immunological mechanisms. The diseases under intensive study are those caused by viruses, bacteria, mycoplasma, fungi, protozoa, and helminths.

Research and development contracts. The activities carried out under this program are through research contracts with industry and other Federal and non-Federal institutions. Primary objectives include translation of significant basic research data into practical achievements of clinical applicability in immunologic and infectious diseases. The program also conducts and supports developmental research in the prevention, control, and treatment of diseases caused by infectious agents including bacteria, viruses, and parasites and abnormalities in the body's immune mechanisms.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	101,321	103,676	105,626
Fellowships	16,951	15,609	15,609
Training	43,746	43,746	43,746
Total grants	162,018	163,031	164,981
Direct operations:			
Research and development contracts	3,263	4,816	5,016
Research management and program services	4,664	5,488	5,719
Total direct operations	7,927	10,304	10,735
Total program costs funded	169,945	173,335	175,716
Change in selected resources	−10,104		
Total obligations	159,841	173,335	175,716

Grants. Research. Approximately 1,278 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 1,277 in 1972 and 1,142 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, pharmacology-toxicology research centers and research centers in genetics, diagnostic radiology, and anesthesiology.

Fellowships. Approximately 1,085 fellowship awards will be made in 1973 as compared to 1,221 in 1972 and 1,735 in 1971.

Training. Approximately 467 grants and 3,952 trainees will be funded in 1973 as compared to 468 grants and 4,160 trainees in 1972 and 521 grants and 4,360 trainees in 1971.

Direct operations. Research and development contracts. This activity supports the research contract program in the biomedical sciences and supportive areas and is utilized to achieve specific research and training objectives that cannot be accomplished appropriately through the research and training grant mechanisms.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	48,780	63,836	72,001
Fellowships	4,471	3,786	3,786
Training	13,867	10,142	10,142
Total grants	67,118	77,764	85,929
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	7,611	11,685	10,558
Research and development contracts	6,934	21,021	24,242
Collaborative research and development	374	686	797
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	536	602	616
Research management and program services	3,862	4,403	4,554
Total direct operations	19,317	38,397	40,767
Total program costs funded	86,435	116,161	126,696
Change in selected resources	8,309		
Total obligations	94,744	116,161	126,696

Grants. Research. Approximately 965 regular research grants will be supported in 1973. This compares with an anticipated 811 in 1972 and 748 in 1971. Additionally this activity provides funds for general research support grants, and mental retardation research centers.

Fellowships. In 1973 the fellowship program will be supported at the same dollar level as in 1972. Approximately 210 awards will be supported as contrasted to 214 in 1972 and 220 in 1971.

Training. In 1973 the Institute will support approximately 98 training grants. This compares with 99 anticipated for 1972 and 112 supported in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. The laboratories of this activity conduct research in five major program areas of child health and human development. Reproduction and population research in-

cludes research in reproductive biology, endocrinology, and ecology. Perinatal biology and infant mortality includes research relating to maternal-child interactions, maturation of motor and behavioral systems, nutrition, and development. Growth and development includes research in the areas of neurophysiology, neurochemistry, and nutrition. Adult development and aging includes research in cellular biology, biochemistry, physiology, psychological development. Mental retardation includes biochemical, neurophysiological, and behavioral research.

Research and development contracts. This activity, primarily through the contract mechanism, supplements the Institute's five research programs. The research conducted is usually Institute initiated and is directed toward gaps in existing research or to expand on current studies of either the intramural program or the research grant program. This activity provides one of the most effective ways for coordinating program development in the Institute's five program areas. The main thrust of the Institute's population research program is accomplished through contract efforts within this activity.

Collaborative research and support. This activity supports the Center for Population Research which was established in 1968 to administer the Institute's population research program. Research and training is conducted in the biomedical and behavioral sciences of population. The goals of such research are to develop and evaluate methods of contraception and fertility regulation and to support acquisition of knowledge on determinants and consequences of population growth.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. This activity supports the Institute's scientific staff in planning and in conducting studies dealing with the incidence, distribution, and control of health problems in certain populations. It supports development of more effective and reliable means for measuring health problems, collects analyzes health data, and makes statistical studies for use in initiating and evaluating scientific programs.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	12,550	24,984	24,950
Fellowships	1,058	1,676	1,676
Training	2,819	2,998	2,998
Total grants	16,427	29,658	29,624
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	1,454	3,277	3,419
Research and development contracts	425	2,225	2,225
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	305	446	454
Research management and program services	968	1,416	1,479
Total direct operations	3,152	7,364	7,577
Total program costs funded	19,579	37,022	37,201
Change in selected resources	10,406		
Total obligations	29,985	37,022	37,201

Grants. Research. The research grants program of the National Eye Institute supports the acquisition of new knowledge to combat the widespread incidence of visual disability. Projects range from basic investigations of the visual process to the clinical application of knowledge acquired in the laboratory. Glaucoma, retinal disease, disorders of the cornea and lens, cataract, and infectious eye diseases are among the specific conditions undergoing intensive investigation. In addition, funds are provided for vision clinical research centers and general research support grants. During 1973 the Institute plans to award approximately 418 research grants as compared to 423 awards in 1972 and 411 in 1971.

Fellowships. The fellowship program supports the national vision research effort through the provision of postdoctoral research training to individual investigators working on problems of visual health. Awardees receive training in the wide variety of scientific disciplines associated with vision research. Approximately 101 fellowships will be awarded in 1973 as compared to 101 in 1972 and 88 in 1971.

Training. Training grants are awarded to academic institutions for the establishment, improvement, or expansion of vision research training programs. The grants provide sophisticated training environments for more advanced investigators who wish to pursue academic careers in vision research. Approximately 42 training grants will be awarded in 1973 as compared to 45 in 1972 and 48 in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. This activity supports laboratory and clinical investigations conducted by staff of the National Eye Institute. Talented investigators representing a broad spectrum of scientific disciplines strive to increase our knowledge and understanding of glaucoma, retinal disorders, inflammatory diseases of the eye, embryology of the retina and cornea, and the coding of visual information from the eye to the brain. A close association between the laboratory and clinic facilities the rapid translation of research findings to the care of eye patients.

Research and development contracts. This program supports research contracts with universities, other Federal agencies, and industrial research organizations for projects that require close direction and surveillance by Institute staff and offer high probability of rapid payoff. Projects have been initiated to improve the diagnosis and treatment of glaucoma, retinal disease, and developmental abnormalities of the visual system.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. This activity constitutes a program for the collection and analysis of data on the incidence and prevalence of vision disorders in selected population groups, and for the study of environmental and hereditary factors in the etiology of eye disease. The program also provides biometric and epidemiologic support to intramural and collaborative programs, including clinical trials to evaluate the efficacy of various regimens in the prevention of blindness.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	10,093	12,750	14,404
Fellowships	240	264	264
Training	3,233	3,117	3,117
Total grants	13,566	16,131	17,785
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	5,585	7,206	7,673
Research and development contracts	442	2,054	2,354
Research management and program services	818	936	1,005
Total direct operations	6,845	10,196	11,032
Total program costs funded	20,411	26,327	28,817
Change in selected resources	−318		
Total obligations	20,093	26,327	28,817

Grants. Research. Approximately 177 regular research and center grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 146 in 1972 and 118 in 1971. This activity supports research on the phenomena associated with the source, distribution, mode of entry, and effect of environmental agents on biological systems through grants to universities, research institutes, and other public or private nonprofit institutions.

Fellowships. Approximately 17 awards will be supported in 1973 as compared to 17 in 1972 and 18 in 1971. Under the following program, postdoctoral, special, and research career development awards are made to physicians and scientists for training in the field of environmental health sciences.

Training grants. Approximately 30 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 35 in 1972 and 42 in 1971. The graduate research training program supports the availability of high quality training opportunities in environmental health. It has a threefold goal: to increase the number of highly qualified scientists primarily concerned with environmental health, to enable training institutions to strengthen and enrich the research training capabilities, and to expand opportunities for environmental health research training in a greater number of graduate institutions throughout the United States.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. This activity constitutes the in-house research programs in environmental health sciences at the National Environmental Health Science Center in the Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. Included are research efforts in cell biology, pharmacology and toxicology, analytical and synthetic chemistry, biophysics and biomedical instrumentation, animal science and technology, pathologic physiology, epidemiology, and biometry. Scientific communication as well as the supporting services for these laboratories and branches are also included.

Research and development contracts. This activity supplements and complements the Institute's intramural research program. Research in this activity is supported through contracts in collaboration with other Federal agencies, university research centers, and industrial research organizations.

RESEARCH RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	63,622	71,079	71,079
Fellowships	146	126	126
Training	387	352	352
Total grants	64,155	71,557	71,557
Direct operations:			
Research and development contracts	1,697	1,459	1,430
Research management and program services	1,975	1,912	1,942
Total direct operations	3,672	3,371	3,372
Total program costs funded	67,827	74,928	74,929
Change in selected resources	−1,640		
Total obligations	66,187	74,928	74,929

The programs administered by the Division of Research Resources provide for the creation of specialized research settings for use by grantees and contractors of the NIH categorical programs and for the generation of new knowledge to aid the general progress of biomedical science in the treatment of human disease and disability.

The discrete research resources include: general clinical research centers which are prominent features in many of the Nation's

leading medical schools and which make extensive, controlled studies of human patients possible; biotechnology resources which bring powerful instrumentation and physical sciences expertise within reach of the biomedical scientist; and animal resources, which not only give investigators access to expertly maintained colonies of rare animals for those studies which cannot realistically be undertaken in humans, but also represent standards for the most advanced facilities and procedures for high quality animal care. The Division also administers the general research support program.

Grants. Research. Funds in 1973 will provide the following special research resources: General clinical research centers—approximately 82 centers will be supported in 1973 including three new high priority centers, with some diversification for further expansion of research on ambulatory subjects, as compared to 82 in 1972 and 81 in 1971; biotechnology resources—approximately 48 resources will be supported in 1973 as compared to 48 in 1972 and 47 in 1971; animal resources—approximately 75 animal resources including seven primate centers will receive support in 1973, the same as 1972, as compared to 71 in 1971.

Fellowships. Approximately 14 fellowships will be supported in 1973, the same as 1972 and 1971.

Training. Grants are awarded to institutions to support training in the field of laboratory animal medicine. Approximately eight training grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to nine in 1972 and 1971.

Direct operations. Research and development contracts. This activity is carried out primarily through research contracts with industry, universities, and other Federal and non-Federal institutions. Included are contracts in the areas of chemical/biological information handling, bioetchnology, and laboratory animal care.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	500	500	500
Fellowships	1,076	1,618	1,497
Fogarty scholarships	170	270	270
Direct operations: International Center	1,474	1,892	2,198
Total program costs funded	3,220	4,280	4,465
Change in selected resources	195		
Total obligations	3,415	4,280	4,465

The Fogarty International Center administers programs of advanced study and related international activities to provide a new dimension in the identification, exploration, and solution of biomedical science problems.

Grants. Research. Funds will support the Gorgas Memorial Institute.

Fellowships. Approximately 142 fellowships will be supported in 1973 as compared to 154 in 1972 and 122 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for scientific evaluation.

Fogarty scholarships. Eight scholars will be supported in 1973, as compared to eight in 1972 and eight in 1971.

International Center. Provides for the planning and coordinating of international activities of the National Institutes of Health, including the executive direction of programs mentioned above and international seminars and conferences.

HEALTH MANPOWER

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health professions support	325,934	452,116	391,818
Dental health	10,953	11,850	12,700
Nursing support	55,911	175,911	132,783
Public health support	15,565	20,383	21,609
Allied health support	22,977	31,954	35,600
Program direction and manpower analysis	4,511	6,698	8,530
Total program costs funded	435,851	698,912	603,040
Change in selected resources	−63,826		
Total obligations	372,025	698,912	[1] 603,040

[1] The 1973 decline stems from technical adjustments in advance obligational authority.

Health professions support. The objective of alleviating the shortages of professional health manpower is pursued by providing financial assistance to health professions institutions and their students. This assistance is provided through four mechanisms:

Institutional support. Institutional assistance is provided through several programs. Capitation grants are awarded on a formula basis to health professions schools in order to strengthen their base of financial support, thereby encouraging increases in enrollment and graduates, and improving the quality of their educational programs. Startup grants to new medical, osteopathic, and dental schools are intended to accelerate the date instruction begins or increase the number of students in the entering class. Conversion grants will be awarded to two-year schools that desire to become degree-granting institutions. Special project grants supply broad-range assistance to schools with potential to increase enrollments as well as to enable schools to experiment with programs designed to increase the quality of trained personnel. Financial distress grants help alleviate the difficulties of schools in serious financial straits. The numbers of schools receiving support are:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Capitation:			
Medical and osteopathic	115	115	121
Dental	52	52	56
Other health professions	101	108	109
Special project:			
Medical and osteopathic	62	75	75
Dental	6	21	20
Other health professions		10	10

Included in this category are health manpower education initiative awards which are intended to help achieve special national health manpower goals.

Student assistance. Health professions scholarships and loans enable deserving but financially needy students to pursue their education. Scholarships and loans are awarded to students who, in the judgment of the schools, have exceptional financial need. The numbers of recipients are:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Scholarships:			
Medical and osteopathic	8,430	8,400	8,040
Dental	3,500	3,300	3,015
Other health professions	6,325	6,300	5,695
Loans:			
Medical and osteopathic	10,859	13,100	14,040
Dental	4,077	4,800	5,265
Other health professions	7,506	9,100	9,945

Construction. Grants are made to public and other nonprofit schools, agencies, and organizations for the construction of health professions and nursing teaching facilities and of multipurpose and graduate facilities. In 1972 and 1973, construction assistance will be in the form of both matching grants and interest subsidy payments on guaranteed loans.

Educational grants and contracts and direct operations. Support is focused on innovation and experimentation in medical education as well as scientific evaluation proposals.

Dental health. Programs administered by the Division of Dental Health are oriented to a full-range of dental health efforts, including activities directed toward increasing and improving the dental manpower supply, support for projects concerned with the control of dental diseases, and provision of high-quality dental services through the improvement of delivery systems.

Dental fellowship grants are awarded to candidates pursuing advanced degrees in public health administration, computer technology, bioengineering, dental health delivery systems, dental economics, and education research. In 1973, 11 fellows will be supported, the same number as supported in 1972. Dental research training grants support students working in the areas of oral epidemiology, dental education, and sociology in dental public health. Five grants will be supported in 1973 for continuing education systems which deliver new knowledge to the practicing dentist and dental assistant. The current Dental Auxiliary Utilization program, designed to teach students the effective utilization of a chairside assistant has produced a more productive practitioner; financial support for this current program continues to undergo gradual withdrawal and be redirected to a program which will provide dental students with training in expanded functions and expanded auxiliary management—the team concept of clinical dentistry. This new approach should expand productivity considerably.

Nursing support. Nurses are an essential element in providing the manpower necessary for the delivery of adequate health care. At present, registered nurses are in short supply. Financial assistance is provided to nursing institutions and students through the following programs:

Institutional support. Funds are included for capitation grants which will provide assistance to approximately 1,100 schools of nursing in 1973. Special projects for the improvement of nurse training provide the impetus for schools to initiate new methods in nursing education designed to improve the quality and increase the number of nurses available in the nation. Funds requested for 1973 will support approximately 250 projects in such areas as utilization of faculty, methods of instruction, curriculum revision, and enrollment increases. Major emphasis will be placed on projects for the development of programs to prepare nurses to assume expanded functions and responsibilities in the provision of health care. Financial distress grants assist schools in meeting operational costs required to maintain quality educational programs and accreditation requirements. Funds requested in 1973 will support approximately 20 schools in serious financial straits. Startup grants provide training programs where they are most needed and utilize existing resources wherever possible to increase the numbers trained. Funds requested in 1973 will provide for the establishment of an estimated 20 new nurse training programs.

Student assistance. Nurse scholarships and loans encourage and assist qualified young

people with serious financial need to undertake education for nursing. Numbers of recipients are:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Scholarships: Nursing students	17,000	19,500	19,500
Loans: Nursing students	24,000	30,000	26,000

Traineeships support the graduate and specialized preparation of professional nurses as teachers, administrators, and supervisors. Funds requested in 1973 will provide approximately 2,000 long-term traineeships. In addition, 750 nurses will receive short-term intensive training.

Construction. Grants are made to public and other nonprofit schools, agencies, and organizations for the construction or renovation of teaching facilities for nurses. The 1973 request includes an increase of $800,000 for interest subsidy payments.

Educational grants and contracts and direct operations. Educational research projects in such areas as nursing practice are supported and result in modifications to and development of nurse educational and training programs. Funds requested in 1973 will support 40 nurse research projects. A nurse-scientist graduate training grant program advances nursing and other health-related research by increasing the number of research scientists with a nursing background. Funds requested in 1973 will support science departments in nine universities. Nursing fellowship grants are awarded to prepare professional nurses for independent research, to collaborate in interdisciplinary research, and to direct community health research. In 1973, 120 fellows will be supported. Recruitment grant and contract funds broaden the recruitment base of nursing students by identifying potential nursing candidates and encouraging them to undertake nurse training. The $2,000,000 for this program will support approximately 20 recruitment projects.

Public health support. Changes in the concepts of health services have created needs for new types of public health personnel when existing types are already in short supply. The following mechanisms are currently being used in an attempt to alleviate the shortages:

Institutional support. Formula grants are awarded to accredited schools of public health for the purpose of assisting them in providing comprehensive professional training, specialized consultative services, and technical assistance in public health fields and in public health administration at the state and local levels. Project grants for graduate training in public health are awarded to schools of public health and to other public or nonprofit private institutions to strengthen or expand the graduate or specialized training in public health which they provide. In 1973, the number of grants awarded will increase by over one-third, reaching a total of 120 and including an estimated 40 first-year projects.

Student assistance. Traineeships support the graduate and specialized preparation of students in public health, most of whom are employed by state and local health agencies representing such health disciplines as medicine, dentistry, nursing, and engineering. Types of training included are postprofessional, long-term academic training; short-term training to update the skills of current public health professionals; residency training in preventive medicine and dental public health; and apprenticeships for medical and dental students in public health training. An estimated 450 additional trainees will be supported in 1973.

Direct operations. Grants programing will emphasize consultation with schools and professional organizations which can most readily utilize resources affecting priority areas of nutrition, maternal and child health, and preventive services to people in disadvantaged situations.

Allied health support. More general use of allied health workers in this country requires more efficient utilization of our present training capacities and experimentation with, and development of, new and improved ways of training and using these personnel. The following mechanisms are directed to these ends:

Institutional support. Special improvement grants will be made to allied health training centers offering the greatest comparative potential for expansion of allied health manpower output through enrollment increases in established curriculums, planning and establishing new programs, shortening curriculums, and developing coordinated programs to conserve faculty and facilities. Some 40 more allied health training centers will be brought into participation in this program through new awards.

Student assistance. Traineeships support students preparing to teach or to serve in an administrative, supervisory, or specialist capacity in the allied health disciplines. Funds requested in 1973 will continue long-term and training institute assistance to approximately 3,000 students.

Educational grants and contracts and direct operations. Funds are requested for special project grants in 1973. Efforts will continue to provide awards for developing, demonstrating, or evaluating interdisciplinary training programs; new teaching methods; new types of health manpower; equivalency and proficiency testing mechanisms; and special programs to reach special groups such as returning veterans with experience in a health field.

Program direction and manpower analysis. The Bureau of Health Manpower Education guides, supports, plans, and evaluates health manpower programs; designs proposals for new or revised programs; coordinates improved manpower data gathering, statistical, and reporting activities; and maintains an inventory of all health manpower educational programs in the Nation.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical library assistance	4,998	6,681	7,970
Direct operations:			
Lister Hill National Center for Biomedical Communications	1,177	1,589	2,428
National Medical Audiovisual Center	2,096	2,164	2,522
Library operations	7,404	7,957	8,241
Toxicology information	1,246	1,211	1,508
Review and approval of grants	639	716	676
Program direction	1,877	2,202	2,489
Total program costs funded	19,437	22,520	25,834
Change in selected resources	1,944	1,585	2,270
Total obligations	21,381	24,105	28,104

The National Library of Medicine, the world's largest resource for biomedical documents, facilitates the application of biomedical information to the treatment and prevention of diseases by acquiring, organizing, and disseminating informational materials to health professionals. The Library explores ways in which technological advances in the communications field, which have helped scientists generate vast quantities of new knowledge in recent years, can be applied to organizing that knowledge and making it available where and when it is needed.

The individual programs of the Library are described below.

Medical library assistance. The Library provides six categories of grant and contract support as outlined below.

Training grants. The objective is to train creative leadership for the Nation's medical libraries. In addition to training in conventional library sciences, special emphasis will be placed on training medical librarians in the new communications fields to handle more complex information systems utilizing the computer sciences.

Special scientific project grants. This program will support projects by eminent scientists and scholars to analyze and evaluate the literature in their specialty fields and make it more readily accessible to users in the health sciences.

Research grants. The grants will support investigations that are designed to produce more effective means of storage, retrieval, and transmission of the constantly growing mass of biomedical information and data.

Library resources grants. The library will provide grants to improve the resources and services in local medical libraries, both small and large. The emphasis is on upgrading the medical libraries in hospitals, educational institutions, and medical societies by supplementing rather than replacing local resources.

Regional medical library grants and contracts. In 1973 the Library will continue to provide assistance to 10 major medical libraries which serve as the intermediate links, for their respective regions of the Nation, between the Library and the small hospital or other local medical library. Services provided through the regional medical libraries will include searches, which enable a health professional to identify the current journal articles relevant to his particular information needs; and interlibrary loans, which provide him with that portion of the literature which he needs, but which is not available locally.

Public support grants. The Library will continue the support of projects directed at developing selected publications designed to help health professionals be aware of and digest the world's tremendous output of biomedical information.

Direct operations. This activity includes the following programs:

Lister Hill National Center for Biomedical Communications. This effort involves: Identifying existing innovative communications technology available to the network; demonstrating their feasibility and cost-effectiveness in a biomedical context; and applying computer technology to improve medical education, research, and health care. It also includes managing and coordinating the technical communications aspects of the nationwide network.

National medical audiovisual center. This acquires, organizes, and distributes audiovisual materials; evaluates and provides educational research and consultation on audiovisual systems and materials; and provides audiovisual reference services.

Library operations. The Library acquires and maintains the foremost archival and reference collection of the world's biomedical literature. It provides bibliographic, reference, and loan services from this data base through a network of regional and local medical libraries.

Toxicology information. This program is responsible for developing and operating a computer-based information storage and retrieval system concerning the health effects

of chemical compounds on man and his environment.

Review and approval of grants and program direction. These activities provide the overall scientific and administrative management of the Library programs.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research facilities	348	1,920	1,300
Service and administrative facilities	2,226	3,299	5,700
Total program costs funded	2,574	5,219	7,000
Change in selected resources	−1,479	5,053	4,350
Total obligations	1,095	10,272	11,350

The Buildings and facilities account provides funds for the construction of new facilities required for the mission of the National Institutes of Health as well as for necessary repairs and improvements of existing facilities.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Program direction and management services	8,981	11,010	11,526
Change in selected resources	79		
Total obligations	8,902	11,010	11,526

The Office of the Director provides overall executive and program direction, and supporting services relating to program planning and evaluation, scientific and public information, financial management, personnel management, management policy and review, and grants and contract management and analysis.

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Foreign health research	27,094	27,686	25,619

The scientific activities overseas/special foreign currency program is supported by foreign currencies owned by the United States which have been determined by the Treasury to be in excess of normal U.S. needs. Authorization for these activities is given by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 and the International Health Research Act of 1960.

The general objective of this program is to support health research and research related activities overseas that are within the program interests of the Department's health agencies and of mutual interest to the host country, its institutions, and its scientists. The Department anticipates that the support of health research potential overseas will ultimately enhance the status of the health sciences in the United States. To meet the general objectives, approximately 350 projects are currently active in eight excess currency countries: Ceylon, Egypt, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia. Areas of research include: The improvement of the organization and delivery of health services, environmental health, nutrition, manpower development, population and family planning, disease prevention and control, food and drug consumer protection, biomedical research, and health science communications.

Increased involvement in the worldwide problems of environmental health, population and family planning, and disease prevention and control is planned for 1973. Emphasis will be placed on matching high priority U.S. health needs with salient areas of concern in the host countries in order to achieve domestic goals and also promote U.S. foreign policy.

It is planned to support an estimated 170 new projects in 1973. Specific objectives are: $2,250,000 for environmental health; $4,860,000 for studies to improve the organization and delivery of health services; $1,015,000 for population and family planning research; $1,900,000 for nutrition studies; $580,000 for manpower development; $1,930,000 for disease prevention and control; $5,526,000 for studies in food and drug consumer protection; and $7,550,000 for biomedical research and scientific health communications.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Interest	3,844	3,622	3,623
Loan cancellations		374	223
Total obligations	3,844	3,996	3,846

Title VII, Part C of the Public Health Service Act established a revolving fund from which health professions schools could borrow in order to provide loans to their students. The Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 amended the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Federal Government to pay the difference between the interest paid by students to the schools and the interest payable by the schools to the Government National Mortgage Association and the Treasury.

In 1973, provision is made for the following Federal payments:

$130,000 to GNMA, which represents the difference between the 5.25% interest rate earned by the student loan paper and the 6.38% rate paid by GNMA on the $11,500,000 worth of paper held by the public.

$604,000 to GNMA, which represents the 5.25% interest due on $11,500,000 worth of paper held by the public.

$1,170,000 to the Treasury on the difference between the Treasury interest rate and that paid by the schools on $18,718,000 loaned to the schools.

In addition, $223,000 will be paid to health professions schools for loan cancellations under the Public Health Service Act. These loans are canceled by either the death or permanent and total disability of the borrower or the borrower's willingness to serve in an area designated by the Secretary.

NURSE TRAINING FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Interest	2,597	2,391	2,453
Loan cancellations to schools		951	894
Total obligations	2,597	3,342	3,347

Title VIII, Part B of the Public Health Service Act established a revolving fund from which schools of nursing could borrow in order to provide loans to their students. The Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 amended the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Federal Government to pay the difference between the interest paid by students to the schools and the interest payable by the schools to the Government National Mortgage Association and the Treasury.

In 1973, provision is made for the following Federal payments:

$40,000 to GNMA, which represents the difference between the 5.25% interest rate earned by the student loan paper and the 6.38% rate paid by GNMA on the $3,500,000 worth of paper held by the public.

$184,000 to GNMA which represents the 5.25% interest due on $3,500,000 worth of paper held by the public.

$755,000 to the Treasury on the difference between the Treasury interest rate and that paid by the schools on $12,081,000 loaned to the schools.

In addition, $894,000 will be paid to schools of nursing for loan cancellations under the Public Health Service Act. These loans are canceled by either the death or permanent and total disability of the borrower or the borrower's willingness to serve in an area designated by the Secretary.

GENERAL RESEARCH SUPPORT GRANTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Total obligations	54,200	55,212	54,624

In 1973 funds are provided for the following general research support programs. General research support grants enable institutions heavily engaged in health-related research greater control over the quality, content, emphasis, and direction of their research activities than is possible exclusively under the categorical research project system. Approximately 346 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 338 in 1972 and 326 in 1971. The biomedical sciences support program provides funds to academic institutions other than health professional schools for support of their health-related research and research training activities. Approximately 117 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 115 in 1972 and 112 in 1971. Health sciences advancement awards program—in 1973 continuation awards will be made to two institutions compared to four in 1972 and nine in 1971. The minority schools biomedical support program is designed to strengthen institutional biomedical research and research training capability at institutions where the student enrollment is drawn mainly from minority ethnic groups. Approximately 49 institutions will receive support in 1973 as compared to 26 in 1972 when this program was initiated.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Computer services	4,399	4,592	4,466
Research services	5,377	5,591	5,714
Engineering services	11,897	12,858	14,364
Clinical services	21,416	22,392	23,932
Grant review and approval	8,532	8,848	8,999
Administrative services	9,040	8,961	9,293
Total obligations	60,661	63,242	66,768

The National Institutes of Health Management Fund was established to facilitate the conduct of operations of the NIH which are financed by two or more appropriations. The activities of the fund are financed primarily from advances and reimbursements from the individual institutes. Formulas for determining the contribution from each institute are designed to reflect utilization of services performed by the management fund. The formula takes into consideration

such factors as the number of activated beds in the clinical center, the number of laboratory workers, total personnel, and the dollar level of grants and direct research funds obligated by the individual institutes. A small portion of the funds comes from reimbursements from outside sources and from other Government agencies.

The centralized organizations of the NIH provide supporting services as follows:

Computer services provide a central scientific research and computation resource in support of the NIH programs. The Division plans and conducts an extensive interdisciplinary research and development program in which the concepts and methods of computer science, engineering, and mathematics are applied to biomedical problems.

Research supporting services provide the central administration and operation of services for the conduct of research activities such as providing laboratory animals, culture media, and glassware, design and fabrication of laboratory instrumentation; operating the NIH medical reference library, including the translation of medical literature; scientific photography and medical arts; and environmental engineering services.

Engineering services provide engineering, architectural, craft, and labor services required for the: Operation and maintenance of the NIH facilities, planning of facilities and improvements, administration and inspection of construction performed under direct contract, and liaison and inspection of direct construction projects.

Clinical services provide facilities and services, other than physician care, for: an integrated operation of the clinical center's 516-bed facility serving nine Institutes conducting clinical investigations, developing and recommending policies and rules for the protection and welfare of patients, conducting research in methods and techniques of hospital administration in a medical research environment, professional staff conducting independent research, and numerous other medical care services.

Grant review and approval provide staff support services in formulating NIH grant and award policies and procedures relating to research, training, and fellowship programs.

Administrative services include plant and office services, including cleaning of space, mail, messenger, telephone, and other communication services; operation and maintenance of motor vehicles; guards, fire fighting, and other plant protection and safety services; and procurement and supply management.

SERVICE AND SUPPLY FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Administrative services:			
Cost of goods sold	5,497	5,890	6,121
Other	3,627	3,248	3,388
Data processing services	7,829	7,823	8,712
Instrumentation:			
Cost of goods sold	301	371	395
Other	1,320	1,444	1,577
Research animals:			
Cost of goods sold	140	151	163
Other	1,446	1,551	1,578
Total program costs funded	20,160	20,478	21,934
Change in selected resources	338	−12	−25
Total obligations	20,498	20,466	21,909

The NIH Service and Supply Fund provides a single means for consolidated financing and accounting of business-type operations involving the sale of services and commodities to customers.

The activities of the fund are grouped into four categories: administrative services, data processing services, instrumentation, and reservices or sold commodities to the institutes and divisions of NIH at a $20,171,000 level in 1971. It is expected that the level will be $20,500,000 in 1972 and increase to $22,000,000 in 1973. Two activities, the scientific equipment rental pool and still photography, were added to the fund during 1971, adding approximately $345,000 in services.

A general description of these activities follows:

Administrative services. These services include the sale of commodities from inventory printing and reproduction services and other miscellaneous services. The NIH maintains a supply of scientific and general-use materials and supplies, alteration and construction material, linens, and special equipment. The Printing and Reproduction Branch provides printing, distribution, and related services. Its printing plant is equipped to produce brochures as well as ordinary administrative materials.

Data processing services. This central facility provides data systems design and consultation, key punching, EAM processing, computer programing, and computer processing services.

Instrumentation. The Biomedical Instrumentation and Engineering Branch maintains, repairs, and fabricates scientific laboratory apparatus and equipment for use in the research laboratories at NIH.

Research animals. The NIH animal facilities provide small and large research animals to the research laboratories. The facilities include breeding, holding, and conditioning facilities for mice, rats, guinea pigs, rabbits, hamsters, dogs, cats, primates, and ungulate animals. Bleeding services are also provided.

ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical research	833	8,499	8,716
Health manpower	2,305	2,119	2,039
National Library of Medicine	196	1,000	1,000
Total obligations	3,334	11,618	11,755

OFFICE OF EDUCATION—EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Educational systems improvement: National priority programs: Drug abuse education	5,901	13,024	12,400

Grants are made to State and local agencies to support demonstration, dissemination, and training projects to improve drug abuse education.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants to States for public assistance: Medical assistance	3,373,866	3,827,619	4,502,687

Federal grants for medical assistance under Title XIX of the Social Security Act (Medicaid) are made to States with plans approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. States must provide medical assistance to all persons receiving or eligible to receive assistance payments for their basic needs under the Social Security Act. States may elect to provide medical assistance to certain medically needy persons who need help with their medical bills. Medicaid complements the Federal Medicare program by paying the deductible and coinsurance for the needy aged, paying their premiums for Medicare's supplementary medical insurance program, and by paying for services not covered by Medicare, for example, long-term nursing home care.

MEDICAL PAYMENTS, EXCLUDING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Total payments	5,895,300	7,042,767	7,860,648
Federal share	3,221,924	3,853,476	4,314,028

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Total payments	280,573	298,880	340,956
Federal share	151,942	165,205	188,659

The major factors accounting for the increase from 1972 to 1973 are the continued rise in medical prices, increase in the number of eligible recipients, and continued increase in utilization under State programs.

The following is the estimated number of different persons receiving Federal medical assistance under this program for 1971, 1972, and 1973:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
All recipients	18,223,000	20,632,000	23,537,000
Aged 65 or over	3,600,000	3,800,000	4,000,000
Blind	123,000	132,000	137,000
Permanent and total disability	1,500,000	1,700,000	2,000,000
Children under 21	8,300,000	9,400,000	10,800,000
Adults in Aid for Dependent Children-type families	4,700,000	5,600,000	6,600,000

The increase in the number of persons receiving medical assistance during 1973 results largely from the anticipated increase in the number of recipients of maintenance payments.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE—SUPPLEMENTAL NOW REQUESTED

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical assistance:			
For those eligible for maintenance assistance		68,712	
For those not eligible for maintenance assistance		124,967	
Administration		−2,617	
Total		191,062	

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health services	2,816	3,600	3,600

These services are provided to new arrivals and to needy refugees in Miami and include medical screening, examinations, treatment, and provision of prescribed drugs by the clinic operated for the program by the Dade County, Florida, public health service; arrangements are made for outpatient clinic services when necessary at local hospitals and for care of patients with tuberculosis and mental illness.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Matching payments for supplementary medical insurance	1,245,282	1,376,400	1,434,015
Hospital insurance for the uninsured	878,688	503,351	467,825

Matching payments for supplementary medical insurance. An estimated $1,434,015,000 will be required in 1973 to finance the Government's contribution to the Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund and to cover the deficiencies in financing the Government's contribution for 1971 and 1972. For each monthly premium paid by enrollees in the voluntary medical insurance program, which primarily covers doctor bills, the Federal Government matches a like amount. The estimate for 1973 assumes that an average of about 20,500,000 persons will be enrolled in the program during 1973 as compared with an average of about 20,100,000 in 1972.

Hospital insurance for the uninsured. A payment of $467,825,000 to the Federal hospital insurance trust fund is budgeted for 1973 to cover the costs of hospital and related care for individuals aged 65 and over who are not insured under the social security or railroad retirement systems. The estimate assumes that there will be an average of 1,400,000 uninsured persons covered for hospital benefits during 1973, and is net of adjustments for prior years for which the amounts appropriated were higher than presently estimated costs. The uninsured group covered by this provision includes persons who retired before their occupations were covered by social security (such as teachers and State and local employees), and widows whose husbands died prior to earning coverage under social security.

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES—HEALTH INSURANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Hospital insurance	133,579	156,777	164,961
Supplementary medical insurance	254,649	290,691	328,827

Health insurance. This program includes the hospital insurance and the voluntary supplementary medical insurance programs which were established by the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act and commonly referred to as Medicare.

Hospital insurance. The hospital insurance program affords protection to persons aged 65 and over against the cost of inpatient hospital services, posthospital home health services, and posthospital extended care services. Bills for services rendered under the hospital insurance program are generally submitted by hospitals, extended care facilities, home health agencies, and in some instances by individuals who have received emergency care in nonparticipating hospitals. In most instances, these bills are processed by the Blue Cross associations and private insurance companies acting as intermediaries for the Social Security Administration. The individual beneficiary records of utilization of hospital services are maintained in the central office of the Social Security Administration. The growth in beneficiaries who will be covered by the program as the population of age 65 and over increases and the rise in the utilization of available services cause an increase in the number of claims in both 1972 and 1973.

Supplementary medical insurance. Almost all persons aged 65 and over are eligible to enroll in the supplementary medical insurance program which covers the cost of physician services and other medical costs within certain deductible and coinsurance requirements. Enrollees in the program pay a monthly premium and the aggregate of these premiums is matched by the Federal Government by appropriations from Federal funds. Claims for services under the medical insurance program may be submitted by the physician or other suppliers of service or by the beneficiary to Blue Shield associations and private insurance companies who have been designated to act as carriers for the Social Security Administration in specific geographical areas.

The volume of claims will rise in 1972 and 1973 as a result of the growth in the aged 65 and over population and the projected increase in utilization of medical services.

The health insurance program data is reflected in the following chart:

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Claims received for services covered by hospital insurance	8,332,000	8,411,000	8,621,000
Claims received for services covered by medical insurance	57,540,000	64,538,000	71,390,000
Beneficiaries receiving reimbursed services:			
Hospital insurance	4,500,000	4,600,000	4,700,000
Medical insurance	10,300,000	10,900,000	11,400,000
Benefit payments (in millions):			
Hospital insurance [1]	$5,443	$6,265	$6,950
Medical insurance	$2,035	$2,240	$2,455

[1] Includes $533,000,000 in 1971, $539,000,000 in 1972, and $549,000,000 in 1973 chargeable to Federal funds.

