

Cortez, Ida Marie
 Dault, Judith A.
 Doms, Kathleen Diane
 Elsesser, Mary Ann
 Gierman, Richard Lawrence
 Goss, Barbara Ann
 Henderson, Rebecca Roberto
 Hughes, Barbara Ellen
 Jordan, Janice Yvonne
 Keller, Patricia Jane
 Klefman, Gloria Gay
 Kondash, Anna Marie
 Krzewinski, Barbara Ann
 Laflamme, Marguerite Anna
 Learned, Charles Everett
 McOske, Susan Elizabeth
 Mencik, Barbara Ann
 Mitchell, Mary Catherine
 Monk, Judith Lynn
 Morris, Edward William
 Nye, Margaret Catherine
 Oberhausen, Karen A.
 Parks, Joyce Marie
 Peace, Shirley Ann
 Peace, Velia Decicco
 Pollock, Linda Sue
 Quayle, Leo Claude
 Raach, Carolyn Diane
 Rex, Anita Carmelita
 Rieder, Karen Anne
 Ryan, Kathleen Veronica
 Schneider, Victoria Ann
 Snider, Stephen Emmet
 Stokes, James Edmond
 Stratton, Mariann
 Vering, Wilma Gertrude
 Vivian, Sandra J.
 Walker, Raleigh Louis, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, March 19, 1974:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named Army Medical Department officers for temporary appointment

in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Robert Wesley Green, [xxx-xx-] [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Marshall Edward McCabe, [xxx-xx-] [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Col. Philip Augustus Deffer, [xxx-xx-xxx] Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Floyd Wilmer Baker, [xxx-xx-xxxx] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Edward Henry Vogel, Jr., [xxx-xx-] [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. George Joseph Hayes, [xxx-xx-] [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Marshall Edward McCabe, [xxx-xx-] [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Wesley Green, [xxx-xx-] [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Medical Service Corps

Brig. Gen. John Edward Haggerty, [xxx-xx-] [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Service Corps, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James M. Montgomery John A. Walsh

Lee W. Fisher Thomas J. Hughes, Jr.

Earl B. Fowler, Jr. Frederick F. Palmer

Kent J. Carroll William D. Robertson

Claude P. Ekas, Jr. Jr.

Robert B. McClinton Norman K. Green

Murray C. Cook Albert J. Monger

John C. Dixon, Jr. John H. Alvis

James B. Linder Donald P. Hall

Richard E. Nicholson Lucien Capone, Jr.

Roy D. Snyder, Jr. Arthur K. Knoizen

Sylvester R. Foley, Jr. Paul H. Speer

Edward W. Carter III William P. Lawrence

Bobby R. Inman Gerald E. Thomas

Steven A. White Hugh A. Benton

"M" Staser Holcomb Robert W. Cheowing

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning Loren K. Acker, to be first lieutenant, and ending Daniel B. Satterley, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 1974.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning Russell A. Duke to be colonel, and ending David E. Head, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 1974.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations beginning Vincent A. Albers, Jr., to be colonel, and ending David A. Zucker, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 1974.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 19, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Floyd H. Gayles, St. James Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

My mouth shall speak of wisdom, and the meditation of my heart shall be of understanding.—Psalms 49: 3.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, the source of love, power, and wisdom, we come to Thee concerned with our needs, aware of our shortcomings, and yet confident that Thou wilt hear us pray. Lead us in the ways of justice, peace, and good will. Strengthen us to be diligent in performing our duties. Give us wisdom to make just decisions, and prepare us for the days ahead.

Bless Thou our beloved country and the institutions of this free land. Sustain with Thy power, and enlighten with Thy grace, the President, Speaker, and Members of Congress and all who are entrusted with our safety and security. Increase the faith of our people in government. Lord, help us to remember that we should be guided by Thy spirit. For not by might or power but by My spirit says the Lord of Hosts.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1974, I was present and voting on rollcall No. 85, but although I inserted my card, for some reason my vote was not tabulated. I would like to have the RECORD show that had my vote been properly recorded, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 85.

On March 18, 1974, I was detained in my district, and so missed rollcall No. 91. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ERNEST PETINAUD TO RECEIVE JOHN W. McCORMACK ANNUAL AWARD

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Ernest

Petinaud, who retired in December as headwaiter of the U.S. House of Representatives restaurant, will be the 1973 recipient of the John W. McCormack Annual Award of Excellence to Congressional Employees.

The ceremony will take place in the Rayburn reception room of the U.S. Capitol on Thursday, March 21, 1974, at 10:30 a.m.

On March 4, 1925, the day Calvin Coolidge was inaugurated President, Ernest Petinaud began his career working for the House of Representatives. He was a member of the staff of the House restaurant until 1930 when he left to work in New York. Mr. Petinaud returned to the House restaurant in 1938, and from that time forward he made lasting friendships with the Members of Congress and their wives and guests. Ernest never forgot a name, and his outgoing manner earned him the title of "ambassador of good will" from the House of Representatives. Among the thousands of Members welcomed to the House restaurant by Mr. Petinaud, there were three freshmen Congressmen who later became Presidents of the United States: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon.

Since retirement, Mr. Petinaud has devoted his time to social endeavors through his longstanding memberships

March 19, 1974

in the Victory Lodge in Free Masonry, and in the Jonathan Davis Consistory in the Scottish Rite.

The John W. McCormack Annual Award was established in 1970 as a commemoration to the distinguished and dedicated service of the former Speaker during his 45 years in Congress. Previous recipients of the award are: 1970, Lewis Deschler, House Parliamentarian; 1971, Turner N. Robertson, Chief Page; 1972, Robert M. Menaugh, Superintendent, Radio and Television Gallery.

The Vice President, the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, and many Members of the House are expected to be present for the ceremony.

It would be delightful to all of us to honor Ernest in being at the reception in the reception room on Thursday, March 21 at 10:30. We can pay him great respect for the diligence, the duty, and kindness he has shown to so many.

CLEAR AS MUD—NOT ROGER BUT THE USUAL KIND

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, tonight, when the President responds in Houston to questions of news broadcasters, I hope he is asked and clearly answers what policy this administration has to help stabilize fair beef prices.

Last summer the Cost of Living Council unwisely interfered with the beef market and caused disruption in confidence by consumers of adequate supplies of beef and likewise confidence of producers was shaken by threats of future rollbacks of prices which caused them to wonder if they should continue to produce at high levels.

So far the outcome has satisfied no one. Producers sold cattle for a short time at record high prices and consumers paid temporarily record high prices. Since then prices for cattle have dropped one-third but retail prices have been clinging to high levels. Only in recent days has there been a little retail adjustment to reflect that drop of prices for cattle so consumers would get a fair break and get more beef for their dollar.

The question I hope the President answers tonight in Houston is why this administration with its thousands of data experts in the Department of Agriculture does not establish the relationship of normal economic principles—when the price of cattle drops why do the consumers not get a better deal in buying beef?

The answer supplied lately by Washington economic experts of this administration has been as clear as mud of the usual kind—not the network Roger Mudd of television who is better at reporting on this subject than is the administration.

The Nation deserves a clear answer as to why cattle feeders with losses due to high feed costs and a lower cattle market go broke while consumers pay through the nose for hamburgers, roasts, and steak for their families.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY CAGNEY

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, last night I watched on television a tribute to Jimmy Cagney, one of the all-time great American actors. As I watched the show, I realized Jimmy represents much of what this great land of ours is all about—fun, toughness, humor, love, and above all, pride.

When he was portraying the role of George M. Cohan, his pride in the United States shown brightly as he sang and danced, "I'm a Yankee Doodle Dandy," "Give My Regards to Broadway," and, "You're a Grand Old Flag."

It made me realize how long it has been since I have seen someone wear their love for our country right on their sleeve for all to see.

I must admit, it made me long for the day when all the people of the United States will again feel that they can stand and let all the world know that we are proud of our country and that we are willing to wear our love for it right on our sleeve and in our hearts.

EASTERN SHORE CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest college basketball teams in the country will do battle once again this evening, in the National Invitational Tournament at Madison Square Garden. While their larger affiliate in College Park, Md., has been grabbing a good share of the headlines this year, the country folks from the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore have been whipping team after team among the small colleges.

Led by coach John Bates, the Hawks of Maryland-Eastern Shore won their first game in the NIT last Saturday night, beating Manhattan 84-81. Tonight, and with all due respect to the gentlemen from Florida (Mr. BENNETT and Mr. CHAPPELL), I predict Maryland-Eastern Shore will similarly be the victors over Jacksonville, a fine team that cannot be blamed if they are not quite as good as the talented young men from the Eastern Shore.

The Hawks' dazzling play, their long jump shots, and their own special brand of dunking have bewildered dozens of other college teams, and those of us who live on the Eastern Shore of Maryland are proud indeed to cheer on this fine team in the NIT.

THE GLENDO ROAD

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

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will allow the Bureau of Reclamation to contribute toward the reconstruction of a public road originally

built by the Bureau on the left abutment of Glendo Dam in Wyoming.

The road was originally built by the Bureau during construction of Glendo Dam. Following completion of the dam, the road was turned over to Platte County, Wyo., for local use and maintenance. Glendo Dam Reservoir and immediate vicinity has since been incorporated into the Glendo State Park under the administration of the Wyoming Recreation Commission.

Since its construction the road has been difficult to maintain. Neither Platte County nor the State recreation commission, has had the equipment required or funds to rebuild the road. It is not only used by boaters, fishermen, and other recreationists, but also as a major route by local ranchers, farmers, schoolbuses, and others. The Bureau has contributed as it could under current authority to correct and maintain the road in its present state. However, a major slide in 1966 has made maintenance almost impossible under the current arrangement. Restabilizing the slope of the mountain, resolving the underground drainage of water, and stabilizing the down side of the road fill into the canyon are all required to reopen the road to two-way traffic. The Wyoming State Highway Department estimates the total cost at \$175,000.

The Bureau is willing to assist in providing funds for this necessary correction work, however, under current law, even though the Bureau constructed the road during the building of Glendo Dam, it is not authorized to assist. The bill which I am introducing today would give the Bureau the authorization necessary to relocate, reconstruct, and rehabilitate those portions of this roadway which have become a hazard and a menace to all those who must use it day to day.

EUROPEAN CRITICISM OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of exception to the criticism being leveled at the United States from abroad because of the President's insistence on European cooperation on matters involving U.S. economic and political problems. I do not think that this is asking too much. For too long, Europe has gladly accepted economic and military assistance we have provided, but has looked the other way whenever we have begun to experience problems—problems, I might add, that have not only affected the United States, but Europe as well. Where would France be today had we not been there to lend a helping hand—economically and politically—in the postwar years or, most recently, when their currency was in danger?

Unmistakably, the question of European mutual defense, trade and economics, and politics are interrelated and cannot be considered as separate issues simply because some of our friends across the Atlantic would like for them

to be. The facts are the U.S. economy is lagging and Europe is looking the other way. Maintaining 320,000 troops in Europe does not help our overall economic situation.

Most of us would agree we must continue to maintain an adequate defense force in Europe, but we cannot be expected to continue to bear a disproportionate share of the burden if some of our economic and political related problems go unattended.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2535) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COL. JOHN H. SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2633) for the relief of Col. John H. Sherman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF THE LATE RICHARD BURTON, SFC, U.S. ARMY (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3533) for the relief of the estate of the late Richard Burton, SFC, U.S. Army (retired).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2508) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MURRAY SWARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6411) for the relief of Murray Swartz.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION TO REFER BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF ESTELLE M. FASS TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 362) to refer the bill (H.R. 7209) entitled "A bill for the relief of Estelle M. Fass" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RITA SWANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1342) for the relief of Rita Swann.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LEONARD ALFRED BROWNRISS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6229) for the relief of Leonard Alfred Brownrigg.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BOULOS STEPHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4438) for the relief of Boulos Stephan.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FAUSTINO MURGIA-MELENDREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7535) for the relief of Faustino Murgia-Melendrez.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROMEO LANCIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4172) for the relief of Romeo Lancin.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RUSSELL G. WELLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8545) for the relief of Russell G. Wells.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL INTERESTS IN LANDS IN FLORIDA TO JOHN CARTER AND MARTHA B. CARTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10626) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands in Florida to John Carter and Martha B. Carter.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JORGE MARIO BELL

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 205) for the relief of Jorge Mario Bell.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

KAMAL ANTOINE CHALABY

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 245) for the relief of Kamal Antoine Chalaby.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ERNEST EDWARD SCOFIELD (ERNESTO ESPINO)

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 428) for the relief of Ernest Edward Scofield (Ernesto Espino).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

March 19, 1974

WILHELM J. R. MALY

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 507) for the relief of Wilhelm J. R. Maly.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. JOZefa SOKOLOWSKA DOMANSKI

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 816) for the relief of Mrs. Jozefa Sokołowska Domanski.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MAHMOOD SHAREEF SULEIMAN

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 912) for the relief of Mahmood Shareef Suleiman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ZOSIMA TELEBANCO VAN ZANTEN

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 1673) for the relief of Mrs. Zosima Telebanco Van Zanten.

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

S. 1673

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Zosima Telebanco Van Zanten, the widow of Sergeant Sam J. Van Zanten, Junior, a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 201(b) of that Act and the provisions of section 204 of the said Act shall not be applicable in this case.

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

GEORGINA HENRIETTA HARRIS

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 1852) for the relief of Georgina Henrietta Harris.

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

S. 1852

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Georgina Henrietta Harris, the adopted daughter of Mrs. Esthyr Harris, a United States citizen, shall be held and considered to have met the residence and physical presence requirements of section 323 of such Act.

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

VO THI SUONG (NINI ANNE HOYT)

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 2112) for the relief of Vo Thi Suong (Nini Anne Hoyt).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUGUST F. WALZ

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 1615) for the relief of August F. Walz.

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

S. 1615

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, on such terms that it deems just, the United States Postal Service is authorized to compromise, release, or discharge in whole or in part the liability of August F. Walz, postmaster, United States Post Office, Wilmington, Delaware, of the sum of \$28,978.62 representing the amount of a revenue deficiency charged to his postal account as postmaster. Such deficiency resulting from unpaid postage on second-class transient mailings of the "Wilmington Suburban News" and the financial inability of the owner of such newspaper, and after his death, his estate to pay any part of such amount.

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

ROBERT J. MARTIN

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 1922) for the relief of Robert J. Martin.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, on such terms as it deems just, the United States Postal Service is authorized to compromise, release, or discharge in whole or in part the liability of Robert J. Martin, of Lake Carmel, New York, to the United States for the loss resulting from the theft of an amount of cash in his custody as a mail-truck driver, which was taken in a theft occurring on January 2, 1969.

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

MILDRED CHRISTINE FORD

The Clerk called the Senate bill (H.R. 1961) for the relief of Mildred Christine Ford.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LIDIA MYSLINSKA BOKOSKY

The Clerk called the Senate bill (H.R. 2537) for the relief of Lidia Myslinska Bokosky.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NEPTY MASAOU JONES

The Clerk called the Senate bill (H.R. 3203) for the relief of Nepty Masaou Jones.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MELISSA CATAMBAY GUTIERREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4590) for the relief of Melissa Catambay Gutierrez.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MILAGROS CATAMBAY GUTIERREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4591) for the relief of Milagros Catambay Gutierrez.

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

H.R. 4591

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Milagros Catambay Gutierrez may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Ulpian F. Gutierrez, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: Provided, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the names "Mr. and Mrs. Ulpian F. Gutierrez" and substitute "Mr. and Mrs. Ulpiano F. Gutierrez".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

URSULA E. MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5266) for the relief of Ursula E. Moore.

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

H.R. 5266

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ursula E. Moore, widow of Staff Sergeant John M. Moore, Junior, United States Army (224-40-8385), is relieved of all liability to the United States that resulted from the shipment of her household goods and personal effects from Nuremberg, Germany, to Pemberton, New Jersey, in May 1971, and the storage of such goods and effects, the expenses of which were held by the Department of the Army to be noncompensable under existing law.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ursula E. Moore, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid by her, or withheld from sums otherwise due her, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ursula E. Moore, of Pemberton, New Jersey, widow of the late Staff Sergeant John M. Moore, Junior, United States Army (XXXX), the sum of \$2,706.51 in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for reimbursement of amounts paid for storage and shipment of household goods from Germany to the United States in 1971. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

THOMAS C. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6202) for the relief of Thomas C. Johnson.