The administrative costs budgeted for this program cover the claim payment functions performed by the intermediaries and carriers; services performed by State agencies in certifying and consulting with providers of services; all work performed by the Social Security Administration in directing the program, providing services to beneficiaries, maintaining records by individual beneficiary of utilization of hospital and medical services and processing claims to establish entitlement to hospital insurance for persons not insured for cash benefits under either the social security or railroad retirement program.

FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Benefit payments	5,489,826	6,280,000	6,957,000
Construction	1,522	971	314
Administration:			
Authorized program	146,845	168,674	177,290
Adjustment of prior year costs	920		
Incentive reimbursement experimentation	364	6,442	2,372
Total obligations	5,639,478	6,456,088	7,136,977

The hospital insurance program protects individuals and families against the costs of health care by helping eligible people aged 65 and over finance the cost of hospital and related care.

Benefit payments. The hospital insurance program provides protection to over 20,000,000 persons aged 65 and over against the costs of inpatient hospital services, posthospital home health services, and posthospital extended care services. The following table shows comparative data on hospital insurance beneficiaries and on benefit payments classified by type of coverage for 1971 through 1973 (in millions):

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Persons with hospital insurance protection (average)	20.3	20.6	20.9
Beneficiaries receiving reimbursed services	4.5	4.6	4.7
Payments for inpatient hospital services	$5,119	$5,903	$6,513
Payments for extended care services	247	268	323
Payments for home health services	77	94	114
Total benefit payments	5,443	6,265	6,950

The growth in benefit payments in 1972 and 1973 results primarily from increases in the size of the covered population and in the cost of covered services. The estimates are in keeping with the wage and price guidelines. Without these guidelines, estimated benefit outlays would be $135,000,000 higher in 1972 and $290,000,000 higher in 1973.

Construction. The cost of site acquisition, design, and construction of office facilities for the Social Security Administration are financed by this and the other trust funds.

Administration. The administration expenses of the Social Security Administration as reflected in its salaries and expenses appropriation and those incurred for social security programs by the Treasury Department and other Department of Health, Education, and Welfare components are financed in part by each trust fund.

Incentive reimbursement experimentation. The 1967 Social Security Amendments provide authorization to conduct experiments for reimbursement of providers of services on a basis other than the "reasonable cost" or "reasonable charges" provisions generally applicable under the Medicare program, in order to achieve incentive for economy while maintaining or improving quality in the provision of health services. The cost of administering and evaluating the experiments is financed by the hospital insurance and supplementary medical insurance trust funds. Hospital insurance benefit payments made to providers of health services who are participating in these experiments are included in the benefit payments shown above.

FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Benefit payments	2,055,364	2,241,976	2,457,150
Construction	1,836	1,170	374
Administration			
Authorized program	258,713	293,338	332,956
Adjustment in prior year costs	1,939		
Incentive reimbursement experimentation		1,094	808
Total obligations	2,317,852	2,537,578	2,791,287

The supplementary medical insurance program protects individuals and families against the costs of health care by helping individuals aged 65 and over who elect this coverage to finance the cost of physicians' services and certain other medical and health services. Almost all persons aged 65 and over are eligible to enroll in the voluntary supplementary medical insurance program provided by the Social Security Act and about 96% of those eligible have chosen to do so. The costs of services covered by the program and administrative expenses are financed by premium payments from enrollees together with matching contributions from the general revenues of the Treasury.

Benefit payments. Participants in the program are covered for the cost of physician's services, home health services not covered under the hospital insurance program, outpatient services, and certain other medical costs, with specified deductible and coinsurance amounts. The following table shows comparative data on supplementary medical insurance beneficiaries and benefit payments, classified by type of coverage, for 1971 through 1973 (in millions).

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Persons with supplementary medical insurance protection (average)	19.8	20.1	20.5
Beneficiaries receiving reimbursed services	10.3	10.9	11.4
Payment for physicians' services	$1,864	$2,043	$2,231
Payments for home health services	32	36	41
Payments for outpatient services	106	119	136
Payments for other medical and health services	33	42	47
Total benefit payments	2,035	2,240	2,455

The growth in benefit payments in 1972 and 1973 results from increases in the covered population and projected increases in the utilization and cost of medical care services. For 1973 it is assumed that the controls will limit recognized fee increases to approximately 2½%. Without these assumptions the 1972 benefit estimate would be $5,000,000 higher and the 1973 benefit estimate would be $65,000,000 higher.

Construction. The costs of site acquisition, design, and construction of the office facilities for the Social Security Administration are financed by this and the other trust funds.

Administration. The administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration as reflected in its Salaries and Expenses appropriation, and those incurred for social security programs by the Treasury Department and other Department of Health, Education and Welfare components are financed in part by each trust fund.

Incentive reimbursement experimentation. The 1967 Social Security Amendments provide authorization to conduct experiments for reimbursement of providers of services on a basis other than the "reasonable cost" or "reasonable charges" provisions generally applicable under the Medicare program in order to achieve incentives for economy while maintaining or improving quality in the provision of health services. The cost of administering and evaluating the experiments is financed by the hospital insurance and supplementary medical insurance trust funds. Medical insurance benefit payments made to providers of health services who are participating in these experiments are included in the benefit payments shown above.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Howard University: Freedmen's Hospital	18,958	20,555	21,195

The hospital furnishes inpatient and outpatient care and a facility for training of physicians and nurses and other professional and technical health personnel. Operation of the hospital is financed by direct appropriation and income derived from charges for medical and hospital services for self-pay and insured patients, Medicare patients, and other patients paid for by the District of Columbia and other jurisdictions. Federal funds provide 67% of the total operating costs.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patient statistics:			
Admissions	11,376	11,600	11,800
Average daily patient load including newborns	389.9	398.0	406.0
Outpatient visits:			
Clinic	70,784	73,000	75,000
Emergency	57,369	59,000	60,000
Total outpatient visits	128,153	132,000	135,000

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Departmental management: Commission on Medical Malpractice		1,500	500

The Commission convened to collect, classify, and analyze data showing the incidence of malpractice claims and litigation, and to study the present system for compensating individuals (or their representatives) for injury or death arising out of medical treatment, the relationship between malpractice claims and the current legal environment on professional practices of health care providers and institutions, and the present malpractice insurance system to determine its role and its effectiveness in the processing of malpractice claims.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
International health activities	1,123	990	1,029
Family health insurance plan	153	----------	----------
Advisory committee on dental health	23	86	----------
Ad hoc committee on health professions	76	105	----------

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Food, Drug, and Product Safety: Wholesome fish, consumer and hazardous product safety, and medical device safety			38,845

Legislation has been proposed that will require intensive screening of fish and fishery products by the Food and Drug Administration. Frequency and intensity of current fish establishment inspections will be increased to provide comprehensive coverage. Grants will be provided to States to assist in their development of inspection programs for the intrastate fish industry.

This estimate also provides resources for implementation of consumer product safety legislation and proposed amendments to the Hazardous Substances Act. The new legislation will provide authority to establish standards for consumer products not subject to existing legislation, to remove hazardous products from the market, and to inspect manufacturers' and distributors' records.

Legislation also has been proposed to authorize the Food and Drug Administration to establish standards relating to the safety of medical devices.

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health services planning and development: Health maintenance organization activities		57,000	60,000

Legislation has been proposed to promote the development and expansion of health maintenance organizations through technical and financial assistance in order to make this health care option available to all citizens of the Nation. By encouraging Health maintenance organization development the program will deal with specific major health care problems: rapid inflation, inefficient organization, uneven distribution of medical resources, and inadequate emphasis on illness prevention.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants to States for public assistance: Medical assistance			—700,220

Pending legislation would provide Medicare coverage to some disabled persons currently relying on Medicaid and would thus cause a reduction in Medicaid costs.

This legislation would also modify the Medicaid program, including provisions that would permit States more flexibility in scope of program, discourage over utilization of services, place increased emphasis on preventive and ambulatory medical care, and restrain cost increases for institutional services. These changes are consistent with the proposed family health insurance plan, one objective of which is to promote cost sharing according to the beneficiary's ability to pay.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Prisons:			
Medical services	5,306	6,316	7,107
Narcotic addict treatment	1,486	2,748	3,398

Medical services. Funds are allocated to the Health Services and Mental Health Administration for the cost of medical, psychiatric, and technical services.

Narcotic addict treatment. This covers the cost of treatment of narcotic addicts while in institutions and provides for aftercare treatment services after the inmate is released.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

[In thousands of dollars]

Advances and reimbursements	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Kabul Hospital:			
Agency for International Development	193	211	211
Peace Corps	21	23	23
Defense	18	19	19
Other accounts	33	37	37

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Contributions to international organizations:			
World Health Organization	21,681	23,741	26,342
Pan American Health Organization	9,263	10,437	11,313

The World Health Organization is increasing its activities in the areas of drug monitoring, drug efficacy, environmental services and water supply, and small pox eradication.

The Pan American Health Organization is increasing its activities with respect to malaria eradication and its support of the Pan American Zoonosis Center, which was involved in the recent outbreak of Venezuelan equine encephalitis.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operations: Administration of medical programs	6,897	----------	7,363

This activity covers the development of regulations governing the physical and mental fitness of airmen and other persons whose health affects safety in flight; the development and supervision of a health and medical program for agency personnel; the administration of an aviation medical research program, the project costs of which are financed under Engineering and development; and the operation of the Civil Aeromedical Institute building.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Safety regulation: Administration of medical programs		4,568	----------

Note: This account will be phased out in 1972 and the activity will be shown in the operations account in 1973.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operations (airport and airway trust fund); Administration of medical programs		2,745	----------

Note. This account will be phased out in 1972. The activity will be shown in the operations account in 1973.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and development: Aviation medicine	2,130	----------	----------

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Engineering and Development (airport and airway trust fund): Aviation medicine		675	985

This provides for conducting aeromedical research directed toward identifying and eliminating those physiological and psychological factors inimical to personnel engaged in operating the traffic control system.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operating expenses: Biology and medicine	88,117	88,845	93,800

This program includes basic and applied research and development in the life sciences. By major category, the costs are as follows (in thousands of dollars):

Category	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Interaction of radiation with biological systems	32,981	32,613	34,000
Assessment, evaluation, and control of radiation exposure to man and his environment	44,274	45,767	49,000
Beneficial applications of radiation	10,862	10,465	10,800
Total biology and medicine	88,117	88,845	93,800
Additional amounts for environmental research included in proposed 1972 supplemental		2,000	700

The program provides the scientific information necessary to assure that all nuclear energy activities are conducted with due regard for the safety of man and his environment and which increases the ability to predict the environmental behavior and biological effects of radionuclides. The program is thus directly responsive to the needs of the AEC in both its operations and its regulatory functions. The program is coordinated with other Government agencies conducting programs in related aspects of biomedical research.

Primary emphasis in 1973 will be placed on program areas of particular importance and urgency including: the late effects of low doses of radiation: tumorigenicity of particles of plutonium and other alpha emitters; thermal alteration of fresh water, marine, and atmospheric environments; toxicity of radioelements such as radium and uranium in humans; and studies of the structure and function of biological molecules and components of cells, radiation-induced damage to cells, and the processes by which the damage is repaired.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operating expenses (supplemental now requested): Biology and medicine		2,000	700
Plant and capital equipment: Biology and medicine	7,079	7,330	10,355
Plant and capital equipment (supplemental now requested): Biology and medicine		2,000	----------

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—MEDICAL CARE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Direct operating costs funded:			
Maintenance and operation of VA facilities:			
VA hospital care:			
Medical bed sections	537,247	683,833	727,301
Surgical bed sections	330,179	379,796	401,868
Psychiatric bed sections	404,581	400,161	415,047
Nursing home care	44,409	53,255	65,642
Domiciliary care	42,510	43,002	44,325
Restoration centers	4,065	4,217	4,325
Outpatient care	293,362	357,770	447,169
Miscellaneous benefits and services	28,788	33,808	38,854
Education and training	102,742	117,382	143,457
Research and development in health services	2,333	2,189	----------
Contract care:			
Hospitalization	17,551	20,270	21,727
Nursing home	19,685	26,922	32,450
Grants for State home care:			
Domiciliary	7,757	8,058	8,420
Nursing home	5,405	6,032	7,111
Hospitalization	3,145	3,245	3,784
Total direct operating costs funded	1,843,759	2,139,940	2,361,480
Capital outlay funded:			
Maintenance and operation of VA facilities:			
VA hospital care:			
Medical bed sections	22,015	44,350	51,200
Surgical bed sections	13,326	27,000	25,300
Psychiatric bed sections	10,057	20,165	15,900
Nursing home care	1,354	733	1,650
Domiciliary care	1,185	1,200	1,220
Restoration centers	122	190	220
Outpatient care	3,890	6,510	8,974
Miscellaneous benefits and services	2,986	3,812	3,900
Education and training	387	900	2,000
Research and development in health services	1	1	----------
Total capital outlay	55,323	104,861	110,364
Total direct program costs funded	1,899,082	2,224,801	2,471,844

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Reimbursable program:			
Maintenance and operation of VA facilities:			
VA hospital care	13,535	13,154	13,154
Outpatient care	2,930	2,846	2,846
Total reimbursable program costs	16,465	16,000	16,000
Total program costs funded	1,915,547	2,260,801	2,487,844
Change in selected resources	42,326	----------	----------
Total obligations	1,957,873	2,260,801	2,487,844

Providing the highest-quality health care to eligible veterans is the prime mission of the Veterans Administration's medical system. In fulfilling that mission, the Veterans Administration operates the country's largest civilian hospital system. Between 1971 and 1973, the system will expand from 166 to 170 hospitals, from 76 to 83 VA nursing homes, and from 199 to 203 outpatient clinics. Employment will rise by 11,824 permanent positions in this period, to 145,245 physicians, nurses, and other health workers. The total number of veterans, who in 1973 will receive some form of health care financed by this

appropriation will rise by nearly 24% over the number served in 1971, to 4,700,000. To help maintain its standards of medical excellence, the Veterans Administration trains medical students, physicians, and all other categories of health manpower, and conducts an extensive program of medical research (largely financed by the Medical and prosthetic research appropriation). Under the impetus of the President's national health initiatives for improving the quality and accessibility of health care, the Veterans Administration has proposed legislation to authorize earlier treatment of disease. VA also has engaged in an expanding program of demonstrations of new models of health organization and delivery, including progressive regionalization of its hospitals, improvements in design and location of outpatient clinics, and other improvements.

Specific increases in 1973 cover activation expenses for the new hospitals at San Antonio, Texas; Columbia, Missouri; Lexington, Kentucky; Northport, New York; San Diego, California; and Tampa, Florida; increased staffing to improve inpatient and outpatient care; extension of new specialized medical services begun in 1972 and initiation of additional specialized medical services; increased outpatient workloads resulting from the Vietnam war; 1,723 more VA nursing home care beneficiaries treated and 5,122 more beneficiaries treated in non-VA facilities; expansion of the education and training program; increased usage of drugs, utilities, communications, prosthetics, medical and dental supplies, and operating supplies; increased equipment and minor improvements; wage and salary increases and other payroll adjustments including Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes; and increased cost of operation and maintenance of additional facilities and space.

Maintenance and operation of VA facilities.

VA hospital care.

Medical bed sections	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	367,230	389,500	405,000
Average employment (including education and training)	46,535	56,175	59,162

Surgical bed sections	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	291,049	288,025	288,987
Average employment (including education and training)	27,936	30,053	31,699

Psychiatric bed sections	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	160,300	148,100	150,216
Average employment (including education and training)	36,470	32,475	33,151

VA Hospitals	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	818,579	825,625	844,203
Average employment (including education and training)	110,941	118,703	124,012

Nursing home care	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	7,398	8,837	10,560
Average employment (including education and training)	3,955	4,494	5,467

Domiciliary care	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	25,666	25,710	24,380
Average employment (including education and training)	3,084	3,024	3,009

Restoration centers	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	2,467	2,886	2,993
Average employment (including education and training)	297	338	341

Outpatient care. This includes care provided by VA staff and by physicians and dentists participating under a fee basis arrangement in the hometown care program.

NUMBER OF MEDICAL VISITS AND DENTAL CASES AUTHORIZED

[In thousands]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical visits:			
Staff	6,798	7,349	8,450
Fee	1,266	2,084	2,395
Total	8,064	9,433	10,845
Dental cases authorized:			
Examinations:			
Staff	148,988	139,000	149,000
Fee	97,835	118,700	119,000
Total	246,823	257,700	268,000
Treatments:			
Staff	83,025	89,000	91,000
Fee	160,963	143,590	156,000
Total	243,988	232,590	247,000
Average employment (including education and training)	14,488	16,064	20,318

Miscellaneous benefits and services. This includes items of expense not directly connected with medical care and treatment such as beneficiary travel, care of the dead, operation of personnel quarters at medical facilities, and the cost of furnishing supply, engineering, housekeeping, and other administrative support service to other Veterans Administration departments on a nonreimbursable basis.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Average employment	1,084	1,097	1,097

Education and training. All Education and training average employment has been apportioned to the respective inpatient activity.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Average employment	5,958	6,168	7,489

Research and development in health services. In 1973 there will be an increase in funds over 1972 to expand and diversify research and development for improved delivery of health care services. The 1973 funds for this activity are included under the appropriation Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Average employment	89	100	

Contract care. Hospitalization. This covers the hospitalization in other Federal hospitals for service and non-service-connected disabilities where Veterans Administration facilities are not available. It also covers the use of non-Federal hospitals which are limited to treatment of service-connected disabilities, except that female veterans, veterans in training under the provisions of 38 U.S. Code 1506, and veterans in U.S. territories and possessions may also receive treatment for non-service-connected disabilities.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	22,168	22,225	22,500

Nursing home. This includes provision for nursing care of veterans in private facilities where Veterans Administration facilities are not available.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	12,803	15,165	17,060

GRANTS FOR STATE HOME CARE—DOMICILIARY

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	11,129	11,356	11,926

Nursing home	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	5,413	5,977	7,098

Hospitalization	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	6,728	6,943	8,204
Average employment (for support of non-VA facility workloads)	197	197	197

The requirements presented in this budget submission take into consideration the contemplated receipt in 1973 of an amount of property and supplies from other Federal agencies or from the General post fund, national homes, Veterans Administration, equivalent to that experienced in 1971 which had an acquisition value of $3,100,000. This does not, however, represent the value of the items when transferred.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Direct operating costs funded:			
Medical research	53,088	56,538	62,670
Prosthetic research	2,019	2,078	3,053
Total direct operating costs funded	55,107	58,616	65,723

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Capital outlay funded:			
Medical research	6,613	9,079	9,410
Prosthetic research	26	40	160
Total capital outlay	6,640	9,119	9,570
Total direct program costs funded	61,746	67,735	75,293
Reimbursable program:			
Medical research:			
Cancer chemotherapy research	921	1,906	1,950
Other	560	550	550
Total reimbursable program costs	1,481	2,456	2,500
Total program costs funded	63,227	70,191	77,793
Change in selected resources	1,038		
Total obligations	64,265	70,191	77,793

Medical research. The 1973 program provides for additional research in drug addiction, sickle cell disease, psychiatry, pulmonary disease, and other areas of Veterans Administration specialization.

Prosthetic research. The budget provides a 50% increase in 1973 funding of research, development, and testing of prosthetic, orthopedic, and sensory aids for improving the care and rehabilitation of disabled eligible veterans, including amputees, paraplegics, and the blind.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

Operating costs funded	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical, hospital, and domiciliary administration	14,272	15,212	17,242
Postgraduate and inservice training	3,297	4,215	4,908
Exchange of medical information	1,923	76	1,500
Research and development in health services	99	101	2,301
Total operating costs funded	19,591	19,605	25,915
Capital outlay funded:			
Medical, hospital, and domiciliary administration	53	57	101
Postgraduate and inservice training	210	590	500
Exchange of medical information	402		500
Research and development in health services			240
Total capital outlay	665	647	1,341
Total program costs funded	20,256	20,252	27,292
Change in selected resources	−211		
Total obligations	20,045	20,252	27,292

Medical, hospital, and domiciliary administration covers the development, implementation, and administration of policies, plans, and broad objectives, and provides executive direction for all agency medical programs.

Postgraduate and inservice training provides for tuition and registration payments, lecturer fees, travel expenses, and training materials incidental to continuing education programs for professional medical and administrative staff. This also serves as a media for disseminating information on medical advances resulting from research efforts.

Exchange of medical information provides for entering into agreements with medical schools, hospitals, research centers and individual institutions, and members of the medical-scientific community under which physicians at hospitals not affiliated with medical schools will maintain closer contact with such schools and other primary sources of medical information. (This program was extended an additional four years by Public Law 92–69, approved August 6, 1971. Estimates for 1972 are being submitted under the Proposed for separate transmittal, existing legislation section. Funds for 1972 are to be obtained by transfer of savings from Medical care appropriation.)

Research and development in health services provides for studies designed to facilitate improved delivery of health care services. (The major portion of this activity was funded under the appropriation Medical care prior to 1973.)

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES (SUPPLEMENTAL NOW REQUESTED)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Exchange of medical information		1,924	

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Hospitals:			
Replacement and modernization	53,854	53,671	37,127
Other improvements	11,935	30,401	37,024
Domiciliaries		40	417
Nursing homes	624	2,858	2,853
Construction of research and education facilities	7,043	11,662	8,838
General administration	7,463	8,765	9,741
Total program costs funded	80,919	107,397	96,000
Change in selected resources	21,915	2,500	59,923
Total obligations	102,834	109,897	155,923

These funds provide for the construction of new hospital and domiciliary facilities; replacement and relocation of existing hospitals and domiciliaries; acquisition of sites; modernization and other improvements; including alterations and additions for medical research and education facilities, nursing home beds, supply depots, and data processing centers; all of which include construction planning, administration, and related staff activities.

Hospitals. Replacement and modernization. This activity provides for construction of new hospitals, replacement and relocation of existing hospitals, and modernization of existing hospitals to bring them up to the standards of new hospitals insofar as practicable.

Other improvements. This activity provides for needed improvements at hospitals which are not included as replacement or modernization projects.

Domiciliaries. This activity provides for construction of domiciliary facilities, including restoration centers.

Nursing homes. This activity provides for the construction necessary to establish VA nursing home facilities. These facilities are being provided by altering existing hospital and domiciliary facilities and by new construction where necessary.

General administration. This activity provides for planning, administration, design and construction supervision, construction research and development program, and related staff activities.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants for State nursing home construction	4,168	2,680	1,575
Grants for existing State home hospital or domiciliary facility remodeling, modification, or alteration		1,320	3,725
Total program costs funded	4,168	4,000	5,300
Change in selected resources	188	685	3,700
Tota obligations	4,356	4,685	9,000

This program provides grants to assist the States in the construction of State nursing facilities and to remodel, modify, or alter existing hospital and domiciliary facilities in State homes for providing care and treatment to war veterans.

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical care and treatment of veterans	1,558	2,000	2,000
Medical research and training grants	72	100	
Hospital equipment, plant, and facilities rehabilitation grants	31	9	
Total obligations	1,661	2,109	2,000

Grants are made to the Republic of the Philippines for the medical care and treatment, at the Veterans Memorial Hospital or at contract facilities, of Philippine Commonwealth Army veterans and new Philippine Scouts. Public Law 89–612 extended the program for another five years through June 30, 1973, and expanded reimbursement to include payments for hospital care for nonservice-connected disabilities.

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Patients treated	4,270	5,455	5,388

ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	45	50	52
Research, training, and demonstration project	420	440	750
Total program costs funced	465	490	802
Change in selected resources	−13		
Total obligations	452	490	802

MEDICAL CARE, DIRECT OPERATING COSTS FUNDED

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Maintenance and operation of VA facilities:			
VA hospital care:			
Medical bed sections			6,928
Surgical bed sections			2,961
Psychiatric bed sections			4,173
Nursing home care			389
Domiciliary care			30
Restoration centers			8
Outpatient care			1,456
Total obligations			15,945

Proposed legislation, 1973. To provide shift differential pay for certain nurses in the Veterans Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery performing service in the evening or night shifts, on weekends, on holidays, or overtime ($15,936,000).

To extend installation of official telephone service in the private residences of all nonmedical Veterans Administration facility directors ($3,000).

To authorize agreements between Veterans Administration hospitals and other hospitals, medical schools, or medical installations for central administration of training for interns and residents ($6,000).

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

(Proposed for later transmittal, proposed legislation)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical, hospital, and domiciliary administration			155

To provide for the appointment of two additional Assistant Chief Medical Directors, $82,000.

To amend salary range for Director of Nursing Service, Chaplain Service, Pharmacy Service, and Dietetic Service, and create Director grade in nursing schedule and position of Chief Optometrist, $73,000.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Total obligations			1,000

Grants provided under this program to assist States in the construction of State nursing facilities and to remodel, modify, or alter existing hospital and domiciliary facilities in State homes have been restricted to 50% of the total cost of the projects. Legislation is proposed in 1973 to increase the amount of grants from the 50% limit to 65% of the total cost of the projects.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
HEALTH BENEFITS			
Government contributions for annuitants benefits (1959 law)	59,400	96,936	126,846
Operating costs funded			
Government contributions for annuitants benefits (1960 act)	10,615	12,229	12,145
Administrative expense (1960 act)	278	205	227
Total program costs funded	70,293	109,370	139,218
Change in selected resources	112	198	−1,610
Total obligations	70,405	109,568	137,608

This appropriation covers: the Government's share of the cost of health insurance for certain annuitants as defined in Sections 8901 and 8906 of Title 5, United States Code; the Government's share of the cost of health insurance for other annuitants (who were retired when the Federal Employees Health Benefits law became effective), as defined in the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1960; and the Government's contribution for payment of administrative expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in administration of the Retired Employees Health Benefits Act of 1960.

The use of these funds is reflected in the schedules for the Employees health benefits fund and the Retired employees health benefits fund.

EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND—OPERATING COSTS FUNDED

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Payments to carriers:			
Semimonthly (subscriptions)	1,021,382	1,306,294	1,633,382
Annual from contingency reserve	37,124	35,000	38,000
Excess or deficiency on payments to carriers	12,734	−12,570	−17,500
Administration	1,499	1,641	2,314
Total operating costs funded	1,072,739	1,330,365	1,656,196
Change in selected resources	−4,570	20,070	27,000
Total obligations	1,068,169	1,350,435	1,683,196

The fund finances the cost of health benefits for: Active employees; employees who retired after June, 1960, or their survivors; and the related expenses of the Commission in administering the program.

RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Subscription charge payments to uniform plan carrier	6,526	5,973	5,779
Less excess subscription charge held by carrier	−827	−2,164	−2,306
Net payments	7,353	8,137	8,085
Government contributions to annuitants with private plans	6,570	8,214	8,230
Administration	283	205	227
Total obligations	14,206	16,556	16,542

This fund finances: The cost of health benefits for retired employees and survivors who enroll in the Government-sponsored uniform health benefits plan; the contribution to retired employees and survivors, who retain or purchase private health insurance; and expenses of the Commission in administering the program.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medicare activities (Social Security Administration)	607	634	634

LIMITATION ON RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Processing of sickness claims	2,402	2,473	2,646

TEMPORARY STUDY COMMISSIONS—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA AND DRUG ABUSE

[In thousands of dollars]

Salaries and expenses	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Conduct a study of marihuana and the causes of drug abuse	76	1,762	1,080
Change in selected resources	5	85	40
Total obligations	81	1,847	1,120

The Commission will conduct a study of marihuana, including the extent of its use, the efficacy of existing laws, its pharmacology and effects, its relationship to crime and other drugs, and its international control. The Commission will also conduct a study and investigation into the causes of drug abuse and their relative significance.

On the basis of its study, the Commission will make recommendations to the President and the Congress for legislation and administrative action.

RECAPITULATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grand total of obligations	21,412,218	24,887,482	26,716,189
Executive Office of the President: Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention		3,000	6,856
Funds appropriated to the President	(206,003)	(263,181)	(208,928)
Appalachian regional development programs	36,372	55,129	48,000
Foreign assistance	2,309	28,852	8,928
Office of Economic Opportunity	167,322	179,200	152,000
Department of Agriculture	(105,388)	(140,880)	(137,608)
Agricultural Research Service	101,483	49,463	[1] 2,533
Animal and Plant Health Service		74,848	[1] 108,385
Forest Service	3,905	16,569	26,690
Department of Commerce: Promotion of Industry and Commerce	298	310	310
Department of Defense—Military	(241,134)	(250,272)	(251,496)
Operation and maintenance	1,614	2,257	[2] 2,543
Revolving and management funds	239,520	248,015	248,953
Department of Defense—Civil	(23,083)	(25,664)	(26,758)
Soldiers Home	4,863	5,109	5,076
The Panama Canal	18,220	20,555	21,682
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	(17,386,732)	(20,100,618)	(21,303,080)
Food and Drug Administration	92,263	136,664	193,027
Health Services and Mental Health Administration	(1,656,514)	(2,222,155)	(2,529,654)
Mental health	421,442	602,530	622,130
St. Elizabeths Hospital	45,314	49,783	55,860
Health Services planning and development	324,021	401,839	500,117
Health Services delivery	607,434	770,006	773,875
Patient care and special health services		5,610	
Preventive health services	46,637	86,818	153,822
National health statistics	10,342	15,844	18,659
Commissioned officers' dependents medical care	10,173	11,460	11,913

RECAPITULATION—Continued

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued			
Buildings and facilities	3,002	9,652	19,457
Office of the Administrator	11,032	12,359	12,590
Indian health services	126,891	154,086	163,179
Indian health facilities	23,185	32,107	42,984
Emergency health	5,073	4,267	4,268
Medical facilities guarantee and loan fund		35,000	112,800
Service and supply fund	5,634	10,063	10,809
Advances and reimbursements	15,666	19,722	26,177
Public Health Service trust funds	668	1,009	1,014
National Institutes of Health	(1,765,511)	(2,362,373)	(2,415,316)
Biologics standards	9,277	9,139	9,297
National Cancer Institute	232,856	337,705	430,206
National Heart and Lung Institute	194,826	232,135	254,416
National Institute of Dental Research	35,211	43,260	44,076
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases	137,947	152,968	158,394
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke	103,445	116,519	117,298
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	102,053	108,733	111,917
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	159,841	173,335	175,716
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	94,744	116,161	126,696
National Eye Institute	29,985	37,022	37,201
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	20,093	26,327	28,817
Research resources	66,187	74,928	74,929
Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences	3,415	4,280	4,465
Health manpower	372,025	698,912	[3] 603,040
National Library of Medicine	21,381	24,105	28,104
Buildings and Facilities	1,095	10,272	11,350
Office of the Director	8,902	11,010	11,526
Scientific activities overseas	27,094	27,686	25,619
Health professions education fund	3,844	3,996	3,846
Nurse training fund	2,597	3,342	3,347
General research support grants	54,200	55,212	54,624
National Institutes of Health management fund	60,661	63,242	66,768
Service and supply fund	20,498	20,466	21,909
Advances and reimbursements	3,334	11,618	11,755
Office of Education	5,901	13,024	12,400
Social and Rehabilitation Service	(3,376,682)	(4,022,281)	(3,806,067)
Grants to States for Public Assistance: Medical assistance	3,373,866	4,018,681	3,802,467
Assistance to refugees in the United States	2,816	3,600	3,600
Social Security Administration	(10,469,528)	(11,320,885)	(12,323,892)
Payments to Social Security Trust Funds: Matching payments for supplementary medical insurance	1,245,282	1,376,400	1,434,015
Hospital insurance for the uninsured	878,688	503,351	467,825
Limitation on Salaries and Expenses: Health insurance:			
Hospital insurance	133,579	156,777	164,961
Supplementary medical insurance	254,649	290,691	328,827
Federal hospital insurance trust fund	5,639,478	6,456,088	7,136,977
Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund	2,317,852	2,537,578	2,791,287
Special Institutions: Howard University—Freedmen's Hospital	18,958	20,555	21,195
Office of the Secretary	1,375	2,681	1,529
Department of Justice: Federal Prison System	6,792	9,064	10,505
Department of State	(31,209)	(34,468)	(37,945)
Kabul Hospital	265	290	290
World Health Organization	21,681	23,741	26,342
Pan American Health Organization	9,263	10,437	11,313
Department of Transportation: Federal Aviation Administration	9,027	7,988	8,348
Atomic Energy Commission	95,196	100,175	104,855
Veterans Administration	(2,151,486)	(2,470,349)	(2,777,754)
Medical care	1,957,873	2,260,801	2,503,789
Medical and prosthetic research	64,265	70,191	77,793
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	20,045	22,176	27,447
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	102,834	109,897	155,923
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	4,356	4,685	10,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1,661	2,109	2,000
Advances and reimbursements	452	490	802
Civil Service Commission	(1,152,780)	(1,476,559)	(1,837,346)
Government payments for annuitants, employees health benefits	70,405	109,568	137,608
Employees health benefits fund	1,068,169	1,350,435	1,683,196
Retired employees health benefits program	14,206	16,556	16,542
Railroad Retirement Board	3,009	3,107	3,280
National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse	81	1,847	1,120
Grand total of obligations	21,412,218	24,887,482	26,716,189

[1] Increases and decreases due partly to shifts in programs from one Service to the other.
[2] Large amounts for Medical under Defense are not isolated from other budget items and are therefore not included above.
[3] The 1973 decline stems from technical adjustments in advance obligational authority.

WHY EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT MUST BE STOPPED AND HOW TO GO ABOUT IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week when I took strong exception to the action of the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol to proceed with the long-planned extension of the West Front, several new Members expressed perplexity to me over this clash. What is so wrong with the Commission's decision to proceed with the new West Front? they asked. And if it is wrong, what can we as Congressmen do about it anyway?

These are good questions, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve a straightforward and honest answer. Also they remind us that this West Front extension has been kicking around here for a long time. It is all too familiar to those of us who have been here for a few terms, but it may be strange to our new Members. After all, the last public debate on the West Front took place in December 1969, and the matter has not been raised on the floor since.

Now that the question has suddenly been projected into the foreground again by the Commission's abrupt action last week, this is a good time to review the issues involved.

The most important thing that is wrong, Mr. Speaker—and Senator KENNEDY made this point very clear in the RECORD for March 13—is that what has happened is completely contrary to the democratic, deliberative process of government which Congress itself embodies. If we want to add another tally clerk to the House staff at a few thousand dollars salary it requires a vote of the membership. Yet a decision that could profoundly alter the Nation's No. 1 historic shrine, to say nothing of ultimately costing the taxpayers more than $70 million, is taken without debate, without discussion, without a public record, behind closed doors, by the desires of just a handful of Members, and without any opportunity for other Members to comment, much less vote, on the issue.

This is profoundly wrong today in America, Mr. Speaker, no matter what the 1970 appropriation bill may say. It flies directly in the face of everything we have been trying to do in this new 92d Congress to reform our arbitrary procedures and turn more of our decisions over to the will of rank-and-file Members rather than have them continue to be made behind closed doors and without recorded votes by a handful of congressional "brass."

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Commission completely ignores the facts. If we in Congress, in discharging our legislative duties, were to proceed in such total disregard of the facts as the Commission has done in this case, the Republic would be in grave trouble indeed.

Let us look at the record. When the West Front extension was last debated in the House in 1969 the case for it rested on two principal arguments. First, the West Front was said to be in imminent danger of collapse. In fact we were told it might come tumbling down around our heads if even a jet airplane flew too close to the dome. Those who were in the Chamber at the time will recall that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) in presenting the case for extension, brought several colorful drawings into the Chamber to illustrate just how badly off were the brick arches that support the West Front, and how dangerous was the "'lateral thrust" which these weakened arches were gradually being forced to bear. His words struck terror into the heart of every Member who heard him, and few Members, understandably, were willing to endanger their own lives and those of their colleagues for an instant longer than absolutely necessary.

Second, it was alleged, the cheapest, simplest and, indeed, the only feasible way to prevent the West Front from collapsing was by means of the long-standing extension plan. Normal restoration had become impossible, we were told. It would cost more than extension, it could not be spelled out clearly enough for any contractor to bid on, and it would

cause far more lengthy disruption in offices located in the present West Front while the reconstruction work was underway.

Some of us, myself included, were skeptical of those arguments. We were not engineering professionals, of course, but we did arouse public opinion enough over the spending of $45 to $60 million for such a dubious project that the proponents of extension finally agreed to fund an independent, professional engineering study to settle once and for all the validity of these assertions.

Some $225,000 was appropriated for this study in late 1969 and the prestigious firm of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury of New York City was engaged to do the job. Their report was submitted to Congress in early 1971, and its conclusions totally demolished all the contentions that had underlain the long pressure for a West Front extension.

It had been charged, for example—and the legislation setting up the study required it to address five specific points—that restoration of the West Front—in place of extension—could not be carried out without "undue hazard" to structure and persons, nor could the building be made "safe, sound, durable and beautiful." On this the Praeger report said flatly:

> The West Central Front can be made safe, sound, and durable for the foreseeable future without impairing its inherent beauty and without hazard to safety of the structure and persons by cleaning the wall, strengthening it by grouting and restoring its appearance by repainting.

Second, it had been charged that restoration would involve more vacating of existing office "space in the building proper than would be required by the proposed extension." Here too the Praeger report entered a flat denial:

> Such restoration can be accomplished without vacation of west central front office space or the terrace structure.

Third, it had been alleged that a restoration assignment could not be sufficiently specified as to form the basis for performance by competitive bids. This charge, too, was found to be untrue:

> Restoration methods can be specified to form a basis for performance of the work by competitive lump sum construction bids.

Fourth, the cost of restoration, it had been charged, would exceed the cost of extension, and the 1969 legislation imposed the rigid—and I believe somewhat unreasonable—requirement that the cost of restoration not exceed $15 million. Yet even here the Praeger report concluded—in early 1971—that—

> The cost of restoration can be limited to $15 million.