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

H.R. 6202

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Thomas C. Johnson, of Hingham, Massachusetts, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$2,382.94, representing overpayments of active duty pay received by him as a member of the United States Army for the period from July 5, 1967, to July 4, 1969, inclusive, as a result of an administrative error which, through no fault of his

own, occurred in crediting him with service in the advanced Reserve Officers Training Corps program. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Thomas C. Johnson, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

MRS. RITA PETERMANN BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7128) for the relief of Mrs. Rita Petermann Brown.

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

H.R. 7128

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$12,500 to Mrs. Rita Petermann Brown of New Orleans, Louisiana, in full settlement of her claims against the United States for an award under the Act of August 12, 1955 (Public Law 84-378, 69 Stat. 707, relating to the Texas City disaster), as amended, due her under the laws of the State of Texas based upon the injuries sustained by her former husband, Ross M. Petermann, in the Texas City disaster on April 16, 1947. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

EMMETT A. AND AGNES J. RATHBUN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7207) for the relief of Emmett A. and Agnes J. Rathbun.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

GIUSEPPE OTTAVIANO-GRECO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7685) for the relief of Giuseppe Ottaviano-Greco.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARY NOTARTHOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9393) for the relief of Mary Notarthomas.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RAYMOND MONROE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11392) for the relief of Raymond Monroe.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. GERTRUDE BERKLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2950) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Berkley.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

VIOLA BURROUGHS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7397) for the relief of Viola Burroughs.

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

H.R. 7397

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of removing a cloud on the title to certain land, the United States hereby quitclaims to Viola Burroughs, of Burlington, New Jersey, all right, title, and interest in and to all that certain frame dwelling house and lot for ground, situate on the north side of Federal Street, between Lawrence and York Streets, in the city of Burlington, in the county of Burlington and the State of New Jersey, bounded and described as follows, viz: Beginning on Federal Street at the southeast corner of the house now or late of Mary Vandergrift, and extending thence eastwardly, along Federal Street and parallel with said Vandergrift's line fifty feet; thence north eighteen degrees and twenty minutes east fifty-seven feet six inches to the line of now or late Amos Hutchin's lot; thence westwardly by his line twenty feet to the northeast corner of said Vandergrift's lot; thence southwardly by said lot sixty-six feet eleven inches to another corner of said Vandergrift; thence southwardly by the same, at right angles with Federal Street, fifty feet to the place of beginning.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3: After "Street" insert "twenty feet; thence northwardly at right angles with Federal Street".

Page 2, line 10: Strike "Vandergrift" and insert "lot".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

WILLIAM L. CAMERON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8322) for the relief of William L. Cameron, Jr.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JAMES A. WENTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8823) for the relief of James A. Wentz.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

UHEL D. POLLY

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 71) for the relief of Uhel D. Polly.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

RAPHAEL JOHNSON

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2533) for the relief of Raphael Johnson, with Senate amendments thereof, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "natural parents or".

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Gidharry" and insert "Johnson".

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Alabama if there is any change that has been made from the time the bill passed the House?

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding that these are merely technical amendments, and that there has been

no change from what was in the House bill.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGES IN DEFINITIONS OF WIDOW AND WIDOWER UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2174) to amend the civil service retirement system with respect to the definitions of widow and widower, as amended.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2174

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) clauses (1) (A) and (2) (A) of section 8341(a) of title 5, United States Code, are amended by striking out "2 years" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1 year".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall not apply in the cases of employees, Members, or annuitants who died before the date of enactment of this Act. The rights of such individuals and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if such amendments had not been enacted.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8339(f) (2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by deleting "greater" and inserting "greatest" in place thereof;

(2) by deleting the word "or" immediately after the semicolon at the end of clause (A);

(3) by redesignating clause (B) as clause (C); and

(4) by inserting immediately below clause (A) the following new clause (B):

"(B) the average pay of the Member; or".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to annuities paid for months beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 94]

Alexander Blatnik Burke, Fla.
Annunzio Bracco Carey, N.Y.
Ashley Burke, Calif. Chamberlain

Chappell	Harsha	Peyster
Chisholm	Hébert	Reid
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	Reuss
Collins, III.	Heinz	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	Hogan	Rose
Corman	Holifield	Ryan
Diggs	Horton	Satterfield
Dingell	Jarman	Sebelius
Dorn	Johnson, Colo.	Selberling
Drinan	King	Steed
Evans, Colo.	Lehman	Stephens
Fountain	McClory	Stubblefield
Fraser	Metcalf	Teague
Frelinghuysen	Minshall, Ohio	Waldie
Gettys	Mollohan	Whitten
Giamo	Moorhead, Pa.	Wilson,
Gibbons	Moss	Charles, Tex.
Goldwater	Murphy, Ill.	Yatron
Gray	Nix	Young, S.C.
Gude	O'Brien	
Hanrahan	Patman	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). On this rollcall 363 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

CHANGES IN DEFINITIONS OF WIDOW AND WIDOWER UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

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

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this bill. It passed the Senate unanimously. It was approved by our committee by a unanimous voice vote and the administration recommends enactment.

I have called it up under Suspension of the Rules because the annual cost of \$4.6 million is in excess of the cost which would qualify the bill for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

The primary purpose of the bill is to change the 2-year marriage requirement under the civil service retirement law to a 1-year requirement. This requirement applies only to the cases of surviving spouses of employees who died in service, and in the cases of surviving spouses acquired after retirement.

It does not apply to a spouse to whom an annuitant was married at the time of retirement as the law requires only that such a spouse be married at the time of retirement in order to be entitled to benefits.

Under a 1948 amendment (Public Law 80-426) to the retirement law, an employee could provide an annuity for his spouse by taking a reduction in his own annuity. To be eligible for the survivor annuity, the widow must have been married for at least 2 years immediately pre-

ceding his death, or have been the mother of his children born of their marriage.

The Civil Service Commission makes the point that the 2-year requirement was arbitrary and arose out of a compromise recommended by the conferees on the bill, some of whom recommended a 5-year marriage requirement.

The current trend is to liberalize the restriction. The Veterans' Administration marriage requirement for the payment of benefits to widows was amended to a 1-year requirement in 1967. The social security requirement was reduced in 1968 from 1 year to 9 months, as to 3 months in the case of an accidental death or a death in line of duty in the Armed Forces, and a subsequent law (Public Law 92-603) provides for a waiver of those requirements under certain circumstances.

Consequently, our committee unanimously recommended that the 2-year requirement be reduced to more nearly conform with the marriage requirement periods now provided in connection with comparable benefits under other laws.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I know of no opposition to this legislation and I urge the Members to vote in favor of S. 2174.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO S. 2174

The amendment to the bill is intended to correct a deficiency in the provisions of the retirement law (5 U.S.C. 8339(f) (2)), relating to a maximum civil service annuity. The deficiency arises because of the method of computing the annuity.

Under existing law, an annuity may not exceed 80 percent of the "average pay" in the case of an employee, and 80 percent of the "final basic pay" in the case of most Members.

The "final basic pay" of most Members currently is \$42,500, and in the case of Members serving in the leadership positions, is \$62,500 for the Speaker, and \$49,500 for the President pro tempore of the Senate and the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

However, when a Member who has served in one of the leadership positions subsequently serves as a Member, but not in a leadership position, his final basic pay currently is \$42,500. Consequently, such a Member loses all rights to have the higher rate of pay he received as a Member in a leadership position considered in determining his maximum annuity.

The amendment to the bill will permit the pay received while in a leadership position to be used in determining the maximum annuity to which a Member is entitled when he serves as a Member subsequent to service in a leadership position.

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to the bill; in fact, I am for it, but I would like to ask a question.

Mr. Speaker, I have in mind a situation, and I would like to know whether or not the bill would take care of it. Years ago, when I was practicing law, I was

consulted by the widow of a retired police officer. The circumstances were these:

The husband and wife had lived together and were married during all, or very nearly all, of his time in the police department. He then retired. They continued to be married for a number of years. For whatever reason, they got a divorce. Shortly after the divorce, the former husband married another lady. In a few weeks they, too, got a divorce, and a year or two later the original husband and original wife decided to get married again, and they did.

About 6 months later, the husband died of natural causes. We had this situation: The surviving widow had only been married to him for a period of 6 months immediately preceding the death of the annuitant, although they had been married for some 30 years, including all of the time in which the pension had been earned, and they were married at the time of his retirement, and at the time of his death.

I found in my research that, although this was an unusual situation, it was not unique. This situation, the interrupted marriage, does happen from time to time. What would be the effect of the bill which is now before us under that type of situation?

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the gentleman refers to a situation involving a city policeman, is that correct?

Mr. DANIELSON. That is correct.

Mr. DULSKI. This law deals with Federal employees.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that, but Federal people are no different than city people. The same factual situation could happen.

Mr. DULSKI. It would not change.

Mr. DANIELSON. Would the widow in that case have a right to claim the survivor's benefit even though she had been married to the annuitant only 6 months before his death; and even though she had been married to him for more than 30 years while the pension was being earned; and at the time he retired?

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the answer is "no."

Mr. DANIELSON. The gentleman's answer is "no," and I appreciate his candor. I would like respectfully to suggest to the chairman that this real situation which I have outlined does happen from time to time, and it works a real inequity on the surviving widow. Say that she was with him for 30 years while he earned the pension and, just due to human nature, they interrupted the marriage.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has to realize that this legislation merely deals with Federal employees. He is referring to a situation of civil employment with local governments. This legislation would have no application. However, it may set a precedent which they may follow.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman and agree with

the gentleman's comments, but it would be easy to change my real situation of a Los Angeles city policeman to a hypothetical case of an FBI agent or a civil service employee of the Post Office Department. They could be married for 30 years, the one could retire; 5 years later they get a divorce with remarriage intervening; another divorce, and now the original spouses are married again and he dies within 6 months.

Mr. DULSKI. This bill would not change it.

Mr. DANIELSON. The widow would not get the benefit?

Mr. DULSKI. That is right.

Mr. DANIELSON. This is an area that badly needs to be covered, because these cases happen, and I respectfully urge that the gentleman consider this matter in the next appropriate legislation that comes before his committee.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has my assurance that will be done.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2174, a bill which redefines "widow" and "widower," under the civil service retirement system. The Civil Service Commission and the Office of Management and Budget recommended enactment.

Present law defines a "widow" and "widower" as a surviving spouse who was married to the decedent for at least 2 years immediately prior to the date of death, or was the parent of a child by that marriage. This legislation would change the 2-year marriage requirement to a 1-year requirement.

In 1948, the Congress passed Public Law 80-426, establishing the 2-year marriage requirement. It was intended to protect against so-called death bed marriages. However, in the past decade the trend of other benefit systems operated by the Government has been to liberalize similar marriage requirements. For example, the Veterans' Administration in 1967, and the social security system in 1968, reduced their statutory marriage requirements to 1 year and 9 months, respectively.

According to the Civil Service Commission—

... this protection to the civil service retirement and disability fund given by this statutory restriction is (in practice) mostly nominal, and causes undue anxiety and concern on the part of the employee who desires to protect the interests of his widow.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation improves the survivor protection provisions of the civil service retirement system.

I support it.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that S. 2174 has come before us today. I compliment the chairman of the Post Office Committee, Mr. DULSKI, for bringing this matter to the floor.

The proposed changes are minor but a step in the right direction.

I would especially like to call this measure to the attention of the House conferees on the pension bill from the Education and Labor Committee. Unfortunately, the Education and Labor version of the pension bill, as passed by this House, contains a provision requir-

ing the participant and spouse to have been married for 5 years before the annuity starting date to be eligible. The Senate version of the pension reform bill contains no such outlandish provision. As the committee report accompanying S. 2174 clearly states, the trend in other benefit systems is toward liberalization of marriage requirements. If the history of the civil service retirement system can prove this I submit that the private pension system can also afford it. No one has made anything like a convincing case that "death-bed, December-May marriages are going to upset the system.

I urge the adoption of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2174, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend certain provisions of law defining widow and widower under the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NARCOTIC ADDICT TREATMENT ACT OF 1974

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12503) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the registration of practitioners conducting narcotic treatment programs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12503

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 "Narcotic Addict Treatment Act of 1974".

Sec. 2. Section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) is amended by adding the following after paragraph (26):

"(27) The term 'maintenance treatment' means the dispensing, for a period in excess of twenty-one days, of a narcotic drug in the treatment of an individual for dependence upon heroin or other morphine-like drugs.

"(28) The term 'detoxification treatment' means the dispensing, for a period not in excess of twenty-one days, of a narcotic drug in decreasing doses to an individual in order to alleviate adverse physiological or psychological effects incident to withdrawal from the continuous or sustained use of a narcotic drug and as a method of bringing the individual to a narcotic drug-free state within such period."

Sec. 3. Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended by adding the following after subsection (f):

"(g) Practitioners who dispense narcotic drugs to individuals for maintenance treatment or detoxification treatment shall obtain annually a separate registration for that purpose. The Attorney General shall register an applicant to dispense narcotic drugs to individuals for maintenance treatment or detoxification treatment (or both)—

"(1) if the applicant is a practitioner who is determined by the Secretary to be qualified (under standards established by the

Secretary) to engage in the treatment with respect to which registration is sought;

"(2) if the Attorney General determines that the applicant will comply with standards established by the Attorney General respecting (A) security of stocks of narcotic drugs for such treatment, and (B) the maintenance of records (in accordance with section 307) on such drugs; and

"(3) if the Secretary determines that the applicant will comply with standards established by the Secretary (after consultation with the Attorney General) respecting the quantities of narcotic drugs which may be provided for unsupervised use by individuals in such treatment."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 304(a) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 824(a)) is amended by adding after and below paragraph (3) the following: "A registration pursuant to section 303(g) to dispense a narcotic drug for maintenance treatment or detoxification treatment may be suspended or revoked by the Attorney General upon finding that the registrant has failed to comply with any standard referred to in section 303(g)."

(b) Section 304(d) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the first sentence the following: "A failure to comply with a standard referred to in section 303(g) may be treated under this subsection as grounds for immediate suspension of a registration granted under such section"; and (2) by striking out "Such suspension" and inserting in lieu thereof "A suspension under this subsection".

Sec. 5. Section 307(c)(1)(A) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 827(c)(1)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) with respect to any narcotic controlled substance in schedule II, III, IV, or V, to the prescribing or administering of such substance by a practitioner in the lawful course of his professional practice unless such substance was prescribed or administered in the course of maintaining treatment or detoxification treatment of an individual; or,"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Narcotic Addict Treatment Act of 1974 (H.R. 12503), a bill similar to S. 1115 passed by the Senate last year, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for registration of practitioners conducting narcotic treatment programs.

In hearings on this bill's predecessor, at which all witnesses including the administration's offered their support for the bill, the committee was pleased to learn, as we all must be, that the heroin epidemic which was sweeping our Nation has finally begun to subside. One of the important factors in turning the tide and turning heroin addicts away from that drug was the development of methadone treatment programs. The committee learned that methadone, while not a cure for the problem of heroin addiction, is being used effectively to treat some 73,000 addicts in over 2,000 programs across the Nation. At present these programs are operated under standards set out by the Food and Drug Administration and the Attorney General. While these standards have generally been adhered to,

there have been occasional abuses including cases in which methadone has been diverted for illegal sale.

To remedy this situation, and to avoid these problems in the future, the FDA has sought authority to register all such treatment programs. Registration would be granted to programs which satisfy medical standards set by the Food and Drug Administration and security and diversion standards set by the Drug Enforcement Administration. This would maintain the appropriate functions of these two agencies while coordinating their efforts to insure the necessary controls.

In addition to providing authority for the formulation of standards, the bill also provides that if a program is granted registration, but fails to maintain compliance with the standards, its registration will be revoked and the program will close.

This bill then, without authorizing any new appropriations, will make possible the continued benefit of methadone treatment programs in curbing heroin abuse, while eliminating possible abuses of the programs themselves. Therefore I call on you to join the committee, the administration, and me in backing this bill and giving it your vote.