In fact they recommended a plan they said would cost only $13.7 million.

Fifth and finally, it was alleged that restoration would require too much time. But the Praeger report concluded that "restoration work can be accomplished within the time projected for the plan 2 extension work," and went on to say, "it is estimated that with proper timing and phasing the work can be accomplished in about 3 years, with no single wall section being scaffolded more than 1 year."

In short all five of the conditions spelled out in the 1969 legislation in behalf of extension were decisively demolished by the Praeger report, which had been formally filed in January 1971. Yet from that moment until last week the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol never uttered one, single word of comment on it. Then suddenly, on March 8, 1972, following a secret meeting, they issued a curt statement that "all five of the conditions specified in Public Law 91–145 relating to restoration cannot be met," and ordered the original extension into final design planning.

The Commission did not even deign, Mr. Speaker, to specify which of the five conclusions it did not believe to have been "established to its satisfaction." No argument, no explanation: just an ex cathedra order. Mr. Speaker, this is really incredible. If the Commission can arbitrarily reject the findings of this report without even a single word of comment, what on earth did Congress think it was doing in ordering a quarter of a million dollars spent to obtain an independent, professional engineering study? Surely, whatever the 1969 legislation may say, the Commission has an obvious obligation to spell out just where and why they, as nontechnical people, have chosen to challenge the factual findings of a group of top-flight professional engineers on a strictly technical issue.

It is true that the provisions of Public Law 91–145 do not require the Commission to justify their decision or to make any report to anybody. A legislative booby trap, it turns out now, had been planted in the middle of that bill, permitting the all-important determination of whether the conclusions of an independent, professional engineering study actually did or did not meet the five conditions to be made exclusively by the Commission itself. In fact Public Law 91–145 provided that even if the Commission acknowledged that all five conditions for restoration had been met they could still recommend—though apparently not direct—that the extension plan be carried out anyway. It was a kind of heads-you-win, tails-I-lose arrangement that conceded little to opponents of extension. By requiring that all five conditions had to be met in the 1969 legislation insured that hesitation on only one of the five would be enough to trigger extension automatically.

There has been no official comment yet, but indications are that the one condition on which the Commission tried to hang its hat was the $15 million cost ceiling. Even conceding that some unknown factors might ultimately push the cost of restoration over $15 million by a 1975 or 1976 completion date, inflation is nothing new here in Washington. The $15 million after all, was a 1970 figure. Even if that total had risen in a year and a half to $16 or $20 million, it is still hard to see how this justifies jumping all the way to an expenditure of $60 or $70 million.

With the argument about a collapse of the Capitol shot down so conclusively, the Commission now bases its continuing support for extension, appropriately on an alleged need for additional office space. But with five large office buildings already at hand, surely we cannot seriously argue that we have to alter the Nation's most important historic shrine just for the sake of a few convenient hideaways for senior Members who want to avoid riding 100 yards back to their present suites. If space is really the problem, which I doubt, let us consider another building, but let us not transform our historic Capitol into a super Howard Johnson's just because a few Members think it would be fun to have more offices.

If we do not like what the Commission has done, what can we do about it? Are we helpless before their action, or can the remainder of the Nation's elected representatives do something to remedy the situation? Specifically, is there some way in which we can insure that a question of such magnitude and national significance will be settled only after debate and a vote in both Houses of Congress?

Of course, there is a way. A majority of the Members of Congress always have that power. What Congress has given Congress can take away—by appropriate legislation. I have today introduced in the House three separate bills to accomplish just that.

The first would rescind the mistake we made in 1969 in allowing the Commission to give a go-ahead on extension of the west front without any reference to Congress as a whole. It would require that nothing further can be done with respect to either restoration or extension of the west front without specific legislative authorization by Congress.

My second bill would prohibit any repair or reconstruction work on any part of the Capitol in excess of $50,000 without specific authorization by Congress.

The third bill would abolish the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol. The checkered history of the west front over the past 6 years has demonstrated conclusively that there is no proper place today for a body with such secret and autocratic powers. It no longer serves any useful purpose. Any normal, routine housekeeping duties around the Capitol can be adequately carried out by the Architect and his staff. Matters of greater importance deserve to be determined by the entire Congress through normal channels of legislative action, not by any elite body.

Some may ask, Mr. Speaker, what chance is there to get such legislation enacted? Well, that depends on how strongly we all feel about the integrity of the Capitol Building, and how strongly the American people feel. Obviously, those of us who do feel strongly will not have an easy job in taking on the congressional establishment. But an aroused public opinion can accomplish much, Mr. Speaker. Already we have managed, I might point out to those Members who are relatively new in this House, to prevent this extension for a period of some years, and I am convinced we can, if we all work hard together, kill it completely.

But the one thing that is essential is that we go to work now to get these three bills enacted. We cannot succeed by

waiting another couple of years until the $2 million available for "planning" has already been spent. By then the Architect will already have started us well down the road toward construction, and we may find it almost impossible to cut off further appropriations.

Besides, considering the influential opposition we face, public interest and support is not something we can turn on and turn off like a faucet. Far better to fight the battle on our own grounds, and at a time of our own choosing, than merely react to what the other side does.

This is the picture as I see it. These are the steps we can take to preserve this great, historic edifice. I urge every Member who feels as I do to join with me in an all-out effort to enlist the public support we need and to enact the legislation required to end the highly unsatisfactory arrangements that now exist.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include editorials from the Washington Post and the New York Times of March 13, 1972, a news article from the Washington Post of March 12, 1972, a press release issued by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) dated March 16, 1972, and draft copies of the three bills I have introduced on this subject:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1972]

OBSTINATE VANDALISM ON CAPITOL HILL

Obstinate vandalism has once again triumphed on Captol Hill. We cannot conceive that it will ultimately prevail.

In an arrogant maneuver of dubious legality and in the face of clear opposition on the part of the nation's architects and architectural historians, not to speak of a contrary recommendation by its own expert consultants, the ruling congressional establishment has decided to proceed with its old plan to extend the west front of the United States Capitol. Seven men—House Speaker Albert, Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, House majority and minority leaders Hale Boggs and Gerald R. Ford, Senate majority and minority leaders Mike Mansfield and Hugh Scott and the Architect of the Capitol, George M. White, who are ex officio members of a commission created for the purpose in 1955—would rebuild the most prominent part of the Nation's First Building in the image of (declining) Roman imperialism so that it would be physically and spiritually akin to that pompous disaster, the Sam Rayburn House Office Building. It makes not a shred of sense in terms of history, function, finance or aesthetics.

Historically, or rather anti-historically, what the extenders would do, is to bury the last remaining external vestiges of the Capitol as it was originally designed and built. William Thornton's softly elegant sandstone facade is the only visible link to the Capitol's beginning in the early years of the Republic. It is the last remnant of an architecture that was at once inspired by and expressive of the Jeffersonian concept of civilization, a concept that believed in gentle manners, the virtues of classical beauty and the pursuit of happiness. This part of our history would be irretrievably obscured behind a glossy, new marble facade, some 70 feet further out, which, far from expressing our own time, fakes classic architecture in a clumsy way. To make matters worse, the extension of the building into a massive box will ruin the commodious terraces designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, America's greatest landscape architect, reducing them to a narrow strip. It would puncture Olmsted's blank terrace walls with windows, destroying his landscaping with a service road and spoil the present sight of the dome by setting it much too far back on the building, much as a brazen drunk pushes back his hat.

All this, ironically, could well turn the Capitol into a messy construction site during the sumer of 1976, just when millions of Americans will flock to Washington to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the nation and pay their respects to our historic traditions.

Functionally, the extension folly was to be justified by the need to rebuild the "crumbling" west front walls. The alleged crumbling, which so frightened the last Architect of the Capitol, George Stewart, has been proven a myth in an extensive study by Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, a reputable architectral engineering firm, selected under Mr. Stewart's regime and retained by Congress under Public Law 91–145 of 1971. The present Capitol Architect, George M. White, called it "a careful and diligent open-minded study." It concluded, in sum, that there was nothing wrong with the west front that careful restoration could not fix under all five conditions set down by Congress two years ago. The conditions were, in sum, that restoration could, without undue hazard, make the building safe, sound, durable and beautiful for the foreseeable future and that restoration would be no more disrupting than extension and wouldn't take any more time.

Now the argument is made, that Congress needs more space *within the Capitol* and that is only a little less spurious. Under the Stewart plan most of the 4½ acres of expended space was to be used for tourist cafeterias, "a giant Howard Johnson," as one Congressman put it. The new architect has thought better of duplicating the tourist services which the proposed Visitors' Center in the remodeled Union Station will provide a few hundred yards away. Mr. White talks of 285 offices and conference rooms. But he does not give any reason why these offices must be built *inside* the Capitol.

Nor does Mr. White say anything about a recent report by a task force of the American Institute of Architects which found the present space within the Capitol "crowded, misused and underused" all at the same time. It noted that many functions now located within the building have no reason for being there. And it urged a rational space utilization and development plan outside the old building since the proposed extension "will not begin to meet present, least of all projected, space needs."

Financially, the extension plan is as illogical as it is shocking. The extenders imply that they are not bound by Public Law 91–145 because restoration would cost more than $15 million. What with the rise in building costs and the contingencies of careful restoration work, it probably will. But is that any reason to spend an estimated $60 million on the extension? A few years ago the extension was to cost only $45 million—no less than $166.95 a square foot which was five times more than the Rayburn Building, at the time the most expensive office building in the world (since eclipsed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation building). Why should we believe that the cost will not go up by another $15 million or more in another few years?

But apparently nothing can be done to stop this fit until Mr. White has drawn up the $2 million worth of extension plans for which Congress appropriated the funds in 1969. This will assure him a place in history as the Architect of the Great Capitol Boondoggle. But when he comes back to Congress with this folly and an appropriation request for $60 or $75 or $100 million to carry it out, Congress will, we are sure, refuse him. For Congress is responsive to the people. And the American people, after far too many years of destructive "progress" which bulldozed away some of our more cherished landmarks, are gaining a new and wholesome respect for our historic heritage. They like the Capitol as it stands.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 1972]

CAPITOL CRIME

The United States Capitol does not belong to the seven Congressmen of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol. It belongs to the people of the United States and to history. In spite of public and professional opinion that the controversial extension of the Capitol's West Front is a gross error of art and judgment, these gentlemen seem determined to proceed with this gigantic bungle and boondoggle.

They have, in fact, insured it by booby-trapping the legislation that called for the recent feasibility study that recommended restoration instead of new construction. They built in a proviso that the extension scheme must go ahead if certain criteria could not be met by preservation, and they guaranteed it could not be met by setting a totally unrealistic $15-million maximum cost for restoration. No limits have been set on the extension, however. They are quite willing to let that price go up from the original $36 million to $50 or $60 million today and ever onward. Call it cynicism or sabotage.

Even if the extension scheme were not a contradiction of the historical and esthetic values that this country has been promoting in recent years in landmark legislation and preservation, the proposal is an appallingly bad plan. It is architecturally atrocious, loaded with ill-considered features. It is based on no adequate space utilization studies to correctly determine real present and future needs. It is a third-rate railroading job. [With the destruction of the West Terraces designed by Frederick Law Olmsted timed for national celebration of the Olmsted Sesquicentennial, irony is added to irresponsibility.]

The decision is reported to have been made by the Commission because its members feel that preservation involves too many unknowns of cost and durability. Of course there are procedural unknowns, but no reason to doubt results. The skill and ingenuity required are becoming an American specialty as the body of landmarks being restored grows daily.

The extension plan offers the Congressmen certainty if that is what they want—the certainty of irreversible damage to an irreplaceable structure and of absurd costs for minimum space gains and maximum loss of architectural integrity.

And there is the certainty of a monumental national display of arrogance and ignorance in the cold permanence of marble. That is not a memorial any Congress should want to leave.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1972]

THE U.S. CAPITOL: AN UNEASY FUTURE

"This Dutchman in taste,
this monumental builder,
This planner of grand steps and walls
This falling-arch maker,
this blunder-roof gilder,
Himself still an architect calls."

(By Abbott Combes)

The United States Capitol has had an uneasy past. In the aftermath of last week's decision to proceed with the outward extension of the building's west front, it seems destined to have just as uneasy a future.

While most buildings exercise a somnambulant influence on their environment, the Capitol is this country's symbol of governmental purpose and has had anything but a sleepwalker's effect. It is guarded zealously

by the people it serves—in this case an entire population—and any tampering with the structure is regarded suspiciously.

The above verse, for example, expresses the low esteem in which the first architect of the Capitol and designer of the original building, William Thornton, held Benjamin Latrobe, his successor and the first professional to hold the post.

The position continues to generate an uproar. While Rep. Samuel S. Stratton (D-N.Y.) did not resort to rhyme last week, his criticism of the current Capitol architect's participation in extension plans was just as harsh: "Instead of giving Congress his professional judgment, he (George M. White) has allowed himself to be pushed around . . . His performance is a disgrace and he should resign."

The present clamor concerns those who favor as-is restoration of the west front, since it is the last remaining exterior portion of the original building, and those who favor extending the west front outward, since this would provide additional office space at the same time the structure is buttressed.

The Capitol is a building oft-changed by additions, extensions and redecorations.

It began with an advertisement in Philadelphia newspapers on March 14, 1792, announcing a design competition for the Capitol with a prize of $500.

There were few trained architects in the newly independent colonies, so a young physician, Dr. Thornton, was awarded the cash. George Washington laid the cornerstone on Sept. 18, 1793. Construction began under the direction of the runner-up in the competition, Etienne S. Hallet, because Thornton was unfamiliar with the building trade.

Hallet added so many personal touches that a third person, James Hoban, who had won another competition to design the White House, took charge. Guided by these men, the Capitol's north wing was completed in 1800 and Congress met in Washington for the first time in November of that year.

Three years later, Latrobe, the subject of Thornton's rancor, was placed in command by President Thomas Jefferson. By 1807, Latrobe had directed completion of the south wing and already had started to repair and alter the north side. The disconcerted Dr. Thornton demonstrated his versatility by going on to establish the U.S. Patent Office.

Then along ventured Sir George Cockburn, rear admiral of the British fleet, who ordered "this harbor of Yankee democracy" set ablaze on Aug. 24, 1814. As a result, Congress relocated in a temporary "Brick Capitol" on the site of the present Supreme Court, and Latrobe began rebuilding "this magnificent ruin."

After friction developed between Latrobe and other officials involved in the restoration, he resigned under pressure in 1817. The present interior reflects Latrobe's own work but he closely followed Thornton's initial exterior design.

Charles Bulfinch, America's first native-born architect of distinction, was appointed by President James Monroe to succeed Latrobe. Bulfinch supervised construction of the Capitol's mid-section linking the two wings and the building's first low, wooden dome.

Two years after Bulfinch had completed the link and dome still paralleling Thornton's scheme, Congress approved a bill abolishing the office of Capitol architect. From 1829 to 1851, necessary services were performed by either the commissioner of public buildings and grounds or the architect of public buildings.

During this period, there was growing congressional grumbling over the lack of space in the Capitol, the same complaints heard today. And so another $500 was offered for the best design extending the building north and south. (Jefferson Davis, later president of the Confederacy, was chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings which ran the contest.)

After considerable interference from President Millar Fillmore, a Philadelphia architect named Thomas Ustick Walter was chosen the winner. Exercising his infrequently used presidential initiative, Fillmore then re-established the office of Capitol architect and appointed Walter to the post in 1851.

Walter's tutelage saw the House extension finished in 1857 and its Senate-side counterpart in 1859. These extensions, although the interiors have been remodeled, contain the present House and Senate chambers.

Also under Walter's architectural direction, the huge cast-iron dome, rising 285 feet above the eastern plaza, was erected. Thomas Crawford's Freedom statute was hoisted atop it on Dec. 2, 1863. According to President Abraham Lincoln, construction was continued during the Civil War because "If people see the Capitol going on . . . it is a sign we intend the Union shall go on."

Today's congressional leaders privately cite the Vietnam War as the prime reason extension of the west front has been delayed until now, not preservation sentiment among some members of Congress. The leaders say that they were reluctant to countenance an expensive alteration of the Capitol until the war's conclusion. "The war must be over," one observer said cynically last week on learning of the decision to proceed.

The first 90 years after the Civil War were relatively calm ones for the Capitol itself, as the Senate and House office buildings, the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court sprang up around it. Changes to the Capitol tended to be functional: steam heating was added in 1865, elevators in 1874, fireproofing in 1881, modern drainage in 1882, electricity in 1884 and so on.

The Capitol architects of the period—Edward Clark (1865–1902), Elliott Woods (1902–1923) and David Lynn (1923–1954)—fussed with repairs, with grounds or with nearby construction, but left the Capitol alone.

Indeed, the most lasting development was the hiring of landscape architect Frederick Law Olmstead to lay out the Capitol grounds, a task that took from 1874 to 1885.

Then on Oct. 1, 1954, President Dwight Eisenhower appointed as architect of the Capitol J. George Stewart, an ex-congressman with a varied nonarchitectual career. And the tranquility of the post-Civil War period evaporated.

From then until he died on May 24, 1970, Stewart had managed to anger nearly everyone except a tightly knit coterie of congressional leaders and favored architects.

At Stewart's insistence and under his direction, the east front of the Capitol was extended 32½ feet between 1958 and 1962, adding 102 rooms at a cost of approximately $12 million. And it was Stewart, charging that the west front could collapse at any minute, who first proposed extending it nearly 10 years ago.

George White, Stewart's successor and the first real architect since Walter, says he tended to favor restoration of the west front when he first arrived here from Cleveland a year ago.

Now, he maintains, he has changed his mind after considerable "soul searching—I used to lie awake nights". The reasons for the change of mind, he explains, are cost factors, congressional space needs and the continuous past altering of the building.

His critics, mobilized against him only last week, view his change of mind in a different light, charging that he has compromised his professional integrity at the insistence of top congressional leaders.

In addition to congressional critics, William L. Slayton, executive vice president of the American Institute of Architects issued a statement Friday night that said, "We deplore the ill-considered decision of the commission to destroy the last portion of the original walls of the Capitol.

"The AIA refuses to accept this decision as irrevocable; we intend to make every effort to prevent the destruction of part of the nation's heritage."

And so the war of the walls goes on.

The certain thing is that the west front needs work—even though it won't fall down tomorrow.

George Washington and the British are to blame: Washington because he demanded it be built with sandstone from nearby Virginia quarries rather than with more expensive and durable Vermont marble; and the British, because their torches generated much of the front's flaking and chipping ("spalling").

An 1851 interior fire in the Capitol's west central and an 1898 gas explosion in the old north wing did not increase its strength either. (Last year's expansion on the Senate side did not harm the structure's strength.)

Thus, after a year of solitude the Capitol architect's role has returned to calamitous normality.

And reverberating in the halls of Congress is a verse former Sen. Paul Douglas was fond of directing at White's predecessor Stewart. Neither the quality of the doggerel nor the message has changed much since Thornton's time. Douglas would periodically rise in the Senate chamber and implore:

"Architect, spare our Capitol,
Touch not another stone.
In youth it sheltered our Republic,
O please, let it alone."

NEWS FROM REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Woe, I suppose, is the lot of all mortals. But sometimes it seems as if our capital city of Washington gets more than its fair share. Witness, if you please, the latest assault by the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol.

It is acknowledged that the Capitol needs structural repair. The standstone walls of the west front are literally held in place with wooden buttresses. But reconstruction has been held in abeyance pending a decision as to whether the west front is to be restored so as to preserve the facade created by William Thornton, or whether the walls are to be covered by marble and extended outward some 88 feet.

The proposed expansion came within inches of being railroaded through six years ago by former Speaker McCormack and the then Capitol Architect, George Stewart. The argument was made that in addition to its historic function as the seat of Congress, the Capitol should also serve as a kind of visitors' center. Various restaurants, auditoriums and rest rooms were to be fashioned within the 4½ acre expansion area as well as assorted rooms and chambers for senior Members of Congress, all at a reported cost then of $45 million.

But a number of us, myself included, felt that the Capitol's historic west front should not be sacrificed to create a Howard Johnson atmosphere; that other provisions could be made to host the visitors who descend upon Washington throughout the year. Moreover, I thought it essential that we obtain the viewpoint of the nation's leading architects as to whether: (a) the Capitol was really in immediate danger of falling down and (b) whether restoration, rather than expansion was feasible from a financial and architectural point of view.

Reviewing that hearing record, I must confess that the arguments made against expansion are just as valid today as they were then. Witness this comment from the then President of the American Institute of Architects, Mr. Charles Nes, Jr.:

"The AIA believes that it should be a permanent policy of the Congress that the exterior of the Capitol is to remain unchanged. Today, the west front contains the last remaining external vestiges of the Capitol as it was originally designed and built. It is the only important link with the beginnings of the building. If the west front of the Capitol is extended, we will have buried the last of those walls that date from early years of the Republic and will have obscured a part of our history that can never be restored."

Those words are as valid today as when they were delivered before my Subcommittee in 1966. Moreover, it has now been determined that the west front can, indeed, be restored at substantially less cost than the proposed expansion. Congress has in the interim made specific provision for a visitors' center for the city. It would appear now that the only justification being given for the extension is the need for additional space for Members of Congress. In my judgment, that argument has not been well made. I know of no function of Congress, or any of its Members or committees which will suffer for want of office space in the Capitol. Funds for the extension should be denied and restoration should be approved as recommended by this nation's leading architects.

H.R. 13892

A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for the restoration or extension of the west central front of the United States Capitol

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, for expenditure in connection with the restoration or extension of the west central front of the United States Capitol may be expended for any purpose in connection with such restoration or extension (other than emergency shoring and repairs of, and related work on, such west central front), until the Congress by concurrent resolution has approved either the restoration or extension of such west central front.

H.R. 13890

A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for repair or construction work in or about the United States Capitol

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law and effective on the date of enactment of this Act, no funds in excess of $50,000 available, on or after such date of enactment, may be expended for any repair or construction work on the United States Capitol, unless the Congress by joint resolution has given its prior approval to such expenditure for such purpose.

H.R. 13891

A bill to abolish the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, to repeal the authority for the extension of the west central front of the United States Capitol, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That that portion of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, under the center heading "Architect of the Capitol" with the subheading "Capitol Buildings and Grounds" and the side caption "Extension of the Capitol" (69 Stat. 515; 83 Stat. 124; 40 U.S.C. 166, note) is repealed.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, we have been up the hill and then down the hill a time or two before on this west addition to the Capitol. At this moment I am in the same position as Will Rogers who once said all he knew was what he read in the papers.

There have been two or three newspaper stories. One in particular I call to the attention of the membership. It was on the editorial page of the Washington Post. I recommend the perusing, of that paper's editorial on the proposed west alteration of our Capitol to the Members of the House.

The facts are the Washington Post came out editorially against changing the West Front of the Capitol. Does the gentleman agree that the Post's editorial was well reasoned and reached valid conclusions?

Mr. STRATTON. That is absolutely true. And the New York Times as well. These are not always endorsments that commend themselves to all of the Members of this House but I think those editorials have some good meat in them, I am, in fact, including them with my remarks, and I am glad to have the support of those two great newspapers.

Mr. RANDALL. As I recall the point of that particular editorial, it was that if we go ahead now on the West Front, we would be tampering with the last remaining part of the Capitol that has remained intact from the time when the Capitol was first built. In other words the West is all we have left unchanged. Everything else has already been altered or changed for something new. I do hope we might be able to preserve at least a little of the Capitol, as it was when built.

Mr. Speaker, I am most delighted that the gentleman has taken this time to discuss this important matter. I recall that we had quite a debate here a few years ago. I hope we will be given the opportunity and the privilege to have another debate to bring out all the facts.

As I recall, all the architects of America were against this change and all the historians were against it.

Could the gentleman say who is really for it now?

Mr. STRATTON. Well, the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol at least was for it. Why? We do not know because the body meets behind closed doors and keeps no records. It does not have any requirement to report to the Congress.

I do think when we are dealing, as the gentleman has said, with the Nation's No. 1 historic shrine, with a building that was originally built in 1800, one that even the British Army when they invaded Washington in 1814 were not able to destroy. I do think a decision as to whether we are going to destroy that historic building and cover it up and make this West Front look like a cheap imitation of the East Front or a super Howard Johnson restaurant—at least the membership of the House and of the Senate ought to be able to vote on the issue and not have the whole thing done by secret ballot of a few elite Members.

In fact, the gentleman, I know, is always interested in economy, and in this case we have had the top structural engineering firm from the great city of New York, which completed a quarter of a million dollar study of the engineering aspects of the Capitol, and they have concluded that it could be restored for $15 million. Maybe with inflation that figure might go up to $16 or $17 million. Instead, the Commission last week turned that professional recommendation down and now orders us to go ahead with something that will cost $60 or $70 million. I think with a $40 billion deficit already staring us in the face, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me we ought not to throw away $45 or $50 million more of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. My recollection is that at some point during the debate the proposed restoration was described as taking away from the beauty of the Capitol. It was referred to as a Howard Johnson. It is my recollection that someone described it as attempting to create a sort of pyramid-like structure, starting at the base and sloping up like a pyramid, trying to bring about a reasonable replica of an Egyptian pyramid on the West Side of the Capitol.

The gentleman has mentioned the matter of the secrecy of this Commission. I have been led to believe that we have in the House a subcommittee which has to do with freedom of information. It occurs to me that maybe that subcommittee could call in the Commission and inquire by what charter or prerogative—and surely it could not be by executive privilege—do these people meet behind closed doors and not divulge any of their information to the membership of this body or the other body?

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman has made a very good point. What happened is this. Before the gentleman from Missouri came to this body and before I came to this body, Congress in its wisdom, in 1955, as part of the drive to extend the East Front of the Capitol, created this Commission on the Extension of the Capitol and gave them carte blanche to proceed with any kind of restoration, repair, or extension work that they thought was appropriate. The only thing the Commission has to do is come back to the House and the Senate occasionally for money. But no further authorization is needed.

One of the three bills I have introduced would repeal that particular provision of law. Whether it was a good thing then or not, it certainly is not in keeping today. We have been trying to reform our procedures in this 92d Congress so the average Members, like the gentleman from Missouri and myself, could have something to say about what goes on. Certainly, when it comes to the future of our Capitol, we should have something to say.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope the gentleman

will give us the style of his bill. We want to cosponsor it. I suggest that at this moment all is not hopeless, nor is all lost and gone. I remember that we were able to generate a little bit of interest in stopping the appropriation for this third library going forward a block from the Capitol. There is now a huge hole that is being dug for the Library extension, a facility we need on Capitol Hill like we need a hole in our heads.

I remember at that time when the appropriation bill came before the House there was a chance to defeat that appropriation. With just a little bit of advance preparation we could have held the line on the third library.

So I suggest to the gentleman that all is not lost. We might be able to meet them at the bridge for another skirmish if they ask for appropriations to tamper with the west side of the Capitol.

Mr. STRATTON. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's encouragement and help. He is a very valuable Member of this House. This support and the support of other Members will certainly be welcome. I share his optimism, but I am sure he knows it will not be easy. But we will keep at it.

One thing I would like to emphasize is this. The gentleman will remember that when we last discussed this matter on the floor of this Chamber we were told the Capitol was about ready to collapse. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), as I mentioned in my remarks, came in here with some beautiful pictures pointing out how the brick arches of the west front would no longer bear the weight of the superstructure. Members were trembling in this Chamber for fear the whole thing might collapse around them.

Well, that is one of the things we asked the Praeger firm in New York City to investigate. They came back here with a huge and detailed document pointing out that this charge was all nonsense, that the Capitol is not going to collapse.

They said that for $15 million we can fix it up so that the cracks are gone, and we can take away all those fancy supports that the former Architect of the Capitol put up there a few years ago as public relations gimmicks to try to contribute to this scare psychology that everything was going to colapse. We can fix the West Front for $15 million, so there is really no reason to talk about extending it at all, except that some Members just do not like to walk or ride 100 yards back to the House Office Building. They would rather have secret hideaways in the Capitol building. And that is why we are being asked to spend all this money and destroy the Nation's greatest shrine. It just does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the gentleman agrees with me.

DUE PROCESS AND THE COURTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of this body to a trial now being conducted in New York City which is causing great controversy and raising many questions concerning not only the conduct of defendants during the time between arrest and adjudication, but also the due process assurances which all American citizens are guaranteed as a basic, constitutional right.

I make no pretense, Mr. Speaker, to pronounce upon the guilt or innocence of Sonni and Timbuk Pyles, who have been detained for over a year now in the Manhattan House of Detention—commonly known as the Tombs—and who are currently being tried in the New York State Supreme Court on a charge of robbery. I am quite aware of the dangers involved when one branch of government interferes in the proceedings of another.

I do feel quite strongly, however, that there should be a thorough judicial review into all aspects of this case—a review which would investigate the charges of false arrest, unreasonable bail, false testimony, and the denial of basic due process rights as charged by the Pyles brothers, as well as the contention of the court that these complaints are nothing more than desperate delaying tactics.

Today I have formally requested the Appellate Division of the State of New York to exercise its judicial overseeing function by proceeding with a detailed investigation into the conduct of the police and prosecution in the Pyles case on the one hand, and that of the defendants on the other.

To forge on with the trial at this time would appear to be quite imprudent. The defendants, who claim innocence and refuse to enter the courtroom until their due process grievances are heard, have had to be tear-gassed and brought forcibly to court. Their fellow inmates at the Tombs have threatened to riot if the Pyles brothers are brought to trial before their complaints are given a full hearing.

This is hardly the atmosphere in which trials in America have traditionally been conducted. A continuation of such a spectacle at this time would benefit no one. Mr. Speaker, in order to present my colleagues and the American people with some of the details of this case, I would like to submit into the RECORD correspondence from the Pyles brothers themselves and from a Sister Marlane who works with prisoners in the Tombs, as well as two excellent articles which recently appeared in the New York Post and the Times, written by Emile Milne and Michael Kaufman respectively.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

From: The Silent Majority in Jail.

DEAR SIR: Why is it everybody only speak of the so-called bed side? There are two sides to every coin and there are two sides to Manhattan House of Detention. First, we think it is very nice some people want to make the institution very comfortable for the inmates so they will forget where they are and how they got here and why, if they stay busy in the games and T.V. and going to the movies, before they realize it they will be going to a much bigger institution.

Now, they are teaching the officers to smile at the inmates to make them feel right at home. In return some of the inmates want a "better cell" or as they call it a "better house." Some of them want certain types of meats for dinner, more doctors on the staff, more TV on the floor. What's going on? We are sorry, we just can't sympathize with all this! We don't want a better jail or as they call it nowaday "institution."

The jail is not the problem, its the "court room!" Why is everybody on the warden's back? The warden has done a wonderful job, as a matter of fact" to good of job, and he is still improving the place.

Please, please stop the campaign about the jail and, put the thoughts in the "court room" that's the place improvement is needed. Thank God, for people like "Sister Mariane" who is not trying to get more games in here for the men, but is trying to get men out of here, and she is not doing this for personal gain, but out of her concern and love for her "fellow man." She is not doing these things with a group or an organization, she is doing these things alone. Sister Marlane, is a "women liberation movement by herself, and is doing what a real women liberation movement should be doing "helping man."

Sister Marlane is one who knows the root of the problem is in the "Court Room" she knows a man can't go from prison to court, but from court to prison. Thank God, that somebody out there in society knows we are not all criminals or addicts, and know if the law worked right, only the guilty would be here.

The criminals and addicts don't need a better jail but, they need a hospital because they are sick people and it appears that nobody realizes this fact. If you who are reading these words are sane; would you do what they do and call yourself sane?

Please wake up! please, some of us in here don't want a better jail because we are not trying to make this "our home." The inmates that want to make this a better home for themselves, "so be it." But the majority of us want to make the "Court Room" a just place; and we will make a better home in society.

They already have "orphan homes", this place is supposed to be a jail! A man is supposed to be only brought here when he is accused of a crime. Next, the court room is there to decide whether the accused is innocent or guilty, and if the court room follows the laws that govern it, the truth will prevail. That is why it is so important that the court room function right. Presently, they need help, they are not functioning right.

If the people really want to do something they should set up a committee to help the judges. These "Honorable Men" make mistakes sometimes, they are only human beings. They could use some help. With a committee they could see that a person is not denied or overlooked his due process and constitutional rights and human rights.

Why don't people wake up? Jail is not supposed to be a honorable place. It's a place for criminals and if the people put their thoughts in the "court room" only the criminals would be in jail. And then, they could be helped; not with games, T.V., and movies, but with medical and spiritual care. Sister Marlane has done wonders in separating the innocent from the guilty and have helped both, but she is only one person. Sister Marlane has restored faith in us that somebody cares and knows the root of the problem.

What's wrong with people today? Are they really trying to stop crime or improve it? Are they trying to make "jail" a nice place to come? Anybody should know if you make jail a honorable place to come.

Why not commit a crime?

From people that are in here; we know!

The innocent silent majority in jail,

Mr. SONNI PYLES,
Mr. RONALD JOHNSON,
Mr. RICHARD SHARFF,
Mr. TIMBUK PYLES.

These are just a few.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. SEYMOUR HALPERN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALPERN, I am urging your immediate attention to the case of the two men who composed this letter . . . Timbuk and Sonni Pyles: It is so difficult for them to receive justice and due process now in these courts . . . that I am going to call publicly for a full-scale Congressional investigation into the arrest and court proceedings that have kept these men . . . innocent men . . . in the Tombs.

There is wide-spread police and court corruption that has not been touched by the Knapp Commission hearings. The worst kind of police corruption is the kind they commit in order to secure convictions.

In the case of the Pyles Brothers I have uncovered lying by the assistant district attorneys, cops and complainants. I feel that such men paid to protect the innocent should be charged with "malicious persecution" and obstruction of justice.

The innocent Pyles Brothers are victims of crimes committed against them in the name of the people of the City and State of New York.

The devices used by cops, district attorneys and judges to force pleas do not work in their case. They will not plead guilty to crimes they did not do. Yet other men despair of ever receiving justice. They plead guilty and go to state prison. Some hope an Appellate Court will give them justice eventually.

The District Attorney runs these criminal courts on Centre Street. The way it is run has nothing to do with justice . . . and very little to do with law.

Judges are run by the District Attorney . . . and both are either ignorant of the law or chose to ignore it.

Prisoners don't need rehabilitating. The *courts* and personnel do. From the moment of apprehension by police . . . thru precinct handling . . . and then on thru the courts . . . the law is ignored and personal prejudices take over. Loss of liberties thru such abuse of law is very serious and cannot continue any longer.

Now many prioners take out their anger and frustration *in connection with their cases* on the facilities that hold them. And when they know of innocent men in jail this feeds the fire.

Written on two court houses on Centre Street is: "The true administration of Justice is the firmest pillar of good government". What goes on inside these buildings is a mockery of everything you lawmakers in Washington work to bring about.

I do not see "law and order" by those paid to uphold the law. I see a perversion of the law to further careers. There is game-playing by law-enforcers . . . with the lives of sick, troubled men . . . most all of whom are overcharged automatically by lying cops who feel justified because "the charges will be knocked down anyway". These cops are sicker than the men they bring in . . . because most of the cops are not on dope.

Mr. Halpern, I help hundreds of men in an effort to help them be better men. In the case of the Pyles Brothers. I have found no better men! It was a shock to find them in the Tombs . . . charged as they were. Months of investigation and conferences with them and people connected with their case has revealed utter confusion, corruption and disintegration of what may at one time have been justice in these courts.

I urge you to step in immediately to get them out of prison and have them appear before people in position to stop this court and cop corruption . . . that can best be shown by what has been happening to them.

The facts of this case bear public disclosure and these men are willing to proceed to let what has been happening to them help others.

They are good men and men of character. They have no convictions . . . only numerous arrests since they filed suit against the city for false arrest in 1968.

They believe in the law . . . but it has not been followed or they would not be in jail now.

I am seeking any additional legal and investigative help I can get. Also I am seeking persons who have the capital . . . to invest in PEOPLE . . . to put up their bond now.

I want them out to help their case. Judges and juries are very prejudiced when they see a defendant come into the court under guard. Also they can help prove their case better when out. The assistant district attorney has fought any bail reduction so they have never had one. He said he wants to keep them in jail. He also lied to keep the high bail. There are men with double homicides with bail a tenth of theirs . . . out on the streets.

These men would never commit a crime. I know the men . . . and I know the illegal means that put and hold them there.

It is important that you talk with these men if you are truly seeking the answers to government. They are a classic example of how innocent men can be victims of injustice. They are not militants, muslims, addicts or criminals. They do not smoke, drink, use profanity and have worked all their lives. In prison now they are helping me help others.

If citizens are to better understand the problems that confront us . . . and if you as a lawmaker . . . are to have a better understanding . . . you should bring these men to Washington to talk with you and other lawmakers. You should talk with them in the Tombs during this holiday.

It will soon be ten months since this last arrest.

Cops and District Attorneys who climb to financial security and recognition over the bodies of men they illegally incarcerate and deny due process should be fired and replaced with men of integrity.

Crime rates rise with the amount of *corruption.* In New York City it is wide-spread . . . and deep.

Cops who make false-arrests not only should be sued (which they are not in city and state arrests) . . . but they should be charged with a crime. To incarcerate a man illegally . . . swear falsely . . . lie to complainants . . . (to persuade them to identify defendants for crimes they did not do) . . . kick in the doors with revolvers drawn and NO arrest or search warrants or probable cause . . . to hold loaded gun on the pregnant wife with three tots in the apartment . . . not saying who they were . . . why they were there . . . then arresting BOTH brothers in their separate apartments for crime committed months before next door by only ONE person . . . and so reported . . . forcing them into illegal show-ups at the station house . . . not allowing counsel or phone calls . . . "finding" evidence that was just not theirs at all . . . these and numerous other devices used against Timbuk and Sonni Pyles . . . should show you . . . and the public . . . how innocent men can be the victims of crimes and court and police corruption and injustice.