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

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), for bringing before the House a bill as important as this one is to help provide an answer to one of the most serious problems affecting this Nation—that of narcotics addiction.

This is but one prong in attacking the serious drug problem we have in America. Concomitant, however, is the fact that we must try to reach the source of supply of the narcotics dealer. For it really is only at the source, according to law enforcement officials, that we can stop the traffic in narcotics.

I am happy to report to the House that after a 2-day session in Turkey, Congressman RANGEL and I have gotten from the Turkish Foreign Minister a decision that they would not begin opium production again this spring thereby keeping in force the agreement that was originally made with Turkey to ban opium production. Before the ban on growing in Turkey they did supply some 80 percent of the opium that went into the heroin that came to the American market through the "French Connection."

Additionally, we were informed that discussions between Turkish authorities, U.S. Ambassador William Macomber and American officials will be continued in an effort to resolve the differences.

If Turkey, at any future date, goes back into opium production—even on a limited basis—it will open up a pandora's box. Everyone concerned with narcotics and crime in America knows that we do not grow opium based heroin in this country and that the one way to stop heroin abuse is to stop heroin at its

source—the poppy. This is why the decision by Turkey is so important.

We learned that there are forces at work, including some greedy American pharmaceutical manufacturers and demagogic Turk politicians, attempting to make the opium culture an issue of "national independence from USA influence," by calling for a repudiation of the executive agreement entered into by both governments.

We must do all in our power to use every weapon at our command including the passage of this important bill before us today to eliminate the drug menace from our society.

I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

I may say that in congratulating the chairman the gentleman should also congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for the work they have done, because they have brought to us a good bill and one which we can support. I give them the credit because that is where it is due.

In fact, I think that all the members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment—Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. FREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUNNUT—deserve a commendation for the magnificent work they have done, and the hours of work as well, to support and improve the health of all our people.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my thanks to the good chairman.

This is perhaps one of the most important endeavors that this legislative body has embarked upon. It deals with one of the real problems that the youth of America and the youth of the world faces, namely, the danger of drug abuse. This bill seeks to assure the proper administration of drug abuse programs.

I thank the chairman for his efforts.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HUNNUT), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HUNNUT. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of H.R. 12503, I rise in support of this legislation. It calls for the highest degree of cooperation between the concerned agencies within the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the fight against drug abuse.

The Justice Department will be given greater power to identify and quickly act against those few practitioners who conduct treatment programs using narcotic drugs, especially methadone, improperly and thereby jeopardize their communities. In addition, it will provide a statutory complement to the FDA regulation of methadone, and provide more specific controls over diversions. Every possible means must be employed to insure proper treatment of narcotic addicts, while at the same time preventing diversions of the substitute drugs.

Evidence derived from the examination of methadone seized during arrests and from the examinations of arrest records suggests that most methadone diverted for illegal use and sale is derived

from unscrupulous activities of certain individual practitioners: negligent administrations of legitimate programs, individual patients participating in otherwise carefully operated programs who sell drugs prescribed to them to others; and armed robberies of clinics, thefts and hijackings from commerce and drugstore burglaries.

This bill is designed to help prevent such diversions, and I hope it will be given quick passage by the House and the Senate.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, again the chairman wants to say that he congratulates all of the subcommittee for the diligent work they have done not only on this bill but on the many other bills that have been brought to the floor which try to protect the health of the Nation.

At this time I yield to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12503, the Narcotic Addict Treatment Act, a bill reported unanimously from the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment after thorough hearings and careful consideration during executive session.

The diversion of methadone constitutes a serious health problem in this country. Several deaths are reported each year from overdoses of methadone and the abuse of the drug—sometimes in combination with heroin, sometimes by injection into the veins to get a "high"—is widespread. In Washington, D.C., methadone-related deaths accounted for 40 percent of total narcotic deaths during 1972. In late 1972 in Nassau County, N.Y., 29 of 60, and in Suffolk County, 7 of 11 narcotic deaths proved to be related to the use of methadone. Much of the diversion is a result of unscrupulous activities of certain individual practitioners or negligent administration of legitimate programs. This bill is designed to minimize the possibility of such activities.

Mr. Speaker, in December 1972, the Food and Drug Administration published regulations which cast methadone in a legal status somewhere between that of an investigational new drug—its previous status—and a new drug application, which allowed FDA to exert more controls over methadone. The import of the new regulations is that FDA now allows methadone to be distributed only in approved clinical facilities if it is to be used as a method of detoxification or maintenance or in a hospital pharmacy if it is used for treatment of pain. At present, there are approximately 60,000 addicts in methadone maintenance programs. Over 700 methadone maintenance facilities have been approved and around 3,000 hospitals have been approved to dispense methadone as a pain reliever.

Mr. Speaker, this bill facilitates enforcement of this policy by requiring a separate registration of practitioners by the Attorney General who wish to dispense or administer narcotic drugs in the course of treatment programs. Registration is based on three criteria: First, a determination by the Secretary of HEW that the applicant is qualified to engage

in such treatment for maintenance or detoxification; second, a determination by the Attorney General that the applicant will maintain proper security of stocks of narcotics and maintain proper records; and third, a determination by the Secretary of HEW that the applicant will comply with standards respecting the amount of narcotics that may be provided for unsupervised use by an individual undergoing treatment—takeout privileges.

The bill also provides that the Attorney General may revoke a registration upon a determination that the registrant has failed to comply with any of the above three standards. This last provision—ability to revoke the methadone registration—is what will make the bill work, because it will become far easier for the registration of a practitioner to be revoked if the facility for which he is responsible becomes the source of diverted methadone. Existing law—which does not provide authority for separate registration—authorizes revocation of the narcotic license only in cases of conviction of a felony, falsification of an application for a narcotic license, or revocation of State medical license. This new methadone registration procedure will make revocation easier. Of course, revocation of the methadone license is without prejudice to the status of the narcotic license or State license.

Mr. Speaker, there is a typographical error in the report. The last sentence in the third paragraph under the heading "Purpose" should read as follows:

Should the situation arise where practitioners are engaging in treatment which is neither purely maintenance, nor purely detoxification, there is ample authority under existing laws for suitable, flexible controls.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has administration support, and deserves the unanimous support of this House. I ask for its approval.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman. **Mr. ECKHARDT.** There was only one point on which I think there was some discussion in the committee on which reservations were held, and that was with respect to whether or not this registration was intended for the typical methadone control program or whether it would also apply in certain situations where the patient who is dependent on narcotic drugs and requires acute medical-surgical attention and is maintained on methadone or other narcotics until the acute medical or surgical problem has been dealt with—whether or not that would also be covered and whether it would unduly restrict a doctor.

A note in the report on the legislation deals with that and makes it clear that the legislation does not restrict doctors in that kind of action or in exercising the ordinary judgment that they could exercise but for the provisions of this act.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman did express his concern on that, as did the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), who is very much interested in making sure that this provision would not place an impediment on any physician giving methadone as a

medical treatment other than for detoxification and maintenance.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I wish to compliment the subcommittee for its very careful work in this area and its concern on that very specific problem.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) would agree with that interpretation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the committee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill H.R. 12503, the Narcotic Addict Treatment Act, to provide for the registration of practitioners conducting narcotic treatment programs.

Although the artificial narcotic methadone does not afford a permanent solution to the problem of heroine addiction, many treatment programs involving the use of methadone have had some success. The number of patients now participating in these programs is estimated to be 73,000, and the FDA is receiving a large number of applications for the use of this drug.

With the increasingly widespread use of methadone there is the inevitable problem of its illegal sale and use. This legislation is designed to strengthen control over such programs and to prevent the increasing numbers of deaths from methadone overdoses.

Through improved enforcement methods and improved treatment techniques, we are making forward strides in overcoming the drug abuse problem in America. This legislation, by the increased regulation of methadone and other narcotic drugs used in the treatment of narcotic addicts, is necessary if we are to effectively continue our efforts in this important area of national concern.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I join in very strong support for this legislation. I first introduced this bill in 1973, and we did not consider it then, so I am delighted that the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee saw fit this year to allow this measure to receive the careful attention that it did in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned over the related deaths through methadone overdoses. We have been accustomed in this country to deaths through heroin overdoses, and so I believe the principal impact of this bill is that we are now trying to pay the attention that is needed to the advances that have occurred through the utilization of methadone in the legally authorized clinics in this country. The measure recognizes that methadone treatment is no longer a research project, but that we are now treating over 70,000 addicts with methadone today. This measure goes a long way toward provid-

ing the protection that is necessary to continue this very fine program.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I believe that it serves a valuable purpose and urge its swift passage.

However, I would like to clarify one point. It is essential that the definition of "maintenance treatment" in no way be construed to condone or permit the usage of heroin or morphine as treatment drugs. It is my understanding that the bill is clear on this point, but I think that the intent of the House should be known. When we refer to narcotic drugs in the definition of "maintenance treatment" we are not including heroin or morphine. In fact, if the rules permitted, I would offer an amendment to specifically exclude these two drugs from ever being dispensed in any drug maintenance program in the country. I have a bill in right now to do that, and I hope that we can have hearings on it in the near future.

As I said, though, I do support the provisions of this bill. It is important that strict regulations be placed over the dispensing of any maintenance or treatment narcotic drug, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. HASTINGS) for recognizing this problem and for sponsoring this bill. The gentleman is to be commended not only by the House of Representatives, but also by the country, for the energetic leadership the gentleman has provided in this matter, as well as that of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Dr. CARTER, and all the other members of the subcommittee.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12503.

The question was taken.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. 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 pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 0, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]		
YEAS—375		
Abdnor	Arends	Bell
Abzug	Armstrong	Bennett
Adams	Ashbrook	Bergland
Addabbo	Ashley	Bevill
Anderson,	Aspin	Biaggi
Calif.	Badillo	Biester
Anderson, Ill.	Bafalis	Bingham
Andrews, N.C.	Baker	Blackburn
Andrews,	Barrett	Boggs
N. Dak.	Bauman	Boland
Archer	Beard	Bolling
Bowen	Grasso	Mosher
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.
Bray	Green, Pa.	Murtha
Breaux	Gross	Myers
Breckinridge	Grover	Natcher
Brinkley	Gubser	Nedzi
Brooks	Gunter	Nelsen
Broomfield	Guyer	Obey
Brotzman	Haley	O'Hara
Brown, Calif.	Hamilton	O'Neill
Brown, Mich.	Hammer-	Owens
Brown, Ohio	schmidt	Parris
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanley	Passman
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Patten
Buchanan	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Burgener	Harrington	Perkins
Burke, Mass.	Harsha	Pettis
Burleson, Tex.	Hastings	Peyser
Burris, Mo.	Hawkins	Pickle
Burton	Hays	Pike
Butler	Hébert	Poage
Byron	Hechler, W. Va.	Podell
Camp	Heilstoski	Powell, Ohio
Carney, Ohio	Henderson	Preyer
Carter	Hicks	Price, Ill.
Casey, Tex.	Hillis	Price, Tex.
Cederberg	Hinshaw	Pritchard
Chamberlain	Holt	Quie
Chisholm	Holtzman	Quillen
Clancy	Hosmer	Rallsback
Clausen,	Howard	Randall
Don H.	Huber	Rangel
Clawson, Del	Hudnut	Rarick
Clay	Hungate	Rees
Cleveland	Hunt	Regula
Cochran	Hutchinson	Rhodes
Cohen	Ichord	Riegle
Collier	Johnson, Calif.	Rinaldo
Collins, Tex.	Johnson, Pa.	Roberts
Conable	Jones, Ala.	Robinson, Va.
Conlan	Jones, N.C.	Robison, N.Y.
Conte	Jones, Okla.	Rodino
Conyers	Jones, Tenn.	Roe
Corman	Jordan	Rogers
Cotter	Karth	Roncalio, Wyo.
Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Roncalio, N.Y.
Crane	Kazen	Rooney, Pa.
Cronin	Kemp	Rose
Culver	Ketchum	Rosenthal
Daniel, Dan	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski
Daniel, Robert	Koch	Roush
W., Jr.	Kuykendall	Rousselot
Daniels,	Kyros	Roy
Dominick V.	Lagomarsino	Royal
Danielson	Landgrebe	Runnels
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Ruppe
Davis, S.C.	Latta	St Germain
Davis, Wis.	Leggett	Sandman
de la Garza	Lent	Sarasin
Delaney	Litton	Sarbanes
Dellenback	Long, La.	Satterfield.
Dellums	Long, Md.	Scherle
Denholm	Lott	Schneebeli
Dennis	Lujan	Schroeder
Dent	Luken	Sebelius
Derwinski	McCloskey	Shipley
Devine	McCormack	Shoup
Dickinson	McDade	Shriver
Donohue	McFall	Shuster
Downing	McKay	Sikes
Drinan	McKinney	Skubitz
Dulski	McSpadden	Slack
Duncan	Macdonald	Smith, Iowa
du Pont	Madden	Smith, N.Y.
Eckhardt	Madigan	Snyder
Edwards, Ala.	Mahon	Spence
Edwards, Calif.	Mallary	Staggers
Eilberg	Mann	Stanton,
Erlenborn	Maraziti	J. William
Esch	Martin, Nebr.	Stanton,
Eshleman	Martin, N.C.	James V.
Evans, Colo.	Mathias, Calif.	Stark
Evins, Tenn.	Mathis, Ga.	Steele
Fascell	Matsunaga	Steelman
Findley	Mayne	Steiger, Ariz.
Fish	Mazzoli	Steiger, Wis.
Flood	Meeds	Stephens
Flynt	Meicher	Stokes
Foley	Milford	Stratton
Ford	Miller	Stucky
Forsythe	Mills	Studds
Frenzel	Minish	Sullivan
Frey	Mink	Symington
Froehlich	Mitchell, Md.	Talcott
Fulton	Mitchell, N.Y.	Taylor, Mo.
Fuqua	Mizell	Taylor, N.C.
Gaydos	Moakley	Thompson, N.J.
Gettys	Mollohan	Thomson, Wis.
Gilman	Montgomery	Thone
Ginn	Moorhead,	Thornton
Gonzalez	Calif.	Tiernan
Goodling	Morgan	Towell, Nev.
		Treen

Udall	White	Wylie
Ullman	Whitehurst	Wyman
Van Deerlin	Widnall	Yates
Vander Jagt	Wiggins	Young, Alaska
Vander Veen	Wilson, Bob	Young, Fla.
Vanik	Wilson,	Young, Ga.
Veysey	Charles H.,	Young, Ill.
Vigorito	Calif.	Young, S.C.
Waggonner	Winn	Young, Tex.
Walsh	Wolff	Zablocki
Wampler	Wright	Zion
Ware	Wyatt	Zwach
Whalen	Wydler	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—57

Alexander	Gude	Nix
Annunzio	Hanna	O'Brien
Blatnik	Hanrahan	Patman
Brasco	Heckler, Mass.	Reid
Burke, Calif.	Heinz	Reuss
Burke, Fla.	Hogan	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Holifield	Ruth
Chappell	Horton	Ryan
Clark	Jarman	Seiberling
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Colo.	Steed
Dingell	King	Stubblefield
Dorn	Lehman	Teague
Fountain	McClory	Waldie
Fraser	McEwen	Whitten
Frelinghuysen	Metcalfe	Williams
Giaimo	Minshall, Ohio	Wilson,
Gibbons	Moorhead, Pa.	Charles, Tex.
Goldwater	Moss	Yatron
Gray	Murphy, Ill.	
Griffiths	Nichols	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. King.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Hanrahan.
Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Johnson of Colorado.
Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Fraser with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Clark with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Lehman.
Mr. Hanna with Mrs. Burke of California.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Giaimo.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Gibbons.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Yatron.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 1115) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the registration of practitioners conducting narcotic treatment programs.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1115

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 "Methadone Diversion Control Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Controlled Substances Act (84 Stat. 1242; 21 U.S.C. 801) is amended by adding the following after paragraph (7):

"(8) The diversion of narcotic drugs, particularly methadone, used in the treatment of addicts dependent upon heroin or other morphine-like drugs into other than legitimate medical, scientific, or industrial channels is detrimental to the health and general welfare of the American people."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (85 Stat. 1242; 21 U.S.C. 802), is amended by adding the following after paragraph (9):

"(10) The term 'detoxification treatment' means the furnishing, for a period not in excess of twenty-one days, of a narcotic drug in decreasing doses to an addict in order to alleviate pain and other adverse physiological effects incident to withdrawal from the habitual use of a narcotic drug, as a method of bringing the addict to a drug-free state within such period."