As these men say . . . if this can happen to men sleeping in their homes with their families . . . then they don't want to go out of jail . . . they are safer in jail. And they mean this.

Most of the courts are now closed for the holidays. They cannot get out when others go home to enjoy the holidays.

What I have said of what has occurred to them is only a little of the most incredible travesty of justice. And it has happened to wonderful men.

The doors of these courts should be locked permanently . . . bolted . . . to stop this barbaric, inhuman disdain for human life and liberty.

I am sure you can be of great help. They very much appreciated hearing your reply to their letter.

Will you come to the Tombs to talk to them during the holidays?

If you cannot come to them I will come to you here or in Washington on their behalf. I feel strongly that their case can be a turning point in our Justice system. And we feel you can help make this so.

Bless you.

Very sincerely,

Sister MARLANE.

THE TOMBS TWINS REMAIN DEFIANT

(By Emile Milne)

Timbuk and Soni Pyles, 26-year-old twin brothers held in jail for more than a year while awaiting trial on robbery charges, were expected to refuse today—for a second time—to attend the start of their trial in Supreme Court.

The brothers, described as "model prisoners", balked at the start of their proceedings on Tuesday until the Appellate Division ruled on their two-month-old motion for bail reduction.

The opening of the trial was then postponed by Judge Myles Lane until today at the request of Correction Commissioner Benjamin Malcolm.

The brothers, informed yesterday during an interview at the Tombs, where they are being held, that their bail motion had been denied, contended that irregularities in their arrest and indictment had prevented them from getting "due process" and that they would continue to refuse to report to a trial they described as a "hanging."

They have each been arrested before, but never convicted of any crime. The charges were usually dropped after numerous court appearances.

"I'm not going to holler that they're doing this to us because we're black," Timbuk, who is married and the father of four children, said. "But I'm tired of getting picked up out there while I'm not doing anything. This time it's not going to be dismissed without finding out why all this happened."

Meanwhile, Rep. Seymour Halpern (R-L-Queens), who has been corresponding with the brothers, said in a statement from Washington that "there are serious questions of due process to be investigated in this case and I plan to see that their plight is brought out in the open."

Halpern concurred with prison officials who have described the men as "model prisoners" who had "succeeded not only in helping individual inmates at the Tombs but in quelling potential riots at the institution."

Late yesterday, court-appointed attorneys for the two brothers, in an effort to head off a showdown, sought an order in Federal Court for the lowering of the $30,000 bail set for each or the postponed of today's scheduled proceedings.

The motions were rejected by Federal District Court Judge Charles Breitel. That ruling could now be appealed, which would leave the impasse basically unchanged.

Correction Board chairman William vanden Heuvel and Tombs officials, noting that "disturbances are altogether possible" if the men are forced to go to trial, said a Federal Court stay was the only hope at this point.

Sources in the Tombs close to the case said the possibility of violence remained real today, as it had been last Tuesday when the men first balked at appearing.

Malcolm's decision to request a delay, the sources contend, was based heavily on this fear. But it appeared unlikely today that the trial would again be postponed without the intervention of the federal court. A spokesman for Justice Lane said the trial would go on as scheduled at 11 a.m.

The brothers, who were arrested on robbery charges in their Manhattan apartment a year ago this week, said, however, that short of violence they would do anything so as not to have to report to court without a "promise of due process."

"We have great respect for Warden (Albert) Glick," Timbuk Pyles said in an interview yesterday. "But we are going to be the first men to die unless they get due process. This time they are dealing with men who know they are innocent and are going to prove we are innocent."

It was not until last January that the men received their first hearing, on a motion to suppress evidence, according to a source close to the case. The brothers contend the judge's decision last Friday to start the trial this week came as a complete surprise.

"We pleaded with the judge to give us an adjournment so we could prepare a defense," said Timbuk. "We aren't ready for trial."

The brothers, who are fraternal twins and do not look alike, were both employed as cooks and studied music, one under a Juilliard professor, before their arrest. Though neither has ever been convicted of a crime, both have been arrested yearly since 1968, according to their attorneys.

In that year, the brothers filed a suit for false arrest after charges were dropped in a robbery indictment against them.

The following year, Timbuk was arrested for homicide in the death of an army colonel. He was released in his own custody while awaiting trial and appeared in court 10 times before the charges were dropped. Both brothers were arrested and released on minor charges in 1970.

TWIN BROTHERS APPEAR IN COURT VOLUNTARILY

(By Michael T. Kaufman)

The Pyles twins, who twice in the last week were teargassed by Correction Department personnel and carried to their trial, appeared in court yesterday without coercion.

They said they had ceased their resistance to avert a riot in the Manhattan House of Detention for Men.

But before the day was over they were ordered removed.

Their appearance before Justice Myles J. Lane marked the first time since the trial actually got under way last Thursday that the 26-year-old twins were in the courtroom at 100 Centre Street.

On Monday, Justice Lane ordered them tried in absentia because, he said, they had refused to conduct themselves "with the decorum befitting an American court."

As yesterday's session began, the neatly dressed twins, Timbuk and Soni Pyles, sat quietly next to their court-appointed lawyers, who the defendants say they have dismissed.

ACCUSED OF ROBBERIES

The prosecution made its opening statement, contending it would prove that the brothers were the men who took a total of about $500 from desk clerks at the Mansfield and Mansfield Hall Hotels in two separate robberies, last February.

Then Timbuk Pyles rose to address the jury.

A tall, thin black man who came here from Mississippi with his brother eight years ago, he said he had worked as a cook and studied jazz at the Manhattan School of Music.

The brothers describe themselves as deeply religious spiritualists. They have never been convicted, but have been arrested several times and are currently detained on five other indictments.

Timbuk Pyles said the only reason he and his brother came willingly to court yesterday was to prevent bloodshed at the Tombs, where fellow inmates were reported to have organized protests in the event of more teargassing.

Justice Lane admonished him to limit his statements to his defense.

"We do not have a defense," he replied. "We have asked the court for an adjournment to prepare one."

The justice again broke in, saying the remarks were inappropriate, but Mr. Pyles continued.

"All we're asking for is due process," he said. "It is the right of the accused to a speedy trial. We waive that right. What we want is a fair trial."

The justice replied that the prosecution had been ready since last May and that the defendants had three times dismissed teams of lawyers and filed preliminary motions, which were heard. And he ordered the defendant to sit down and be still.

Instead Mr. Pyles said he and his brother had been "unconscious" during Monday's hearing, when the court proceedings were broadcast into an adjoining pen where the two men were held.

At this point Justice Lane ordered the defendants removed and guards escorted them to the adjoining room.

After the men were taken out, Justice Pyles said the men's statement that they had been unconscious was a lie. He said he had a report of a medical examination that showed no neurological effects of the tear gas.

"As far as the court is concerned, these men were conscious and heard everything that happened."

During the rest of yesterday's session, the prosecution introduced two hotel clerks who identified the brothers as the men who took money from them on Feb. 25 and Feb. 28 last year.

The court-appointed lawyers conferred with their clients and then declined to cross-examine.

ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION PASSES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Union Resolution, House Joint Resolution 900, was approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee today by a vote of 22 to 9. I view the committee's action as historic. The first major step has now been taken which hopefully will lead the nations of the Atlantic community to a convention very similar to our own constitutional convention in 1787.

The resolution establishes an 18-member delegation of prominent U.S. citizens to meet with similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as desire to join in the enterprise—to explore the possibility of agreement on a declaration that the goal of their peoples is to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on Federal principles.

The resolution also calls upon the convention to agree on a timetable for transition to the agreed upon goal and create a commission to help keep the transition on schedule.

The Atlantic community has suffered severe setbacks in recent years. The monetary crisis continues with the dollar scraping the bottom of its limits at near record lows. England has entered the Common Market, threatening the loss of valuable U.S. trade markets. NATO is in difficulty, with France out of the integrated command and most of Europe uneasy about the U.S. commitment on the Continent.

The Atlantic Union Resolution is a forward-looking proposal aimed at developing better institutions for dealing with all of these problems. It shows that the United States will not turn its back on Europe, that our whole political and cultural heritage forms a common bond across the Atlantic Ocean. In my view, it also provides the only effective way to deal with multinational problems of defense, economics, pollution, and many others, with which the United Nations has had little success.

It counters a strong isolationist tendency in our country which has developed largely as a result of the Vietnam war.

Atlantic Union enjoys the support of many prominent Americans, including President Nixon, who while a private citizen in 1966, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

> The Atlantic Union Resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change which is going on in the world around us. I urge its adoption.

Former President Eisenhower, in a personal letter to me gave his support, saying:

> I strongly favor your undertaking; let there be no mistake about this.

Other supporters have been: Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and BARRY GOLDWATER, former Senator Eugene McCarthy, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, and the late Robert F. Kennedy.

In the House of Representatives, more than one-quarter of the Members, a broad bipartisan group, are cosponsors.

ASPIN RELEASES RICKOVER MEMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am releasing to the public today a memo recently written by Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover criticizing the Navy's new claims system for subsidizing inefficiency.

Admiral Rickover's astute observations demonstrate that the Navy's new ship claims system is a huge, bureaucratic, multi-million-dollar boondoggle for shipbuilders.

I have written to Secretary of the Navy John Chafee and asked him to personally review the claims systems in light of Admiral Rickover's comments and report his findings to the Congress. At the moment shipbuilders are attempting to collect approximately $1 billion of claims. We must act now to avoid a huge scandal in shipbuilding claims.

In his memorandum Admiral Rickover points out that as long as contractors believe the Government will bail them out, either through change orders—that is, changing the design of the ship or claims—it will be impossible to achieve efficiency cost control or lower costs.

As many of my colleagues may know, Admiral Rickover's memo was prompted

by the abolishment of a civilian claims board and the earlier removal of its chairman, after that group rejected a $73 million claim for Avondale Shipyards, Avondale, La.

In January, Gordon Rule's civilian panel was replaced by an all military board. Senator PROXMIRE and I have written to Secretary Chafee requesting the reestablishment of a civilian panel and the reinstatement of Mr. Rule.

Admiral Rickover, in his memorandum, suggests that many naval officers have neither the experience nor the expertise to handle giant claims. It is suggested by Admiral Rickover that much of the negotiating work for final settlements of claims be handed over to the Navy's legal counsel. There is no doubt that giant shipbuilders are able to employ the best legal and accounting talent in the country and easily overwhelm our own Navy's procurement officers.

Mr. Speaker, the Navy needs a complete shakeup in claims procedure before hundreds of millions of dollars are paid to greedy shipbuilders. The Navy brass should heed Admiral Rickover's recommendations before they have a first-class scandal on their hands. I hope that Secretary Chafee will conclude that some basic and fundamental changes are needed in Navy procedures to handle claims.

My letter to Secretary Chafee and Admiral Rickover's memorandum follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1972.

Hon. JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Secretary, Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am forwarding you a copy of a memorandum written by Vice Admiral Hyman Rickover regarding changes in the Navy's claims systems.

As you may know, I am most concerned that recent changes in the Navy's procedures will result in the payment of large, unjustified claims to shipbuilders.

I believe that Admiral Rickover has correctly observed that the Navy Counsel should participate in a direct way in the final negotiation of a claims settlement. It is my understanding under the new regulations there are no lawyers who act as voting members of either the Naval Material General Board or its subsidiary civilian claims board.

Claims are a major concern to the Navy and to many members of Congress. I hope that you will personally review the current situation and present procedures in light of Admiral Rickover's comments and report to the Congress your evaluation of this situation.

It is my hope that shipbuilding claims can be settled in a fair and equitable way for both the contractor and the Navy.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
NAVAL SHIP SYSTEMS COMMAND,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1972.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL

Subject: Claims Procedures.

Reference: (a) NAVMAT NOTICE 4200 dtd 11 Jan. 1972; (b) My memorandum for the General Counsel of the Navy dtd May 10, 1971, subj.: Shipbuilder Claims.

1. I have just learned of the new procedures established by reference (a) for handling contractor claims against the Navy. I am concerned because these new procedures appear to be a step in the wrong direction, particularly for the large complex shipbuilding claims we are encountering today.

2. The new procedures provide for settlement of contract claims at the "lowest possible level in the contracting framework." Claims of $10 million or more are subject to review by a General Board consisting of selected senior flag officers in the Naval Material Command and the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. This General Board is to be assisted by a Claims Board composed of "procurement executives" designated by COMNAVSHIPS, COMNAVAIR, COMNAVORD and COMNAVELEX. Presumably, assignment to the Claims Board is in addition to each procurement executive's normal full-time job. Reference (a) further provides that a Navy Deputy General Counsel will be an adviser to but not a member of the Claims Board.

3. I consider a number of things to be wrong with this approach.

a. First, the new procedures make claims settlements a routine contract matter. Yet these claims, by their very nature, go beyond routine contract actions and therefore should be accorded special handling. Routine settlement of claims as an ordinary contracting matter will encourage more claims and will tend to undermine our contractual relations.

b. These claims usually involve complex questions of fact and of law; to properly resolve these matters requires both special expertise and legal training. My experience over a period of many years is that most Navy contracting officers and procurement executives are not adequately trained or experienced to analyze and settle these large claims. Further, few flag officers possess the training, background, experience and judgment to deal with such claims; even fewer have the time to do so.

c. The settlement of claims, particularly large complex claims against the Government is principally a legal matter, not a contract negotiation. The Navy should not pay any claim or part of a claim that is not solidly grounded in fact or in law. Any claim not susceptible of factual determination should be rejected. Items not clearly supported by factual records or not susceptible of factual determination should, if pressed by contractors, be settled by the courts, not by the Navy.

4. In reference (b) I pointed out that our contractors are exerting considerable effort to establish, early in their contracts, claims against the Government. Some contractors have set up large organizations with experienced lawyers, accountants and engineers—as many as are needed—to develop claims against the Government. Often, they also engage outside claims experts in the legal profession to guide and assist them. The Government has no comparable body of talent to defend itself against these claims.

5. In reference (b) I also pointed out that to the extent contractors get more than they should in claims settlements, the Navy is not only subsidizing inefficiency but also undermining its own contracts. As long as contractors believe that the Government will bail them out through changes and claims, it will not be possible to achieve effective cost control, efficiency, or lower costs.

6. I would like to reiterate my recommendations in reference (b) for handling major claims against the Government:

a. I would assign primary responsibility to the Office of the General Counsel.

b. The Office of General Counsel should establish a Review Board composed of qualified legal, accounting and technical experts to carefully review proposed claim settlements and to eliminate from them any items not clearly supported by factual determination of entitlement and amount. The elimination of unsubstantiated items from negotiated settlements would compel contractors to keep proper records.

c. Whenever it is necessary to augment its own resources for legal analysis and defense against contractor claims, the Office of General Counsel should obtain competent outside help—legal and technical. The use of outside legal firms to help the Government defend against claims would ease the burden on the small existing organizations. It woud serve to expedite the review and settlement process, and would provide for the thorough analysis required to settle claims on their merits.

d. Government contracts should prohibit payment, directly or indirectly, of any costs associated with preparation or prosecution of claims against the Government. The Armed Services Procurement Regulation should be strengthened as necessary to implement this; and with no room for ambiguity, as is presently the case in many of its provisions.

e. The Office of General Counsel should promulgate a list of contractors who frequently or repetitively make claims against the Government, or who submit excessive or unwarranted claims. Procurement agencies should give consideration to a contractor's claim record in awarding new contracts.

7. I know of your strong desire to improve Navy procurement. I trust you will give full consideration to my recommendations. We must have procedures that will ensure that all claim settlements are adequately supported, factually and legally.

H. G. RICKOVER.

STILL NO WORD FROM PRESIDENT NIXON ON TAX REFORM; 59 DEMOCRATS INTRODUCE $7.25 BILLION "QUICK-YIELD" TAX REFORM PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference H.R. 13877, which would provide $7.25 billion a year in new revenue by closing some of the loopholes in our tax laws which allow many wealthy Americans to avoid paying their fair share in taxes. This "quick-yield" tax reform package is sponsored by 59 House Democrats:

LIST OF SPONSORS

James Abourezk of South Dakota.
Bella S. Abzug of New York.
Joseph P. Addabbo of New York.
William R. Anderson of Tennessee.
Les Aspin of Wisconsin.
Herman Badillo of New York.
Nick Begich of Alaska.
Bob Bergland of Minnesota.
Jonathan B. Bingham of New York.
Phillip Burton of California.
Charles J. Carney of Ohio.
Shirley Chisholm of New York.
John Conyers, Jr. of Michigan.
Ronald V. Dellums of California.
Charles C. Diggs, Jr. of Michigan.
John D. Dingell of Michigan.
Robert F. Drinan of Massachusetts.
Thaddeus J. Dulski of New York.
Don Edwards of California.
Joshua Eilberg of Pennsylvania.
William D. Ford of Michigan.
Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota.
Michael Harrington of Massachusetts.
Ken Hechler of West Virginia.
Henry Helstoski of New Jersey.
Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin.
Edward I. Koch of New York.
Robert L. Leggett of California.

Clarence D. Long of Maryland.
Ray J. Madden of Indiana.
Romano L. Mazzoli of Kentucky.
Lloyd Meeds of Washington.
Ralph H. Metcalfe, of Illinois.
Abner J. Mikva of Illinois.
Parren J. Mitchell of Maryland.
William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.
John E. Moss of California.
Lucien N. Nedzi of Michigan.
David R. Obey of Wisconsin.
James G. O'Hara of Michigan.
Melvin Price of Illinois.
Bertram L. Podell of New York.
Charles B. Rangel of New York.
Thomas M. Rees of California.
Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York.
Edward R. Roybal of California.
William R. Roy of Kansas.
William F. Ryan of New York.
Paul S. Sarbanes of Maryland.
James H. Scheuer of New York.
John F. Seiberling of Ohio.
James V. Stanton of Ohio.
Louis Stokes of Ohio.
Frank Thompson, Jr. of New Jersey.
Charles A. Vanik of Ohio.
Jerome R. Waldie of California.
Charles H. Wilson of California.
Gus Yatron of Pennsylvania.

I am disappointed that President Nixon has so far failed to follow through on his promise of last September that he would submit tax reform proposals to Congress in this session. Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee reminded President Nixon of his pledge in a letter on February 7, and urged the President to submit his proposals to Congress by March 15 so we would have time to act on them in this session.

These proposals have not been forthcoming, and, as the Democratic caucus resolved yesterday, further increases in the Federal debt ceiling "will be jeopardized" if the President fails to publicly support meaningful tax reform, or at least make clear to Congress which tax reform proposals can be passed without facing a Presidential veto.

Our request is a modest one. It will be difficult indeed to get real tax reform through Congress without the President's wholehearted backing. As DNC Chairman Larry O'Brien pointed out in a recent speech:

My years on Capitol Hill have taught me that strong presidential leadership is *the* essential ingredient in any serious tax reform effort. The President must define the battle ground, marshall the troops, organize public opinion and personally commit his prestige to passage of the legislation in the House and Senate.

Yet all we are asking is that President Nixon tell us which tax reforms he will not veto. If he will just take our tax bill, or Congressman CORMAN'S, or the one Senator NELSON is preparing, and put a little check by those tax reform provisions he will not veto, we will be set to go. We would welcome Presidential leadership in support of tax reform, but if we have to settle for acquiescence we will take what we can get.

I am surprised that the President is not in the lead on tax reform. If I faced a cumulative 3-year budget deficit in excess of $87 billion, I would welcome tax reform proposals that promised new revenue. And certainly the President cannot be deterred by the fact that these are Democratic proposals. Given the precedents set last August, that should recommend them to him even more highly.

Furthermore, a President faced with a nationwide unemployment rate approaching 6 percent, a budget deficit approaching $40 billion, and an election—all in 1 year—should welcome tax reform proposals which promise job creation, deficit reduction, and the affection and gratitude of the electorate.

The $7.25 billion "quick-yield" tax reform package we propose has no provisions which would reduce jobs, has some which would increase them, and provides the revenue needed for Federal job-creation programs like the "Jobs Now" program to create 500,000 public service jobs.

The proposal to tax capital gains on property transferred at death, for example, would eliminate the incentive older people now have to hang on to capital gains property until they die. Instead, they could sell their assets freely, and invest the proceeds in newer and more innovative "growth" companies where the best profit and job creating potential is.

Or take the proposal in our bill to tax the income of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations on a current basis. This would eliminate an incentive in the present law which induces American firms to build plants in foreign countries and export American jobs.

Repeal of the ADR rapid depreciation scheme would have little or no impact on jobs, since ADR's principal, if not sole, purpose is to create profits rather than jobs.

A section-by-section explanation of H.R. 13877 and the full text of the bill follow:

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF H.R. 13877

TITLE I—TAXATION OF CAPITAL GAINS ON PROPERTY TRANSFERRED AT DEATH OR BY GIFT—ANNUAL REVENUE GAIN—$2 BILLION

When real estate, shares of stock, and other forms of property increase in value, the increase is subject to tax as a capital gain. However, the capital gains tax rate on property held for more than 6 months is only half of that for ordinary income. (Prior to 1969, the maximum capital gains rate in all cases was only 25 percent. The 1969 Tax Reform Act increased the maximum rate for corporations to 30 percent, and for individuals the maximum rate on gains of more than $50,000 was raised in stages to its present level of 35 percent—half the top ordinary rate of 70 percent.)

But some capital gains—those on property transferred at death—are never taxed at all. Here is how it works. Suppose a taxpayer bought some stock in a small electronics company for $50,000 back in 1962. The company has flourished and the stock is now worth $150,000. If he sells it now he will have to pay a capital gains tax on the $100,000 increase in value. If he is in the highest 70 percent tax bracket, this means a tax of $30,000 (25% of the first $50,000 plus 35% of the second $50,000). But if he never sells the stock and it passes on to his heirs, neither he nor his heirs will ever have to pay income tax on the increase in value. The heirs will have to pay capital gains taxes on any increase in the value of the stock beyond $150,000 if they later sell it, but that's all.

The greatest beneficiaries of this loophole, obviously, are those with large amounts of accumulated wealth to pass on to the next generation.

The Treasury Department in December, 1968, called for an end to this loophole, recommending that the increase in value of assets be taxed when they are transferred at death or by gift (see "Tax Reform Studies and Proposals", published in three volumes on February 5, 1969, by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, pp. 331–351).

The present system of not taxing appreciation on assets transferred at death, the Treasury said, "is grossly inequitable and substantially impairs the progressivity of the tax structure."

In addition, the Treasury estimated, it allows at least $15 billion in capital gains to fall completely outside the income tax system each year.

Furthermore, it has "undesirable economic effects, particularly in cases of older people":

"Assets become immobilized; investors become "locked in" by the prospect of avoiding income tax completely if they hold appreciated assets until death rather than selling them. This freezing of investment positions deprives the economy of the fruits of an unencumbered flow of capital toward areas of enterprise promising larger rewards."

In its August 2, 1969, Report on the 1969 Tax Reform Act, the House Ways and Means Committee said that "the time available" did not permit the inclusion of reform measures relating to the problem of the tax treatment of property passing at death. However, the Report went on, the Committee would "undertake to study" this problem as soon as possible, "with the expectation of reporting out a bill on this subject in this Congress."

More than 2½ years later, in an interview in the February 26, 1972, issue of Business Week, Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills again singled out capital gains at death as one of the "problem areas" in the estate and gift tax system, and raised the question of "whether we should continue to let an individual give away everything he has at death and avoid taxes on any of it."

The time is over-ripe for action on this loophole. H.R. —— would treat property transferred at death as if the decedent had sold it at death. An income tax would be imposed on the capital gain and the tax would be treated as a debt of the decendent's estate. It would thus be deductible from the gross estate for estate tax purposes and would reduce the estate tax liability. Small estates—those under $60,000—would be exempted, and there would be additional exemptions for personal and household effects, transfers to a husband or wife, and to orphans. In order to avoid giving an artificial incentive for lifetime gifts, the gain on appreciated property transferred by gift would also be taxed at the time of transfer.

The revenue gain from this provision would be $2 to $3 billion a year.

TITLE II—REPEAL OF ASSET DEPRECIATION RANGE (ADR) SYSTEM OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION FOR BUSINESS PROPERTY—ANNUAL REVENUE GAIN—$2 BILLION

The tax law allows businesses to deduct from their taxable income every year a "reasonable allowance" for the exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence of property used in the business. Until 1971, Treasury rules required that these deductions for depreciation be spread over the actual useful life of the property. Businesses could not write off property for tax purposes faster than they were actually replacing it.

In 1971, however, the Treasury changed its rules to permit businesses to write off their plant and equipment 20 percent faster than before, whether the property was actually

depreciating that fast or not. These larger deductions of course meant lower tax bills for businesses. Late in 1971 Congress wrote this "Asset Depreciation Range" (ADR) system of 20 percent depreciation speed-ups into law (The Revenue Act of 1971, P.L. 92–178, December 10, 1971).

The ostensible reason for initiating the ADR system was to encourage businesses to invest in new plant and equipment. However, with business using only 74 percent of the plant and equipment it already has, it is difficult to see how ADR is going to induce much additional investment. In addition, the 1971 Revenue Act also re-instated the 7 percent Investment Tax Credit, which has the same purpose as ADR, so that retaining both provisions results in wasteful over-kill.

The Administration has apparently been disappointed in the response of businessmen to these double incentives for capital investment. Treasury Secretary John Connally, addressing more than 1000 businessmen assembled by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Washington, on January 20, 1972, reminded them that the Administration has given them both rapid depreciation and the 7 percent investment tax credit. "You asked for it," Connally said. "You got it. What have you done with it? Nothing."

H.R. 13877 would repeal ADR, thus going back to the pre-1971 depreciation system. The revenue gain would be $2 to $3 billion a year.

TITLE III—FEDERAL INTEREST SUBSIDY TO STATES AND LOCALITIES TO ENCOURAGE ISSUANCE OF TAXABLE BONDS—ANNUAL REVENUE GAIN—$100 MILLION

The interest on state and local bonds has been tax-free ever since the original income tax law of 1913. As a matter of fact, taxpayers need not even report this income on their tax returns.

As a consequence, state and local bonds have long been a favorite investment for the very rich. Although the average taxpayer perceives no great advantage in buying tax-free municipal bonds paying 4 percent interest when he can get taxable corporate bonds paying 7 percent, tax-free interest begins to look better and better as a taxpayer's marginal tax bracket gets up around 42 percent (the rate paid on taxable income in excess of $32,000 by a married couple filing jointly).

It has been estimated that over 80 percent of the tax-free bonds held by individuals are in the hands of the wealthiest 1 percent of the population.

This tax exemption does, however, have one important redeeming feature—it enables hard-pressed states and cities to raise money for schools, roads, sewage treatment plants, hospitals, and other essential public facilities at relatively low interest rates. Simply taxing the interest on municipal bonds, therefore, would force municipalities either to pay higher interest rates (which few of them could afford) or to forego badly-needed public improvements.

Understandably, states and localities have strongly opposed taxing the interest on their bonds. H.R. 13877 would not require that this interest be taxed. States and localities could continue to issue tax-free bonds, but they would be given the additional option of issuing taxable bonds and receiving from the Federal government an interest subsidy to make up for the higher interest rate they would have to pay. This Federal interest subsidy could go as high as 40 percent of the total interest paid, and there would be no strings attached.

The Treasury would still come out ahead on the deal, since it now *loses* far more revenue by failing to tax the interest on municipal bonds than states and localities *save* in lower borrowing costs. An estimate cited by the House Ways and Means Committee in 1969 put the saving to states and localities at only $1.3 billion a year, while the annual revenue loss to the Federal government was estimated at $1.8 billion. Other estimates of the disparity between interest saving and revenue loss have been even higher, approaching a ratio of 2 to 1. It is therefore reasonable to estimate a revenue gain of $100 million a year from the proposal.

In addition to bringing in more revenue and closing off a loophole from which only a small number of wealthy investors can benefit, this provision would also make it easier for states and localities to market their bonds. Tax-free municipals must now be sold in a fairly limited market, consisting almost entirely of very wealthy individuals, banks, and other financial institutions. By making it possible for these bonds to be sold at higher, federally-subsidized, interest rates, H.R. 13877 would make them attractive to a far wider spectrum of the investing public. With more buyers available, the market would not be as tight and there would be less upward pressure on municipal bond interest rates.

The House approved this provision in 1969, when it was part of the House version of the 1969 Tax Reform Act (H.R. 13270, Secs. 601 and 602). It was dropped in conference.

TITLE IV—TAXATION OF INCOME OF FOREIGN SUBSIDIARIES OF U.S. CORPORATIONS ON A CURRENT BASIS—ANNUAL REVENUE GAIN—$150 MILLION

The income of foreign subsidiaries of United States corporations is not taxed by the U.S. until it is returned to the parent corporation or corporations in this country. This usually means that the tax on this income is deferred for many years, and in some cases the income may never be taxed at all.

In addition to costing the Treasury more than $150 million a year in lost revenue, this provision gives U.S. corporations an artificial incentive to build plants abroad and export American jobs. A U.S. firm faced with a close decision on whether to build a plant in this country or abroad may well decide to build in a foreign country in order to get the tax deferral benefits of present law. The Federal government is in effect giving them an interest-free loan if they invest abroad.

H.R. 13877 would close this loophole by taxing this foreign subsidiary income on a current basis. Only "controlled" foreign corporations—those with more than half of their stock held by American corporations—would be covered. Each American corporation holding more than 10 percent of a controlled foreign corporation's stock would have to include in its U.S. tax return each year its pro rata share of the foreign corporation's earnings and profits for that year.

TITLE V—TIGHTENING OF MINIMUM TAX ON TAX PREFERENCES—ANNUAL REVENUE GAIN—$3 BILLION

The 1969 Tax Reform Act contained a "Minimum Tax" provision which was intended to deal with the problem of very wealthy persons who paid little or nothing in Federal income taxes. There were, for example, 155 persons with reported incomes for 1967 in excess of $200,000 who paid no Federal income tax at all for that year, and the number rose to 222 for 1968 and 301 for 1969. Many other wealthy individuals pay only a small fraction of their income in taxes.

The Minimum Tax has had some impact, but not much. There were still 112 persons with reported incomes in excess of $200,000 who paid no Federal income tax for 1970, the first year in which the Minimum Tax was in effect.

The problem is that the Minimum Tax contains so many exclusions and exemptions that relatively little "preference income" is reached by it. Only certain specified "tax preference items" are subject to the Minimum Tax:

(1) *Excess investment interest*—the excess of interest on loans to buy investments over investment income (expires on January 1, 1972, when direct limitations on deductibility of investment interest take effect);

(2) *Accelerated depreciation on real property and on personal property subject to a net lease*—the excess of accelerated depreciation over straight-line depreciation;

(3) *Amortization of certified pollution control facilities and railroad rolling stock*—the excess of special 5-year amortization over normally-allowed depreciation;

(4) *Stock options*—the excess of the fair market value of the stock at the time of exercise over the option price;

(5) *Reserves for losses on bad debts of financial institutions*—the excess of the institution's fixed-formula bad debt reserve over its actual bad debt loss experience;

(6) *Depletion*—Oil and other mineral depletion allowances to the extent they exceed the actual cost of acquiring and developing the property;

(7) *Capital gains*—One-half of capital gains for individuals and three-eighths for corporations.

A great many other items generally considered to be tax preferences are not covered by the Minimum Tax, including intangible oil and gas drilling expenses, tax-exempt bond interest, the unrealized appreciation on property contributed to charity, and excess farm losses.

Furthermore, the taxpayer's total "tax preference" income must exceed $30,000 *plus* the amount of income tax he pays on his regular, non-preference income before the Minimum Tax is even assessed. And then the Minimum Tax rate is only 10 percent, about what a married couple filing separately would pay on a total family income of $12,000.

The Minimum Tax brought in only $116.9 million in additional revenue in 1970, according to preliminary figures just released by the Treasury. At the time the 1969 Tax Reform Act was passed the Treasury estimated that the Minimum Tax would bring in around $500 million a year in additional revenue when fully implemented. H.R. 13877 would raise an additional $3 billion a year by making the following changes in the Minimum Tax:

(1) Eliminate the deduction presently allowed for the amount of tax paid on regular, non-preference income;

(2) Include state and local bond interest among the "tax preference" items subject to the Minimum Tax; and

(3) Increase the Minimum Tax rate from 10 percent to 20 percent.

H.R. 13877

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) Short title.—This Act may be cited as the "Tax Reform Act of 1972".

(b) Table of Contents.—

TITLE I—GAIN ON CERTAIN PROPERTY TRANSFERRED AT DEATH OR BY GIFT

(c) Amendment of 1954 Code.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(d) Technical and Conforming Changes.—The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall, as soon as practicable but in any event not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a draft of the technical and conforming changes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which are necessary to reflect throughout such Code the changes in the substantive provisions of law made by this Act.

TITLE I—GAIN ON CERTAIN PROPERTY TRANSFERRED AT DEATH OR BY GIFT

SEC. 101. GAINS AND LOSSES ON PROPERTY TRANSMITTED AT DEATH

(a) Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 84. GAINS AND LOSSES ON PROPERTY AT TIME OF DEATH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the death of a taxpayer there shall be included in computing taxable income for the taxable period in which falls the date of his death, the gains and losses which would be taken into account if the taxpayer had sold all property (except items of income in respect of a decedent under section 691), which is considered to have been acquired from or to have passed from the decedent taxpayer (within the meaning of section 1014(b)) at a selling price equal to its fair market value at death, or if an election is made under section 2032 (relating to the alternate valuation date), at a price equal to its fair market value on such date. The gain and losses so computed shall be considered amounts received from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than six months. For purposes of this section, losses shall be determined without regard to section 1091.

"(b) EXEMPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the following:

"(1) HOUSEHOLD OR PERSONAL EFFECTS.—Gain on a personal or household item acquired from a decedent or which has passed from a decedent (within the meaning of section 1014(b)), if the fair market value of such item at death (or, if an election is made under section 2032, relating to the alternate valuation date, the fair market value on such date) is less than $2,000.

"(2) PROPERTY WHICH PASSES OR HAS PASSED TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Property which passes or has passed from the decedent to his surviving spouse, but only to the extent deductible under section 2056 (relating to the allowance of an estate tax marital deduction).

"(c) BASIS FOR COMPUTING GAIN OR LOSS.—For purposes of subsection (a), the following rules shall apply in determining basis for computing gain or loss:

"(1) MINIMUM BASIS.—Property to which subsection (a) applies shall be considered to have a minimum total adjusted basis to the decedent of $60,000 or the total fair market value of the property, if lower.

"(2) PROPERTY ACQUIRED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—In the case of property acquired before the date of enactment of this section, if the basis otherwise determined under this subtitle, adjusted as provided in section 1016, is less than the fair market value of the property as of the date of enactment of this section, then the basis for determining gain shall be such fair market value.

"(3) ALLOCATION OF BASIS.—If subsection (a) does not apply, by reason of paragraph (2) of subsection (b), the basis of property (as determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be allocated (pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) among all property (other than cash) to which subsection (a) applies in proportion to the fair market value of such property.

"(d) LOSS CARRYBACK.—If the application of subsection (a) produces a net long term capital loss, the amount thereof (to the extent not utilized against net capital gain, computed without regard to subsection (a), for the decedent's final taxable period) shall be a loss carryback to each of the three taxable years preceding the decedent's final taxable year. The entire amount of the net loss produced by subsection (a) shall first be carried, as a net long term capital loss, to the earliest of the taxable years to which such loss may be carried, and the portion of such loss which shall be carried to each of the other years to which such loss may be carried shall be the excess, if any, of such loss over the total of the net capital gains for each of the prior taxable years to which such loss may be carried. If there remains, after the application of the preceding sentence, any unused loss produced by subsection (a), one-half of the amount thereof shall first be carried, as a loss deductible against ordinary income, to the earliest of the taxable years to which such loss may be carried, and the portion of such loss which shall be carried to each of the other taxable years to which such loss may be carried shall be that portion, if any, of one-half of such loss which is not used to reduce the amount subject to income taxation for a prior taxable year to which such loss may be carried. The carryback of a loss pursuant to this paragraph may not increase or produce a net operating loss (as defined in section 172(c)) for the taxable year to which it is being carried back.

"(e) LIABILITY FOR INCOME ON GAINS AT DEATH.—Unless the decedent directs otherwise in his will, if any part of the property which is subject to tax by reason of section 84 (relating to income taxation of gains at death) consists of property transferred by the decedent during his lifetime, the executor shall be entitled to recover from the donee to which the decedent made a transfer during his lifetime, such portion of the total tax paid by reason of section 84 as the tax attributable to the property transferred during the decedent's lifetime bears to the total tax paid."

(b) The table of sections for part II of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following item:

"Sec. 84. Gains and losses on property at time of death."

SEC. 102. GAINS AND LOSSES ON LIFETIME GIFTS.

(a) Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 85. GAINS AND LOSSES ON LIFETIME GIFTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the transfer of property by gift, there shall be included in computing taxable income for the taxable period in which the transfer was made, the gains and losses which would be taken into account if the taxpayer had sold the transferred property at a selling price equal to its fair market value at the time of the transfer.

"(b) EXEMPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the following:

"(1) PROPERTY TRANSFERRED TO SPOUSE.—Property transferred by gift to an individual who at the time of the transfer is the taxpayer's spouse, but only to the extent the property transferred is deductible (without regard to the limitation equal to one-half of the value of the transferred property) under section 2523 (relating to the allowance of a gift tax marital deduction).

"(2) ANNUAL PER DONEE EXEMPTION.—In the case of transfers of property by gift made to any person during the taxable year, the first $1,000 of the amount of gain which would otherwise be taken into account for purposes of subsection (a).

"(c) BASIS FOR COMPUTING GAIN OR LOSS.—In the case of property acquired before the date of enactment of this section, if the basis otherwise determined under this subtitle, adjusted as provided in section 1016, is less than the fair market value of the property as of the date of enactment of this section, then the basis for determining gain shall be such fair market value.

"(d) LOSSES BETWEEN RELATED PARTIES.—No deduction shall be allowed in respect of losses from transfers of property by gift where both the donor and the donee (or transferee) are persons specified within any one of the paragraphs of subsection (b) of section 267."

(b) The table of sections of part II of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following item:

"SEC. 85. GAINS AND LOSSES ON LIFETIME GIFTS."

SEC. 103. GROSS INCOME DEFINITION.

Section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(16) Gains derived, pursuant to section 84, on property at time of death.

"(17) Gains derived, pursuant to section 85, on property transferred during lifetime."

SEC. 104. BASIS OF CERTAIN PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM A DECEDENT

Section 1014 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to basis of property acquired from a decedent) is amended by striking out paragraph (6) of subsection (b) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) PROPERTY SUBJECT TO TAX AT DEATH.—The basis of property in the hands of a person acquiring the property from a decedent or to whom the property passed from a decedent, which is not, pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 84(b)) (relating to property which passes or has passed to surviving spouse), subject to taxation under section 84(a), shall be the adjusted basis of the property, determined with regard to section 84(c)(3) (relating to allocation of basis), immediately before the death of the decedent."

SEC. 105. BASIS OF PROPERTY ACQUIRED BY GIFT.

Section 1015 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to basis of property acquired by gifts and transfers in trust) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) Property Subject to Tax Upon Transfer.—To the extent that gain or loss is taken into account in computing taxable income, pursuant to section 85(a) (relating to gains and losses on lifetime gifts), the basis of

property in the hands of a person acquiring the property by gift shall be the fair market value of the property at the time of the transfer by gift."

SEC. 106. CONTRIBUTIONS OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO CHARITY.

Section 170(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Property subject to tax upon transfer to a charity.—In determining the amount of any charitable contribution of property otherwise taken into account under this section no reduction shall be made under paragraph (1) to the extent gain is taken into account in computing taxable income under section 85(a) (relating to gains and losses on lifetime gifts)."

SEC. 107. TIME FOR FILING DECEDENT'S FINAL INCOME TAX RETURN.

Section 6072 is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) FINAL INCOME TAX RETURN OF A DECEDENT.—The return for a decedent's final taxable period, required under section 6012 or 6013, shall be filed on or before the date required by subsection (a) or within 9 months after the date of the decedent's death, whichever is later."

SEC. 108. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PAYING TAX.

(a)(1) Section 6161(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting "or income tax due for the decedent's final taxable period" after "estate tax" in the parentheses in the first sentence thereof.

(2) Section 6161(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking out the comma at the end of subparagraph (A) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "or section 84 (relating to income taxation of gains at death),"

(3) The heading of section 6161(a)(2) is amended to read "ESTATE TAX OR INCOME TAX ON GAINS AT DEATH."

(b)(1) Section 6166(a) of such Code is amended by inserting "section 84 (relating to income taxation of gains at death) or" before "section 2001" in the first sentence thereof.

(2) Section 6166(b) of such Code is amended—

(A) by inserting "imposed by section 2001" before "which may be paid in installments"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "The maximum amount of tax imposed by section 84 (relating to income taxation of gains at death) which may be paid in installments as provided in this section shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax imposed by section 84 as the gain attributable (pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the interest in the closely held business bears to the total gains subject to tax pursuant to section 84."

(3) Section 6166(f) of such Code is amended by inserting "section 84 (relating to income taxation of gains at death) or" before "section 2001' in the first sentence thereof.

(4) Section 6166(h)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by inserting "section 84 (relating to income taxation of gains at death) or" before "section 2001" in the last sentence thereof.

(5) The heading of section 6166 is amended by inserting "OR INCOME TAX ON GAINS AT DEATH" after "ESTATE TAX" and the items relating to section 6166 in the table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 62 of subtitle F is amended to read as follows: "Extension of time for payment of estate tax or income tax on gains at death where estate consists largely of interest in closely held business."

SEC. 109. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to decedents dying on or after the first day of the first calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—DEPRECIATION REVISION

SEC. 201. REASONABLE ALLOWANCE FOR DEPRECIATION.

(a) Repeal of Asset Depreciation Range.—Section 167 (m)(1) (relating to class lives for depreciation allowance) is amended by striking out the following: "The allowance so prescribed may (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) permit a variance from any class life by not more than 20 percent (rounded to the nearest half year) of such life.".

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 1970.

TITLE III—STATE AND LOCAL BONDS

SEC. 301. INTEREST ON STATE AND LOCAL OBLIGATIONS.

(a) Election To Issue Taxable Bonds.—Section 103 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) Election To Issue Taxable Bonds.—

"(1) Subsection (a) not to apply.—The issuer of obligations described in subsection (a)(1) may elect to issue obligations to which subsection (a)(1) does not apply.

"(2) Election.—The election described in paragraph (1) shall be made (at such time, in such manner, and subject to such conditions as the Secretary or his delegate by regulations prescribes) with respect to each issue of obligations to which it is to apply. An election with respect to any issue once made shall be irrevocable."

(b) United States To Pay Fixed Percentage of Interest Yield on Taxable Issues.—

(1) Permanent appropriation.—There are appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection; and such appropriations shall be deemed permanent annual appropriations.

(2) Payment of fixed percentage of interest yield.—

(A) In general.—The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall pay a fixed percentage of the interest yield on each issue of obligations with respect to which an election under section 103(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to election to issue taxable bonds) applies. Before the first day of each calendar quarter, the Secretary or his delegate shall determine (and publish in the Federal Register) the fixed percentage—

(i) for calendar quarters beginning before January 1, 1977, not less than 30 percent and not more than 40 percent, and

(ii) for calendar quarters beginning after December 31, 1976, not less than 25 percent and not more than 40 percent,

of the interest yield which he determines it is necessary for the United States to pay in order to encourage the States and political subdivisions thereof to make elections under section 103(e). The fixed percentage so determined and published shall apply with respect to all issues of obligations made during such calendar quarter to which elections under such section 103(e) apply.

(B) Interest yield.—For purposes of this subsection, the interest yield on any issue of obligations shall be determined immediately after such obligations are issued.

(C) Time of payment.—Payment of any interest required under subparagraph (A) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate not later than the time at which the interest payment on the obligation is required to be made by the issuer.

(3) Dual coupon obligations.—At the request of the issuer, the liability of the United States under this subsection to pay the interest to the holder of an issue of obligations shall be made through assumption by the United States of the obligation to pay a separate set of interest coupons issued with the obligations.

(4) Subsection to apply only to section 103(e) obligations.—This subsection shall apply only to obligations which, but for an election under section 103(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, would be obligations to which section 103(a)(1) of such Code applies.

(c) Effective Date.—This section shall apply only to obligations issued in a calendar quarter beginning after June 30, 1975.

TITLE IV—FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

SEC. 401. TAXATION OF EARNINGS AND PROFITS OF CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 (relating to income from sources without the United States) is amended by inserting after subpart H thereof the following:

"SUBPART I—CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

"SEC. 991. AMOUNTS INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME OF UNITED STATES SHAREHOLDERS.

"(a) AMOUNTS INCLUDED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If a foreign corporation is a controlled foreign corporation for an uninterrupted period of 30 days or more during any taxable year, every United States shareholder of such corporation who owns (within the meaning of section 993(a)) stock in such corporation on the last day in such year on which such corporation is a controlled foreign corporation shall include in its gross income, for its taxable year in which or with which such taxable year of the corporation ends, its pro rata share of the corporation's earnings and profits for such year.

"(2) PRO RATA SHARE OF EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—A United States shareholder's pro rata share referred to in paragraph (1) is the amount—

"(A) which would have been distributed with respect to the stock which such shareholder owns (within the meaning of section 993(a)) in such corporation if on the last day, in its taxable year, on which the corporation is a controlled foreign corporation it had distributed pro rata to its shareholders an amount (i) which bears the same ratio to its earnings and profits for the taxable year, as (ii) the part of such year during which the corporation is a controlled foreign corporation bears to the entire year, reduced by

"(B) an amount (i) which bears the same ratio to the earnings and profits of such corporation for the taxable year, as (ii) the part of such year described in subparagraph (A) (ii) during which such shareholder did not own (within the meaning of section 993(a)) such stock bears to the entire year.

"(b) EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—For purposes of this subpart, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the earnings and profits of any foreign corporation, and the deficit in earnings and profits of any foreign corporation, for any taxable year—

"(1) except as provided in section 312(m)(3), shall be determined according to rules

substantially similar to those applicable to domestic corporations,

"(2) shall be appropriately adjusted for deficits in earnings and profits of such corporation for any prior taxable year beginning after December 31, 1971.

"(3) shall not include any item of income which is effectively connected with the conduct by such corporation of a trade or business within the United States unless such item is exempt from taxation (or is subject to a reduced rate of tax) pursuant to a treaty obligation of the United States, and

"(4) shall not include any amount of earnings and profits which could not have been distributed by such corporation because of currency or other restrictions or limitations imposed under the laws of any foreign country.

"(c) COORDINATION WITH ELECTION OF A FOREIGN INVESTMENT COMPANY TO DISTRIBUTE INCOME—A United States shareholder who, for his taxable year, is a qualified shareholder (within the meaning of section 1247(c)) of a foreign investment company with respect to which an election under section 1247 is in effect shall not be required to include in gross income, for such taxable year, any amount under subsection (a) with respect to such company.

"(d) COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY PROVISIONS.—In the case of a United States shareholder who, for his taxable year, is subject to tax under section 551(b) (relating to foreign personal holding company income included in gross income of United States shareholders) or income of a controlled foreign corporation, the amount required to be included in gross income by such shareholder under subsection (a) with respect to such company shall be reduced by the amount included in gross income by such shareholder under section 551(b).

"SEC. 992. DEFINITIONS.

"(a) UNITED STATES SHAREHOLDER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'United States shareholder' means, with respect to any foreign corporation, a domestic corporation which owns (within the meaning of section 993(a)), or is considered as owning by applying the rules of ownership of section 993(b), 10 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote of such foreign corporation.

"(b) CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'controlled foreign corporation' means any foreign corporation of which more than 50 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote is owned (within the meaning of section 993(a)), or is considered as owned by applying the rules of ownership of section 993(b), by United States shareholders on any day during the taxable year of such foreign corporation.

"SEC. 993. RULES FOR DETERMINING STOCK OWNERSHIP.

"(a) DIRECT AND INDIRECT OWNERSHIP.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of this subpart, stock owned means—

"(A) stock owned directly, and

"(B) stock owned with the application of paragraph (2).

"(2) STOCK OWNERSHIP THROUGH FOREIGN ENTITIES.—For purposes of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for a foreign corporation or foreign estate (within the meaning of section 7701(a)(31)) or by or for a partnership or trust shall be considered as being owned proportionately by its shareholders, partners, or beneficiaries. Stock considered to be owned by a person by reason of the application of the preceding sentence shall, for purposes of applying such sentence, be treated as actually owned by such person.

"(b) CONSTRUCTIVE OWNERSHIP.—For purposes of section 992, section 318(a) (relating to constructive ownership of stock) shall apply to the extent that the effect is to treat any domestic corporation as a United States shareholder within the meaning of section 992(a), or to treat a foreign corporation as a controlled foreign corporation under section 992(b), except that—

"(1) In applying subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 318(a)(2), if a partnership, estate, trust, or corporation owns, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote of a corporation, it shall be considered as owning all of the stock entitled to vote.

"(2) In applying subparagraph (C) of section 318(a)(2), the phrase '10 percent' shall be substituted for the phrase '50 percent' used in subparagraph (C).

"SEC. 994. EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME OF PREVIOUSLY TAXED EARNINGS AND PROFITS.

"(a) EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this chapter, the earnings and profits for a taxable year of a foreign corporation attributable to amounts which are, or have been, included in the gross income of a United States shareholder under section 991(a) shall not, when such amounts are distributed directly, or indirectly through a chain of ownership described under section 993(a), to—

"(1) such shareholder (or any domestic corporation which acquires from any person any portion of the interest of such United States shareholder in such foreign corporation, but only to the extent of such portion, and subject to such proof of the identity of such interest as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe), or

"(2) a trust (other than a foreign trust) of which such shareholder is a beneficiary, be again included in the gross income of such United States shareholder (or of such domestic corporation or of such trust).

"(b) EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SUBSIDIARIES.—For purposes of section 991(a), the earnings and profits for a taxable year of a controlled foreign corporation attributable to amounts which are, or have been, included in the gross income of a United States shareholder under section 991(a), shall not, when distributed through a chain of ownership described under section 993(a), be also included in the gross income of another controlled foreign corporation in such chain for purposes of the application of section 991(a) to such other controlled foreign corporation with respect to such United States shareholder (or to any other United States shareholder who acquires from any person any portion of the interest of such United States shareholder in the controlled foreign corporation, but only to the extent of such portion, and subject to such proof of identity of such interest as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations).

"(c) ALLOCATION OF DISTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of subsections (a) and (b), section 316(a) shall be applied by applying paragraph (2) thereof, and then paragraph (1) thereof—

"(1) first, to earnings and profits attributable to amounts including in gross income under section 991(a), and

"(2) then to other earnings and profits.

"(d) DISTRIBUTIONS EXCLUDED FROM GROSS INCOME NOT TO BE TREATED AS DIVIDENDS.—Any distribution excluded from gross income under subsection (a) shall be treated, for purposes of this chapter, as a distribution which is not a dividend.

"SEC. 995. ADJUSTMENTS TO BASIS IN STOCK IN CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS AND OF OTHER PROPERTY.

"(a) INCREASE IN BASIS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the basis of a United States shareholder's stock in a controlled foreign corporation, and the basis of property of a United States shareholder by reason of which it is considered under section 993(a)(2) as owning stock of a controlled foreign corporation, shall be increased by the amount required to be included in its gross income under section 991(a) with respect to such stock or with respect to such property, as the case may be, but only to the extent to which such amount was included in the gross income of such United States shareholder.

"(b) REDUCTION IN BASIS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the adjusted basis of stock or other property with respect to which a United States shareholder or a United States person receives an amount which is excluded from gross income under section 994(a) shall be reduced by the amount so excluded.

"(2) AMOUNT IN EXCESS OF BASIS.—To the extent that an amount excluded from gross income under section 994(a) exceeds the adjusted basis of the stock or other property with respect to which it is received, the amount shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of property.

"SEC. 996. RECORDS AND ACCOUNTS OF UNITED STATES SHAREHOLDERS.

"(a) RECORDS AND ACCOUNTS TO BE MAINTAINED.—The Secretary or his delegate may by regulations require each person who is, or has been, a United States shareholder of a controlled foreign corporation to maintain such records and accounts as may be prescribed by such regulations as necessary to carry out the provisions of this subpart.

"(b) TWO OR MORE PERSONS REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN OF FURNISH THE SAME RECORDS AND ACCOUNTS WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME FOREIGN CORPORATION.—Where, but for this subsection, two or more persons would be required to maintain or furnish the same records and accounts as may by regulations be required under subsection (a) with respect to the same controlled foreign corporation for the same period, the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations provide that the maintenance or furnishing of such records and accounts by only one such person shall satisfy the requirements of subsection (a) for such other persons."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 864(c)(4)(D) is amended to read as follows:

"(D) No income from sources without the United States shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States if it consists of dividends, interest, or royalties paid by a foreign corporation in which the taxpayer owns (within the meaning of section 958(a), or is considered as owning (by applying the ownership rules of section 958(b)), more than 50 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote."

(2) Section 951 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) TAXABLE YEARS ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1971.—No amount shall be required to be included in the gross income of a United States shareholder under subsection (a) (other than paragraph (1)(A)(ii) of such subsection) with respect to a

taxable year of a controlled foreign corporation ending after December 31, 1971.'

(3) Section 1018(a) (20) is amended by striking out "section 961" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 961 and 995".

(4) Section 1246(a)(2)(B) is amended by inserting "or 991" after "section 951" and by inserting "or 994" after "section 959".

(5) Section 1248 is amended—

(A) by striking out subsection (b);

(B) by revising subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

"(1) AMOUNTS INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME UNDER SECTION 951 OR 991.—Earnings and profits of the foreign corporation attributable to any amount previously included in the gross income of such person under section 951 or 991, with respect to the stock sold or exchanged, but only to the extent the inclusion of such amount did not result in an exclusion of an amount from gross income under section 959 or 994.":

(C) by striking out in subsection (d)(3) "section 902(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (h)", and by adding at the end of such subsection "No amount shall be excluded from the earnings and profits of a foreign corporation under this paragraph with respect to any United States person which is a domestic corporation for any taxable year of such foreign corporation ending after December 31, 1971."; and

(D) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(h) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY CORPORATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "less developed country corporation" means—

"(1) a foreign corporation which, for its taxable year, is a less developed country corporation within the meaning of section 955(c)(1) or (2), and

"(2) a foreign corporation which owns 10 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote of a foreign corporation which is a less country corporation within the meaning of section 955(c)(1), and—

"(A) 80 percent or more of the gross income of which for its taxable year meets the requirement of section 955(c)(1)(A); and

"(B) 80 percent or more in value of the assets of which on each day of such year consists of property described in section 955(c)(1)(B)."

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) Except as provided in subsection (a), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to taxable years of foreign corporations ending after December 31, 1971, and to taxable years of United States shareholders within which or with which such taxable years of such foreign corporations end.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (b)(4) of section 401 shall apply with respect to sales or exchanges occurring in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1971.

TITLE V—MINIMUM TAX FOR TAX PREFERENCES

SEC. 501. REPEAL OF DEDUCTION FOR TAXES AND RATE INCREASE.

(a) In General.—Section 56(a) (relating to imposition of minimum tax for tax preferences) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In General.—In addition to the other taxes imposed by this chapter, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year, with respect to the income of every person, a tax equal to 20 percent of the amount (if any) by which the sum of the items of tax preference exceeds $30,000."

(b) Repeal of Tax Carryover Provision.—Section 56(c) (relating to tax carryovers) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 502. INCLUSION OF INTEREST ON STATE OBLIGATIONS.

Section 57(a) (relating to items of tax preference in general) is amended by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraph:

"(11) Interest on certain governmental obligations.—The interest on obligations which is excludable from gross income for the taxable year under section 103."

SEC. 503. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

OVERTAXED TAX MEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last year when we adopted the Economic Stabilization Act, I warned that the bill was fundamentally wrong in assigning the enforcement responsibilities for the stabilization program to the Internal Revenue Service. I said that the IRS was not equipped to do the task, that it was not the appropriate agency in the first place, and that it could hardly be expected to stabilize the economy and administer the tax laws at the same time.

Now we are hearing complaints from the Cost of Living Council that not enough suits are being filed against those who have somehow violated the edicts of the Council. We are also beginning to learn, in the midst of the tax season, that the IRS is nowwhere near its goals in auditing of tax returns, and nowhere near its hoped for efforts to administer and enforce the tax laws. Such a situation is only an open invitation to tax avoiders and abusers, and the IRS is helpless to do much about it, because it simply has too much else to do.

I was alone in raising this warning, alone in pleading for the House not to enact an ill-considered bill, but instead to come back this winter and evaluate the situation and write a program that responded to the known and demonstrated needs of the country. But no, we acted in haste. The result is that today we have nothing like a stabilized economy; the IRS can enforce neither the stabilization program nor the tax laws. We have in the economic stabilization program the worst of all possible results.

I regret that this is the case. My conscience is clear, however, for I did my best to recognize the dangers and warn of them.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of an article from Tuesday's Wall Street Journal:

OVERTAXED IRS: AS TAX TIME NEARS, REVENUERS ARE BUSY—ON OTHER MATTERS—AGENCY CHASES DYNAMITERS, WATCHES PRIVATE SCHOOLS, MEASURES RHUBARB JUICE—UPSHOT: BREAK FOR CHEATERS

(By Richard F. Janssen)

WASHINGTON.—Internal Revenue Service agents are very busy as tax time nears.

They're busy:

Hassling with landlords and businessmen over consumers' rent and price-control complaints.

Nabbing narcotics dealers.

Tracking down dynamiters and gun-law violators.

Enforcing antipollution laws at distilleries.

Censoring "obscenity" in beer advertisements.

Evaluating private schools' admission policies.

Standing by for presidential campaign bodyguard duty.

Measuring the amount of rhubarb juice used in rhubarb wine.

These nontax burdens have been piled on the IRS by laws old and new, by presidential orders or else by necessity or chance. And the diversification raises the question: Do the agents still have time to collect the income tax?

The answer IRS officials give is a somewhat nervous affirmative. Despite the accumulation of extra duties, Commissioner Johnnie M. Walters says, "we think we are going to be able to make it all right," perhaps even handling the flood of predeadline inquiries and later audits "a little better" than last year.

ASLEEP AT THE THROTTLE?

But that would be far from good enough, Mr. Walters readily admits. He says that even before the White House handed the IRS its biggest nontax chore of policing compliance with controls, the service was "concerned about a lack of manpower to do what we think is an adequate job in our examination" of tax returns.

The work accomplished in regular tax enforcement "is estimated to be somewhat less than would otherwise be expected" because of the controls chore, the IRS budget blandly cautions. And because crack agents increasingly are being diverted into special attacks on organized crime, there's no doubt that "our audit coverage has declined" to take in fewer ordinary taxpayers, adds John F. Hanlon, assistant commissioner for compliance.

Yet to keep the rank-and-file taxpayer honest, it is "absolutely critical" that the IRS convince the public that it isn't "sleeping at the throttle," Mr. Walters emphasizes. The distraction of the miscellaneous duties started bothering Mr. Walters soon after he became commissioner last year, and he plans to spin off some of them. Next July the 4,000 employes of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division will be transferred out of the IRS to become a separate bureau of the Treasury.

The clearest danger signal is that the IRS was able to audit only 1.6 million returns of all types, including 1.3 million individual returns, in the fiscal year ended last June 30. That was far below its goal of 2.4 million, and an outright decline of 363,000 from the year before.

A SOFTER SQUEEZE

The IRS hopes to scrutinize 2.1 million returns this fiscal year, a target that's still below the 2.5 million audits attained several years ago. The current goal implies that about 98% of the returns will escape any check beyond routine processing.

The enforcement muscle hasn't weakened quite as much as the figures suggest, officials argue. The staff is being increased and asked to work harder, Mr. Walters says. New computer-selection techniques allow officials to pick out for audit those returns most likely to pay off in extra liabilities. And agents are being told to go on to a new audit rather than try to squeeze "the last penny" from a current one.

Awareness that IRS agents are collaring more big-time criminals probably has a "de-

terrent effect" on the average taxpayer, too, reasons Richard A. Nossen, assistant intelligence director. But still more effective is seeing friends, neighbors and relatives visited by revenue agents, other officials concede.

Last fiscal year the number of delinquent income-tax accounts jumped 8% from the preceding year to 2.8 million and unpaid taxes increased by 6% to a record $3.5 billion. Possible reasons: It was also a year in which IRS men were tapped to become the first "sky marshals" guarding against airliner hijackings, to temporarily augment United Nations security forces and to help defend Washington against "May Day" demonstrators.

Why the IRS?

Partly because it is the government's biggest law-enforcement agency. The IRS has more than 63,000 full-time employes, of whom about 18,000 are revenue agents and officers and 4,000 or more are investigator-types in the intelligence and alcohol-tobacco tax units. (In contrast, the FBI has 8,600 agents.) And the service's tax role makes it particularly appropriate for policing price controls, wryly says Budget Director George P. Shultz. "The IRS has a reputation that somehow makes people think twice before thumbing their nose," he maintains.

But it's the service's role in controls that raises the most doubts about whether it can preserve its reputation as a relentless tax collector. For the rest of this year, officials aim to keep about 3,000 IRS people concentrating on controls—including almost 1,000 of the approximately 13,300 agents, who are the backbone of the tax-enforcement effort.

"Realistically, though, we don't keep a clean separation" between the tax and "stabilization" staffs, says Edward F. Preston, assistant commissioner for stabilization. He explains that especially in smaller offices revenue agents and the "taxpayer service representatives" who handle routine inquiries are dividing their time between both areas. With the workload of taxpayer inquiries high as the April 17 filing deadline approaches, he says, the very nature of the telephone calls coming in dictates that more time is spent on tax matters.

Fortunately for the IRS, "the stabilization inquiries are diminishing," Mr. Preston reports. From a high of 30,000 a day immediately following the wage-price freeze of last Aug. 15, the daily average of stabilization inquiries dropped to 15,124 in the week ended Feb. 15; that was also below the 17,982 of a week before.

It's true, too, that the IRS is getting a rare respite from the usual increase in income-tax returns. Because the 1969 tax-reform law lopped a lot of low-income people off the tax rolls, the number of individual returns received dropped by 1.8 million to 76.6 million in the last fiscal year, and it is expected to hold about level this year.

Moreover, technology is helping to hold the line against widespread evasion. The IRS used to rely on "fellows in green eyeshades" to pick out returns for audit, recalls James R. Turner, planning and research director. But now computers "score" each return for the likelihood of error or fraud. With refining of the secret formulas applied, the proportion of time-wasing audits that turn up no change in the taxpayer's liability has dropped to 30% from 41% three years. ago.

THE "STRIKE FORCES"

At the same time, the massive new efforts against organized crime are clearly distracting tax men from their regular duties. Compared with only 25 agents at the onset in 1966, the IRS now contributes close to 1,000 agents to the government's interagency "strike forces," which are investigating racketeers and suspect local officials in 18 cities. This anticrime drive does yield a revenue payoff, of course; the revenue men taking part have recommended additional taxes and penalties of $260 million, almost half of that just in the past half-year.

The even newer "IRS narcotics trafficker program" seeks mainly to disrupt the traffic in illicit drugs by tripping up middle and high-level narcotics racketeers on income-tax-evasion charges. Officials explain that the top men of narcotics rings are often too "insulated" from day-to-day dealings to be convicted directly on drug charges. Just lately the IRS has been scrutinizing the spending habits and life styles of 10 men suspected of being Washington's biggest heroin dealers; prosecution is expected within months.

This program, launched last July, also promises to be a moneymaker for the Treasury. But the narcotics crackdown is a major claim on tax-enforcement manpower and top-level attention.

Some of the IRS' newer duties don't even involve any fattening of the tax take. Among these are the firearms cases. The IRS arrested 2,223 people on gun and explosive charges in its last fiscal year, more than twice the number of people indicted for tax fraud. Under the 1968 law bringing bombings under its jurisdiction, the service devoted some 620 man-years last year to investigating such incidents as the bombing of a high school in Anaheim, Calif. and of an automobile on the police-station parking lot in Falls Church, Va.

(The extra activities don't always enhance the good name of the IRS. The severe wounding of a suburban Maryland gun collector when its agents and local police burst into his apartment last June became a cause celebre in which the Treasury drew the wrath of gun lobbyists and civil libertarians alike.)

MOONSHINERS AND POLITICIANS

Although it isn't sure how much manpower it will take, the alcohol unit has been getting ready to carry out a new law requiring that it deny operating permits to breweries, distilleries and explosives plants unless they comply with federal antipollution standards for air and water. Similarly unfamiliar but more controversial has been the IRS role since mid-1970 of denying tax exemption to private schools unless they can demonstrate a "known nondiscriminatory admission policy."

Also with scant prospect for collecting extra money, the IRS has been sharply stepping up its audits of foundations and other tax-exempt organization. Under congressional pressure, it has assigned more than 500 auditors to this task, a 41% increase from a year before. Because most organizations being scrutinized are managing to keep their tax exemptions, little added revenue results.

And with the pursuit of traditional backwoods moonshiners already badly neglected, the IRS is hoping that not many of its gun-toting types will be called upon to help protect presidential candidates this year. But with a pack of Democrats running, the service isn't likely to be so lucky, one official acknowledges.

It isn't hard to see how some of the IRS' obscure older duties have frayed the patience of officials who would prefer to concentrate on collecting taxes. Chiefly as a convenience to the industry, officials keep such detailed statistics on alcoholic beverages that it's the IRS from which one can learn, for instance, how much rhubarb juice was used in wine-making in March 1970. (Answer: nine gallons.)

And under a law dating from the 1930s, the service reviews about 18,000 publications and listens to hundreds of radio broadcasts annually to check the "acceptability" of beer and * * *.

RICHARD BURGSTEINER, VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER: "MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DAVIS), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to honor a citizen of the First Congressional District of South Carolina. Although he is a young citizen, he shows remarkable knowledge of this great country and the democratic concept.

I pay tribute today to Richard E. Burgsteiner of Goose Creek, S.C., who at the age of 17 has already distinguished himself many times. He has been the president of his student council, a youth leader in his church, and a former student of the month.

He has excelled scholastically and has brought pride to his parents, Edward and Betty Burgsteiner. Richard has provided an inspiration to his classmates and leadership for his friends. He is now ready to begin a career in college, which I am sure will be just as illustrious.

The latest achievement of this young man is presenting a winning entry in the Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, I thank God that there are still young men of Richard E. Burgsteiner's caliber coming through our schools. It is not far in the future when young men of his mold will be the leaders this great country will need. I would like to place in this RECORD today the text of the winning essay so that all might see the talent and the love for country that this young man has:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

Imagine in your mind the world of yesteryear, and place yourself in that world. It is the seventeenth hundred and seventy-fourth year of our Lord. The atmosphere seems quite ordinary. Men are out working the lands. They sweat and strain with the thought of preparing for winter. The women sit within the wooden walls of their cabin. They too, do their daily routine, that of mending, cooking, teaching, and many more assorted occupations. These men and women are Americans. Yet they are not as of yet granted the complete individualism they so desire. They live and work in a new world, yet they are to obey the whims of a mother country.

Days passed into years. With each new rising sun there grew a stronger desire to escape the grip of the mother country. Men began to display brave, courageous acts, evincing their strong desire for individualism and freedom. Within nearly every settler's heart there existed this idea of freedom: freedom to prosper and grow, a means of fulfilling personal dreams and aspirations. This individual right cried so very loud in the hearts of these people.

Leaders began to prosper. They spoke fiery words and cried for action. Patrick Henry screamed for liberty or death. Men began to come together and mold into a power. A small power at first but one that would grow and become overbearing. Thomas Paine cried out reasons for action in "Common Sense." The colonies began to feel the sharp tongue of all these leaders. They felt the sting of their words and freedom became their goal.

The days began with bloodshed and ended with the same. With each dawning the

atmosphere grew more tense. The settlers shed much blood, they were outnumbered. They had courageous, devoted, and skilled leaders though. These leaders led gallantly to overcome restraint. There also was the never ending devotion and love of the settlers for their lands. They wanted freedom so badly they could taste its sweetness. They realized they were to sacrifice much, for freedom is not a privilege it is an achievement. Many lost their lives so that others could cherish this freedom.

Why was freedom worth sacrificing so much for? So many lives, so much blood, so many heartaches. Can anyone place down in words just why men go to such great lengths to keep freedom in existence? It's always been done. Throughout the dusty pages of history there lie countless acts of devout duty to terminate the enemies of freedom.

Why do men risk life and limb for this individual right? It's because freedom is the most vital part of any individual. It allows him to be him and not someone else. Without freedom we would be machines programmed only to serve.

Freedom is the essence of existence. Without freedom a man is nothing. Freedom allows a man to reach the once-unreachable star. Without freedom a man can only gaze and wonder. He can never be or do anything.

The greatest thing about this fantastic nation of ours is simply freedom. Without freedom there would be no "liberty and justice for all." If freedom had not been defended through the years, America would not be the greatest of all nations. It is freedom that places the United States high above all other countries.

You ask me what is my responsibility towards freedom. Freedom is my most prized possession. I may have all the world has to offer but without freedom I have nothing. It is my utmost responsibility as it is every American's duty, to keep this individual right in existence. Freedom must always burn in the hearts of men. Young and old must join hands and create a wall that can not be toppled by opposition. We can not allow anyone or anything to deprive us and our future generations of the opportunity to prosper in a free world. To prosper as we have.

My responsibility is not to create utter chaos and destruction—instead to build on the knowledge of my forefathers and keep freedom as a constant part of the American Heritage.

I love this country and I'm very proud to be an American. It is with this pride and this love that I gain the desire to sacrifice what I may to keep America, "the land of the free." If need be, I shall give my life so that this country and its ideals may flourish.

What is my responsibility to freedom? It's summed up in John Kennedy's Inaugural Address where he so strongly stated, "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY WITH RESPECT TO NONMETROPOLITAN AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, Friday I will be talking to the members of the chamber of commerce at Marked Tree, Ark. Early in the day, and on Saturday, I will be visiting a number of other small towns which, like Marked Tree and thousands of its counterparts in other regions of the Nation, are caught in a program of money-grab politics.

Planning for this trip and thoughts about the needs of the countryside brought to mind a letter I recently received from County Judge Leon Cooper of Izard County, Ark. Judge Cooper was disturbed over the operations of the employment programs under the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971.

He pointed out that faulty methods used for alloting the work slots resulted in small, eligible counties such as his getting little or no benefit from a program which should have helped them. Yet counties near his—counties with significantly more industrial job opportunities—received so many job slots they had difficulty filling them.

In closing his letter, Judge Cooper wrote:

If there is any way that you can help call attention to the constant discrimination being exercised against rural communities, it needs doing.

The problem Judge Cooper pointed out, areas with heavy population concentrations monopolizing the attention of State and Federal officials is one which I have regularly brought to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

The situation pinpointed in his letter underscores testimony given by Madison, Ark., Mayor Willard Whitaker at the community development hearing I held in Brinkley, Ark., last August. Mayor Whitaker was discussing the obstacles his small town struck in trying to use Federal programs.

The problem which we encounter most frequently is that we are not large enough we cannot get funded. How can we get large enough to qualify if we cannot get the money to grow?

Another example of the repressive effect executive branch policies have on small towns has been the closing, since 1967, of more than 100 small medical clinics and, since July 1971, of more than 100 small post offices in Arkansas and across the Nation. Little tangible effort seems to have been made to compensate residents of these small communities for these blows to their attempts to increase the vitality of their area economies.

This is true even though it is commonly accepted that a doctor, post office and general store are basic to the nucleus of a town with a future.

The small towns, their medium-sized sister cities, and the dispersed-population communities which dot the rolling hills, fertile deltas, green valleys and golden plains of our land are the backbone of this Nation. Their continued good health—economically, culturally, and socially—is essential to the future of America.

We, as a nation, cannot afford to continue to condone enactment or establishment of Federal programs which perpetuate the existence of the small communities in a developmental limbo. For there is no such thing as a limbo for the countryside. Either its communities acquire new or remodeled stores, offices and plants where jobs are to be had; vocational-technical schools where special skills can be learned; clean, attractive housing on quiet, residential streets; sparkling, well-equipped playgrounds and recreation areas; modern health facilities and well-planned, constructed and maintained transportation systems or they die.

The facts of life are the same for these places for our major cities and counties. There is no standing still and marking time. They either move forward or slip into the abyss of things past.

In a May 13, 1940 speech urging the people of England to fight against a foreign aggressor, Sir Winston Churchill said:

Victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory however long and hard the road may be; for without victory there is no survival.

The forces against which we as a people struggle in our efforts to assist nonmetropolitan America are internal. They too often take the form of apathy, lack of understanding, preoccupation with symptoms rather than causes, and frustration with attempts to untangle ourselves from the morass of bureaucratic redtape. The need for an unwavering commitment to victory is the same for the friends and residents of America's countryside as it was for the British.

There is little glamour to be found in the task of helping a small town get or keep its hospital or post office, or, in pushing through to the grant stage an application for money to establish an industrial park and then filling the park with job-producing industry.

This is a nuts-and-bolts job of hard work. It should not require a lot of imagination or clear thinking to make the connection between the cultivation of progress and the good life which the future can bring. But the hoe handle must be composed of sound planning and a commitment to action. The hoe blade must be formed of grit and determination.

So far as I am concerned there is no program which this Congress or this Nation could undertake that is more important than a national growth policy which recognizes the importance of and actively seeks to encourage the development and redevelopment of nonmetropolitan areas of the Nation.

Promotion of such a policy is a major reason for my introduction of the Small Communities Planning, Development, and Training Act of 1972. Title I of the bill, the Community Development Bank, could provide a strong, new, reliable source of development money to communities on a long-term, low-interest basis.

Title II of the act, which would expand and amend the existing public facilities loan program would provide an alternative method for financing the community facilities so necessary for strong development and redevelopment efforts. It is my view that subsidizing the sale of taxable municipal bonds would help provide the credit resources for which these small towns and communities plead.

Title III of the bill is a direct effort to consolidate the community development grant programs which are now operating, reduce the excessive time and effort involved in using the programs and inject a new measure of flexibility into the programs.

I also feel that my proposals in titles IV and V of this bill for the establishment of a National Small Community Affairs Institute and fellowships for persons interested in developing and initiating solutions to the problems of our Nation's countryside, are essential to our effort to initiate the national development policy responsive to the needs I have outlined.

We make speeches in praise of a development policy which is truly national in scope. But, in practice the policy continues to be narrowly focused and gives small attention to the needs of the countryside. This lack of direction encourages bureaucratic pursuits which are harmful to the thousands of small towns, communities and counties of America.

Mr. Speaker, block by block we are witnessing the destruction of the once strong foundation upon which this Nation was built.

THE ELIMINATION OF "RECENT COVERED WORK REQUIREMENT"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to announce that 43 of my colleagues have joined me in reintroducing H.R. 11199 to modify the qualifications for social security disability benefits.