(b) Section 102 of such Act is amended by adding the following after paragraph (12):

"(14) The term 'emergency treatment' means the administration of a narcotic drug to an addict when necessary to alleviate pain incident to withdrawal from a narcotic drug while arrangements are made for referral of the addict to a treatment program and the administration of a narcotic drug to detoxify a patient as a necessary adjunct to medical and surgical treatment of not more than twenty-one days duration in a hospital."

(c) Section 102 of such Act is amended by adding the following after paragraph (13):

"(16) The term 'maintenance treatment' means the furnishing, for a period in excess of twenty-one days, of a narcotic drug in the treatment of an addict for dependence upon heroin or other morphine-like drugs."

(d) Section 102, of such Act is amended by redesignating paragraphs (10), (11), and (12) as paragraphs (11), (12), and (13), respectively; by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (15); and by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (26) paragraphs (17) through (29), respectively."

SEC. 4. Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (84 Stat. 1253; 21 U.S.C. 823) is amended by adding the following after subsection (f):

"(g) Practitioners who dispense or administer narcotic drugs in a treatment program for addicts shall obtain annually a separate registration for that purpose. The registration may be for maintenance treatment, detoxification treatment, or both. The Attorney General shall grant a registration under this subsection if the applicant—

"(1) is determined by the Secretary to be qualified to engage in such treatment under standards set by the Secretary, and

"(2) is determined by the Attorney General to be prepared to comply with standards imposed by the Attorney General relating to the security of the narcotic drug stocks, the maintenance of records in accordance with section 307, and with the concurrence of the Secretary, the quantities of drugs which may be provided for unsupervised use."

SEC. 5. Section 304(a) of the Controlled Substances Act (84 Stat. 1255; 21 U.S.C. 24(a)) is amended (A) by striking "or" at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting ";" or"; and (C) by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

"(4) has failed to comply with standards imposed pursuant to section 303(g). Such a failure may be treated as grounds for

immediate suspension of registration under subsection (d) of this section. Action under this paragraph is entirely without prejudice to any other registration to utilize narcotic drugs in other types of medical practice."

SEC. 6. Section 307(c)(1)(A) of the Controlled Substances Act (84 Stat. 1258; 21 U.S.C. 827(c)(1)(A)) is amended by adding the following after the word "practice"; "except in the treatment of narcotic addicts in accordance with registration under section 309(g), or in emergency treatment as defined in section 102(14);".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1115 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12503, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12503) was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DIABETES MELLITUS ACT OF 1974

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12417) to require the development of a long-range plan to advance the national attack on diabetes mellitus, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12417

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Diabetes mellitus is a major health problem in the United States which directly affects perhaps as many as ten million Americans and indirectly affects perhaps as many as fifty million Americans who will pass the tendency to develop diabetes mellitus to their children or grandchildren or to both.

(2) Diabetes mellitus is a family of diseases that has an impact on virtually all biological systems of the human body.

(3) Diabetes mellitus is the fifth leading cause of death from disease, and it is the second leading cause of new cases of blindness.

(4) The severity of diabetes mellitus in children and most adolescents is greater than in adults, in which most cases involves greater problems in the management of the disease.

(5) The complications of diabetes mellitus, particularly cardiovascular degeneration, lead to many other serious health problems.

(6) Uncontrolled diabetes mellitus significantly decreases life expectancy.

(7) There is convincing evidence that the known prevalence of diabetes mellitus has increased dramatically in the past decade.

(8) The citizens of the United States should have a full understanding of the nature of the impact of diabetes mellitus.

(9) The attainment of better methods of diagnosis and treatment of diabetes mellitus deserves the highest priority.

(10) In order to provide for the most effective program against diabetes mellitus it

is important to mobilize the resources of the National Institutes of Health as well as the public and private organizations capable of the necessary research and public education in the disease.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to establish a long-range plan to—

(1) expand and coordinate the national research effort against diabetes mellitus;

(2) advance activities of patient education, professional education, and public education which will alert the citizens of the United States to the early indications of diabetes mellitus; and

(3) to emphasize the significance of early detection, proper control, and complications which may evolve from the disease.

DIABETES PLAN

SEC. 3. (a) The Director of the National Institutes of Health, with the advice of the advisory council to the Director, shall, within sixty days of the date of the enactment of this section, establish a National Commission on Diabetes (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seventeen members as follows:

(1) The Directors of the seven Institutes named in subsection (e)(1).

(2) Six members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from scientists or physicians who are not in the employment of the Federal Government and who represent the various specialties and disciplines involving diabetes mellitus and related endocrine and metabolic diseases.

(3) Four members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from the general public. At least two of the members appointed pursuant to this paragraph shall be diabetics or parents of diabetics.

The members of the Commission shall select a chairman from among their own number.

(c) The Commission may appoint an executive director and such additional personnel as it determines are necessary for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(d) Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the Federal Government shall serve as members of the Commission without compensation in addition to that received in their regular public employment. Members of the Commission who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government shall each receive the daily equivalent of the rate in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule for each day (including traveltime) they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission. All members of the Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(e) The Commission shall formulate a long-range plan to combat diabetes mellitus with specific recommendations for the utilization and organization of national resources for that purpose. Such a plan shall be based on a comprehensive survey investigating the magnitude of diabetes mellitus, its epidemiology, its economic and social consequences, and an evaluation of available scientific information and the national resources capable of dealing with the problem. The plan shall include at least the following:

(1) A plan for a coordinated research program encompassing programs of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, the National Eye Institute, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases, the National Heart and Lung Institute, the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and the National Institute of Dental Research, and other Federal and non-Federal programs. This coordinated research program shall provide for—

(A) investigation in the epidemiology, etiology, prevention, and control of diabetes mellitus, including investigation into the social, environmental, behavioral, nutritional, biological, and genetic determinants and influences involved in the epidemiology, etiology, prevention, and control of diabetes mellitus;

(B) studies and research into the basic biological processes and mechanisms involved in the underlying normal and abnormal phenomena associated with diabetes mellitus, including abnormalities of the skin, cardiovascular system, kidneys, eyes, and nervous system, and evaluation of influences of other endocrine hormones on the etiology, treatment, and complications of diabetes mellitus;

(C) research into the development, trial, and evaluation of techniques and drugs used in, and approaches to, the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of diabetes mellitus;

(D) establishment of programs that will focus and apply scientific and technological efforts involving biological, physical, and engineering science to all facets of diabetes mellitus;

(E) establishment of programs for the conduct and direction of field studies, large-scale testing and evaluation, and demonstration of preventive diagnostic, therapeutic, rehabilitative, and control approaches to diabetes mellitus;

(F) the education and training of scientists, clinicians, educators, and allied health personnel, in the fields and specialties requisite to the conduct of programs respecting diabetes mellitus; and

(G) a system for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of all data useful in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of diabetes mellitus, including the establishment of a diabetes research data bank to collect, catalog, store, and disseminate insofar as is practicable the results of diabetes research undertaken for the use of any person involved in diabetes research.

(2) Proposed Federal, State, and local programs for—

(A) the screening of and detection in members of the general public for the overt symptoms of diabetes and, where appropriate methods exist, for cardiovascular degeneration occurring prior to the onset of such overt symptoms and referral for appropriate treatment of those who require it; and

(B) continuing counseling and education of doctors, diabetics, and relatives of diabetics (especially parents of diabetic children) on the steps that must be taken in order to live with diabetes.

The counseling and education described in subparagraph (B) shall include the dissemination of information on the importance of diet, on how to cope with the gradual progression of the disease, and on the critical importance of self-discipline and compliance with medical directives.

(f) The Commission may hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such time and places as the Commission deems advisable to develop the long-range plan required by subsection (e).

(g)(1) The Commission shall prepare for each of the Institutes whose programs are to be encompassed by the plan described in subsection (e)(1) budget estimates for each Institute's part of the coordinated diabetes research program described in that subsection. The budget estimates shall be prepared for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next two fiscal years.

(2) Within five days after the budget is transmitted by the President to the Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next two fiscal years, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, and the Committee on Interstate and For-

ign Commerce of the United States House of Representatives an estimate of the amounts requested for each of the Institutes for diabetes research, and a comparison of such amounts with the budget estimates prepared by the Commission under paragraph (1).

(h)(1) The Commission shall publish and transmit directly to the Congress (without prior administrative approval) a final report within two hundred and ten days after the date funds are first appropriated for the implementation of this section. Such report shall contain the long-range plan required by subsection (e) and the budget estimates required by subsection (g).

(2) The Commission shall cease to exist on the thirtieth day following the date of the submission of its final report pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(i) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section \$1,000,000.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING CENTER, DIABETES COORDINATING COMMITTEE

SEC. 4. Part D of title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"DIABETES RESEARCH AND TRAINING CENTERS

"SEC. 435. (a) The Secretary may provide for the development, or substantial expansion, of centers for research and training in diabetes mellitus and related endocrine and metabolic disorders. Each center developed or expanded under this section shall (1) utilize the facilities of a single institution, or be formed from a consortium of cooperating institutions, meeting such research and training qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and (2) conduct (A) research in the diagnosis and treatment of diabetes mellitus and related endocrine and metabolic disorders and the complications resulting from such disease or disorders, (B) training programs for physicians and allied health personnel in current methods of diagnosis and treatment of such disease, disorders, and complications, and (C) information programs for physicians and allied health personnel who provide primary care for patients with such disease, disorders, or complications. The Secretary shall, insofar as practicable, provide for an equitable geographical distribution of centers developed or expanded under this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall evaluate on an annual basis the activities of centers developed or expanded under this section and shall report to the Congress (on or before June 30 of each year) the results of his evaluation.

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$7,500,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$10,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1977.

"DIABETES COORDINATING COMMITTEE

"SEC. 436. In order to better coordinate the total National Institutes of Health research activities relating to diabetes mellitus, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall establish an Inter-Institute Diabetes Mellitus Coordinating Committee. This Committee shall be composed of the Directors (or their designated representatives) of each of the Institutes and divisions involved in diabetes-related research. The Committee will be chaired by the Director of the National Institutes of Health (or his designated representative). Such Committee shall prepare a report as soon after the end of each fiscal year as possible for the Director of the National Institutes of Health detailing the work of the Committee in coordinating the research activities of the National Institutes of Health relating to diabetes mellitus during the preceding year."

THE SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? **MR. NELSEN.** Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12417, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974, a bill very similar to S. 2830 which recently passed calling for creation of a long-range plan for a national attack on diabetes, and establishment of diabetes research and training centers.

Witnesses before our committee reminded us that because science has learned to partially control and slow the most devastating effects of diabetes many of us are unaware of how serious and widespread this disease is. Diabetes directly affects over 10 million Americans and indirectly affects millions more. It is the fifth leading cause of death in America, and the second leading cause of blindness. Its complications may lead to heart disease, stroke, and kidney disease. It strikes both young and old, most severely the young, but most commonly those over 45. And despite medical advances in controlling this disease it actually seems to be increasing.

To respond to this serious and increasing problem of diabetes, H.R. 12417 provides several major steps.

First, it calls for the creation of a new National Commission on Diabetes. This Commission would be responsible for developing a long-range plan for a national attack on diabetes. This plan would contain specific recommendations for improved use and organization of national resources available to fight diabetes. This will include plans for coordinating diabetes research at NIH, plans for improving collection of data on diabetes, and plans for extending programs for diabetes screening, detection, and counseling and education programs on diabetes for scientists, health professionals, and the general public. One million dollars is authorized for the work of the Commission and development of the plan.

This bill carries the attack on diabetes further by providing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to fund the development and expansion of centers for research and training on diabetes and its most serious complications. For this purpose, \$22.5 million is authorized to be spent between 1975 and 1977.

Now that the severity of the problem of diabetes has been brought to our attention we cannot fail to provide the response contained in this bill and the \$23.5 million authorized to back that response. So I urge you to join me in voting for this bill.

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

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members of the House are concerned with and support the attack upon diabetes, but how much is already being spent on this program by the Federal Government and by the States?

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I could not say how much is being spent by the States, because it has not been coordinated to the extent it should be. I would say to my distinguished colleague from Iowa that the NIH spent \$8½ million.

There are people in America who think it ought to be up in the hundreds of millions of dollars instead of the small sum we are starting out with now. The Senate in its bill has provided far more than we have.

We say that we must start on a scale that we can handle to get to the people and do something with, so that is the reason we have started with \$23½ million over a period of 2 years, from 1975 to 1977.

As I said, it is the fifth ranking killer in America of all the diseases. There are so many complications from it that lead to other illnesses, which cause death. Diabetes may lead to heart disease, stroke and kidney disease and other killer diseases. Therefore, we have just begun to realize the real, true significance and seriousness of the disease, and realize that something must be done, and done now, to control it.

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are any number of people in this country who would like to spend several hundred million dollars annually on this campaign, but there is an end to how much money can be spent for these purposes. Simply because there are people in this country who want to spend hundreds of millions of dollars does not mean that we should even spend another \$23.5 million now.

Mr. Speaker, have the objections of the administration to this bill been removed, or is it still opposed to it?

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, they are not opposed, I do not think, to any amount of money or to the essence of the bill.

They perhaps have voiced some concern about the place of the NIH in the program. The subcommittee, though thought the NIH should control it.

I might say to the distinguished gentleman that the cost of this disease to the American people is so great that no one can estimate it. It runs into the billions of dollars. The little bit that we might be able to do with this legislation will prevent not only suffering and death, it will save the tremendous costs which are spent on medicines and treatment in our families, and spare them the heartbreak of watching somebody who has the disease and is finally passing through the last stages.

MR. GROSS. This legislation is not going to remove all of the responsibility and the burdens which are sustained by reason of this disease, is it?

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this is only a start. We as the direct representatives of the people are trying to help eradicate something that is being discovered and has been known as a killer in America. We are now finding out the ramifications of this disease and the tremendous harm it is doing to our people, and we think it is a small thing to ask that we have this program coordinated and have it coordinated in the NIH.

MR. GROSS. However, this bill will call for the creation of another commission

in Government, and it will result in all the bureaucrats that go with such a commission; is that not correct?

MR. STAGGERS. This is correct, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa.

But we must have someone named to direct the program and see that something is done about this problem.

The subcommittee took great pains in the creation of that commission to see that it was balanced in every way. I believe there were seven members from the NIH, six scientists, and four members from the public. Of the four members from the public, two of them had even had diabetes or had children who had diabetes, so that we could have the input of those who had suffered, so that they could give us firsthand knowledge about the disease.

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask this further question of the gentleman:

Was not the National Institutes of Health created for the very purpose of coordinating medical research in the health programs of all kinds?

MR. STAGGERS. It was indeed. However, we have found that there are certain diseases which are the great killers and cripplers of the American people. We have to pay some attention to them and get more input concerning these diseases and eradicate them.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed this out many times: When polio was crippling millions of people across America, we were concerned and we were trying to help. It was because of the fact that we did have an input concerning the problem that polio today is eradicated. We have eradicated most of the great killers of this land, diseases that have killed hundreds and thousands of our people, diseases like smallpox, diphtheria, and yellow fever, for example.

Those diseases are now on the scrap heap because someone got into a research program and helped to eliminate them.

We hope to eradicate the five leading killer diseases, all of them, and we think it can be done.

But it is not going to be done unless it is coordinated properly, unless we have the best minds in America working on the problem and coordinating this program.

MR. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. STAGGERS. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

MR. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12417, a bill aimed at advancing the national attack on diabetes mellitus. I would also like to commend the distinguished gentlemen on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who studied this matter and unanimously recommended support for this bill. In reading through their report, I am impressed by their thoroughness and detail, and by the sound case they make for passage of this worthwhile legislation.

A reading of the hearings and the report on this bill reveals the pressing necessity for enactment of this comprehensive piece of legislation. Consider these compelling facts:

An estimated 10 to 12 million Americans today suffer from diabetes mellitus.