Present law provides that an applicant must meet the test of "recent covered work." This means that the applicant must have worked at least 20 of the 40 quarters immediately preceding his disability—5 of the last 10 years—in a job covered by social security.

In the course of assisting many applicants. I have found that many people cannot meet the requirement of "recent covered work." Let me describe two cases which are typical.

Mr. A. is 56. He had worked under social security and, had he been old enough, would have been eligible for retirement benefits. He had worked for the county government for the 10 years prior to becoming disabled. That job was not covered by social security. Although he was permanently and totally disabled, social security could not pay him benefits. Mr. A. has cancer and is being supported by his sister.

Mr. B. is 50 and has a wife and four children. He has a 100-percent disability rating with the Veterans' Administration because of a neuropsychiatric disorder. That rating was established several years ago. The illness has prevented him from working, except sporadically, for 7 years. He was not considered "permanently and totally disabled" by social security until this year. Because he had not worked the required 5 of the past 10 years, social security denied him benefits.

With these and similar cases in mind, I introduced H.R. 11199 to eliminate the requirement of "recent covered work." Instead, an applicant who is disabled and who has worked under social security enough to be eligible for retirement benefits could qualify for disability benefits.

An advisory council on social security was appointed in 1969 by then Secretary Finch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the social security program. The council has submitted its report to Secretary Richardson who transmitted it to the Speaker change provided for by the bill. I insert Document 92–80. I am pleased to state that the report strongly recommends the change provided for by the bill. I insert here the pertinent passage from pages 28 and 29 of the report:

13. INSURED-STATUS REQUIREMENTS FOR DISABILITY BENEFITS

Workers should be able to qualify for disability benefits without having to meet a test of recent covered work—a test that does not have to be met to qualify for other social security benefits.

The insured-status requirements for social security disability protection are more strict than that for retirement protection. Retirement benefits may be paid if a worker is "fully insured."[18] To be eligible for disability benefits a worker must be fully insured and must meet a test of substantial recent covered work. To meet the test of substantial recent covered work, a worker disabled at age 31 or later must have at least 20 quarters (5 years) of social security coverage during the 40-calendar-quarter period before he became disabled. (The law provides an alternative test for workers disabled before age 31 which permits them to qualify with less than 20 quarters of coverage in view of the relatively short time that they could have been in the work force.)

Some workers lose their disability protection when, because of progressive illness, they become unable to work with the regularity needed to continue to meet the recency test and thus maintain their insured status. Many people with progressive impairments experience difficulty in maintaining steady employment even though they retain the capacity to engage in some type of substantial gainful activity and are not disabled within the meaning of the law. By the time their impairments progress to the point of preventing substantial gainful activity altogether, though, the interruptions of their work caused by the illness have resulted in loss of insured status under the test. Also, some of those disabled workers who fail to meet the recency test have worked under social security for 20 years or more. Even though they may not have lost covered earnings clearly and directly as a result of disability, they have lost their potential to continue earning after a long period of covered work.

The Council recognizes that the making of disability determinations has progressed to such a point that valid determinations can be made without reliance on the recency-of-work test as an indication that the individual would still be in the work force if it were not for his impairment. Disability determinations are now made regularly under the program in cases of widows and widowers and adults who became disabled in childhood, without regard to whether they have done recent work or whether they ever have worked.

The Council recommends that the test of substantial recent covered work be eliminated so that all workers would be insured for disability protection on a basis comparable to that for retirement benefit protection.

If the bill is enacted, about 650 to 700 thousand more people, disabled workers and dependents, would qualify for benefits. About 1.7 million workers and 1.2 million dependents are now receiving benefits. The bill would mean an increase of about $900 million over the present $3.8 billion paid out annually in benefits.

It is important to note that the beneficiaries of the bill have paid into the social security system for a number of years but have been denied critically needed disability benefits because of the inequitable and unnecessary "recent covered work" requirement. I hope that my colleagues will support this measure to correct this injustice. The other sponsors of the bill are:

Hon. BELLA ABZUG, Hon. WILLIAM ANDERSON, Hon. LES ASPIN, Hon. HERMAN BADILLO, Hon. JONATHAN BINGHAM, Hon. PHILLIP BURTON, Hon. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, Hon. WILLIAM CLAY.

Hon. JAMES CLEVELAND, Hon. GEORGE W. COLLINS, Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Hon. JORGE CÓRDOVA, Hon. DOMINIC DANIELS, Hon. RONALD DELLUMS, Hon. JOHN DENT.

Hon. CHARLES DIGGS, Hon. JOHN G. DOW, Hon. ROBERT DRINAN, Hon. DON EDWARDS, Hon. JOSHUA EILBERG, Hon. WALTER FAUNTROY, Hon. EDWIN FORSYTHE.

Hon. DONALD FRASER, Hon. SAM GIBBONS, Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN, Hon. MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Hon. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI, Hon. FLOYD HICKS, Hon. RALPH METCALFE.

Hon. ABNER MIKVA, Hon. PATSY MINK, Hon. PARREN MITCHELL, Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, Hon. BERTRAM PODELL, Hon. MELVIN PRICE, Hon. CHARLES RANGEL.

Hon. DONALD RIEGLE, Hon. BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, Hon. WILLIAM RYAN, Hon. PAUL SARBANES, Hon. JOHN SEIBERLING, and Hon. RICHARD WHITE.

For the convenience of the Members I insert here the text of the bill:

H.R. 11199

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has enough quarters of coverage to be fully insured for old-age benefit purposes regardless of when such quarters were earned

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 223(c)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) An individual shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if he would have been a fully insured individual (as defined in section 214) had he attained age 62 (if a woman) or age 65 (if a man) and filed application for benefits under section 202(a) on the first day of such month."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 216(i)(3) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The requirements referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (2)(C) are satisfied by an individual with respect to any quarter only if he would have been a fully

[18] To be fully insured a worker must have earned at least as many quarters of coverage as the number of calendar years that elapsed after 1950 (or the year he reached age 21, if later) and up to the year in which he became disabled, died, or reached retirement age, except that he cannot be fully insured with fewer than 6 quarters of coverage and in no case will need more than 40 quarters of coverage.

insured individual (as defined in section 214) had he attained age 62 (if a woman) or age 65 (if a man) and filed application for benefits under section 202(a) on the first day of such quarter."

(b) The last paragraph of section 3(e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "clauses (A) and (B) of".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to applications for disability insurance benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, and for disability determinations under section 216 (i) of such Act, filed—

(1) in or after the month in which this Act is enacted, or

(2) before the month in which this Act is enacted, if—

(A) notice of the final decision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has not been given to the applicant before such month; or

(B) the notice referred to in subparagraph (A) has been so given before such month but a civil action with respect to such final decision is commenced under section 205(g) of the Social Security Act (whether before, in, or after such month) and the decision in such civil action has not become final before such month;

except that no monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act shall be payable or increased by reason of the amendments made by this section for any month before the month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last November, I mailed my first questionnaire to the constituents of the Third Congressional District in Illinois. The response to one question was particularly noteworthy. I asked who favored the registration of firearms in the United States and the imposition of strict fines and/or prison sentences for possession of unregistered firearms—77.7 percent of the men, 76.4 percent of the women and 75 percent of the young voters answered affirmatively. In addition, 80.9 percent of the men, 84.5 percent of the women, and 77.4 percent of the young voters recognized the need for a prohibition on manufacturing so-called "Saturday Night Specials."

I believe these statistics are significant. The overwhelming majority rejected a passive approach and stressed the need for positive action in the battle against crime. A decrease in the number of guns in circulation could conceivably mean a decrease in the number of crimes committed. There is no guarantee of success but most feel the approach is at least worth a try.

In light of these results, I am pleased to report on a resolution unanimously passed by Chicago's City Council on February 24 urging the Congress to enact legislation outlawing ownership and manufacturing of handguns except in very restricted cases.

I commend the Chicago City Council for its foresight and trust that the passage of this bold resolution will prompt other major cities in the Nation to follow suit. I recommend the resolution to my colleagues in the House. It is as follows:

Whereas; Chicago's patience is exhausted by the endless sickening and lethal shots from hand guns in its streets and buildings. The only use of hand guns is to kill and maim people. So long as hand guns can be privately owned, no one is safe. Outlawry of hand guns by a single city cannot solve the problem; hand guns should be outlawed nationally, as other nations have outlawed them.

The destruction in Chicago from hand guns is beyond belief. In the last few days, for example, a Chicago police commander was shot and hurt by a hand gun when he commanded a robber to surrender in the loop; two boys, 17 and 18, were shot and killed by a hand gun in an alley in the west side; and a father of three young children was killed by a hand gun which discharged accidentally as he fell down the stairs of his home on the south side.

Chicago knows the problems. Chicago knows that hand guns must be outlawed. Chicago knows that the hand gun lobby must be overcome in the interest of protecting life and safety.

Be it resolved by the City Council of the city of Chicago, the City of Chicago urgently memorializes the Congress of the United States to meet a national emergency by enacting S. 2815, which prohibits the ownership and manufacture of hand guns by all persons (except the Armed Forces, law enforcement officials, and, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, licensed manufacturers, dealers, antique collectors, and pistol clubs).

Be it further resolved by the City Council of the City of Chicago; the City of Chicago urgently memorializes the Congress of the United States to draft legislation or amend S. 2815 to establish strict requirements for the use and ownership of long guns, as well as hand guns.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FIRST STATE CAPITOL RESTORATION AND SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress an outstanding accomplishment that took place in the great State of Missouri during our sesquicentennial celebration last year. When Missouri entered the Union in 1821, few, if any, could have envisioned the great progress that would take place in our Nation during the next 150 years. As the Nation moved forward, the State of Missouri contributed her share—and often more than her share—every step of the way. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it was proper and meaningful for the "Show-Me" State to celebrate her 150th birthday during 1971. It gives me much pleasure and fills me with pride to report that this celebration was successful in every respect.

However, Mr. Speaker, I wish to especially call attention to the unusual achievements of the First State Capitol Restoration and Sesquicentennial Commission of which my good friend and able administrator F. E. "Buck" Robinson, served as executive director. This commission not only refunded the entire $25,000 appropriated to them by the Missouri legislature, but also gave to the State an additional $12,500 to be placed in the State treasury. This is certainly an accomplishment worthy of praise and imitation by other commissions on all levels of government. This refund of $25,000 plus the $12,500 above expenses raised through contributions by the citizens of the State of Missouri and the sale of souvenirs commemorating the celebration contrasts with the fact that $150,000 was appropriated by the Missouri legislature and spent during the 100th birthday celebration. When one compares the size of the State, the State budget and the value of the dollar today as contrasted to 1921, this would mean that had the 1971 Commission spent State money as had been done 50 years earlier, the figure would have ranged between a half and a million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the First State Capitol Restoration and Sesquicentennial Commission and Mr. "Buck" Robinson have offered us an example of what can still be done in this country when good American ingenuity and determination are exercised to get a job done. I wish to say "well done" to "Buck" and to the commission and submit this example to all the Members of the U.S. Congress for their consideration.

THE VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Volunteers of America has been serving the unfortunate of America for three-quarters of a century, and its age has perhaps given it an image of being an old-fashioned Bowery mission, Santa Claus-with-a-kettle type of charity. The Volunteers still aid the derelicts in the Bowery in New York, and their Santas are still on the street corners at Christmas time but in fact the Volunteers of America is a progressive and imaginative service organization which has changed as our country's problems have changed—all except the basic concept that Americans will always be prepared to give their time and money to help their less fortunate fellows.

I have the responsibility of chairing a subcommittee of the House which concerns itself with the problems of the aging, and it is of special interest to me that more than two decades ago, before there were White House conferences and strong organizations to represent the interests of the elderly, the Volunteers of America moved into service for the aged.

Today it has a strong program of help for the aged, has built some exceptionally good housing for retirees, and is expanding this area of its operations. At the same time, it is providing specially designed housing for single parents, with day care centers and facilities to enable

family life to exist where death or divorce has separated a family.

In fact, Volunteers of America has programs to aid the unfortunate from birth to death. Recently the Newcomen Society held a dinner at the Hotel Pierre in New York to pay tribute to the Volunteers of America for their 75 years of service. Gen. John F. McMahon, commander in chief of the Volunteers, described some of the organization's achievements on that occasion. I believe my fellow Members of the House will appreciate the opportunity to hear some of the excerpts from his remarks on that occasion.

I shall read portions of General McMahon's address as delivered.

HELPING THE NEEDY TO HELP THEMSELVES FROM CRADLE TO GRAVE FOR 75 YEARS—THE STORY OF THE VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA

(Remarks by General John F. McMahon, Commander-in-Chief, Volunteers of America, at Newcomen Society Dinner in New York honoring the Volunteers of America for 75 years of service to the unfortunate.)

My fellow members of Newcomen . . . On behalf of the Volunteers of America, I thank you for the honor you have accorded us on this 75th anniversary occasion. It is a privilege indeed to be here tonight to briefly share with you our story of growth—of change—of progress . . .

Although the Volunteers of America is a non-profit organization, we have been guided over our 75-year history by the same concept that has pointed the way to success for most commercial enterprises. That is—find a need and fill it.

Since our inception, we have always sought to single out those areas of human need in which we could make the greatest contribution, and then, having the task set out before us, we have rolled up our sleeves and plunged in.

In 1896, the Volunteers of America was founded in New York City, on the Bowery, by a small group of dedicated people—supported by a number of community leaders, with their guidance, advice and financial support.

Our first headquarters was a three-room flat on the Lower East Side. Today, we operate humanitarian services from some 650 centers in hundreds of cities across the nation. From a single men's shelter, we now either operate or are building scores of modern apartments for low-income or one-parent families or the aged.

But before I tell you more about the Volunteers of America, let me comment on where we fit into the overall picture of social welfare in the United States and why we have grown so rapidly in recent years.

Let me take you back to the beginning and trace the development of some of our programs and accomplishments.

Like America itself and like every great enterprise throughout the ages, the Volunteers of America was founded by dedicated people of vision. Our founders—Ballington and Maud Booth—were such people. Their mission in life—to aid the suffering, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Seeing the need, the suffering and misery in New York's slums, Ballington and Maud Booth, on March 8, 1896, at Cooper Union, announced to a cheering throng of thousands the formation of the Volunteers of America.

Immediate financial aid gave the new organization the strength to survive and the encouragement to grow. Among our first supporters were such illustrious people as President Cleveland, former President Harrison, the Rev. Josiah Strong, Bishop Phillips Brooks, Dr. Russell Conwell, John Wanamaker and William Dodge.

Among the first to be served were the homeless, penniless, alcoholics—the desperate men of skid row.

The Booths established the credo that was to guide us in the operation of our mission chapels and program centers down through the years. Ballington Booth's words were: "You cannot talk to a man about God when he is hungry, half-clothed and has no place to sleep. You have to feed him, clothe him and shelter him first."

Even now these words are guiding our daily endeavors at such shelters as the Volunteers of America Bowery Tabernacle and Men's Center right here in New York and at scores of similar facilities for the down-and-out in major urban areas throughout the nation.

Around the turn of the century, the needs of the poor knew no bounds. The poverty and squalor of our cities has been well documented by historians and social scientists and has been branded as our "national shame."

So large was the need and so generous was the public support for the Volunteers of America that within six months after our founding we became a truly national organization. In those first 180 days, we established some 140 mission chapels and program centers in urban areas from coast to coast to offer spiritual and material aid to people in need. Our future course was set.

During those early years, our service facilities included: Fresh air camps, orphanages, working girls' homes, hospitals, day nurseries, shelters for unemployed men and rescue homes for young women.

There were also mission chapels and Sunday School programs and something that has become an institution in the business districts of our cities—Sidewalk Santa Clauses. These street corner campaigns at Christmastime still raise substantial funds that help us to provide Christmas and Thanksgiving assistance for the poor.

One of our earliest program developments to receive public notice and high praise was our aid to prisoners and their families. This was a deep personal interest of Maud Booth and her work in this area has served as an inspiration for thousands who followed her in the Volunteers of America and in the entire field of corrections.

At the prisons, Maud Booth talked with the inmates at chapel services—straight talk—no Pollyanna philosophy—and she formed what were called Volunteer Prison Leagues in which the men set themselves on the right path to rehabilitation.

For the ex-convicts, she opened Hope Halls. Today, these facilities are called half-way houses. They were places where men could live while they looked for work. The Hope Halls were the decompression chambers for convicts being released. Like other Volunteers of America officers, Maud Booth was always looking for employment for these men.

Tere is a warm and interesting story I recall from Maud Booth's experiences. One day, she visited a Southern city to speak on prison reform. She was told that the owner of the city's largest department store wanted to meet with her.

He told her this story: "Twenty years ago I was one of those in your prison audience at Sing Sing. The message that came to us that day, I have never forgotten. I have come far since then, but always I will be grateful to the Volunteers of America for the guidance, the encouragement and the inspiration which started me on the long climb back to success."

Through all the years of this century, the Volunteers of America has continued to help millions of individuals and in so doing to help the society as a whole.

With the exception of the depression years, when there were some cutbacks in services made necessary by the decline in contributions, our organization continued to grow, following the guidance and inspiration of its founders.

Still establishing services to meet needs, we opened half-way houses for chronic alcoholics, and sheltered workshops to teach trades to the physically, emotionally and socially handicapped. We established disaster relief services, Vacation Bible Schools and our well-known waste materials recycling program which helps us to collect and refurbish discarded household goods and clothing to make them available to the needy.

Ballington Booth passed away in 1940 and Maud in 1948. The last great program that Maud was to inspire was our aid to the aged. It was she who urged Volunteers of America Centers to open Sunset Clubs so that senior citizens would have a place where they could spend their hours among friends and not be alone. We found that even the elderly, not in financial want, were hungry for companionship, warmth and social activity.

Our programs for the aged, like most of the other programs of the organization, were to be expanded, changed and strengthened during the 1960's as the Volunteers of America moved into a new era.

By the time the 1960's had rolled around, it became apparent to those of us in the social welfare field that no single voluntary agency, no one organization, no department within the government was big enough, knowledgeable enough and wealthy enough to alone cure all the social ills afflicting our society.

We fully realized that cooperative efforts were needed more than ever before to solve the terribly complex problems that we, as a nation, faced then and still face today.

For the Volunteers of America, the needs of the 1960's called for a rededication to our aims, a reshaping of programs, a new vision of what would be necessary to meet the challenges of the 1970's and beyond.

We have always maintained strong ties to local business and government leaders through our lay boards. In all communities where we operate, these boards of local citizens have served not only to guide us in our existing programs but also to aid in defining unmet needs and developing program services to meet these needs.

During the early 1960's we took steps to strengthen our ties on the national level by expanding cooperation with organizations whose aims are similar to our own. This cooperation has better enabled us to identify areas of need and to more fully meet a greater responsibility in the overall social welfare efforts of this country.

For example, we now work more closely with such groups as the National Conference on Social Welfare, the National Assembly, the American Correctional Association, the National Council of Churches and other similar organizations.

In addition, we have developed better working relationships with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Justice, and we have participated in conferences of these departments and those called by the nation's Presidents over the years to consider urgent human problems.

America, it has often been said, is composed of the most generous people on earth; our citizens are always ready to lend a hand to a worthy cause. And when I say our citizens, I encompass a great measure of support from private citizens, from business and industry and from government.

The happy combination of increased support and deeper experience and knowledge of how best to use our resources resulted in

our greatest period of growth since we were founded. In 1970 alone, our services to mankind increased by 50 per cent. And this year we will spend close to 40 millions of dollars in aiding more than two million fellow Americans in need.

Over the past several years, we have been able to attract greater numbers of staff members and volunteer employees who hold degrees in theology, social work, psychology, geriatrics, teaching and related educational and medical fields.

I would not attempt to describe everything that we do today or to give a full description of any one service, but I would like to tell you a little about some of our programs.

We are still operating homes for unwed mothers, but these, as you can well imagine, are a good deal more sophisticated than the facilities we had in the early years of this century. Our state-licensed center in Fort Worth, for example, combines a maternity home, hospital, nursery and child placement agency. Not only are medical and counseling services provided, but we also have a cooperative agreement with the board of education to offer the girls a continuation of their high school education while they are living at the home.

In recent months, there has been a slight but noticeable decline in the number of unwed mothers and the number of babies placed for adoption around the nation. The pill and the availability of legal abortions have been a factor and there seems to be less and less social stigma attached to the young, unmarried woman who chooses to keep her child rather than to place it for adoption.

This means that only maternity facilities will have to take new directions in the years ahead. In addition to the services they now provide, they will have to go into the local communities and offer counseling and other aid to young single-parent families.

The Volunteers of America is continuing to operate summer camps for needy children, but many of these programs have been expanded in scope. Our Camp Volasuca in the State of Washington, for example, had a session for handicapped children, handicapped adults and single women and their children. All this was in addition to the usual programs for needy youngsters.

Day Care continues to be a vital interest to us and is gaining greater recognition at the national level. These centers that free the mothers of young children to work during the day can be one of the key factors in relieving some of the poverty which now grips our urban areas and in reducing the number of citizens who require public assistance.

Among the newest of the Volunteers of America Day Care Centers is our second center at Allentown, Pa. This is housed at a local church and funded partially by the State Welfare Department.

Most of the children under care come from disadvantaged backgrounds and, as in all of our day care centers, the skills of health, education and social work are utilized to meet the total needs of the youngsters and their parents.

Most of the parents were on the welfare rolls before this program started. Now they are able to work and earn some money toward the financial needs of the family.

To help keep single-parent families together, we are now operating the Maud Booth Family Center in North Hollywood, Calif. This program—costing some $400,000—provides more than day care and recreation. It is also combined with low-cost housing—which we operate on a non-profit basis—and counseling services for mothers and their children is provided.

Our Bar-None Boys' Ranch, in Anoka, Minnesota, is spread over 720 acres. It is a model residential treatment facility for disturbed boys between nine and 12, referred to us by county welfare departments. On the ranch they live in group homes with houseparents. The boys receive normal schooling and education, plus forays into arts and crafts.

But, more importantly, they receive a big boost back into the mainstream of American society. We have other services for youngsters, too, including a relatively new concept for teenagers—the group home. In cities as large as Boston and as small as Hagerstown, Maryland, we provide residences, house parents and professional counseling for youths who—for one reason or another—have no other home to turn to.

Our group foster home in Indianapolis is rather unique in that it serves young ladies who are paroled from the Indiana Girls School. The program is operated in cooperation with the State Department of Corrections in an attempt to break the cycle that often can chain a teenage girl to a life of crime. Correction officials have told me that this is the best alternative to institutional care that they have ever found. It has been estimated that one in every five teenage girl parolees would be better off in a foster home than in her own home.

Another program of the future that we are pioneering today is the community-based rehabilitation service for ex-inmates, parolees and inmates.

In Fort Wayne, Indiana, we operate a facility where prisoners can live while they are serving their sentences prior to their parole. These men find employment, earn money, support their families and receive counseling while living at the Volunteers of America home. It is midway between living in their own homes or being confined in prisons.

In the years ahead, I believe that we will find these work-release programs to be even more successful than their progenitors—the Volunteer Prison League and the Hope Halls of the first half of this century.

More than two decades ago, Maud Booth asked the Volunteers of America to expand its aid to the aged and in the ensuing years we have greatly increased our Sunset Club program. We have also developed new programs for America's senior citizens in recent years. Last spring we started construction on our second nursing home in the Midwest and began building a five-million dollar nonprofit apartment-service complex in Denver.

Like our other residential facilities for the aged, in Seattle and Minneapolis, for example, this new high rise will feature complete recreation and dining facilities. Our Sunset Club will be moved into the new building and a number of services and shops catering to the special needs of older people, to be operated by local business men, will be available in an attached structure.

These apartment complexes are part of our national housing program now underway in more than 30 cities. Some 35 of these complexes are either completed, under construction or on the drawing boards. The multi-million dollar program is administered by the Volunteers of America National Housing Corporation in Washington and is believed to be the largest service of its kind operated by a national organization like the Volunteers of America.

In this massive effort, we are replacing slum housing with middle-income apartments at prices that low-income families can afford.

We have been able to do this both with our own resources and with the cooperation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Financing has been arranged through the FHA and many of the apartments fall under the Federal rent supplement program.

From the beginning, our aim was to be more than a non-profit landlord. We want to be a provider of both shelter and service.

Each of our apartment complexes around the nation is a community in itself to serve the aged, the handicapped, low-income and moderate-income families. We have on-site community centers, adult education programs, recreation facilities, health centers and counseling programs. We are attempting to provide for the total life of the total family.

And in all of our Volunteers of America programs, we offer as best we can, a complete range of services for every member of society.

Our comprehensive, modern and growing social welfare program provides for any one in need—from the unborn baby of an unwed mother to the friendless man in the twilight of his days.

As we keep faith with our founders—serving God by serving mankind—we have developed more than a thousand and one ways to serve people.

Perhaps it was Robert Frost, our great poet, who best summed up what we believe in. He wrote: "Home is the place where, when you have to go there, they have to take you in."

Thank you.

RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a very fine statement written by Robert Lock, of Great Falls, Mont. Bob, a Great Falls High School senior, has been chosen as the Montana Voice of Democracy winner by the Montana Veterans of Foreign Wars and its auxiliary. He outlines his "Responsibility to Freedom." After reading it, I believe all of our colleagues in the House of Representatives will agree and want to share with Robert Lock's concept that "freedom must indeed be protected," and that each of us has an individual responsibility.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Robert Lock)

Freedom, the right to think, speak and live according to conscience, is something we've all grown up with. Few of us have lived life without freedom, and we consequently tend to forget that freedom is precious and perishable, and must be protected. Each of us has a responsibility to undertake this protection—to preserve liberty and "secure (its) blessings to our posterity." This is my responsibility to freedom.

Though we are fond of describing the rights of free speech, a free press, and freedom of thought as inalienable, they are not. A look at the world will show millions who do not have these rights. We here are born to freedom, but we cannot say it can never be taken from us. It has been taken from many around the globe in nations where an indiscreet remark can bring years in prison, if not death. Freedom must indeed be protected.

This protection may take the form of a soldier, slogging through the mud in a land far from home. It may take the form of a policeman, arresting one who would abuse that freedom. It may also take the form of petitions, voting, and yes, demonstrations and marches.

But freedom is not a creation of laws or constitutions, much as these may aid in preserving it. Freedom is a creature arising in the mind of each man who is free. In the mind, in the attitude, of every man, is freedom founded. It is founded as a decision to

let all other men be free. We have liberty in America because I and all others have decided "As long as he harms me not, what my neighbor thinks, says, and does is his affair." Freedom's preservation—my responsibility to freedom—rests in every man's attitudes, in my attitudes. The wrong ideas—ideas against freedom—in but one man's mind can destroy the liberty of a people. The horrors of Auschwitz were born in the liberty-denying cortex of Adolf Hitler.

But what should my attitude be if freedom is to survive? That attitude must be one of tolerance. I must hear all viewpoints from all men. I must be willing to accept the existence of ideas at variance with my own. I must allow others to speak and write errors, and I must hear and read those errors, though I may, indeed must, speak and write against them.

I must never deny a man access to my mind because I believe he is wrong. For you see, if I refuse to hear a man because he is over forty, or because his hair is too long, I have denied him the right to freedom of speech. I have closed his mouth by closing my mind. If I will not read a pamphlet handed me because it is published by an extremist group, I have denied them freedom of the press. For of what use is freedom of speech if no man will listen? It is as though the words were never spoken. Of what use is freedom of the press if no man will read the words—read them if only to then disagree and condemn them?

Jefferson wrote: Error may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I am responsible for that tolerance. That does not mean I must dumbly listen to slander. Rather, I must speak against it—use reason to combat it—but I must do this in the open forum that freedom provides. I must never wish a voice silenced.

The price of freedom is tolerance. I must pay that price. Keeping an open mind is my responsibility to freedom.

REPORTS ON THE NATION'S ECONOMY CONTINUE TO INDICATE IMPROVING CONDITIONS ON A WIDE FRONT

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, reports on the Nation's economy continue to indicate improving conditions on a wide front. New orders by factories for goods rose by 6.2 percent in January on a seasonally adjusted basis over December, and this was the largest increase since August of 1956. Orders by factories were at a rate of $63.1 billion in January. Orders for durable goods increased 9.7 percent and new orders for nondurable goods rose 2.1 percent over December. These increases in durable goods are strong indications that business outlays for new plant and equipment are on the rise, as suggested in the recent Department of Commerce, Security and Exchange Commission business survey.

On the consumer side, there is encouraging news regarding major retail chain sales during February, Sears, Roebuck and Co., our largest retailer, recorded an 8.9-percent sales gain for the 4 weeks ended March 1, over the comparable period a year earlier. J. C. Penney and Montgomery Ward & Co. showed February gains of 14.6 and 6.4 percent respectively. Finally, S. S. Kresge Co. showed a very high 17-percent sales growth in February, which nearly matched the 17.8-percent increase during January.

Mr. Speaker, I think these indications of improvement on both the production and the consumer sides of our economy provide further convincing evidence that our present economic policies have set the economy on the path of strong growth and expansion.

TO FIND THE ANSWERS ON CLEARCUTTING

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, clearcutting, the practice of cutting down all trees in an area regardless of size or age, is defended by the timber industry and by many foresters as efficient management of resources. It is condemned by equally as many foresters and most conservationists as a waste of our natural resources and destructive to our environment.

While the controversy continues to rage about the values or dangers of clearcutting, the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that we do not really know the effects of this practice. We do know that when you cut several square acres of forest lands in high altitudes. the time taken to grow another forest runs up into the hundreds of years. We do know that in several instances valuable top soil is lost and no new trees can grow. We do know that the logging roads can also hasten erosion.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, are answers. We need to develop some clearcutting guidelines which take into consideration soil conditions, the kind of roads that would have to be built, the impact of the cutting and road construction on sedimentary pollution of streams and lakes, the ability of the area to produce new stands of trees, and the recreational value of some areas of particularly scenic beauty.

Because so many questions are unanswered, I and several of my colleagues are today reintroducing a proposal which would establish an independent, interdisciplinary commission to investigate and report within 2 years on the practice of clearcutting on Federal lands, and would call for a moratorium on clearcutting until this report is completed.

The text of the proposal and list of sponsors follows:

H.R. 13884

A bill to establish a Commission to investigate and study the practice of clear cutting of timber resources of the United States on Federal lands

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established the Inter-Disciplinary Clear Cutting Practice Study Commission.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seventeen members as follows:

(1) five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; and

(3) seven members appointed jointly by the President of the Senate upon recommendation of the majority and minority leaders, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of whom—

(A) two shall be representative of the timber and lumber industry;

(B) three shall be from the staff of an accredited school of forestry, and knowledgeable in the field of timber management; and

(C) two shall be individuals who are recognized leaders in the field of conservation.

(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(e) Nine members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the practice of clearcutting of timber on Federal lands with a view to determining whether it is in the best interest of the United States to permit the practice of clear-cutting in connection with the timber resources of the United States on Federal lands, and to the extent, if any that such practice is in the best interests of the United States, the best and most effective method or methods of carrying out such practice.

(b) The Commission shall, within eighteen months following the date of the enactment of this Act, transmit to the Congress a report which shall set forth the results of its study and investigation and its recommendations with respect thereto.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after the submission of its report to the Congress.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission or any committee thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any committee thereof.

(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its duties under this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) Members of the Commission who are Members of the Congress shall serve as members of the Commission without additional compensation, but shall be allowed necessary travel expenses (or, in the alternative, a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence and mileage not to exceed the rates prescribed by the provisions of subchapter I, chapter 57, of title 5, United States Code), and shall be reimbursed for other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties imposed upon the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are not Members of the Congress shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day on which they are engaged in the performance of duties of the Commission, and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses reasonably incurred in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director and such other staff personnel as it deems necessary. Staff personnel shall in-

clude experts from the physical, life, and social sciences, as well as the humanities, so that the study of approach is interdisciplinary.

(b) The Commission may procure the services of experts and consultants without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may compensate such experts and consultants without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, in accordance with section 3109 of that title.

SEC. 6. On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, no clear cutting of timber resources of the United States shall be permitted on any Federal lands until the expiration of ninety days following the submission of the report required under section 2(b) of this Act, or the expiration of the twenty-four-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 7. As used in this Act, the term "clear cutting" means the practice customarily used in the timbering industry which requires the removal of substantially the entire stock of timber within a particular designated area for the purpose of commercial harvest of timber or silviculture management of timber.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $2,500,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SPONSORS OF CLEARCUTTING BILL

Mr. Teno Roncalio of Wyoming.
Mr. Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota.
Mr. John G. Dow of New York.
Mrs. Bella S. Abzug of New York.
Mr. Herman Badillo of New York.
Mr. Jonathan B. Bingham of New York.
Mr. John Brademas of Indiana.
Mr. John Buchanan of Alabama.
Mr. William R. Cotter of Connecticut.
Mr. George E. Danielson of California.
Mr. Ronald V. Dellums of California.
Mrs. Ella T. Grasso of Connecticut.
Mr. Gilbert Gude of Maryland.
Mr. Seymour Halpern of New York.
Mr. Michael Harrington of Massachusetts.
Mr. Ken Hechler of West Virginia.
Mr. Harry Helstoski of New Jersey.
Mr. Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin.
Mr. Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., of California.
Mr. Spark M. Matsunaga of Hawaii.
Mr. Parren J. Mitchell of Maryland.
Mr. John E. Moss of California.
Mr. James G. O'Hara of Michigan.
Mr. Otis G. Pike of New York.
Mr. Thomas M. Rees of California.
Mr. William F. Ryan of New York.
Mr. Fernand J. St Germain of Rhode Island.
Mr. Paul S. Sarbanes of Maryland.
Mr. James H. Scheuer of New York.
Mr. John F. Seiberling of Ohio.
Mr. James W. Symington of Missouri.
Mr. Jerome R. Waldie of California.
Mr. Lester L. Wolff of New York.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, every now and then I receive a letter which is so striking that I feel compelled to share it with my colleagues. The following is just such a letter—

GREYBULL, WYO.,
March 4, 1972.

DEAR SIR: I wrote to you about a year or so ago to register a complaint because Social Security is so flagrantly inadequate for our inflated times. I'd like to submit the following resume from my account book. Before 1964 our two children were growing up and at home. Year-to-year variations are taken into consideration.

	1940	1950	1960	1970
Income	2,095	4,765	7,030	6,545
Groceries	770	1,460	1,475	1,890
Clothing	185	465	745	675
Medical	200	400	600	2,300
Utilities	200	230	300	430
Transportation	120	225	1,620	220
Miscellaneous and personal	140	210	450	880
Income tax and social security	100	365	1,030	1,160
Total per year	1,715	3,355	6,220	7,555
Average per month	143	296	518	629

This is not a *theory*, but the history of one family's progress through the 30-odd best working years of our lives! I had a heart attack in 1959 from which I partly recovered. In 1970 I had my second one and have been totally disabled since. They tell us to live on $263.50 per month social security and the State of Wyoming has *nothing* for a disabled man.

Our savings is nearly all used up now. When it is gone—what do we do?

Yours truly,

TOM POOLE.

Mr. Speaker, what do I tell my constituent?

Do I tell him that Congress is going to continue business as usual—that with our various and sundry vacations, early afternoon adjournments, and the upcoming elections—we will be unable to give any consideration to further amendments to the social security laws?

Do I tell him that we have lost the ability to be responsive to our constituent needs?

Do I send his letter over to the Social Security Administration in the hopes that that agency will give me a letter on how much Mr. Poole's benefits will increase should H.R. 1 ever become law?

I am confident that each and every Member on the floor today represents constituents who could relay the same sense of urgency, the very dependence of their future on what we do in these Chambers from day to day.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that time will not wait. I am hopeful these plain and simple words of Mr. Poole will spur this Congress on to more positive action, not only in the realm of social security benefits, but generally, in a renewed vow to meet the many valid and pressing needs of the citizens of this Nation.

REPRESENTATIVE ULLMAN INTRODUCES HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 819, A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ABOLISH ELECTORAL COLLEGE

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

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, last July I introduced House Joint Resolution 819, a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college, to provide for the direct election of the President, and to call for a national presidential primary election. Yesterday, I introduced H.R. 13848 that provides the procedures for direct popular election of our President.

We have now seen the results of two presidential primaries, New Hampshire and Florida. Twenty-three more of these State primaries remain. It is likely that the results of the remaining primaries will be as inconclusive and confusing as the results of the first two. Often delegates are not bound to primary winners. State primary laws have only one thing in common, and that is their inconsistency. And how exhausted and broke will the candidates be by convention time? This system of selecting our top executive official is inadequate and wasteful.

The 1968 election experience should have sufficiently highlighted the need for changes. But the Congress did not act. That is why we must act now, so that we do not face another circus in 1976.

Abolition of the electoral college and allowing the direct popular election of the President is a good beginning, but it does not go far enough. We must also implement such reform by abandoning the convention method of nominating candidates, and instituting a direct national presidential primary election.

If we intend to do an honest job of making the people the direct source of electoral power, we must extend direct democracy to the nomination process. I certainly believe we can trust the people to register their will in the selection of candidates as well as in the election of the President. I thus provided for a national presidential primary election in my constitutional amendment, and in my implementing legislation. The constitutionality of the primary would undoubtedly be questioned if it were provided only by statute, so I propose the constitutional amendment to give it a solid legal base.

H.R. 13848 would set up a National Presidential Elections Commission to administer the national presidential primaries, runoff-elections, and the general election. Safeguards for the States' right to conduct elections are included in this proposal. Candidates wishing to participate must qualify in at least two-thirds of the States, by either fulfilling the qualifications of State law for getting on the ballot, or if no such law exists, by filing a petition containing signatures of 2 percent of the registered voters in that State.