Diabetes is the fifth leading cause of death from disease in this country.

It is the second leading cause of new cases of blindness.

Diabetes decreases the life expectancy by approximately 30 percent.

There are 35,000 deaths a year attributed to diabetes, and experts believe that the actual toll is much higher, and

As of today, no cure exists for diabetes, only methods to stop the symptoms.

But these figures tell only part of the story, for because of the genetic connections of this disease, there is a geometric rather than an arithmetic increase in the number of diabetics, and some estimates predict that by 1980, one in five Americans will have diabetes or its traits.

Standing in stark contrast to these figures is the amount of Federal funding now provided for attacking this disease. Although the Federal Government has long taken the lead in financing research on diabetes, supplying the vast majority of the funding, only one-half of 1 percent of the NIH budget is earmarked for attacking this serious disease. To put the story of funding into clearer terms, it should be pointed out that only \$1.25 per diabetic per year is now spent on research and related activities.

This is clearly inadequate. One explanation for this disparity, I think, is that this disease is so invisible. Many people have diabetes for years and are unaware of it. And the manifestations of the disease are not as graphic as other diseases, such as polio. All too often, the tendency has been to turn attention to the most visible problems, while neglecting those less visible but potentially more serious. This has been the case with diabetes.

And as any physician would tell you, one of the most important factors in the treatment of most illnesses is early detection. This is particularly important with diabetes, because of the serious complications which it all too often causes.

With this valuable piece of legislation, we have the opportunity to establish a national commission to develop long-range plans for combating diabetes, while recommending the most beneficial use and organization of national resources. Significantly, this legislation would also include the establishment of plans for the coordination of research programs and data collection, in order that efforts not be duplicated but rather focused and concentrated. Also, there are provisions for public education to encourage early detection of this disease.

These are just a few of the many important and far-reaching provisions of this bill. I strongly urge favorable consideration of this legislation, so that we may take positive steps toward the treatment and cure of this serious disease.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HUDDNUT.

Mr. HUDDNUT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment as well as a cosponsor of H.R. 12417, National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974, I rise in support of this important legislation.

H.R. 12417 would require the Director of NIH to establish a new National Com-

mission on Diabetes. The Commission would then be required to formulate a long-range plan for combating diabetes with specific recommendations for the use and organization of national resources. The proposal is to include plans for a coordinated research program on all aspects of diabetes by the NIH; data collection as it concerns diabetes; the education of scientists and health manpower on diabetes; and programs for diabetes screening detection, counseling and education. The bill also authorizes the funding of new centers for diabetes research and training, and establishes an Inter-Institute Diabetes Mellitus Coordinating Committee within the NIH.

In the hearings on this bill our subcommittee heard extensive testimony on diabetes from the medical community, and also heard from a number of young people who are facing the future under this affliction.

At the present time we actually know very little about this disease that affects so many of our people. It is the fifth leading cause of death from disease in America. It is a leading cause of blindness and a major cause of heart attacks, strokes and blood vessel disorders. It sharply reduces life expectancy and causes millions of people to observe a strict regimen. It is a costly disease, not only in terms of national income lost by persons who are unable to work or severely restricted in their occupations, but also in terms of the expense which individuals and families who experience it must meet in order to sustain life. In my view, it is tragic that this Nation has been devoting only about \$1.25 per diabetic each year for research and related activities.

According to information that has come to me recently there are 1.25 million diabetics on insulin in the United States. For each of these patients there are three others on diet alone or diet and oral therapy. Therefore, we know there are approximately 5 million diabetics in the United States and for every diabetic that is known, it is estimated there is one who has the disease but it is undiagnosed.

We need to have a much greater emphasis on this disease than is presently being provided. That is the purpose of H.R. 12417 and I hope it will receive the near unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Again I want to compliment this Subcommittee on Health. I think the subcommittee is doing a great job. The Members on both sides of the aisle on that subcommittee have worked hard.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I firmly support the National Diabetes Mellitus Act, H.R. 12417, which would significantly advance the national attack on diabetes mellitus.

Under this important legislation, the Director of the National Institutes of Health would establish a new National Commission on Diabetes, which would be charged with the responsibility of formulating a coordinated plan for combating this complex disease. Further, this

measure authorizes the funding of new centers for diabetes research and training, and establishes an interinstitute diabetes mellitus coordinating committee within NIH.

The true seriousness of diabetes mellitus is not widely understood or appreciated today. Although approximately 10 million Americans are afflicted with the disease, and 325,000 new cases are being diagnosed each year, appropriate attention has not been focused upon the complex nature of diabetes. It is now known that this disease is the underlying cause of many thousands of deaths from other illness such as heart disease, stroke, and kidney disease. Further, diabetes is the second leading cause of blindness.

I submit that we must now take this step to coordinate our efforts in understanding diabetes and in locating the causes and most effective forms of treatment.

Under an amendment that I sponsored in subcommittee, this bill provides for the funding of centers throughout the United States to conduct research, disseminate information to the public, and to train professionals in the diagnosis and treatment of diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, diabetes is not arrested or controlled by insulin or by tablets commonly used for this purpose. Although blood sugar can often be controlled, this disease and its complications cannot. It silently, insidiously, progresses to bring about blindness, vascular difficulties, gangrene of the extremities, and other illnesses.

An effective means must be found to control and cure diabetes, and I believe that this legislation will provide a most important step.

Fine work is being done by our researchers at NIH, but we have the capacity to greatly increase our attack upon diabetes. I firmly support these efforts and I am in favor of this legislation.

Diabetes mellitus—

First, afflicts approximately 10 million Americans;

Second, is diagnosed in 325,000 new cases each year;

Third, is the fifth leading cause of death from disease;

Fourth, is directly attributed to 35,000 deaths each year;

Fifth, underlies the cause of many thousands of deaths each year from other diseases, such as heart disease, stroke, and kidney disease;

Sixth, is the second leading cause of blindness, producing blindness almost 20 years earlier than the leading cause of blindness, through such complications as diabetic retinopathy and other forms of vision degeneration; and

Seventh, costs the American economy approximately \$2 billion annually in disability, sickness absenteeism, and premature death.

Present work now being conducted at NIH; or supported by NIH:

First, investigation into small blood vessel disease;

Second, infections;

Third, transportation, of insulin-producing cells;

Fourth; oral antidiabetic drugs;

Fifth, preventive measures against diabetes complications; and

Sixth, studies of the diabetes-prone pima Indians of Arizona.

Authorizations of appropriations under H.R. 12417

Diabetes plan (no specified fiscal year)	\$1,000,000
Diabetes centers:	
Fiscal year 1975	5,000,000
Fiscal year 1976	7,500,000
Fiscal year 1977	10,000,000
Total	23,500,000

Mr. GILMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974.

Earlier this year I introduced similar legislation, H.R. 12059, calling for a national attack on diabetes, a disease that takes 35,000 lives annually—the fifth leading cause of death by disease.

While some might argue that programs such as this one, categorical in nature, are inappropriate, it is my opinion that our Nation, the wealthiest and most prosperous nation in the world, has a responsibility to help our citizenry have the benefit of the best possible health care.

The fact that diabetes produces many severe side effects, including blindness, kidney disease, and abnormalities of the skin and nervous system, coupled with the fact that it takes its toll indiscriminately among our young people, underscores the necessity for congressional action in combating this disease.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has reported out a bill which will lead us up the road to meet the dread disease head on. The committee is prudently seeking the formulation of a long-range plan to combat diabetes, coordinating programs within NIH, as well as providing assistance to States and local communities for detection, screening, counseling, and education of diabetes. While we cannot expect any miracle from this legislation, by the passage of this measure we are recognizing the severity of the disease and embarking on an active battle to combat its harmful effects.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill before us, H.R. 12417, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act, and urge my colleagues to adopt this measure.

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAKER. I am very much inclined to support the remarks of the gentleman in this regard. I have one question, however, that maybe the gentleman can clarify.

As I read the bill, I understand that it provides for the development and transmittal of budget estimates by an advisory committee independent of the normal budgetary process. In other words, there is some new means by which funds are budgeted in this instance for this pur-

pose other than is normally provided in the budgetary process.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. As I read the bill, the commission does have some input into this. However, the amendment I propose and which provides \$5 million in the first year for research and training centers, such as exist in the gentleman's home State of Tennessee, will not be allocated according to the method that he mentioned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the question raised by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) I do not think that the fear that the gentleman has expressed is of any concern on the part of the administration. What this legislation does is to set up an advisory commission to study the problem and then report back to the Congress. The advisory commission is to be made up of more private citizens than it is employees of the Federal Government.

The concern of the administration was that the report, instead of being brought back to the Congress, really should be channeled through the OBM. However, I really do not think that would be proper. The Congress is setting up this Advisory Commission. We really should have the report of that Commission, as to what its estimates are of the total program needs, presented to the Congress. It does not really get down into the budgetary process in the usual way we think of.

Mr. BAKER. There is no mandate of expenditures, so far as this legislation is concerned?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. That is correct.

Mr. CARTER. I might add that the Commission is formed by the seven heads of the Departments of NIH, six appointees of science and medicine is, and four people from the general public, two of whom are diabetics.

I believe I am correct on that.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) asked, Does this provision provide a new procedure on the budget? I think the answer quite clearly is no; it does not. What this procedure is, as best I understand it, is to have the recommendations of the Commission forwarded to the Congress so that the Congress can consider them, and that then we shall have transmitted to the Com-

mittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the Senate, a comparison of the recommendations of the Commission with the budgetary requests of the President. So that clearly, as best I can understand the proposition, it would not disrupt the budgetary procedure now done within NIH, and within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, or within OMB.

Mr. CARTER. As I understand it, it is advisory only.

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

Mr. CARTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman in the well for the extensive work the gentleman has done on this bill. I also want to point out that it did come to my attention, too, from downtown, from HEW, that there was some concern about the provisions that are now under discussion. I have discussed this with the chairman of our subcommittee, and I will later ask the gentleman to enter into a colloquy on this subject.

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as I started to say, I will engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) to establish what our course of action is, and I am sure that this will be of some value to the agencies looking on, and ahead into the future. Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. CARTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished doctor and Member from Kentucky, Mr. TIM LEE CARTER, for yielding, and commend him for his remarks. I and other colleagues value highly his judgment and special expertise in matters of medicine and health. I commend also the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for their efforts in preparing and reporting favorably this important legislation, and strongly request all in this House to give their full support to passage of H.R. 12417, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974.

Diabetes mellitus is the fifth leading cause of death by disease. It is the second leading cause of new cases of blindness and produces blindness almost 20 years earlier than the leading cause. It is also the underlying cause of thousands of deaths from related diseases. Although insulin therapy has successfully controlled the more obvious symptoms of diabetes mellitus, complications from the disease often lead to deterioration of blood vessels, the kidneys, the nervous

system, and the retina of the eye. No cure has yet been developed for this disease, and modern diabetes research has not yet discovered its cause.

The National Institutes of Health—NIH—have provided the major support for current diabetes research, with focuses on: Investigation into small blood vessel disease and certain infections as possible causes of diabetes; treatment innovations such as the transplantation of insulin-producing cells and the production of less expensive, more reliable forms of insulin; the development of oral anti-diabetic drugs; investigation into possible preventive measures against diabetes complications; and studies of the Pima Indians of Arizona who are particularly prone to the disease. This research has already provided valuable information regarding the disease, making possible our current understanding of the disease and its complications, but even more is needed.

I believe the present legislation, developed by the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee following its hearings last summer, will enable important progress toward the ultimate conquest of diabetes mellitus. It deserves the wholehearted support of this House.

H.R. 12417 requires the Director of the National Institutes of Health to establish a 17-man National Commission on Diabetes to formulate a long-range plan for combating diabetes mellitus, following a comprehensive study of the disease and its consequences. The plan must provide for coordination of the diabetes research programs within the various Institutes of NIH, and recommend Federal, State, and local programs for diabetes detection, screening, counseling, and education.

The Commission's research program on diabetes is to include data collection, analysis, and dissemination; education of scientists and health manpower personnel; and various applied research programs. The Commission is to report directly to Congress its long-range plan and its budget estimates for each NIH Institute participating in the research program. The bill authorizes \$1 million for the Commission's study and planning activities.

The bill further provides \$22.5 million over 3 years—\$5 million in fiscal year, 1975, \$7.5 million in fiscal year 1976, and \$10 million in fiscal year 1977—for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop centers in which to conduct research, training, and information programs for physicians and allied health personnel in the diagnosis and treatment of diabetes mellitus and related endocrine disorders.

H.R. 12417 also requires the Director of the National Institutes of Health to establish an Inter-Institute Diabetes Mellitus Coordinating Committee. Diabetes is a prime example of a disease which affects the work of many of the Institutes, yet there is at present no formal apparatus within NIH to assure a coordinated research program related to diabetes in the various Institutes.

I concur in the committee's enthusiasm for the existing mechanism

that the National Institutes of Health have for supporting basic research, with research support based on scientific merit as determined by the well-established NIH peer-review system. The plan to be prepared pursuant to H.R. 12417 is intended to preserve that system, and to expand or enlarge the existing efforts against diabetes, not to replace them.

Several constituents from the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa have advised me of their support for increased emphasis upon diabetes research. An Iowa couple wrote:

It means a lot to the future of our family and our relatives. Our daughter, now 15, was found to be a diabetic shortly after birth. She has always accepted this, as we have, with no self pity. It is the other things, as eye sight; a cut toe—will it heal? and how any other illness affects the diabetes. Will she be near help when needed? These are constant thoughts every day. Diabetes is hereditary (four generations in our family), so how many more will be affected? We don't feel we dare have any more family (it also becomes expensive), and relatives are wondering if one of their family may show up to be diabetic.

Both our daughters have stated they would not want a family because of more and more diabetics. Is this fair to them? We would like to know there could be a way to prevent diabetes so we might look forward to being grandparents someday to grandchildren that don't have to worry about becoming diabetics.

A student nurse in my district wrote: I have seen the effects of diabetes mellitus in the surgical ward. Amputations are frequently necessary due to gangrene, which is caused by decreased circulation associated with diabetes mellitus.

A doctor engaged in medical research at a nearby university wrote:

Despite the discovery of insulin 51 years ago, the vascular complications of diabetes pose a most serious problem. Diabetics are prone to develop blindness, fatal kidney disease and other vascular complications leading to gangrene and requiring amputation occur all too frequently despite our present treatment methods of insulin, diet and/or the blood sugar lowering agents. We have reason to hope that beta cell transplants in man might prevent these serious complications... but an estimated additional 5 years of research may be required to provide the needed scientific answers before beta cell transplants are justified in man. We must prove that beta cell transplants are more effective in preventing the serious complications of diabetes than is insulin treatment. This evaluation may require an additional five to ten year period after we are able to begin human beta cell transplants.

The doctor warned:

In the initial decades following the discovery of insulin, the medical community was lulled into false complacency because it assumed that all of the complications of diabetes would be eradicated by insulin treatment. Let us not therefore assume that the problem of diabetes will automatically be solved by the development of a successful human islet transplant procedure [beta cell transplants]. We must carry out a broad attack on the diabetes problem. There are limitless ramifications that require critical research. We must know more about the causes of diabetes. We must characterize the specific actions of insulin on the various cells and organs in the body. We must learn more about the cause of vascular complications of diabetes and how they may be prevented or treated.

These comments are representative examples of the letters I received concerning diabetes research.

There is a need not only for targeted research in the hope of providing a cure, but also for substantial basic research. All new disease treatments have been built upon more fundamental basic science investigations, and diabetes mellitus is no exception.

Diabetes afflicts 2.8 million Americans. It is estimated to exist undiagnosed in an additional 1.6 million individuals. Diabetes mellitus is a health problem of major proportions and deserves the attention directed by H.R. 12417. I urge my colleagues to join in approving this important and progressive legislation.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding me this time. I am pleased to be able to recommend to my colleagues the National Diabetes Act of 1974 which is intended to strengthen the research effort on diabetes. Diabetes is the fifth-leading cause of death among Americans and a major contributor to cardiovascular disease, the Nation's leading killer. There are 325,000 new cases of diabetes each year. A diabetic's life expectancy is about two-thirds that of a nondiabetic at any age. Doctors at the Joslin Clinic reported recently, for example, that a 30-year-old with diabetes could expect to live another 30 years, while a 30-year-old without diabetes can expect to live another 42 years.

Despite these staggering figures, Mr. Speaker, the current NIH effort in research related directly to diabetes is around \$8 million, spread among no fewer than seven institutes within the NIH—the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases; the National Eye Institute; the National Institute of Neurological Diseases; the National Heart and Lung Institute; the National Institute of General Medical Sciences; the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; and the National Institute of Dental Research.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to rationalize the existing NIH program through providing a coordinated effort among the several Institutes within NIH and make recommendations for Federal, State, and local programs. The bill also authorizes the establishment of research and training centers for diabetes and related diseases.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the bill will require, within 60 days of enactment, the establishment of a National Commission on Diabetes whose membership is to include the seven directors of the institutes which engage in diabetes research, six non-Federal scientists and physicians, and four members of the general public, two of whom are to be persons who have diabetes or who are par-

ents of diabetics. The Commission would have the following duties:

First. Formulation of a long-range plan encompassing the programs of all seven Institutes which engage in diabetes research as well as other Federal and non-Federal programs.

Second. Recommendations for Federal, State, and local programs for screening, detection, counseling, and education.

Third. Preparation of budget estimates for each of the seven institutes which would engage in the coordinated research program. Following its report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

The bill also requires that for the next 3 fiscal years, the Secretary is to transmit to the Appropriations Committees and to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, a comparison of what the Commission has recommended for each of the institutes under the coordinated plan, and what the budget estimate is.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide for the development or substantial expansion of centers for research and training in diabetes. Authorizations for this purpose are \$5 million for fiscal year 1975, \$7.5 million for fiscal year 1976, and \$10 million for fiscal year 1977.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill requires establishment of a permanent committee composed of the directors of all seven institutes to better coordinate research activities of each institute with respect to diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, it was the view of a unanimous Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment that the needs of persons with diabetes in the United States will not be met in the future unless the Federal Government expands its leadership role in the area and provides the financial support essential to implement successful research and treatment programs. This bill is designed to assist the National Institutes of Health in this role, and I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the work of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) who are particularly interested in this matter, as well as the other members of our committee, such as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) who worked diligently on this bill.

Now, I think the concerns that have been expressed with respect to the preparation of budget estimates by the Commission should be eased upon a careful reading of the bill because there is no problem, either as to what is intended, or as to what is written.

The bill itself simply requires that the Commission will make budgetary suggestions as to what each of the seven involved institutes should spend on diabetes. Then the Secretary is to report what the Commission recommends and what the budget recommends. We think this is helpful so all Members of Congress can see what the Commission recommends and what the President, himself, in his budget recommends. But I emphasize that this bill would not interfere with the normal budgetary process.

There is no change in the process, but just a means to provide for a comparison.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the passage of the bill under suspension. I think all Members can have great satisfaction in casting a "yes" vote and thus being able to tell the American people that they helped participate in doing something in a positive way against this dreadful disease—diabetes.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT).

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors, together with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman WILLIAM STEIGER, and 108 Members of this body, of the original legislation from which this bill evolves, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this legislation. This bill does not go as far or do as much as the original legislation, but it is a significant and important step forward by the Federal Government.

In testimony on that original legislation, I described it as a working paper and a commitment. I am a little disappointed that the committee took me literally on the working paper part, but the commitment remains, and that is, indeed, the important thing.

I commend the committee, the subcommittee, and their leadership on both sides of the aisle for very, very constructive efforts. It is modest in its approach. It has been said to be one small step forward for the Federal Government, but, believe me, it is a giant leap forward for the millions of American diabetics. This bill is an illustration of how this House can be, contrary to charges, responsive to the needs and desires of the American people. It really began 2½ years ago when a lady constituent came into my district office, Mrs. Kortman, a parent of diabetic children. She pointed out that diabetes is the fifth leading cause of death in America, the second leading cause of blindness; that 10 million Americans have it or will have it; and if we break that down to the family formula of 4, that means that 1 out of every 5 or 6 Americans is directly affected by diabetes.

In spite of that, the Federal attack was buried over there in the Institute on Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, and less than one-half of 1 percent of the Federal research dollar for disease was going to diabetes.

Out of that discussion evolved a bill. Since that time I have been astounded at the outpouring of support from the grass roots across America, and from my colleagues in the House as they have come forward to join in sponsorship. From those who have diabetes themselves, or whose relatives or friends are living with this disease, there has been a steadily growing plea for greater Federal support of research and related programs. In the words of a letter which I received:

My little girl, nearly 5, has had juvenile diabetes since she was under 2 years old. We can accept the shots, the rigid schedule, the exact diet, but we can't live with the knowledge that she will probably be blind,

or without legs or with heart and kidney disease before she is 30, if she lives that long.

Because we felt the need for legislation was so great, we first tried to offer an amendment to digestive disease legislation on the floor, but upon the pledge of the chairmen of the subcommittee and the committee that diabetes would be considered separately in the following year, my amendment was withdrawn. Those promises were kept; hearings were held; and this bill was the result.

This particular bill seeks to set up diagnosis centers for early detection, and to improve the chances for preventing diabetes' onset in those people predisposed to it; but, above all else, the bill seeks to educate people as to how to live with this dreaded disease. Most people think that just because we discovered insulin, there is no real problem with diabetes. Nothing could be further from the truth, as we were reminded a little over a year ago upon the tragic death of Jackie Robinson, who died from diabetes. That athlete, whose magnificent physique could elude the second baseman's tag, could not elude the tag of diabetes and the ravage that it did to his body.

This bill will also enable us to take advantage of the possibilities—the exciting possibilities—that we have in research for better treatment and an eventual cure for diabetes.

If that should ever happen, I would like to think that Jackie Robinson would be remembered for two reasons. First would be that Jackie Robinson's life was the catalyst that gave hope to millions of blacks and wiped out discrimination in the big leagues, and second that Jackie Robinson's death would be remembered as a catalyst that would have nudged this Government into the program that gave hope to millions of diabetics and helped wipe out that dread disease.

However that may be, this program says to the millions of sufferers from this disease that we understand their problem, that we care about their problem, and that we have concern for them. We are giving hope to the quiet sufferers who have for too long been neglected.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin who had so very much to do in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I applaud the gentleman from Michigan for his eloquent statement and I associate myself obviously with his remarks and also extend my thanks to the subcommittee and to the full committee for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the consideration today of H.R. 12417, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974, is the culmination of the efforts of literally thousands of people over the last 2 years.

My colleagues may remember the debate on the floor of the House on May 3, 1972, concerning diabetes research. At that time, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) offered an amendment to elevate the level of research on diabetes within the Institute. He was

joined in this effort by Minority Leader FORD, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY), and myself. The amendment was withdrawn on the assurances of the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (Mr. STAGGERS) that hearings would be held on this problem.

On February 27, 1973, Mr. VANDER JAGT and I introduced H.R. 4882, the National Diabetes Act of 1973. The response to that bill was quite overwhelming. More than 110 Members of the House eventually cosponsored the legislation, and hearings were finally held on July 21 and August 1, 1973 by Chairman ROGERS' Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment.

These events were due in no small part to the thousands upon thousands of citizens who contacted the committee and their representatives in support of this effort.

It was, therefore, indeed gratifying to see the committee mark up and report out the legislation before us today.

While neither Mr. VANDER JAGT nor I and many others were fully satisfied with the provisions of this legislation, we strongly believe it represents a major step in the right direction—a direction which will substantially increase the Federal initiative in this vital area.

Substantial credit is also due to Senators McGEE and SCHWEIKER for their sustained leadership in the other body toward this same end.

The hearings last February 26, 1973, and the passage by the Senate of S. 2830 on December 20, 1973, clearly provided the further impetus to action by the House.

In addition to the legislation by both Houses to expand the Federal authority for research and treatment efforts, the provisions of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 also clearly indicate the congressional intent to beef up this area by calling for a broad multidisciplinary approach to research and the establishment of regional research and treatment centers.

The point has been made that the administration clearly has sufficient authority already to undertake all the efforts called for in both the legislation before us today and the appropriations laws.

While I would agree with this, it is equally clear to me and to many others that if initiative is to be taken in this area that it must come from the Congress. On that basis I strongly urge your support of this legislation.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 12417, which I cosponsored, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974, which will provide a concerted effort to advance the national attack on diabetes.

The Federal Government is the largest sponsor of diabetes research in the United States, conducting some 97 percent of all diabetes research now going on in this country. Virtually all of it is conducted under the auspices of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases.

H.R. 12417 mandates the director of the National Institutes of Health to establish a National Commission on Diabetes to expand, intensify and coordinate the Institute's activities respecting diabetes and related diseases. Both research and public education about the problem of diabetes will be expanded and centers for research and demonstration of clinical techniques will be established.

One must consider the devastating effects of diabetes to understand the importance of this legislation. Diabetes is one of the leading causes of blindness and death in the United States. Almost 4 million Americans are diagnosed to have diabetes and an additional 2 million persons are estimated to suffer from undiagnosed diabetes. Also, more than 5 million persons carry the potential to become diabetics. In the United States alone, there are over 300,000 new cases annually, and it has been estimated that in 2 years one out of 25 Americans will fall prey to diabetes.

Diabetes is a complicated disease for which there is no permanent cure. It is considered to be a hereditary disorder, causing an inability to metabolize carbohydrates. Symptoms of diabetes include weakness, loss of weight, excessive hunger and thirst, and occasionally arrested growth. Since the discovery of insulin 50 years ago there have been no significant discoveries leading toward its cure. There is important research now going on, however, and I was recently informed of the efforts of Prof. Arnold Lazarow of the University of Minnesota in this field. He is currently working with diabetic rats, and his experiments with beta cell transplantation show great promise.

I personally have a great interest in this and other research efforts, as I found a number of years ago, that I myself have diabetes. It is an interesting phenomenon, that once a person discovers he has diabetes, he learns how many others suffer from the same disease. It was, therefore, not long before I learned that many in the Congress are subject to diabetes, some have been for a long time.

Our colleague Mr. STEIGER should be congratulated on the outstanding effort he demonstrated in seeking enactment of this legislation and the chairman and committee deserve congratulations for their formidable support.

The necessity for mounting a concerted and high priority effort to find a cure for this disease is apparent. The estimated annual economic cost of diabetes is \$2 billion, including medical costs, drugs and manpower losses. When we consider how the Nation's strength has been sapped because of diabetes, the importance of this legislation becomes clear. H.R. 12417 will provide an effective mechanism and sufficient funding for a concerted attack on diabetes. Although expenditures on diabetes research and education will increase from previous levels, the end result will mean a savings to America in the long run.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not support H.R. 12417 due to the requirement for preparation and transmittal of budget estimates without prior administrative approval. I understand the administration's concern over this departure from the normal

budgetary process, but frankly this does not overly disturb me. The actual appropriation of funds—namely, the \$1 million authorized in section 3(I) and the \$22.5 million authorized over a 3-year period for diabetes research and training centers—would only become available, and to the extent provided for, under the normal appropriations process of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this necessary and humane legislation.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this legislation. As one of the cosponsors of the original legislation I concur in, and would like to associate myself with, the eloquent and persuasive remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT), whose untiring efforts are primarily responsible for this bill being before us today. I am confident of its passage.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want very briefly to add my support to the legislation and point out that some weeks ago I attended a meeting in Minneapolis and met with a group of people who were working on this program.

They pointed out something I had never really known before; that is, that diabetes-afflicted persons have kept their problem in a low profile. Thus Congress moved in other areas, on the problems of cancer and other major diseases. Those concerned with diabetes sat quietly, not getting the attention that their problem required. Now they are suddenly becoming alive.

I think the Congress has responded. I believe this is a good piece of legislation.

I would point out, however, that sometimes we in the committee are inclined to get into administrative processes a little too deeply. I believe it is the wish of the committee not to interfere with the internal budget processes which properly belong to the Executive.

I am sure the colloquy today has given assurance to HEW as to our intent.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if someone were to come before this body and warn that within the next few years 5 million Americans would be stricken with a disease for which there is no prevention or cure, I am certain that we would, in our concern for the welfare of the people of America, hasten to responsible action.

Ironically, in considering the National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974 today, that is exactly what we are doing. Last year 5 million Americans suffered from diabetes mellitus, a disease for which there is no prevention or cure. Insulin is a life-prolonging drug which undoubtedly has saved the lives of millions of diabetics. But it is no cure. It has changed the character of this disease from an acute condition leading to early death from a diabetic coma to a chronic disease that far

too often results in blindness, kidney failure, or in an acceleration of the blood vessel disease that leads to heart attack, stroke or gangrene.

Thus, while insulin is a tremendous step in the containment of this disease, as far as prevention and cure are concerned we remain in the Dark Ages.

This legislation would open the window to the light of knowledge. It would establish a national commission required to develop a long-range coordinated program to combat diabetes mellitus.

It would also provide Federal money for diabetes research and training centers to supplement the work in this field which now is being done almost entirely with private funding.

Mr. Speaker, the hearings on this legislation have outlined and detailed the need for this legislation and spelled out what it can accomplish to end needless suffering for millions in the future.

This legislation has my full support and I respectfully urge its passage.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 12417, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act. I believe Congress is well-advised in this move to underwrite a broad program for fighting this pernicious disease.

It has been assumed by many Americans that the advent of insulin, which stabilizes the diabetic's condition, represented a sufficient medical treatment of diabetes. Such is certainly not the case, as the diabetic's health is inevitably and pervasively affected by his or her disease.

For instance, a diabetic is more likely than others to suffer stroke, heart attack, kidney disease and other cardiovascular debilitations.

Our knowledge of how diabetes afflicts its victims and how the disease might be reversed instead of merely controlled remains relatively slim, and the bill before us today will begin a concerted effort to expand this knowledge. Over the next 3 fiscal years, \$23.5 million will be earmarked for helping the diabetic and developing new means for fighting diabetes mellitus, the most crippling of several types of diabetes.

I would like to commend the work of the subcommittee on this measure, and I was proud to support it in the full Commerce Committee. The bill embodies the sound research and human compassion needed to cope with diabetes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one further statement that occurred to me while listening to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) who has spoken very persuasively. I would like to pay tribute to him and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) for their unwavering efforts in the past 2 or 3 years to get this legislation before this House.

I want to compliment them, and also the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) and all the other Members; but Mr. VANDER JAGT and Mr. STEIGER especially, because they have carried the ball and have certainly kept it in front of us. As a result, the legislation is here

today. I want to congratulate both of them, because they have done something to help the people of America live a better life and perhaps whip this dread disease. In this legislation we are doing something for the good of the land.

I want to again pay a compliment to the members of the committee and the staff that have worked so hard, as usual, on this piece of legislation.

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

I urge a vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope and urge that the House will overwhelmingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 12417, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974, which is designed to establish a new National Commission on Diabetes empowered to formulate a long-range plan for the use and organization of national resources to combat diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, the highest medical authorities have testified that diabetes is the fifth leading cause of death in this country with 35,000 mortalities attributed to it annually. Its ravages constitute a major health problem in the United States since we know that this disease afflicts approximately 10 million Americans with some 325,000 new cases of diabetes diagnosed each year.

It has also been unquestionably established that the complications of diabetes lead to a great many other serious health problems involving the kidneys, the eyes, the gastrointestinal tract, the nervous system, and blood vessels with resultant heart attacks, stroke, and gangrene of the extremities.

In the face of all the health dangers caused by and associated with diabetes it is unfortunately too clear, from the testimony of record, that the needs of persons with diabetes in the United States are not being met at the present time nor can we reasonably expect that they will be met in the future unless and until the Federal Government expands its leadership role in this area and provides the essential Federal support that is undeniably required.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12417 is to grant this essential support. In summary, it will do so by establishing, among other things, an Inter-Institute Diabetes Mellitus Coordinating Committee within the National Institutes of Health to conduct and coordinate research programs on all aspects of diabetes; collecting data concerning the disease; providing education programs for scientists and health manpower personnel; and projecting programs for diabetes screening, detection, counseling, and education.