This bill will not weaken the viability of our two-party system. Splinter movements are allowed, but not encouraged. To participate in a primary, a party must have sufficient backing in two-thirds of the States, either by having received 25 percent of the vote in the previous presidential election in that State or by filing a petition containing signatures of at least 5 percent of the qualified voters in each such States. Candidates must declare their affiliation with a qualified party to appear on the ballot.

Only the names of those who meet the candidate qualifications and are affiliated with qualified parties will appear on the

primary ballot in all States on the first Tuesday in September. If no candidate received 45 percent of the votes in the party primary, a runoff election will be held the following Tuesday between the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes. The parties retain the right to nominate their vice presidential candidate by any means they wish.

The general election date is unchanged by my bill. The same runoff procedure would apply in the general election, with the date being the third Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

I know that we must be careful and thoughtful as we consider these electoral reforms, but I firmly believe that we must act now. The arguments for changes have a long history, and there is no need to continue to stall the issue with endless debate. Congressional committees to study the possibility of abolishing the electoral college date back to the last century. Likewise, the first proposal for a national presidential primary election was made by President Woodrow Wilson early in this century. Public opinion polls show that the people favor this change. Enormous and escalating sums of money are spent to vie for public attention.

We must heed the necessity for reform. We must enact a meaningful system that maximizes public participation, shortens the time spent, reduces the cost of campaigns, and eliminates the fragmented and illogical system now operating.

The February 27, 1972, issue of the New York Times Magazine includes a fine article by Robert Bendiner, entitled "The Presidential Primaries Are Haphazard, Unfair, and Wildly Illogical." I include it at the end of my remarks, along with a copy of my constitutional amendment and H.R. 13848. I call upon my colleagues to join me in this effort to reform the electoral process.

H.R. 13848

A bill to provide for the selection of candidates for President of the United States in a national presidential primary election, and for the election of a President and a Vice President by direct vote of the people, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Presidential Elections Act".

SEC. 2. The President and Vice President of the United States shall be elected by direct vote of the people of the States and the District of Columbia. The respective candidates for such offices shall be selected by direct vote of the people of the States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. A national presidential primary election for the selection of candidates in the general election of President of the United States shall be held in each of the several States and in the District of Columbia on the first Tuesday in September in each year immediately prior to the expiration of the term of office of the President of the United States incumbent in office.

SEC. 4. Candidates in the national presidential primary election for the office of President shall meet the requirements for candidates provided in section 6 of this Act and shall represent those political parties which shall meet the requirements for political parties in the primary election provided in section 5 of this Act. A person shall not be eligible to be a candidate for the office of President in the national presidential primary election unless he indicates a preference for a political party which has met the requirements provided by section 5 of this Act for the participation of political parties in the primary election.

SEC. 5. (a) A political party is qualified to participate in a national presidential primary election when, in not less than two-thirds of the several States, that political party has met either of the following requirements:

(1) The presidential candidate of that political party has received, in the immediately preceding general election of the President of the United States, not less than 25 per centum of the total vote cast in that State; or

(2) That political party has filed with the chief elections officer of the State concerned a petition, requesting the official participation of such political party with its candidates in the national presidential primary election in such State, signed by at least 5 per centum of the qualified voters of such State.

A political party may not participate in such primary unless it files, not later than ninety days before the date of the national presidential primary election, with the National Presidential Elections Commission created by section 9 of this Act, evidence satisfactory to the Commission that such political party has met the qualification requirements of this Act, and the Commission approves the statement filed with the Commission as satisfactory evidence of meeting such requirements.

(b) For purposes of this section and sections 6 and 8, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. (a) A person is qualified to participate in a national presidential primary election as a candidate for the presidential nomination of a political party qualified to participate in such primary election if not later than thirty days prior to such election he has filed with the Commission—

(1) evidence, which is approved by the Commission, to the effect that in each of at least two-thirds of the States he has either—

(A) met the qualifications of the State for candidates for the presidential nomination of a political party, if such State has provided by law for such qualifications, or

(B) filed with the chief elections officer of such State a petition signed by 2 per centum of the qualified voters in such State, or containing twenty-five thousand signatures, whichever is greater, if such State has not provided by law for such qualifications; and

(2) a statement of such person indicating his preference for or membership in a political party which has qualified for the national presidential primary election under section 5 of this Act, and the nomination of which he seeks.

A person shall appear on the presidential primary election ballot in any State if and only if he is qualified under this section to participate in such election.

(b) The candidate for the presidential nomination of a political party who receives a plurality of at least 45 per centum of the total vote cast in the presidential primary election shall be such party's candidate for President. If no candidate receives a plurality of at least 45 per centum of the vote, a runoff election shall be held in which the names of the two presidential candidates who received the greater number of votes for such office shall be on the ballot in each State, and the winner of such runoff shall be such party's candidate for President.

SEC. 7. The respective candidates for Vice President in the general election for President and Vice President must be chosen, not later than the third Tuesday in the month of September in which the national presidential primary election is held, in such manner as the respective political parties, which have qualified under this Act, may determine.

SEC. 8. The general election of President and Vice President by the people of the United States shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in every fourth year following each election of a President and Vice President. In such election, the names of each candidate for President selected under section 5, and the names of each candidate for Vice President selected under section 7 by a political party qualified under section 5, shall be on the ballot as candidates for the respective offices to which they have been nominated under such sections. In addition, the name of any candidate for President, with the name of his running mate, shall be on the ballots as candidates for President and Vice President, respectively, if such candidate has filed with the Commissioner, after the date of the national presidential primary provided for by this Act, but before the date of the general election of President and Vice President, evidence which is approved by the Commission to the effect that in each of at least two-thirds of the States he has obtained a petition signed by 2 per centum of the qualified voters in such State, or containing twenty-five thousand signatures, whichever is greater. In the general election of President and Vice President, the voters in each State may vote for any person on the ballot or write in their choices in the spaces provided. The candidates who receive a plurality of at least 45 per centum of the total vote cast in the general election for the office of President and Vice President shall be elected to such offices. If no candidates for the offices of President and Vice President receive a plurality of at least 45 per centum of the vote for such office, a runoff election shall be held in which the names of the two presidential candidates and the two vice presidential candidates who received the greatest number of votes for such offices shall be on the ballot in each State. The voters in each State may vote in such election for either of the candidates on the ballot. The winners of such runoff election shall be elected to such offices.

SEC. 9. (a) There is established a National Presidential Elections Commission composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom the President shall designate as Chairman. If only two political parties are represented on the Commission, no more than three members of the Commission shall be of the same political party. If more than two political parties are represented on the Commission, no more than two members of the Commission shall be of the same political party. The members of the Commission shall be appointed for terms ending on December 31 of the year following the date of election of the President and Vice President.

(b) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation but shall be allowed travel expenses, including a per diem allowance, in accordance with section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, when engaged in the performance of duties for the Commission.

(c) The Commission is authorized to appoint an Executive Director and fix his pay at a rate not in excess of the rate prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, and to appoint such other personnel as may be necessary and fix their rates of pay in accordance with the classification laws.

(d) The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States Government.

(e) The Administrator of General Services

shall provide administrative support services for the Commission on a reimbursable basis.

(f) The Commission shall prescribe regulations with respect to the national presidential primary election and the general election of President and Vice President, determine questions and controversies pertaining to qualifications of political parties and candidates, and certify to the Congress the election of the President and Vice President. The Commission shall conduct studies of the election process with respect to the offices of President and Vice President, from time to time or on a continuing basis, as the Commission may determine, and report the results of its studies, from time to time, to the Congress, together with recommendations of the Commission by December 31 of the year following each presidential election.

SEC. 10. (a) Elections under this Act which are held in a State shall be conducted by such State in accordance with the laws of such State. Such laws shall be consistent with the provisions of this Act and shall provide, insofar as is practicable, the elections under this Act shall be conducted in the same manner as other elections in such State. Elections under this Act which are held in the District of Columbia shall be conducted in such manner as the Congress shall provide by law. Nothing in this Act shall impair the rights of the States and political subdivisions thereof to prescribe the type of their primary elections (other than presidential primary elections) held, to conduct elections for State and local offices, or to prescribe voter qualifications (including qualifications in primary elections relating to party affiliation) so long as such actions are not inconsistent with the purposes of this Act.

(b) Whoever violates or interferes with the right of any person to participate in a primary or general election under this Act or impedes or hinders the operation of this Act shall be imprisoned for not more than five years or fined not more than $10,000, or both.

H.J. RES. 819

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of final passage of this joint resolution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. In lieu of the method of election provided in section 1 of article II and in the twelfth article of amendment, the President and Vice President of the United States shall be elected by direct vote of the people of the United States. The Congress shall provide by law for the nomination of candidates for President by a national primary election and for the election of the President and Vice President of the United States by direct vote of the people of the United States.

"SEC. 2. This article shall not apply to any election for a term of office beginning earlier than two years after the date of ratification of this article."

THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES ARE HAPHAZARD, UNFAIR, AND WILDLY ILLOGICAL

(By Robert Bendiner)

Few political reforms conceived in logic, civic virtue and a desire for a more perfect democracy can have turned out more preposterous than the institution of the Presidential primary as it confronts the country in 1972. Out of the best of intentions we are now plunged into 25 of these preliminary contests (counting the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands). They are bewilderingly varied in rules, techniques and significance and have in their totality no more relevance to the will of the people than the choice of a President by a combination of poker, chess and roulette.

Indeed, the resemblance to just that combination is startling. For poker, read a candidate's decisions—once he has looked at his hand—as to which primaries he will enter and which he figures are too poor a gamble to warrant betting on. For chess, read moves and countermoves like candidate A's low advance estimate to the press of how he will do in a coming primary so that any vote he gets will look like a victory, and Candidate B's high estimate of how A will do, so that whatever A gets will look like a defeat. And for roulette, read the necessity of hazarding a given contest without even being able to guess ahead of time who your opponents will be—or even how numerous.

The offspring of a reform wave early in the century, the Presidential primary reached its peak in 1916 and began to seriously recede a few elections later, as its deficiencies became too glaring to ignore. It has been rising and falling in esteem since 1936, as reformers have found themselves weighing and reweighing the question of which is the lesser evil—a state-and-local convention system, with all its potential for maneuvering and boss control, or a system of variegated primaries which must be played as a complex and costly game, subject to changing rules.

Of this year's Presidential primaries, no two offer their party voters the same combination of opportunities, with the result that the candidate's first chore is to calculate the best choices he can make for the time and money at his disposal. Of course, the game has not up to now been the same for the comparatively poor as it is for the undeniably rich, as Hubert Humphrey discovered to his shock in 1960. Nor is it the same for a Senator, whose time is reasonably expansive, and a Mayor of New York, whose campaign absences are even more of a risk than his continued presence at City Hall.

In some states the ballot presents the voter with no more than a list of unfamiliar names of would-be delegates to the party's national convention—and not so much as a suggestion of whom they expect to support for the Presidency once they get there. In other states that useful piece of information is included but it may be of no help to you, the voter, because the man you happen to prefer for President is not even running in your state's primary—for the simple reason that he might not win.

Some states let voters express a direct preference for a Presidential candidate and then bind the elected delegates to vote for the winner, no matter how they feel about him personally. In others the preference so expressed may serve as no more than that, with the delegates free to do whatever they wish or whatever their state leaders tell them to—just as if the delegates had been picked in the traditional back room. In Wisconsin would-be delegates run only for a Presidential candidate who consents to be on the ballot. In Oregon the Secretary of State decides who is a candidate and there is nothing one so designated can do—if he really is *not* a candidate—but disclaim all interest, keep away from the state and hope he will be believed. A Republican official this year, Oregon's Secretary of State is free to embarrass a Democratic noncandidate like Senator Edward M. Kennedy at his own pleasure.

In Pennsylvania, among other primary states, would-be delegates may declare themselves "uncommitted" and run that way, rendering the process less than vital, while in others, like Ohio, that practice is strictly *verboten*. The delegation from New Mexico will be divided proportionally according to the voting in that state's primary. But in California and Oregon the Presidential preference winner, even by a small plurality, will get *all* of the state's delegates, although a majority of the party's voters may have voted for delegates who can't tolerate him.

Such differences as these are insignificant compared to some of the other variations which, taken nationally, make the results undecipherable from any objective standpoint. To cite the most needless of all aberrations, Wisconsin allows Democrats to vote freely in the Republican primary and allows Republicans to reciprocate. This curious essay on grass-roots freedom—the theory is that party registration violates the secrecy of the ballot—owes not a little to the fact that the elder Robert La Follette, as a Republican, could always count on a good number of reform-minded Democrats crossing over to vote for him. With neither senatorial nor gubernatorial elections in Wisconsin this year, the state's Republicans are expected to take advantage of this peculiar privilege to help pick the Democrats' Presidential candidate.

While these, and many more, variations on the theme may present a candidate with monumental headaches in plotting his course, the inconvenience alone would not be adequate reason for scrapping the primary in its present form. What would seem a more substantial reason for doing so, among others, is the fact that while winning a majority of primaries cannot assure a candidate the nomination, losing a single primary can deny it to him. Estes Kefauver entered 15 out of 16 primaries in 1952 and won 12 of them in a back-breaking performance. Walking the length of New Hampshire in that state's primary campaign, he once strolled absent mindedly across a bridge, continuing all the time to pump hands and invite passers-by to vote for him, until a crusty New Englander advised him, "Can't, Senator, ye're in Vermont."

In spite of his heroic efforts and his successes, Kefauver lost the nomination to Adlai Stevenson. The result, incidentally, failed to disturb the leading reform Democrats of the day.

Conversely, a single defeat in Wisconsin was thought to—and therefore effectively did—finish Wendell Willkie's hopes in 1944, even though a One-Worlder, as Willkie had become, should not have expected to win the country's most isolationist state. Oregon did as much for Harold Stassen in 1948—just as New Hampshire finished Robert Taft in 1952, West Virginia did in Hubert Humphrey in 1960 and California wrecked Rockefeller in 1964.

The consequence of this sudden-death aspect of the primaries is that all the avowed Democratic candidates now in the field are forced into playing a crafty game of picking and choosing their races. Each must be conscious every minute that a single bad guess or unavoidable circumstance can ruin him—while all the time, waiting in the wings, is Senator Kennedy, who without spending even a dollar or risking a vote can walk off with the nomination. Why? Precisely because he will have been unscarred by any of these lethal preliminaries.

Why, then, should any of the other contenders go this costly, laborious and, above all, perilous route? For some there is clearly no alternative. Never having even asked for Democratic votes before, John V. Lindsay has to show that he can get some. Senator McGovern, a comparative unknown and a maverick, has no choice but to follow the

McCarthy model of 1968. Senator Humphrey, still bearing the scars of the Chicago convention of that year, must now "go to the people" to get them healed.

Alone among the leading aspirants, Senator Muskie might have withheld a formal declaration and waited for a tired convention to turn to him, the calm and unifying figure, to lead the party out of the frying pan of the primaries and into the fire of the campaign. But very early and no doubt correctly, he concluded that the role of front-runner was a safer bet and that the momentum of a few primary triumphs was more exciting than the posture of the modest man awaiting the call.

Setting out on the primary route, for whatever reasons, a candidate and his staff sit down and figure out how they can make the best showing at the least risk for the most economic outlay of time and money. A Lindsay decides to start off in Florida, where there are thousands of ex-New Yorkers who can admire his urbanity and attractiveness without having had to concern themselves with the plight of the city or his degreee of success in relieving it. There are blacks, too, in Florida who presumably know of his appeal, now somewhat diminished, to the people in the city's ghettos.

Mr. Lindsay will likewise run in Wisconsin, where he has some financial support and hopes to knock out McGovern. But he will leave New Hampshire alone because Muskie, from a neighboring state, is a shoo-in there. Senator McGovern, on the other hand, will stay in the New Hampshire contest, not to win—his supporters all but promise that he won't—but on the theory that the more votes he and other Democratic contenders get in this New England state, the more vulnerable Muskie must appear. And, like Lindsay, McGovern will try his hand in Wisconsin, where antiwar sentiment is strong and so is the liberal tradition.

Having once decided on going through the primaries, even a contender like Senator Muskie can take the curse off some of them by playing up states where his chances are thought to be good and playing others down, discounting in advance his chances of winning. For him a New Hampshire victory by a majority is considered a must. Wisconsin is hopeful because of the state's large Polish population and the ethnic pride of a people who have not up to now had a serious Presidential contender. But Florida has to be deemphasized in order to offset a defeat made almost inevitable by the nature of the competition.

In that state Mr. Muskie must employ a counterstrategy based on the psychology of numbers. He will presently let it be known that he will consider Florida a victory if he gets only X per cent of the vote in its Democratic primary. Whereupon his opponents will fall back on the counter-counterstrategy of telling all who will listen that Muskie really expected X plus 15 or 20 per cent and was therefore badly defeated.

The arithmetic ploy can be used even when one's opponent has achieved a plurality—because victories and defeats in this strange game are generally "moral." It doesn't matter whether you win or lose but how you play the numbers. Ask the next 10 Americans you meet by how much Senator Eugene McCarthy won that famous New Hampsire primary of 1968; it will be remarkable if eight of them don't tell you they have forgotten the figures but remember that it was decisive.

Of course he did not win at all. He lost to Lyndon B. Johnson, whose name was not even on the ballot and had to be written in. McCarthy won the lion's share of the state's delegates only because there were many more candidates for Johnson delegates on the ticket than were called for, and they succeeded in cutting each other's throats—just one more irrational aspect of a generally irrational process. Nevertheless the Minnesota Senator had won a "moral victory," and it quickly passed for a numerical one in a pastime which is based less on the popular will than on popular psychology.

Appropriately in such circumstances the media play a major role. Eager for the first concrete action of a Presidential year, they zero in on the New Hampshire primary—as though something could really be proved by a contest in which less than 40 per cent of the voters of a minority party of the country's sixth smallest state choose among four candidates for their party's nomination. The contest is not made more realistic by the fact that Mayor Sam Yorty, the least plausible of the four, enjoys the daily front-page support of New Hampshire's only statewide newspaper, which should be good for 15 per cent of the vote.

All told, New Hampshire's Democratic primary this year can be won with a vote total too small to elect a coroner in a self-respecting county seat in Idaho—possibly a total no greater than the number of media representatives, students and outstate politicians who will have poured into the state to report on or take part in an event intrinsically as significant as a county fair.

Florida's chambers of commerce wanted their state's primary to be first this year, but were unsuccessful in their attempt to beat out the small New England state for this tourist-publicity-business attraction. That is precisely what it has become.

Actually, Florida could have made a logical case for primacy among primaries if it had offered a runoff as well. The state really does afford an unusual cross-section—with Dixiecrat country in the north; cosmopolitan, urban and Jewish concentrations around Miami Beach; colonies of retired citizens from Rhode Island, Iowa and points west scattered throughout the state; and large blocs of black and Spanish-speaking citizens as well.

Yet what meaning can be attached to primary results in a state where the whimsical decision of George Wallace to run (he can no more reasonably aspire to the 1972 Democratic nomination than Shirley Chisholm) can dictate sudden death for Senator Jackson's campaign hopes and perhaps dim Senator Muskie's as well? Some of the Wallace vote, it may be assumed, would have fallen to Jackson; without that vote and lost in a field of 10, the Washington Senator can make a showing poor enough to fatally though illogically prejudice his chances in other states.

By the same token, Muskie is bound to suffer in Florida by having to split his natural support with Humphrey and Lindsay and McGovern. A runoff between the top two candidates in Florida would at least give the voters a realistic choice and the country a true indication of how the political winds are blowing. But no Presidential primary has yet come that far along the road to reform.

Perhaps the least arguable defect in the present primary system is that its protracted, piecemeal nature enables a man who has done well, say, in Illinois on March 21 to go into Wisconsin two weeks later with a psychological impetus he has not necessarily earned. He may have taken Illinois due to one of the several flukes already discussed—a favorable mix of contenders, an unfair battering suffered by rivals in the earlier Florida primary, even the dropping out of some rivals subsequent to that race—or he may owe his victory to the special features of the Illinois primary, such as the personal attitude of the powerful Mayor of Chicago. It makes no difference: The winner in Illinois, especially if he has also won in either New Hampshire or Florida, goes into Wisconsin with an advantage he might not have enjoyed if these first four primaries had all been held on the same day. And so it goes throughout the preconvention months, with victory breeding more victories; defeat, more defeats.

Just to add to the impact of timing, the early Florida primary occurs *after* the deadline for filing has already passed in 13 states. This means that candidates who have done poorly in Florida, for whatever reason, must still be on the ballot in those 13 states. Already all but eliminated, they can only serve as sitting ducks for two or three more fortunate contenders. By the time the California primary is reached, on June 6, the chances are that one of these luckier contenders is going to look all but invincible, even though he may owe his position more to a series of skilled selections, lucky breaks and a synthetically stimulated momentum than to any real popular outcry for his services as President.

Canada regards this band-wagon effect as potent enough to warrant controls on Election Day itself. In, say, Manitoba, the media are forbidden to report the vote already completed in the Maritime provinces until the Manitoba polls have closed, just as the British Columbia media may not report the Manitoba results until the Far Western vote is safely locked away. The Canadians rightly fear the band-wagon effect even for a few hours; our primary system allows it to build up for months.

Compared with the old method of choosing delegates solely by local and state conventions, caucuses and the whims of political leaders, this year's rigmarole does have its good points, though they tend to fade when compared with a system that might truly be described as rational. In the nonprimary states, as well as those with primaries, reforms worked out by the McGovern-Fraser Committee have made procedures more honest, democratic and free of phony "favorite sons" than they have been in the past—and they could no doubt be refined still further. But too much has happened for the country to revert altogether to a system that for a century played into the hands of professional politicians and would presumably, when the reformist fever receded, do so again.

Accordingly, if we are to scrap the unsatisfactory half-way system we now have, it should not be abandoned for a return to an increasingly rejected procedure like the nonprimary system; it should be replaced by a national primary—with a run-off.

If 25 primaries raise the serious objections touched on in this article, it may well be asked, why add 27 others? To be sure, the additional primaries would greatly compound the folly if they were scattered at random from March through June, and with rules of bewildering variety. But run them all on a single National Primary Day, with a uniform ballot and uniform filing dates, and you have something entirely different.

Consider first the inequities, discrepancies and sheer nonsense eliminated by that single stroke.

A candidate knows his competition before he sets out on the campaign trail—and he knows it will be with him right down to the end. He cannot shop around for states with just the right combination of opponents to serve his purpose, or gamble on states that offer a winner-take-all bargain. He can count on no band-wagon psychology being stirred up for him by politicans and media on the basis of a few early victories, as likely as not synthetic. And not least, he can be nominated by his partisans only after all of them have had a chance to hear all that he has to say—and all that his opponents have to say as well. He cannot lock up a Florida delegation in March only to take a somewhat different political tack in soliciting the votes of Californians in June.

Admittedly, a national primary, too would

present problems. All machinery—political as well as mechanical—is susceptible to affliction by bugs of all kinds—as well as built-in deficiencies. The question is only whether its defects are too great to be offset by its advantages over some other machinery.

The deficiencies generally cited with respect to a national primary are the high cost to each candidate, the formidable time it would consume, the advantage it might give to the well-known candidate over the newcomer, and the probability that it would do away entirely with the Presidential convention—which binds, however weakly and temporarily, an American political party into something like a coherent body.

These are plausible charges, perhaps, but they are not compelling. With a national primary, it is true, a candidate might ideally possess the wallet of a Harriman and the stamina of a Hereford, but his investment of cash, time and energy would have to be no greater than it is now—and might be considerably less.

Free to win support on a one-man-one-vote basis, he would have no need to go into every state in order to gain big delegations but could pick and choose the areas in which to make his personal appearances, as he does now. He would have, however, a single target date, with possibly a fixed limit of, say, three months for campaigning instead of the year and a half that Senator McGovern, for example, has already been at work. His speeches, pronouncements and television appearances would be addressed to partisans throughout the entire country. Certainly a candidate would go through nothing more harrowing than Kefauver's ordeal of John F. Kennedy's record of 100,000 miles in 20 states (not to mention his estimated 173 meals of creamed chicken and peas).

Under legislation just enacted a candidate in a national primary would not need to worry that a richer candidate would seriously outspend him in media advertising. A maximum for such expenditures would be fixed. It is possible that Congress will still further ease financial disparities by at last allowing taxpayers to earmark a dollar or so for political campaign purposes—including primaries.

In any case, a short nationwide campaign could not be financially worse than the present protracted system, which this year will probably have cost the Democratic candidates more than $6-million before the voters even turn out for the New Hampshire primary. Senator Eugene McCarthy and Robert F. Kennedy spent $20-million between them in the 1968 primaries, and in the current campaign Senator Fred R. Harris went broke after six weeks and had to drop out. Only a greatly abbreviated campaign with a series of free regional telecasts and probbaly no paid advertising at all can possibly solve this vexing question of primary financing.

For the two top winners in a national primary that yields no candidate an outright majority, there would—or should—be one more hurdle before the election campaign itself. If such a primary were to have any meaning at all, it would have to include a runoff. There would be no sense in allowing a lesser candidate, in terms of national following, to win the plurality of, say, 35 per cent just because five far more popular candidates had reduced each other's totals to less than 35 per cent by the sheer weight of their competition. A runoff, involving no further campaigning, could be held a week later—at little or no additional outlay for the contestants. Actually, if there were such runoffs now, state primaries would be a great deal more meaningful than they are—but the expense and drain of energy required for a score of them would obviously be far greater for a single national runoff.

The disadvantage of a comparatively unknown candidate in a national primary is a drawback, but one of less than formidable proportions. True, Senator McCarthy won national stature by plunging into the 1968 primaries, but that is all he won—politically. His few primary victories provided him with no chance whatever of being nominated at the convention. If supporters of a maverick candidate really want to put their trust in the rank-and-file voters rather than the party Establishment, the national primary is their chance to bypass the Establishment entirely. Admittedly, few of them feel that way about it, bemused as they are by the excitement that McCarthy did succeed in stirring up.

With television, moreover, a newcomer to Presidential consideration can get across to the electorate in three months if he has the necessary appeal—and not in two years if he hasn't. Even without TV, Wendell Wilkie came through to the country in a few months back in 1940, managing to build up enough of a public clamor to euchre Thomas E. Dewey out of the Republican nomination. And Adlai E. Stevenson, who was hardly a national personality in the early spring of 1952, was a thoroughly familiar one by the middle of July. Finally, it may be asked why a brand new figure on the political horizon should be nominated, much less elected, on his first time out. What is wrong with giving the country time to observe and judge him between his first and second attempts?

Except for those who view the present primary system as a fantastic chance for getting national exposure, few political figures see it as a permanent feature of the electoral landscape. Candidates who have merely hesitated to accept the ordeal in the past, when a handful of states were involved, now privately condemn it and express convictions that the system has become too costly, wearing and unpredictable to last. The end is not in sight, but as more states decide, under the pressure of reformers, to go the primary route, the closer the country comes to a national primary in fact though not in name—and the more meaningless the objections to it become.

Before considering the last of those objections, one might care to speculate for a moment on how the system would affect the Democratic nomination in 1972, the Republican nomination this year being impervious to any changes in machinery. Taking the run of polls, we find Muskie and Humphrey leading the field, but with neither enjoying a majority. The other candidates, including Governor Wallace but not including non-candidate Kennedy, might have something like 30 per cent of the vote among them. If only half of the votes that went to candidates McGovern, McCarthy, Lindsay and Chisholm in the first balloting went over to Muskie in the run-off, he would most likely have his majority and be the nominee. If not, the winner would have to be Humphrey.

In this case both top candidates are centrists, to use the word loosely. Since together they would probably poll close to 70 per cent of the total party vote, it is clear that neither would represent the political complexion of the party's majority. But suppose Governor Wallace were to be the No. 2 man in the first balloting, to take an extreme case. If he were to poll enough in the runoff to put him over the 50 per cent mark, he would be the party's nominee—and rightly so. But the chance of his picking up that kind of vote from people who had originally voted for Muskie or Humphrey, not to mention McCarthy, McGovern or Lindsay, should allay any fear of his winning by a fluke. There is no more chance of that happening in a primary-plus-runoff than there is in a convention. But if he did win, it would be by the will of the people and not the imposed will of the party Establishment or any part of it.

Finally, there is the question of what would happen to the Presidential convention under the national primary system. It might devote itself to hammering out a platform in line with the real intentions of the man just chosen by the party to head its ticket. It could nominate a Vice-Presidential candidate with a lot more care than that important obligation has been known to receive in the past. It could serve simply as a rally for the party on the eve of its campaign. Or it could disappear altogether.

This recurrent cross between caucus and carnival has afforded the country considerable entertainment from time to time—and it may do so again. But it is not embedded in the Constitution nor was it even conceived of by the Founding Fathers. If it should vanish in time, like other anachronisms, it might not even be missed except by hotel owners, balloon makers and party bosses. Neither would the haphazard, unfair and wildly illogical primary system that now precedes it.

IT IS ABOUT TIME SOMEONE THOUGHT OF OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, all of us, by now, recognize the unmet needs of our senior citizens. Unfortunately, most of our legislative efforts have been devoted to only one problem of the elderly—financial support under the Social Security Act. So today, I am introducing two bills to deal with two relatively neglected problems of the elderly—a health bill on a new "National Institute of Gerontology" and a housing bill entitled the "Campuses for the Elderly Act."

While the Federal Government supports a vast biomedical research center in NIH, it does not conduct research into the very special health problems of the elderly. The practice of medicine for the elderly is an almost nonexistent field in this country. Almost none of the major medical schools emphasize geriatrics as a specialty.

A number of Senators and Congressmen have been concerned about the dearth of geriatric research and have introduced legislation to remedy the situation.

The bill to create a National Institute on Gerontology, which I am introducing today, is much more specific and much broader than previous legislative proposals. My bill provides for a $25 million annual appropriation for an institute to deal with the "physical and mental illnesses as well as problems of normal physical and mental health" of the elderly. In addition, it specifically mandates that, at the very least, the institute should conduct research, education, and demonstrations related to—

First, the diseases of the aged.

Second, the nutritional problems and needs of the aged.

Third, the special psychological problems associated with the aging process.

Fourth, the common physical fitness needs of the aged.

Fifth, the delivery of health care to the aged.

Sixth, the special health related requirements in the architectural design

and building of health care facilities, nursing homes, and living quarters for the aged.

Mr. Speaker, my second bill represents a special testimonial to our democracy. The original idea for the campuses for the Elderly Act came from my Citizens' Advisory Committee on Senior Citizens. As you may know, I was one of the first Congressmen to establish a Citizens' Advisory Committee to advise me on potential legislation. It is heartening for myself and my constituents to know that citizen legislation can be brought to Congress.

In introducing the Campuses for the Elderly Act, I am joining with Senator Moss, who, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Long-term Care of the Aging, has introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

I am the first Member of the House of Representatives to introduce this very imaginative solution to some of the housing needs of the elderly.

This bill would provide a much happier and healthier environment for our senior citizens than does the present policy of stuffing them into shabby nursing houses or crime-ridden, high-rise housing which is really intended for low-income young families.

Campuses for the elderly would unify in one place the four basic needs of the elderly: first, independent living; second, congregate living areas; third, rest homes with nursing supervision; fourth, extended care facilities with extensive medical supervision. The senior citizen would not as present be shunted about from one kind of facility to another as his needs changed. The senior citizen would thus have what many do not now have and what they want—a full service, permanent residence.

This bill also provides for public competition among architects who desire to win contracts for these projects. This provision would direct the attention of the Nation's most talented architects to the design of decent living environments for the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, both campuses for the elderly and a National Institute of Gerontology are important to the third of my constituents who are over the age of 60 and the many millions of other senior citizens across the land. This Nation's senior citizens built the America we now enjoy. We can show our gratitude to them by using our energy and imagination to build a better America for them.

MORE ON CONTROL OF HEROIN TRAFFIC

(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, the subject of narcotic addiction must have top priority with this Congress. I believe our colleagues will be interested in correspondence which I have had with Myles J. Ambrose, recently appointed as Special Assistant to the Attorney General. The correspondence follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1972.

Mr. MYLES J. AMBROSE,
Special Assistant Attorney General, Office of Drug Abuse—Law Enforcement, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBROSE: I read with great interest the report of your testimony before the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse which appeared in today's New York Times. I was particularly interested that it is apparently your position that the effort to deal with the heroin plague by ending the growing of opium poppies in Turkey will meet with little success. I suspect that you are right and that if heroin supplies are to be reduced, it will come as a result of the detection of heroin when the attempt is made to bring it into the United States.

Constituents have raised a question with me which I would like to raise with you—and that is, why are we unable to substantially impede the smuggling of heroin into the United States? These constituents point out that when the United States embarked on a policy to reduce the smuggling of marihuana from Mexico into the United States that it was extremely successful. Its success was predicated on the fact that everyone apparently was searched and ultimately the complaints were so strong that the searches and consequent inconveniences were reduced or eliminated in many cases. Couldn't the same draconian measures at all our points of entry be employed with respect to heroin and if they are, wouldn't they meet with the same success? I do believe that heroin addiction and its consequences are so on the minds of the American people that they would willingly bare whatever inconveniences which would result from such strict enforcement measures.

I would appreciate having your thoughts on the question raised by my constituents and on the proposal that such draconian measures be instituted now.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1972.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Thank you for your letter of February 24, 1972, relative to my recent testimony before the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse. So that there is no misunderstanding, I am enclosing a copy of the full text.

I believe that what we are doing to assist the Government of Turkey end the cultivation of poppy for opium is important and represents a balanced approach. As you know, opium from Turkey has been the raw material from which the bulk of heroin affecting the United States has been produced for many years. The ending of opium production in Turkey following the harvest of the 1972 crop will, in effect, eliminate the raw material source responsible for an estimated 80% of our heroin problem. While this is a significant achievement, I am concerned that some people regard it as the complete solution. It is not.

However, I do believe that the elimination of one of the world's major sources of opium and the one affecting us the most will have a considerable impact on the overall supply of heroin. It can give us the opportunity to severely disrupt current opium and heroin sources. Obviously it will take some time for traffickers to establish new sources, routes, and patterns. Hopefully, now that the appropriate government agencies are being given increased resources, we may begin to cope with this problem.

Remnants of Turkish production are likely to continue to affect us through 1973 and Asiatic sources may begin to partially replace Turkey. While the world community is moving to end the uncontrolled production of opium in those areas, it may be many years before this can be achieved. This is an obvious strategic goal that must be pressed. Turkey's decision can help in this regard. While our efforts abroad should curtail and eventually eliminate the availability of natural narcotic drugs, it is unrealistic to think this can be accomplished overnight or that for the present this is our only means to bring our tragic problem under control. Quite to the contrary, it is my thought that as we work internationally to end the plague affecting us, we must simultaneously implement vigorous national and international illicit traffic suppression operations as well as domestic drug abuse prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs. The President has initiated such programs and we are now striving to increase their effectiveness.

I appreciate the suggestion you advance on behalf of your constituents and yourself that consideration be given to searching every person and item entering the United States. I am afraid that in view of the number and complexities of international commerce and travel that this is not practical. We can, however, make it more difficult for traffickers to operate and require them to employ means which should make them more susceptible to detection by investigative personnel. The increase in Customs personnel and their awareness of the importance of their problem greatly contributed to the overall program. We continue to expand and improve our capability to interdict narcotic drugs directed to the United States. We believe heroin seizures during 1971 both here and abroad in the traffic directed toward the United States is tangible evidence of our growing effectiveness.

A major objective of the new Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement in the Department of Justice is to greatly expand the gathering and dissemination of narcotic enforcement intelligence. Hopefully this will enable us to more effectively strike at the major organizations involved in narcotic trafficking. While some links in the chain of heroin supply from poppy field to addict may seem more vulnerable to attack than others, we believe control must be pressed at every level. Most importantly the demand for narcotic drugs within the United States must be meaningfully reduced.

The Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention under Dr. Jerome Jaffe is developing programs in this important area. With proper support, I believe they can make progress.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to give you, albeit briefly, my thoughts on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MYLES J. AMBROSE,
Special Assistant Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1972.

Mr. MYLES J. AMBROSE,
Special Assistant Attorney General, Office of Drug Abuse—Law Enforcement, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBROSE: I very much appreciate your detailed response of March 9th. I must disagree with you, however, with respect to your response to my suggestion for stricter controls on smuggling. When you say, "I appreciate the suggestion you advance on behalf of your constituents and yourself that consideration be given to searching every person and item entering the United States . . . I am afraid that in view of the sheer number and complexities of international commerce and travel that this is not practical," I must respond that the toll on our society is such that the inconvenience that would be caused by searching every person and every item is an inconvenience that ev-

eryone concerned about narcotic addiction would eagerly subject themselves to. It worked when it was done by the United States at the Mexican border on marihuana. Shouldn't you at least attempt it with respect ot heroin before you discard the proposal?

I urge you to reconsider the suggestion.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

FARMWORKERS ARE DENIED FAIRNESS BY NLRB

(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, I am advised that on March 9, 1972, the attorneys for the National Labor Relations Board of the regional office in Los Angeles filed a petition in the Federal district court in Fresno, Calif., requesting a nationwide injunction which, if granted, would prohibit the boycott activities of the United Farm Workers. The intent is to destroy that union's attempts to urge customers not to shop at retail stores carrying nonunion farm products. What is particularly despicable and unjust about this action of the NLRB is that farmworkers have no rights under the National Labor Relations Act, being exempted from its provisions. Having no rights, they cannot compel collective bargaining by the farm employers and, therefore, cannot achieve their goal of unionization in the usual manner, and their only effective nonviolent tool is the boycott. Surely it is inequitable, unless simultaneously they are granted the rights of all other workers covered under the NLRA, to use the sanction provisions of the NLRA against them. It is not the intention of this Congress to permit the employers to have it both ways. And that is exactly what the current situation is if the injunction were to be granted, for then farm employers exempted under the NLRA need not engage in collective bargaining, and the unions seeking to organize and demanding recognition, are stripped of any lawful weapon to compel the employers to bargain with them. Such inequity cannot be tolerated and must be stopped.