Mr. Speaker, from all the authoritative evidence that has been revealed here, it is my considered opinion that the scientific pursuit and attainment of better methods of diagnosis and treatment of this dread disease deserves the highest priority and, in accord with our traditions, our National Government should encourage the persistent search for and production of fundamental new knowledge to form the basis of future advances in the understanding, prevention, con-

trol, treatment, and ultimately the cure of diabetes.

Therefore, I again urge the House to overwhelmingly adopt this measure without extended delay.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering landmark legislation in the long history of medicine's attack on diabetes mellitus. The need for this legislation, as my colleagues have so soundly documented, is clear, and the bill itself—which grew out of legislation which I and over 100 other Members of the House cosponsored—is essentially strong and responsible. But, important as the National Diabetes Mellitus Act is, it is not enough.

The bill before us today would mandate the creation of a National Commission on Diabetes, charged with formulating an overall plan for combating diabetes, and would authorize increased Federal support of diabetes research and training centers. These are vital developments in the long-range effort by our health institutions to eradicate this disease. But there is right now an immediate, short-term need for emergency funds to keep our diabetes research effort moving forward. Congress must do more than call for a study and authorize a future strengthening of our diabetes-related institutions. We must provide cash, now.

In several locations across the country, diabetes research teams are on the edge of major breakthroughs on a number of fronts. With adequate funding, it is possible that we could be well on the way to a cure in a matter of months. But these projects are moving at a snail's pace because they must live on a month-to-month basis, always unsure of whether money will be available to continue their work for any period of time. And while potential controls or cures may lie just a few experiments ahead, research scientists must spend as much as half their time out of the laboratory, scrambling for funds.

Within the diabetes research community, there is no question about it: What is most needed is not a study and reorganization of the national resources devoted to diabetes. What is most needed is simply dollars.

The irony of this, Mr. Speaker, is that never has there been such genuine excitement in the diabetes field about research now underway. Never has optimism been stronger that watershed breakthroughs are imminent. As never before, it is now possible to say with confidence that soon a new control and, in all likelihood, a cure for diabetes will be found.

Let me illustrate this optimism by quoting from a recent letter from Dr. Walter Ballinger, head of the department of surgery at the Washington University School of Medicine:

It now appears that, if current research can be continued, there is every reason to believe that we are at a time as critical as that when insulin was first discovered and made available. Insulin, however, does not cure diabetes nor does it prevent the horrible complications of diabetes.

Current research indicates that this might very well be achieved very soon. Delay in achieving this research breakthrough means

that millions of diabetics are continuing to have irreversible damage developing insidiously and relentlessly.

As Dr. Ballinger points out, we are now on the threshold of a discovery as monumental as that of insulin in 1922. When—and if—that threshold will be crossed depends largely on what this Congress decides to do.

The optimism of the diabetes experts is based on two developments. First, research teams in Boston, Los Angeles, and elsewhere have begun to perfect an artificial pancreas, which would mechanically replace the faulty insulin-secreting system in the diabetic. This device would constantly monitor the flow of blood sugar in the diabetic and automatically pump the proper amount of insulin as needed. Hence, the diabetic's metabolism will be regulated just as if his body reacted normally to changes in the blood sugar level. Not only would such an artificial pancreas make painful insulin injections obsolete, but it could also avoid the complications which grow out of diabetes—such as blindness, kidney failure, gangrene, and other cardiovascular afflictions—as a result of the metabolic shock caused by daily or twice-daily injections of insulin.

Second, researchers across the Nation—I am aware of specific efforts in Miami, Boston, St. Louis, and Minneapolis—are closing fast on an actual cure for diabetes by transplanting beta cells from the pancreas of nondiabetic subjects to the diabetic's pancreas. When rooted, these cells begin to produce insulin, and the diabetic is, in effect, cured. This process has already been carried to completion successfully in laboratory animals, and scientists are beginning to focus on the problems of transplanting human pancreatic cells. When perfected, these transplants could mean an end to the human misery of diabetes.

Both of these research frontiers are incredibly exciting, and more importantly, both promise results in the foreseeable future. But for lack of money, many aspects on these frontiers are lying dormant. The men and women who probe them, the research scientists, have all they can do just to avoid dismantling their own projects altogether—much less to expand into new areas.

Take for example, the experience of Dr. Arnold Lazarow, who is working with beta cell culturation at the University of Minnesota and who described his problem in the following way:

The funds for diabetes research which my Department now receives from the National Institutes of Health are approximately one half the amount we received three years ago. In May 1973 the University of Minnesota applied for a Diabetes Center Grant in which a major proportion of the research activities relate to our research on "Islet Organ Culture/Transplantation." This grant (1-P17 AM 17467) although approved in November 1973 for a five year period would provide a total budget of \$1,468,744 with \$369,627 allocated for the first year. However, this grant has not been funded, because of the severe limitations of funds within the National Institute for Arthritis, Metabolic and Digestive Diseases. I had been informed that it is uncertain whether our grant will be funded before September 1974 if it is funded at all.

We urgently need to continue and expand our studies on beta cell organ culture/

transplantation using human fetal pancreas. We have already demonstrated that human insulin producing cells can be selectively grown in organ culture. However, many studies must be carried out before organ cultured beta cells can be transplanted into human subjects. It is unfortunate that the funds needed to pursue these human studies are not available and that research investigations which may be of great potential value in the treatment of human diabetes must be delayed because of the lack of funds.

Or of Dr. Dudley Watkins, at the University of Connecticut in my own State:

When I applied for funding from the National Science Foundation for support in diabetes research, I asked for \$66,000 to run my program. I was one of few applicants to be funded, but all I received was \$42,000. I found it necessary to curtail several research projects for lack of sufficient funds. Thus, what I hoped to accomplish in two years will take four to five years. In fact, it was only through the generous support of Dr. Jules Silver that we were able to carry out several of our projects at the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Massachusetts where several thousand of our research animals are kept. I am sure that other researchers have had the same experience. What is equally discouraging is that many capable and bright young investigators were not funded at all. This situation can only lead to low morale among investigators and serve to drive bright young graduate students into other fields.

Or of Dr. Samuel Bessman at the University of Southern California, who describes his success in artificial pancreas research:

All of this work has been done without any federal support, for preliminary efforts to obtain such support made it quite clear there was no money available for human chemical engineering. The NIH had enough trouble funding in the old areas and since little money had been spent on diabetes in the past, less money would now be available. It is an onerous and time-consuming task to write the intricate grant requests which we have written in the past and it is highly disappointing to find them rejected by groups in the NIH who solicit them without even having the funds to pay in the first place. We have, therefore, turned to the public for small donations and to small private funds for assistance. All of the work reported in the papers which I enclose was done through donations totalling approximately \$30,000 over a period of almost 2½ years. I have personally contributed a portion of that funding.

Our work would be considerably accelerated and very much more effective if we had more money but it is not worth wasting time, at present, to seek it through government channels.

The theme spelled out by these scientists is echoed throughout the diabetes research field. The problem is not manpower: Estimates are that four out of five diabetes projects will be turned down due to lack of funds, and that means a loss of valuable research personnel. The problem is not technology; the basic know-how of already established fields should prove adequate when fitted to the specific needs of diabetes. And the problem is not buildings and space: dozens of institutes and universities are eager to host diabetes research. The problem is money, and nothing will bring results faster than quick action by Congress to appropriate the necessary sums.

As a vehicle for this funding, I have introduced legislation for an immediate

appropriation of \$20 million, specifically earmarked for diabetes research. This amount, approximately double that to be spent in fiscal year 1974 for diabetes research by the Federal Government, would shore up the current research effort and accelerate both artificial pancreas and beta cell research progress. It would avoid the dismantling of sophisticated biomedical research teams and operations. It would provide the support needed to capitalize and expand on new findings, thereby broadening the diabetes field. And it would do all this now, when we need it most.

And furthermore, the appropriation would make sound economic sense. Diabetes will cost the American people upwards of \$4 billion this year. For a small Federal investment—my \$20 million emergency relief bill would amount to just \$4 per known diabetic, or less than the average diabetic spends weekly on medication and treatment—we will be able to make major strides toward wiping out not only this huge expense but also untold physical and emotional anguish.

I therefore applaud the bill before us today as a sound and worthy beginning toward a diabetes cure. But I also urge my colleagues to go a step further—to join me in calling for nothing less than a full and immediate commitment from Congress to provide the dollars needed to enable medical science to score the major breakthrough against diabetes which is now so close at hand.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as I have said previously in this debate I know of no one in the House of Representatives who is opposed to reasonable measures for research in combating diabetes as well as other diseases and afflictions that jeopardize human health.

A number of years ago, Congress established what is now known as the National Institutes of Health—NIH—for the purpose of coordinating and financing national programs for research, treatment and cure of diseases, including diabetes.

Through the years NIH has received increasing appropriations from Congress. In the current fiscal year it is receiving \$1,532,000,000 for research yet here is this legislation authorizing an additional \$23.5 million for diabetes research.

Additionally, this bill provides for the establishment of a commission to direct diabetes research, the very function which was supposed to have been vested in NIH.

I oppose this bill, not because of lack of concern for those who are or may be afflicted with diabetes, but because of the huge expenditure already being made for research in the field of human afflictions. If there has been a lack of attention to diabetes on the part of the National Institutes of Health then legislation should have been directed to that situation, not to establishing still another commission and adding another \$23.5 million to the more than \$1.5 billion already being spent.

The citizens of this country cannot afford the luxury of this kind of costly duplication.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the legisla-

tion before us today will require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to establish a new National Commission on Diabetes. This 17-member Commission is to consist of the directors of the 7 Institutes of Health concerned with diabetes, 6 nongovernmental scientific or health specialists, and 4 public members—at least 2 of whom must be diabetics or parents of diabetics. Nothing could be more significant for the 10 million Americans who are now afflicted with diabetes or for the 325,000 new diabetics recognized each year.

If the needs of diabetics are to be met, the Federal Government must expand its role in combating this disease. The committee report states that diabetes is the fifth leading cause of death from disease, and is the underlying cause of many deaths attributed to other diseases.

Funding is authorized in this bill for diabetes research and training centers. The bill also establishes an Inter-Institute Diabetes Mellitus Coordinating Committee within the National Institutes of Health. The National Commission will be required under this legislation to develop a long-range program for coordinated research on all aspects of diabetes, including recommendations regarding organization of national resources, data collection on diabetes, the education of scientists and health manpower on diabetes, and programs for diabetes screening, detection, counseling and education.

I am hopeful that this bill will soon be enacted into law.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the House today passed H.R. 12417, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act. Last year, after hearing from several constituents of mine who either have diabetes or have loved ones who are afflicted by that disease, I joined several of my colleagues in sponsoring this legislation to intensify the attack upon diabetes.

Diabetes is one of our Nation's major health problems. Currently, there are more than 5 million Americans who are afflicted with diabetes. Of these, over 1½ million persons are not aware that they have diabetes. Even more unfortunate is the prevalence of this disease in our country. It is now growing at a rate of 9 percent a year. Diabetes is the fifth leading cause of death by disease, and the second leading cause of blindness. Also, diabetes is now estimated to be five times as common among young school age children as had been previously thought.

Although insulin has controlled the more obvious symptoms of diabetes, complications from the disease have often led to the gradual deterioration of blood vessels, the retina of the eye, the kidneys, and the nervous system. Most unfortunately, there is no known cure for diabetes, and diabetes research has not to date discovered its cause.

Therefore, I am convinced that it is imperative that we develop a national commitment against diabetes. This commitment could most easily and logically take the form of substantially stepped-up programs as envisioned in H.R. 12417.

The bill directs the head of the Na-

tional Institutes of Health to set up a National Commission on Diabetes to develop a long-range plan for combating diabetes. Based upon a comprehensive study, this plan shall include coordination of the various diabetes research programs, and a proposal for various levels of government to provide programs on diabetes screening, detection, education, and counseling. The Commission on Diabetes will develop its long-range plan, and provide budget estimates for each of the NIH Institutes participating in the program.

H.R. 12417 also authorizes \$22.5 million for the next 3 years in which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will develop centers for research, training, and information programs for physicians and associated health personnel in the diagnosis and treatment of diabetes and its related disorders.

Finally, the legislation orders the Director of NIH to create an Inter-Institute Diabetes Mellitus Coordinating Committee for the massive research effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we need a national commitment against diabetes. H.R. 12417, National Diabetes Mellitus Act, provides the tools for the national commitment. I am very encouraged by its passage by this body today.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to support the passage of H.R. 12417, the National Diabetes Mellitus Act of 1974. This legislation is the final version of H.R. 7440, a bill I was proud to have cosponsored on May 2, 1973.

Diabetes is a national tragedy that has gone unrecognized for far too long. Nearly 10 million Americans suffer from diabetes. It accounts for 35,000 deaths annually, making it the fifth leading cause of death in our Nation. In addition, it is the second leading cause of blindness in this Nation. With research we have discovered it to be the underlying cause of many other illnesses such as heart disease, stroke, and kidney disease. It robs many of our citizens of their lives and many more of the opportunity to live full and productive lives.

The cure of diabetes lies in our dedication and coordination of our efforts—H.R. 12417 provides the diverse research authority to enable coordination of such areas as basic scientific knowledge, health-care delivery systems, and methods of prevention, detection, and self-help.

H.R. 12417 is important legislation. It expresses for the first time a national commitment against an awesome disease, and it supports that commitment. Although I am hopeful that the conference committee will see fit to increase the authorization to Senate's authorization level of \$2.5 million, I am proud to have supported it and am pleased with its passage before the House today.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that H.R. 12417, a bill to help in the fight against diabetes, has reached the floor. Diabetes is one of our most critical diseases, afflicting 5 million Americans, sometimes crippling, blinding, or even killing its victims. Although it can be treated, it is still the fifth leading cause of death from disease in the United States.

Diabetes strikes in varying intensities, but even those who have mild cases lead a life of frustration and discomfort. One of my constituents, writing in support of this legislation, told me his young daughter has to receive a daily injection of 21 units of insulin each morning before breakfast. Unless scientists come up with an answer to this puzzling problem, she will face this unpleasant routine for the rest of her life.

Many advances in the treatment of this disease have been made over the years. Indeed, doctors tell us that science is now on the verge of possible breakthroughs in the treatment and cure of diabetes.