I urge the Members of Congress without regard to party or partisanship to speak out in opposition to this unfair and, indeed, un-American action initiated by the NLRB.

PERSUASIVE TESTIMONY ON NATO FROM HON. JOHN. J. McCLOY

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, which I chair, was honored to have as its witness the Honorable John J. McCloy. He brought before the subcommittee a wealth of high-level experience and a capacity for broad vision that no man could exceed.

When Mr. McCloy concluded his statement, his remarks were variously described by several members of my subcommittee as "comprehensive," "excellent," and "impressive." One member of the subcommittee observed that in all of his 20 years of service as a member of the Armed Services Committee, the testimony Mr. McCloy gave to the subcommittee, was the finest summary of past success, the present importance, and the needs for the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that he had ever listened to in all of his years in the Congress.

Mr. McCloy's statement, which will be of great value to our subcommittee on drafting its recommendations will, I am sure, be helpful to all Members of the Congress who may be called upon to vote on recommendations concerning Europe in the course of the year. I am therefore inserting it in the RECORD at this time. I am sure all Members will benefit from the wisdom of this great public servant.

I also will include in the RECORD following his statement a biographical summary of Mr. McCloy. Very few men in our history have held so many important positions in government and industry or have such a record of long and faithful service to their country.

The material follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. McCLOY, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATO COMMITMENTS, FEBRUARY 28, 1972

Gentlemen of the Congress, I have been invited to appear before this Subcommittee to give you some of my thinking in regard to our NATO commitments. I presume that this is due in part to my rather early association with the events and the policy which resulted in the creation of NATO, as well as my rather active connection with security and defense problems of this country and of Europe during and shortly after World War II.

I think that at the outset of any consideration of this subject it is important to ask ourselves the fundamental question; namely what role should the United States play in Europe taking into account the character and extent of its interests there?

Not so very long ago when I spoke out against the adoption of a Senate resolution proposing a unilateral withdrawal of our troops from their stations in Europe, I was charged by some with being a victim of my own experience and a product of the Cold War, now, it was suggested, happily concluded.

I cannot, and do not intend to, disclaim my experience or my association with the policies which induced our intervention in World War II to halt Hitler's aggressions and in the postwar period to aid in the rehabilitation and restoration of Western Europe to a position of integrity and economic viability. This latter intervention was in the face of determined and heavy pressure brought to bear by Communist and Soviet forces to extend their influence and domination from Eastern to Western Europe.

In spite of the spate of revisionist history writing which has appeared in recent years designed to discount any such threat that pressure was indeed exerted and all objective history will confirm it. The chief obstacles to the extension of the domination the Soviet Union achieved in Eastern Europe lay in the determination of the peoples of the Western nations to preserve their own governmental forms buttressed by the then influence and prestige of the United States throughout Western Europe. It was these obstacles which enabled the European economy to be revived, saved the democratic inst'tutions of Europe and preserved the peace. The leadership which the United States then displayed marks the period as a heroic one in American foreign policy.

But our attachment to Europe and theirs to us is not based only on our relationships during the war and postwar periods. It extends from the period of the settlement of the continent and the origins of our national existence and it extends to the present time where it is reflected today in the acute interdependence of our economy and that of Europe, the consequences of which both of us are currently experiencing in the form of trade, our balance of payments and stable monetary relationships. Whether we like it or not, history demonstrates that we have the tendency and disposition to become involved in the great upheavals and developments which occur in Europe to a degree and with a persistence which is not comparable to any other area of the world. Twice in my lifetime and, if not in the lifetime, at least in the fresh memory of each member of this Committee, we have been plunged into a world war commenced in Europe for which we had little or no responsibility and during which we were forced to exert all our energies and wealth in terms of manpower and treasure. One could go on for some time pointing out the areas in which our common interests and inheritances impinge on each other. But they are widespread enough to cause every thoughtful man or woman in this country or in Europe to be aware of the common interests and the common dangers we both share.

They point up the need and the wisdom of establishing a strong partnership between us in order to convince us and the other nations of the world of the great stake we have in the preservation of the peace and security of the Western world. Indeed, it is no figure of speech but an abiding principle that a very large part of our security lies in the security of Europe and an equally large part of European security reposes in the security of the United States. To put it in another way, the extent of our interdependence is such that if we attempt to visualize a Europe no longer on our side but opposing us on all critical issues, neutral or oversensitive to all Communist pressures, the prospect would be bleak indeed. And much the same thing could be said of Europe's prospects if the situation were reversed.

It is well to recall the reasons which impelled us to station our troops in Europe after the close of World War II. It was not because we greatly feared an outright Soviet invasion of Western Europe. We then had a monopoly of the bomb, but we did fear the extension of Soviet influence and pressure such as had taken place in Eastern Europe and the loss of freedoms the imposition of Communist dictatorships had entailed in Eastern Europe. It is very interesting to note that even at a time when we alone possessed the bomb, it was felt the added deterrent of the presence of United States troops in Europe was necessary. The great buildup of Soviet nuclear and naval power had not then taken place. The Soviet fleet had not ventured into the Mediterranean and Czechoslovakia had not been occupied by Soviet troops. Now in terms of comparative military potential, nuclear and conventional, the disparity between the forces of the Warsaw powers and those of Western Europe is greater than it ever has been. If in the early days of NATO it was thought advisable to station United States troops in Europe to insure the deterrent and create confidence in the Alliance, would it not appear reasonable to assume that United States presence in Western Europe would be at least as advisable now that the Soviet Union has achieved nuclear parity with the United States and the disparity between Soviet nuclear and conventional strength and that of Western Europe is wider than ever?

It is also important to ask what role the

United States forces now play in Europe. In the first place they represent the earnest of our NATO commitment to come to the aid of the member states if they are attacked. Standing alone, the NATO commitment is somewhat illusory as it is left to each nation to determine the extent and character of the aid to be given. The stationing of United States troops in Europe in significant quantity, however, creates the confidence that in the event of an attack those troops would be engaged from the outset. They also play another most important role. With the quantity and efficiency of the troops now there, they can, if a conventional attack should occur, reasonably be expected to increase the amount of time that would elapse before the question of employing nuclear weapons would have to be faced. This time period could, of course, be of critical importance. In other words, the presence of United States troops could reasonably be expected to deter any form of aggression, but if it took place, they could well postpone the necessity of making the fateful decision between nuclear devastation and surrender during which time efforts to restore peace might be undertaken.

The presence of these troops has another effect. In the face of overwhelming nuclear and conventional power to the East, the American presence gives Western Europeans the sense of confidence that is needed to resist the pressures which could be brought directly or indirectly against the integrity of their own policies, as well as that of the Alliance itself. In a very real sense, it comments that Alliance and is probably a more convincing deterrent to undue pressure or minor adventures than that of the American strategic nuclear silos. It is that sense of confidence on the part of Western Europe which at this period in time can best serve as the base for a healthy East-West relationship and *modus vivendi*.

I have constantly spoken of a United States troop level of convincing size. I have done this in part to meet the contention that all that is needed is a symbol of our presence in order to create the deterrent. The argument runs somewhat along these lines: Who can say we need 300, 400 or 500 thousand men stationed in Europe? Would not 100,000 or 200,000, or maybe even 50,000 serve the same purpose? Although most of the myths of the astronomical costs of maintaining our troops in Europe have now been dispelled, may we not, in reality, now have more troops in Europe than we really need for the declared objective of their presence?

The most important factor in any deterrent is its convincing character. Our troops in Europe were substantially reduced due to the demands of the Vietnam war. Their drawdowns for that and other purposes have not so far, I understand, been fully replaced. Their present ability to perform their defensive mission should the need arise is, I believe, barely adequate. And apart from their combat mission, it is difficult for even a military or political expert to say just how many troops are needed to constitute effective deterrence, "but it would appear to be foolhardy to err on the side of inadequacy when we are thinking in terms of deterring hostilities in a nuclear age." The argument for a very small force is based on really no more than the old and discarded "trip wire" concept of defense. It was then said, and indeed it is repeated in some quarters now, that all we need is a symbolic force whose military presence, if attacked, would set us off to a nuclear exchange. The trouble is that such a force would defeat its own purpose and it would not be convincing. It would not be convincing to ourselves, to our Allies or to any potential aggressor. It would tend to accelerate, rather than retard, a resort to nuclear weapons.

I would predict that those who now argue for such a symbolic presence would be among the first to attack this "bloody shirt" concept once it was put into effect. Indeed, it is doubtful that it could be supported in any long run by either public or Congressional opinion. In my judgment, it ought not be. What is needed is a force large enough to be capable of responding seriously along with our Allies, to any act of aggression on the part of enemy forces. With this real prospect to confront them and with the latent danger of such an engagement moving to a nuclear stage, any temptation to try aggressive adventures would be convincingly and solidly deterred. Any lesser prospect would be inadequate, and, in such a case, we had better bring them all home.

Of course, I am aware of the considerations which are being put forward to lead us to the withdrawal of our forces from Europe, and indeed to depopularize the whole principle of NATO as being a misguided product of a cold war atmosphere no longer appropriate or credible. It is argued that even though the disparity between the Soviet military strength and that of Western Europe has increased, Western Europe has regained its prosperity and economic vigor and it is no longer subject to the sort of pressure which threatened when it was weak and disorganized. Moreover, the spirit of detente, welcomed by all who seek peace, is considered inconsistent with a military alliance such as NATO. There is a widespread disposition toward greater East-West cooperation and understanding; cold war rhetoric and the burdens of defense expenditures are becoming tiresome. The stationing of troops abroad, twenty-five years after the end of the war in Europe, is viewed as an anomaly, a product of an old policy now out of date.

Moscow has recently had a degree of genuine success in convincing people on both sides of the Atlantic that it is now only interested in the status quo—a thesis which is given credence in the West by references to the USSR's preoccupation with China, its domestic economy, and its interest in greater access to Europe's industrial output. We ourselves are stimulating more East-West interchanges by the initiation of active U.S.-Soviet bilateral contacts on strategic and other issues. In short, Europe, as well as much of the rest of the world, is undergoing a period of transition, in which the policies of the last twenty-five years are under critical scrutiny. There is a widespread desire for "new" approaches in which the Alliance should be de-emphasized and the importance of deterrence discounted by the advent of East-West cooperation.

To the extent that they contribute to stability, such improvements in atmosphere can only be welcomed. I do, however, sense a danger for Western Europe and the Atlantic partnership in some of the euphoria which these very tentative first steps have already induced. The current East-West interchange has given little evidence of any basic changes in Moscow's national interest with respect to Western Europe. Khrushchev never made any bones about it. It was Western Europe he sought to dominate. For two centuries Russia's distress had emanated from Western, not Eastern, Europe. It was his view and it is still Moscow's that a U.S. presence in Europe is anomalous. It was an obstacle to Soviet objectives in the postwar period and it still is. The traditional objective remains: to undermine the rationale for European defense; to weaken the trend toward Western European unity; and, most importantly, to obscure the need for the U.S. presence in Europe as a first step toward easing any U.S. presence off the continent altogether.

Viewed in this light, until more tangible evidence of a fundamentally altered purpose is forthcoming, the decisions to be made with respect to Western Europe in the near future may well prove to be as important historically as those which were made after World War II. Now, as then, the question is not so much one of deterring specific overt acts of aggression, although this remains an incident of the policy, but of assuring that there continues to be enough confidence on both sides of the Atlantic to enable the free societies of Western Europe to maintain their integrity and their representative form of government. Much has been accomplished to assure these ends. NATO is indeed a going concern. The Europeans have recently shown commendable signs of wishing to improve their own force structures and to deal with us in redressing, as far as possible, the payments deficit to which the stationing of our own forces have in the past contributed. British entry into the Common Market seems to have broken the log-jam which, for years, has held up further progress in developing the European Community. In short, Europe is close to accomplishing what has been our sustained objective over the last twenty-five years. As these tendencies develop, the cementing of the partnership across the Atlantic becomes more, rather than less, important to us as well as to them until the time comes when less tangible evidence of our military support is necessary.

Maintaining the credibility of our deterrent to aggressive action, I believe, more than any other single factor, has been the basis for Europe's current stability and confidence. Power imbalances have rarely fostered peace in Europe. At least on two occasions in my lifetime they have brought American armies into battle on the continent. Conversely, such progress toward peace which has been made in the last twenty-five years is, I believe, the result of confidence in European stability, based, as it has been so prominently, on NATO's strength. To the extent that confidence should become undermined, by premature force reductions or failure of will with regard to European defense, it will become more tempting, as has happened in the past, for some Europeans to cross the thin line between improved East-West relations and outright accommodation to pressures based on Eastern strength.

The Soviet Union is already beginning to demonstrate, in the Mediterranean and elsewhere, that in a world of nuclear equality relatively small increments of tactical power can earn very significant political gains. This development, together with the increasing doubts of American willingness to risk a nuclear war for the protection of Europe as a whole, leaves Western Europe in a mood of uncertainty. To the extent that we were now to remove our troops in any significant numbers, these doubts would, I believe, mushroom into deep concern and would in short order substantially undermine confidence in the deterrent.

I conclude that the only effective response to these new dilemmas is to continue to maintain sufficiently large U.S. conventional forces on the continent and in the Mediterranean to emphasize to the USSR that we would consider their involvement in any aggression against Western Europe a vital issue. Put another way, it is precisely because the great increase in Soviet nuclear strength has somewhat weakened the credibility of our deterrent that we should, from now on, attach greater, rather than less, importance to U.S. conventional forces in vital areas such as Europe. I believe Western Europe is more sensitive today to possible U.S. troop reductions than it was some years ago when our deterrent in respect of Europe was more credible.

I think something should be said about costs. The actual operating costs of our present forces in Europe are about 3 billion dollars, a little more than one per cent of our annual budget, and a great deal less than the frequently cited 14 billion dollar figure which refers to a percentage of the *total* cost of *all* U.S. general purpose forces oriented toward Europe. Keeping forces in Europe is,

I believe, as a matter of fact cheaper than any other alternatives we have, unless we were to deactivate them altogether.

Moreover, the military expenditures of our European allies are generally underestimated. They have, in fact, increased from $19.5 billion in 1965 to over $27 billion in 1972 and the governments are committed to increased expenditures in the immediate future.

It should also be kept in mind that the Allies provide by far the major portion of NATO's committed sea power and 3/4 of its air power and have, in fact, increased their armed forces substantially over the last ten years. They now maintain about 3 million men under arms. As significantly, they have made great qualitative improvements in their forces and equipment which have culminated in the very important European Defense Improvement Program now under way.

As for our balance of payments drain, the most recent offset agreement provides us with $2.034 billion through purchases of weapons and medium-term securities, which should ease this problem certainly for the time being.

I must confess I do not see any encouraging prospect in the Mutual Balanced Force reductions now under consideration. It seems to be more of a hope by which domestic U.S. pressures for U.S. troop withdrawals could be accommodated than any realistic prospect of an equitably balanced reduction of forces. There could be benefits in a carefully balanced mutual thinning out of forces, particularly if this is well prepared, and the negotiations took into account the geographic advantages of the Soviet Union's proximity to the European continent. On the other hand, I very much doubt that the Soviet Union would be disposed to make sufficient concessions to balance this a symmetry; or that its interests in the GDR and in Eastern Europe would permit it, in any case, to withdraw more than a small percentage of its forces. In other words, I do not believe that there is much prospect of MBFR talks safely producing the kind of reductions necessary to satisfy Senator Mansfield and others who press for a major U.S. force withdrawal. Moreover, it seems that negotiations, considering all the inner European political, as well as security, implications, could quickly become extremely complicated.

In short, I doubt that our national interest in Europe will be served by placing our main reliance on MBFR. Certainly it is not advanced by the current annual debates threatening unilateral reductions on the basis of invidious comparisons between U.S. and European defense contributions. The whole situation would benefit if we were to return to more fundamental questions, such as a realistic reappraisal of the kind of Europe it will be in our best interests to encourage and support. I believe we have not examined this question for some time, either in the government or in the nation as a whole. If such a debate took place, I think we would once more conclude that Europe is at least as important to us as Moscow or Peking, and we would then be able to go on with new confidence to more specific problems, for instance, how to revitalize the Atlantic partnership and redistribute our respective defense roles.

I believe there are a number of meaningful steps which could be taken towards this end. In the short term, I believe much will depend on the ability of the President and Congress to reawaken American understanding of the European question and to provide greater support for necessary policies. One approach might involve the convening of an Atlantic Summit Conference, perhaps shortly after the beginning of the next presidential term, to balance the emphasis currently being placed on Moscow and Peking. We could breathe new life into the NATO partnership, reassure our Allies of our continued commitment as they approach a European Security Conference; and further strengthen new forms of political and military cooperation. Such an endeavor would be greatly strengthened to the extent that it enjoyed a solid basis of Congressional support. In this connection I think ways should be sought, and probably could be found, to redistribute the defense burdens in the longer run. I believe this would give us a much sounder hope of some force reductions without loss of leverage in the present decisive phase of European affairs.

I would particularly suggest that more intensive thought be given to the possibility of encouraging some greater degree of European nuclear cooperation, an idea which is arousing more interest in Europe these days than is generally realized. For the Europeans such a scheme would be a timely hedge against possible U.S. withdrawal into isolationism and would assure that Germany would not drift off into an independent neutralism. Moreover, the continued political evolution of the European Community also offers more promise than is generally recognized as a base for such cooperation. If the problems of including Germany in the planning and relating such a European force to ours could be solved, Europe would be sufficiently united and secure to justify substantial future reductions.

As to how long we should maintain our troops in Europe—whether for a few years longer, or indefinitely—it is not easy to say. I cannot give a definitive answer. Certainly I would not say forever, but until some more persuasive indications of a change in Soviet attitudes toward Europe evolves, I incline to the view that we should plan to keep a substantial force there as long as the host countries want them and the host nations are reasonably forthcoming in assuming an equitable share of the costs of keeping them there. The question really is: where do such troops now most effectively protect the peace and deter aggression, whether the threat be conventional or nuclear? For the present, at least, it seems to me the answer to this question is clear. Their presence in Europe today has a much greater impact on these objectives than would their presence, say in Fort Knox, have. As long as this condition continues, I should say keep them there. They cost about as much in one place as in the other, taking into account the offsets and the assumption of certain costs of maintenance now undertaken by the hosts. In the meantime we should adopt a policy in respect to them which is understandable to our Allies and has some convincing continuity. The cat and mouse tactics we have been employing recently whereby Europe shivers in uncertainty from one appropriation bill to another vitiates in large part the whole purpose for which the troops are there. The confidence that their presence has previously instilled is in danger of being shattered by recurrent debates on the issue. One day the hosts could not be blamed if they said, "we had better forego the whole thing and move toward a more neutralist attitude."

There is another aspect of the stationing of these troops abroad on which I would like to comment. A few years ago I negotiated the so-called Tripartite Agreements on behalf of the government. From the number of troops we had then stationed in Europe, it was agreed we would return a certain amount to the United States. We then gave assurances, however, that we would return them for training purposes in Germany during the course of each year. We made much of the C5 capacity we were about to have to enable us to do this. I have now heard that appropriations are being held up which would enable us to make good on that commitment. I protested vigorously when my Allied negotiators at the time suggested that commitments under such an arrangement were unreliable. If we do not live up to that agreement now, we will introduce a new note of uncertainty into our relations and raise serious doubts, rather than confidence, in our reliability as a nation and in our intentions.

I should add that, for a number of reasons, I personally have never laid great store by our will or capacity to reinforce the European theatre effectively by air in an actual crisis, and have therefore thought it all the more important to provide for substantial permanent station compliments. The air busing of troops is not a simple matter even in peace time. Their heavier equipment must be stored, properly maintained and regularly inspected in two places if it is to be promptly available at the terminus of the flight. In time of tension, moreover, the dispatch of large numbers of troops by air may not be practicable. Such a flight would be quite spectacular and could greatly complicate the then existing political situation. It could well provoke counteraction that would frustrate all attempts to "cool" the situation. In time of actual hostilities, the flights could be most hazardous since it would not take much time to render the European runways unusable and European based attack planes could inflict great casualties and confuse the operation.

Hence, while we have a solemn international obligation to support those exercises at the agreed level, which we must keep, I would not consider placing any heavier reliance on the "dual-basing" concept a desirable or realistic alternative to the stationing of U.S. troops in Europe.

As for burden sharing, we should recognize that each of us has his security definitely enhanced by the stationing of our troops in Europe. Since we take the full cost of maintaining the strategic nuclear deterrent and we also assume the full cost of our Sixth Fleet operations in the Mediterranean, it would seem reasonable and fitting that some of the operating costs of stationing our troops in Europe be undertaken by the host countries. I believe we should, of course, pay our own troops, feed, clothe and equip them with the arms, tools and vehicles they require. To depend on the hosts to assume such expenses, or even to share in them, I believe, would put them on an inappropriately mercenary basis. On the other hand, certain installation and infrastructure costs could well be assumed by the host, at least from here out. We should not seek current reimbursement for any such costs already incurred by us. The details of such a division could, and should, be worked out in the discussions that might take place in the high level Atlantic Conference which I have suggested should convene in the relatively near future.

There is another aspect to this question which, though a little difficult to describe, is nonetheless real. It relates to the future orientation of West Germany, and it is accented by the emerging Ostpolitik as the outstanding image of the Brandt Government.

Germany is clearly the dominant industrial and economic force in Europe today. The direction in which Germany goes will in all probability be the direction in which a united Europe goes. Certainly if there is to be cohesion in Europe, Germany must not be oriented one way and Europe the other.

In the past it has been the ambivalence of Germany which has caused much of our troubles. Never allied firmly with either East or West, Germany was destined to attack both.

It is essential for European and Western

stability that Germany be confident of her security. Today she finds that her security for the first time in history reposes in the West—the West now includes the Atlantic. As long as this confidence continues, Germany will find herself comfortable in the Western Alliance. If she loses confidence in the U.S. deterrent as part of the Western European security community of which she is a part, the more uncertain her future alignments become.

After all it is Germany which has the most exposed position to the East. Everything reasonable should be done to cement that confidence as it is probably that sense of confidence which most effectively ensures the cohesion of Western Europe, the Atlantic Alliance and the whole stability of the present balance of world forces. Germany's desire for the presence of U.S. troops on her soil should be given great weight.

A Western Germany confident in its own security is a force for stability and peace and the close association of the United States with the concept of that security is not only an assurance of the continuity of the Alliance but it should also be a source of some comfort to the Soviet Union as it would ensure that no unprovoked adventures could be undertaken by Germany in the East without Western concurrence—a concurrence that Western Europe and the United States would certainly withhold.

In concluding I would urge that until we can focus more seriously on the most important of all of our international relationships, i.e. those with Europe, we should refrain from taking either actual or symbolic steps which could lose us an opportunity at this critical point of history to put our policies with respect to Europe again on a constant long range basis. This is a crucial time what with Britains entry into the Common Market, the trip to Peking, the trip to Moscow, detente, Ostpolitik, the European Security Conference, as well as our recent demands on the economic and monetary front most of which is primarily related to Europe. This, I suspect, is not the time to take steps in the thought of reaping some short term benefits, either locally or internationally at the risk of prejudicing our very real and fundamental long term interests.

This statement is too long and not as well organized as I would wish it to be, but it takes a long time to prepare a good short statement on an important subject. I apologize for its length, I should be glad to try to answer your questions.

JOHN J. McCLOY—BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

John J. McCloy, partner of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy, has served as The Assistant Secretary of War; President of the World Bank; U.S. Military Governor and High Commissioner for Germany; Chairman of the Board of Directors of The Chase Manhattan Bank and Chairman of the Board of Trustees of The Ford Foundation. He was for a number of years a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. Early in January, 1961, Mr. McCloy was named by the late President Kennedy as his Advisor on Disarmament Matters, which post he held until October, 1961, when the permanent U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established. He is now Chairman of the General Advisory Committee on Disarmament. Early in December, 1963, Mr. McCloy was named by President Johnson to serve on the Presidential Commission to Investigate the Assassination of President Kennedy.

Mr. McCloy became Chairman of The Chase National Bank on January 19, 1953, succeeding Winthrop W. Aldrich, who left the Bank to become Ambassador to Great Britain. During Mr. McCloy's tenure as Chairman, The Chase National and The Bank of the Manhattan Company merged in April, 1955, to form The Chase Manhattan Bank. Mr. McCloy retired as Chairman December 31, 1960.

Born on March 31, 1895, Mr. McCloy attended The Peddie School and received his B.A. from Amherst College in 1916 and his LL.B. from Harvard Law School in 1921. He was in the U.S. Army from 1917 to 1919, serving as a captain in the field artillery with the A.E.F. in France.

Mr. McCloy was for many years a member of the firm of Cravath, DeGersdorff, Swaine & Wood, and in 1940 he retired from the firm to become a consultant to Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. From 1941 to 1945, he was The Assistant Secretary of War.

In 1947, after a year with the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope, Hadley & McCloy, he was appointed President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). From 1949 to 1952, he was successively U.S. Military Governor and U.S. High Commissioner for Germany.

Mr. McCloy is Chairman of the Executive Committee of Squibb Corporation. He is Chairman of the Board of the United Nations Development Corporation and The Salk Institute, La Jolla, California. He is a Director of The Dreyfus Corporation and the Stott Capital Development Corporation. He is a retired Director of Allied Chemical Corporation; American Telephone and Telegraph Company; The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A.; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and Westinghouse Electric Corporation.

His other affiliations include the following:

Honorary Chairman of the Board of Trustees and Trustee Emeritus of Amherst College; Trustee of Deerfield Academy; Honorary Member of the Board of Political Science, Columbia University; Trustee Emeritus of Johns Hopkins University; Honorary Trustee of the Lenox Hill Hospital; Treasurer and Trustee of the American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece and member of the Committee of the Board of Overseers to Visit the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University.

Chairman of the Committee for Modern Courts, Inc.; Member of the American Bar Association; The American Society of International Law; Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut; the New York County Lawyers' Association and the New York State Bar Association.

Honorary Chairman of the Board of the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc. and International House; a member of the Board of Governors of The Atlantic Institute; Trustee of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce and Trustee of the Army Relief Society.

Mr. McCloy belongs to the Anglers', Bond, Century, Links, Wall Street and University Clubs in New York; the Clove Valley Rod & Gun Club of La Grangeville, New York; Conetquot River Club, Inc. of Oakdale, New York; and Metropolitan Club in Washington, D.C.

He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Medal of Freedom and the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany. He is a Grand Officer of the Legion of Honor of France and a Grand Officer of the Order of Merit of Italy.

Mr. McCloy is an Honorary Member of the Senat of Johann Wolfgang Goethe University in Frankfurt, Germany; and the Friedrich Wilhelm University in Bonn, Germany; Honorary Citizen of the Free University of Berlin, Germany. He has received honorary LL.D. degrees from Amherst, Boston College, Brown, Colby, Columbia, Dartmouth, Franklin and Marshall, Harvard, Haverford College, Lehigh University, New York University, Middlebury College, Princeton, Syracuse, Trinity, University of Maryland, University of Notre Dame, University of Pennsylvania, Swarthmore College, Yale, Williams College and Wilmington College. He was also awarded a D.C.L. by Washington College and an honorary degree by the Technical University of Berlin.

Mr. McCloy and his wife, the former Ellen Zinsser, live in New York City. They have a son, John Jay II, and a daughter, Ellen Zinsser McCloy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. CARNEY), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCKAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STOKES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOCH, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ICHORD, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON to include extraneous matter in special order today.

Mr. GROSS, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. KUYKENDALL in two instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. COLLIER in two instances.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. KEITH.
Mr. FRENZEL.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. HALPERN in two instances.
Mr. HASTINGS.
Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. GOLDWATER.
Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.
Mr. MAYNE.
Mr. ANDREWS in two instances.
Mr. KEMP in two instances.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCKAY) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in three instances.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. RODINO in three instances.
Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in three instances.
Mr. LENNON.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN in two instances.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. BARING.
Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.
Mr. DORN in three instances.
Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
Mr. ROE in five instances.
Mr. ABBITT.
Mr. DINGELL in three instances.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. PURCELL in two instances.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. BRASCO in two instances.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. RONCALIO in four instances.
Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. SYMINGTON.
Mr. WOLFF in three instances.
Mr. MATHIS of Georgia.
Mr. DIGGS.
Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 15, 1972, present to the President, for his approval a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 12910. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; and

H.J. Res. 1097. A joint resolution making certain urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 20, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1747. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the 24th annual report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 883 of the 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1748. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according 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.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1749. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Civilian Health and War-Related Casualty Program in Vietnam—1 Year Later"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1750. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems in making the Labor Department's concentrated employment program work in rural Mississippi; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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:

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 557. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report 92–911 (Rept. No. 92–924). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 550. Concurrent resolution providing for the installation of security apparatus for the protection of the Capitol complex (Rept. No. 92–925). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on statistical activities of the Federal Government, 1971 (Rept. No. 92–926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on census programs and postal systems of several countries in southeastern Asia (Rept. No. 92–927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 8395. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabiliation services and for vocational evaluation and work adjustment, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with sensory disabilities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of Union.

Mr. WAGGONNER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11200. A bill to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the exempt status of clubs; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. STEPHENS):

H.R. 13853. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 13854. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to workers' readjustment allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DOW, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 13855. A bill to provide for the protection of children against injury caused or threatened by the persons responsible for their care through a program of grants to States for the development of child abuse prevention programs (including the enactment and enforcement of child abuse laws and the punishment of child abusers); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 13856. A bill to provide for the protection of children against injury caused or threatened by the persons responsible for their care through a program of grants to States for the development of child abuse prevention programs (including the enactment and enforcement of child abuse laws and the punishment of child abusers); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. NIX, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 13857. A bill to gear the income tax more closely to an individual's ability to pay, to broaden the income tax base of individuals and corporations, and to otherwise reform the income and estate tax provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. KOCH, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mrs. ABZUG):

H.R. 13858. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in order to provide for the registration of manufacturers of cosmetics, the testing of cosmetics, and the labeling of cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 13859. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the full amount of payments under any public retirement or annuity program be excluded as

income for the purpose of determining eligibility for veteran's or widow's pension or parent's dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13860. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder with a $100 minimum primary benefit, to increase the amount of earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes, and to make appropriate adjustments in social security tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 13861. A bill to affirm the President's power to impound appropriated funds, subject to the right of either House of Congress to disapprove any such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 13862. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Air Pollution Control Act to increase the penalties for violation of regulations to protect and improve air quality in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H.R. 13863. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to furnish assistance for the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13864. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who have died while employed by an air carrier or foreign air carrier after 25 or more years of such employment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers and firemen shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BELL, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 13866. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 13867. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to expand American exports by utilizing U.S.-owned foreign currencies to pay import duties on such goods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 13868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FREY, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 13869. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, widower, or parent shall not terminate his or her entitlement to widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefits or reduce the amount thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIX, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 13870. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, widower, or parent shall not terminate his or her entitlement to widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefits or reduce the amount thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13871. A bill to establish more effective community planning and development programs (and expand the related provisions of existing programs) with particular emphasis upon assistance to small communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 13872. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 13873. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 13874. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage and assist in the development on a demonstration basis of several carefully planned projects to meet the special health care and related needs of elderly persons in a campus-type setting; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13875. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the National Institute of Gerontology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 13876. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1966, relating to the care of certain animals used for purposes of research, experimentation, exhibition, or held for sale as pets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. LONG of Maryland):

H.R. 13877. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 13878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 13879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 13880. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations to fully fund bilingual education programs under title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 13881. A bill to provide financial assistance for the construction and operation of senior citizens' community centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13882. A bill to amend Community Mental Health Centers Amendments Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13883. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to add thereto a new title XX under which aged individuals will be assured a minimum annual income of $3,500 in the case of single individuals, and $5,000 in the case of married couples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. DOW, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PIKE, and Mr. REES):

H.R. 13884. A bill to establish a commission to investigate and study the practice of clear cutting of timber resources of the United States on Federal lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RONCALIO (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. DOW, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 13885. A bill to establish a commission to investigate and study the practice of clear-cutting of timber resources of the United States on Federal lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13886. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an annual clothing allowance to certain veterans who, because of a service-connected disability, wear a prosthetic appliance or use an appliance or device which tends to wear out or tear their clothing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13887. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the period of presumption of service connection for certain cases of multiple sclerosis from 7 to 10 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13888. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 13889. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain persons eligible for retired pay for non-Regular service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 13890. A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for repair or construction work on or about the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13891. A bill to abolish the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, to repeal the authority for the extension of the west central front of the U.S. Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13892. A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for the restoration or exten-

sion of the west central front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 13893. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to lobbying by certain types of exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13894. A bill to amend the Constitution of the United States with respect to the attendance of Senators and Representatives at sessions of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HOGAN, and Mr. HILLIS):

H.R. 13895. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 13896. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as amended, to require a study of the environmental impact of mineral exploration in the Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DORN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOSMER, and Mr. ASPIN):

H.J. Res. 1115. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the attendance of Senators and Representatives at sessions of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. WARE, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. MCCLURE):

H.J. Res. 1116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the attendance of Senators and Representatives at sessions of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 564. Concurrent resolution to seek the resurrection of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 565. Concurrent resolution: Congressional spending limitations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Con. Res. 566. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the declaration of policy contained in section 101, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 567. Concurrent resolution to revise the formula for distributing special drawing rights; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ASPIN presented a bill (H.R. 13897) for the relief of Harvey E. Ward, which was referred 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:

199. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Congress of Micronesia, Capitol Hill, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to making the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

200. Also, petition of the Congress of Micronesia, Capitol Hill, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to the appointment and retention of Prof. Harrop A. Freeman, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

201. Also, petition of the Congress of Micronesia, Capitol Hill, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to allowing the Congress of Micronesia to take part in the process of selecting the High Commissioner, the Deputy High Commissioner, the Chief Justice, and the associate justices of the trust territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHO RIDES THE BUS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul Parks, the author of this eloquent letter on the emotionally charged subject of school busing is a man with unsurpassed credentials in the field of integrated education. For many years he was chairman of the education committee of the Greater Boston Chapter of the NAACP. Since January 19, 1968, he has been the administrator of one of the most successful model cities programs in the Nation located in Boston. And it is important to note in this connection that the area served by the Boston model cities program is genuinely racially integrated with large numbers of whites and blacks and growing numbers of Spanish-speaking Americans making up its population. It is indicative of Mr. Parks' deep commitment to the creation of a just and integrated society in America that he has presided over the program in a manner that has increased racial harmony.

I commend Mr. Parks' letter to every Member of this body and it is my earnest hope that it will be given consideration by the House in our future votes on busing.

The letter follows:

MODEL CITY ADMINISTRATION,
Boston, Mass., February 22, 1972.

Representative MICHAEL HARRINGTON,
Longworth Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARRINGTON: I would like to take this opportunity to express my dissatisfaction at the possibility of seeing the Congress support constitutional amendments on the busing of school children. The issue is not now nor has it ever been the question of busing school children; the question happens to be a question of who rides the school bus and what school location does the bus ride end. To talk about quality education without integration is an absolute folly because it was not until white children began to be bused to what was formally all black schools that people began to raise very vociferously the discussion of busing which underscored the fact that the schools were not up to the standards of the schools they had previously attended.

This was an open omission of the fact that they considered the black children whom their children were going to be sitting beside as inferior children or the schools they were attending were inferior. For what other reason would one have at showing such deep concern about the children's involvement in what should be an enlightening educational experience that was created by a bus ride.

I think that there are some very dangerous and serious implications in creating constitutional amendments that would say people have a choice in making the decision as to whether or not their children should be bused to create an integrated system. People could say under most of the amendments that are being proposed that they disapproved or approve of having their children take the bus ride. What they are saying by disapproval is they are opposed (in most cases) to children being in an integrated educational setting.

If we pass a constitutional amendment to prohibit busing of children, we could well be setting a precedent for other constitutional amendments that would allow owners of hotels, restaurants, etc., to decide who they should or should not serve based on the race of the customer. We will be turning back the clock very seriously and once again we will be opening up the possibility of inhumane treatment being perpetrated on black people in America.

I think we should make it unalterably clear that busing is not the issue, but school integration is the issue and the opponents of bus rides are using the bus as a tactic to keep from carrying out a reasonable integration plan.

Even as I hear the governor of Florida talk about a referendum that eliminates busing, but supports quality education, on the surface these two positions are in direct opposition to each other. I also feel strongly that the President by setting the tenor of opposition to busing is de-watering the mandate of the 1954 Supreme Court decision and probably also unwittingly is setting a climate for people to defy the rulings of the Supreme Court. We are moving into a very, very dangerous period in terms of creating a wholesome climate for the continuing posture of interaction between blacks and whites. There are people within the black community who are interested in developing a constituency that would support the separation of the races who see no answer to the racial question in America other than a violent confrontation between the races. The President is again unwillingly adding fuel to that fire. By supporting these kinds of forces as he speaks to the issue of making the constitutional provision that the busing of school children to obtain integration is in fact unconstitutional.

It is for these reasons that I feel very strongly that these constitutional amendments must be defeated and that we must get on about the job of creating an integrated school system throughout our nation and also an integrated society and thus eliminate the impending threat that we will legally commit ourselves to the support of destructive forces that would create a system of violence in our nation.

I also hope that neither the Congress nor the President is using the threat of constitutional amendments as a tactic to force the