Yet unless the Federal Government takes action, these breakthroughs could be years away. H.R. 12417 could be the step that puts us over the top in conquering this crucial health problem. It would provide the organization and funds necessary to wage an all-out attack on diabetes; an attack that if successful, would ease the suffering of millions of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this important legislation to carry out our national attack on diabetes. Future generations, as well as the 5 million people now suffering from the disease, deserve such action on our part.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 12417, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 380, nays 6, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—380

Abdnor	Breaux	Cohen
Abzug	Breckinridge	Collier
Adams	Brinkley	Connable
Addabbo	Brooks	Conlan
Anderson,	Broomfield	Conte
Calif.	Brotzman	Conyers
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Calif.	Corman
Andrews, N.C.	Brown, Mich.	Cotter
Andrews,	Brown, Ohio	Coughlin
N. Dak.	Broyhill, N.C.	Cronin
Archer	Broyhill, Va.	Culver
Arends	Buchanan	Daniel, Dan
Armstrong	Burgener	Daniel, Robert
Ashbrook	Burke, Mass.	W., Jr.
Ashley	Burleson, Tex.	Daniels,
Aspin	Burlison, Mo.	Dominick V.
Badillo	Burton	Danielson
Bafalis	Butler	Davis, Ga.
Baker	Byron	Davis, S.C.
Barrett	Camp	Davis, Wis.
Bauman	Carney, Ohio	de la Garza
Beard	Carter	Dellenback
Bell	Casey, Tex.	Dennis
Bennett	Cederberg	DeJuliens
Bergland	Chamberlain	Denholm
Bevill	Chappell	Devine
Biaggi	Chisholm	Dickinson
Blester	Clancy	Diggs
Bingham	Clark	Don H.
Blackburn	Clausen,	Dingell
Boggs	Clay	Donohue
Bolling	Cleveland	Downing
Bowen	Cochran	Drinan
Brademas		
Bray		

Dulski	Long, La.	Roush	Goldwater	Metcalfe	Ryan
Duncan	Long, Md.	Rousselot	Gude	Minshall, Ohio	Steed
du Pont	Lott	Roy	Hanrahan	Moorhead, Pa.	Stubblefield
Eckhardt	Lujan	Royal	Hogan	Moss	Teague
Edwards, Ala.	Luken	Runnels	Holifield	Murphy, Ill.	Waldie
Edwards, Calif.	McCloskey	Ruppe	Horton	Nix	Whitten
Ellberg	McCollister	Ruth	Jarman	O'Brien	Wilson,
Erlenborn	McCormack	St Germain	King	Patman	Charles, Tex.
Esch	McDade	Sandman	Leggett	Reid	Wyman
Eshleman	McEwen	Sarasin	Lehman	Reuss	Yatron
Evans, Colo.	McFall	Sarbanes	McClory		Rooney, N.Y.
Evins, Tenn.	McKay	Satterfield			
Fascell	McKinney	Scherle			
Findley	McSpadden	Schneebeli			
Fish	Macdonald	Schroeder			
Fisher	Madden	Sebelius			
Flood	Madigan	Seiberling			
Flowers	Mahon	Shipley			
Flynt	Mallary	Shoup			
Foley	Mann	Shriver			
Ford	Maraziti	Shuster			
Forsythe	Martin, Nebr.	Sikes			
Frenzel	Martin, N.C.	Sisk			
Frey	Mathias, Calif.	Skubitz			
Froehlich	Mathis, Ga.	Slack			
Fulton	Matsunaga	Smith, Iowa			
Fuqua	Mayne	Smith, N.Y.			
Gaydos	Mazzoli	Snyder			
Gettys	Meeds	Spence			
Gilman	Melcher	Staggers			
Ginn	Mezvinsky	Stanton			
Gonzalez	Michel	J. William			
Goodling	Milford	Stanton			
Grasso	Miller	James V.			
Gray	Mills	Stark			
Green, Oreg.	Minish	Steele			
Green, Pa.	Mink	Steelman			
Griffiths	Mitchell, Md.	Steiger, Ariz.			
Grover	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.			
Gubser	Mizell	Stephens			
Gunter	Moakley	Stokes			
Guyer	Mollohan	Stratton			
Haley	Montgomery	Stuckey			
Hamilton	Moorhead,	Studds			
Hammer-	Calif.	Sullivan			
schmidt	Morgan	Symington			
Hanley	Mosher	Talcott			
Hanna	Murphy, N.Y.	Taylor, Mo.			
Hansen, Idaho	Murtha	Taylor, N.C.			
Hansen, Wash.	Myers	Thompson, N.J.			
Harrington	Natcher	Thomson, Wis.			
Harsha	Nedzi	Thone			
Hastings	Nelsen	Thornton			
Hawkins	Nichols	Tiernan			
Hays	Obey	Towell, Nev.			
Hebert	O'Hara	Treen			
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill	Udall			
Heckler, Mass.	Owens	Ullman			
Heinz	Parris	Van Deerlin			
Helstoski	Passman	Vander Jagt			
Henderson	Patten	Vander Veen			
Hicks	Pepper	Vanik			
Hillis	Perkins	Veysey			
Hinshaw	Pettis	Vigorito			
Holt	Peyser	Waggoner			
Holtzman	Pickle	Walsh			
Hosmer	Pike	Wampler			
Howard	Poage	Ware			
Huber	Podell	Whalen			
Hudnut	Powell, Ohio	White			
Hungate	Preyer	Whitehurst			
Hunt	Price, Ill.	Widnall			
Hutchinson	Price, Tex.	Wiggins			
Ichord	Pritchard	Williams			
Johnson, Calif.	Quie	Wilson, Bob			
Johnson, Colo.	Quillen	Wilson,			
Johnson, Pa.	Railsback	Charles H., Calif.			
Jones, Ala.	Randall	Winn			
Jones, N.C.	Rangel	Wolf			
Jones, Okla.	Rees	Wright			
Jones, Tenn.	Regula	Rhodes			
Jordan	Rhodes	Rogers			
Karth	Riegle	Roncalio, Wyo.			
Kastenmeier	Rinaldo	Roncalio, N.Y.			
Kazan	Roberts	Young, Alaska			
Kemp	Robinson, Va.	Young, Fla.			
Ketchum	Robison, N.Y.	Young, Ga.			
Kluczynski	Rodino	Young, Ill.			
Koch	Roe	Young, S.C.			
Kuykendall	Rogers	Young, Tex.			
Kyros	Roncalio, Wyo.	Zablocki			
Lagomarsino	Roncalio, N.Y.	Zion			
Landrum	Rooney, Pa.	Zwach			
Latta	Rose				
Lent	Rosenthal				
Litton	Rostenkowski				
	NAYS—6				
Collins, Tex.	Gross	Rarick			
Crane	Landgrebe	Symms			
	NOT VOTING—46				
Alexander	Burke, Calif.	Fountain			
Annunzio	Burke, Fla.	Fraser			
Blatnik	Carey, N.Y.	Frelinghuysen			
Boland	Collins, Ill.	Giaimo			
Brasco	Dorn	Gibbons			

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Brasco with Mrs. Burke of California.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Lehman.
Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. King.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Hanrahan.
Mr. Boland with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Gibbons.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2830) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for greater and more effective efforts in research and public education with regard to diabetes mellitus, a similar bill to that just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2830

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 Diabetes Research and Education Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) diabetes mellitus is a major health problem in the United States;

(2) diabetes mellitus is the fifth leading cause of death from disease and the second leading cause of blindness in the United States;

(3) uncontrolled diabetes mellitus significantly decreases life expectancy;

(4) the citizens of the United States do not have a full understanding of the nature and impact of diabetes mellitus;

(5) there is convincing evidence that the known prevalence of diabetes mellitus has increased dramatically in the past decade;

(6) the determination of the most effective program for discovering the magnitude of the disease, its causes, cures, and treatments must be given immediate attention;

(7) there is great potential for advancement against diabetes mellitus in the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, of National Institutes of Health in concert with public and private organizations capable of necessary research and public education in diabetes mellitus; and

(8) the establishment of regional diabetes research and training centers throughout the country is essential for the development of scientific information and appropriate therapies to deal with diabetes mellitus.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to expand the authority of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases in order to advance the national attack on diabetes mellitus.

DIABETES PROGRAM

Sec. 3. Part D of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"NATIONAL TASK FORCE ON DIABETES"

"Sec. 435. (a) The Secretary within sixty days after the date of enactment of this section shall establish a National Task Force in Diabetes (hereinafter referred to as the task force) to formulate a long-range plan to combat diabetes mellitus. Such plan shall develop recommendations for (1) the utilization and organization of national resources for that purpose, and (2) conducting a comprehensive study and survey investigating the magnitude of diabetes mellitus, its epidemiology, its economic and social consequences, and an evaluation of available scientific information and the national resources capable of dealing with the problem. Such plan shall also include related endocrine and metabolic diseases and basic biologic processes and mechanisms, the better understanding of which is essential to the solution of the problem of diabetes mellitus.

"(b) The task force shall also develop a program to expand, intensify, and coordinate the activities of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases respecting diabetes mellitus and related endocrine and metabolic diseases. Such program shall be coordinated with the other programs conducted or administered by the research institutes of the National Institutes of Health to the extent that such institutes have responsibility respecting such diseases. The program shall provide for—

"(1) investigation in the epidemiology, etiology, prevention, and control of diabetes mellitus, including investigation into the social, environmental, behavioral, nutritional, biological, and genetic determinants and influences involved in the epidemiology, etiology, prevention, and control of diabetes mellitus;

"(2) studies and research into the basic biological processes and mechanisms involved in the underlying normal and abnormal phenomena associated with diabetes mellitus including abnormalities of the skin, gastrointestinal tract, kidneys, eyes, and nervous system, and shall also include evaluation of influences of other endocrine hormones on the etiology, treatment, and complications of diabetes mellitus;

"(3) research into the development, trial, and evaluation of techniques and drugs used in, and approaches to, the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of diabetes mellitus;

"(4) establishment of programs that will focus and apply scientific and technological efforts involving biological, physical, and engineering science to all facets of diabetes mellitus;

"(5) establishment of programs for the conduct and direction of field studies, large-scale testing and evaluation, and demonstration of preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic, rehabilitative, and control approaches to diabetes mellitus;

"(6) the education and training of scientists, clinicians, educators, and allied health personnel, in the fields and specialties requisite to the conduct of programs respecting diabetes mellitus; and

"(7) a system for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of all data useful in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of diabetes mellitus.

"(c) In the development of the plan, required under subsection (a), attention will be given to means to assure continued development of knowledge and dissemination of such knowledge to the public, which would form the basis of future advances in the understanding, treatment, and control of diabetes. Specific recommendations shall be made on the proportion of the effort devoted to individual basic research projects undertaken in the biomedical research laboratories of this Nation.

"(d) The Task Force shall be composed of ten members who are eminently qualified to serve on such Task Force, as follows:

"(1) six members shall be scientists or physicians representing the various specialties and disciplines involving diabetes mellitus and related endocrine and metabolic diseases; and

"(2) four members from the general public, two of whom shall be parents of children suffering from diabetes mellitus.

"(e) (1) The Task Force shall publish and transmit to the Congress an interim report within six months after the date of enactment of this section and a final report not later than three months thereafter. Such report shall contain a national program as required by subsection (b).

"(2) The Task Force may hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Task Force deems advisable to develop a national program to eradicate diabetes mellitus.

"(f) The Director of the National Institute for Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases shall—

"(1) designate a member of the staff of such Institute to act as Executive Secretary of the Task Force; and

"(2) make available to the Task Force such staff, information, and other assistance as it may require.

"(g) Members of the Task Force who are officers or employees of the Federal Government shall serve as members of the Task Force without compensation in addition to that received in their regular public employment. Members of the Task Force who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Task Force. All members of the Task Force shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Task Force.

"(h) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section \$500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and such sums shall remain available until expended.

IMPLEMENTATION ON DIABETES PROGRAM

"SEC. 436. Not later than sixty days after the Task Force submits its report and recommendations to the Congress (as required under section 435), the Director of the National Institute for Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases shall, through the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report outlining the action required and the staff requirements to carry out the recommended program with a request for such additional appropriations (including increased authorizations) in such amounts as may be required to pursue immediately the full implementation of the program recom-

mended by the Task Force for which regularly appropriated funds are not available.

DIABETES EPIDEMIOLOGY PREVENTION AND CONTROL PROGRAM

"SEC. 437. (a) The Director of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, under policies established by the Director of the National Institutes of Health, and after consultation with the Advisory Council (established under section 434(b)), shall establish programs as necessary in cooperation with other Federal health agencies, State, local, and regional public health agencies, and nonprofit private health agencies, in the epidemiology, prevention, control, and evaluation of diagnosis and treatment of diabetes, appropriately emphasizing the prevention, control, diagnosis, and treatment of such diseases in children.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977.

NATIONAL DIABETES RESEARCH AND TRAINING CENTERS

"SEC. 438. (a) The Director of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, under policies established by the Director of the National Institutes of Health and after consultation with the Advisory Council (established under section 434(b)) and consistent with the recommendation of the task force, will provide for the development of research and training centers for the study of diabetes and related endocrine and metabolic disorders. Such centers shall be established geographically on the basis of population density throughout the Nation in an environment with proven research capabilities. A center may utilize the facilities of one institution or could be formed from a consortium of cooperating institutions. Each center shall encompass the research and training continuum from fundamental studies to applied clinical investigation and education of physicians and allied health personnel in optimal methods of diagnosing and treating diabetes and its complications. Each center shall develop effective mechanisms for training biomedical investigators needed for research into diabetes and related diseases, clinicians and allied health personnel to deal with fundamental and clinical problems presented by diabetes and its complications. Each center shall also develop effective mechanisms for disseminating contemporary information about diabetes to physicians and allied health personnel who provide primary care for patients with diabetes that live in the geographic area served by the center.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$15,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$20,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1977.

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR DIABETES

"SEC. 439. (a) There is established within the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases the position of Associate Director for Diabetes who shall report directly to the Director of such Institute and who, under the supervision of the Director of such Institute, shall be responsible for programs with regard to diabetes within such Institute.

"(b) The Director of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases working through the Associate Director for Diabetes shall (1) carry out programs of support for research and training in the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of diabetes mellitus and related endocrine and metabolic diseases, and (2) establish programs of evaluation, planning, and dissemination of knowledge related to research and training in diabetes mellitus and related endocrine and metabolic diseases.

DIABETES COORDINATING COMMITTEE

"SEC. 439A. In order to better coordinate the total National Institutes of Health research activities relating to diabetes mellitus, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall establish an Inter-Institute Diabetes Mellitus Coordinating Committee. This committee will be composed of representatives who can speak for each of the institutes and divisions involved in diabetes-related research. The committee will be chaired by the Associate Director for Diabetes. Such committee will prepare a report as soon after the end of each fiscal year as possible for the Director of the National Institutes of Health detailing the work of the committee in coordinating the research activities of the National Institutes of Health relating to diabetes mellitus during the preceding year.

INTERAGENCY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

"SEC. 439B. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Interagency Technical Committee on Diabetes Mellitus which shall be responsible for coordinating those aspects of all Federal health programs and activities relating to diabetes mellitus to assure the adequacy and technical soundness of such programs and activities and to provide for the full communication and exchange of information necessary to maintain adequate coordination of such programs and activities.

"(b) The Director and Associate Director for Diabetes of the National Institute on Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases respectively of the committee, and the committee shall include representation from all Federal departments and agencies whose programs involve health functions or responsibilities as determined by the Secretary."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2830 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 12417 as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the development of a long-range plan to advance the national attack on diabetes mellitus, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12417) was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

MR. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, right before the vote reported on H.R. 12417, I was called from the Chamber and did not return in time to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative.

GENERAL LEAVE

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on the two bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11105) to amend title VII of the Older Americans Act relating to the nutrition program for the elderly to provide authorization of appropriations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11105

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 708 of the Older Americans Act is amended by striking out the word "and" before "\$150,000,000" and by inserting before the period a comma and the following: "\$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11105, a bill to extend for 3 years title VII of the Older Americans Act which provides for a nutrition program for Americans aged 60 and over.

Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset pay tribute to our distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, who first sponsored this program in Congress, and who has again in the 93d Congress been a leader in the effort to expand upon and improve this program which means so much to our elderly citizens.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS; and the gentleman from Minnesota, the ranking minority member of the committee, the Honorable ALBERT QUIE, both of whom have worked diligently to get this measure through the committee.

And I should also say a word about the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ESHELMAN, and about another gentleman from Florida, the Honorable WILLIAM LEHMAN, as well as the gentleman from Idaho, the Honorable ORVAL HANSEN, who have shown their deep commitment to programs to better the lives of the elderly, including the nutrition program which we are here today considering. I wish also to commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Mrs. GRASSO, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. PEYSER, for their contributions to this legislation.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Speaker, the nutrition program for the elderly, enacted into law in 1972 by Public Law 92-248, initially began as a demonstration program under the Older Americans Act.

The program is designed to provide

Americans aged 60 and over, and in particular the needy elderly, with one, hot, nutritious meal a day, 5 days a week, in a community setting.

And I should stress, Mr. Speaker, that although the nutritional aspects of this program are important in that better diet improves the health of the elderly, the nutrition program also makes it possible for older people to obtain a window on the world by providing them the opportunity to meet with other senior citizens who share their interests.

I regret to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that only today is the program beginning to be fully implemented.

For although the President in 1973 requested the full \$100 million authorized for the nutrition program, he vetoed, first, the 1973 Labor-HEW appropriations measure, which included the funds for this program.

And since, Mr. Speaker, the nutrition program had never previously been funded, the continuing resolutions which provided authority for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to continue its existing programs did not allow the nutrition program to get off the ground.

Not until a subsequent supplemental appropriations measure was signed into law on July 1, 1973, were the fiscal 1973 funds made available for the nutrition program, and that supplemental included a provision making the funds available until December 31, 1973.

I am delighted to be able to tell my colleagues, as well, that the fiscal year 1974 Labor-HEW appropriations measure signed into law included \$104.8 million for nutrition programs funded under the Older Americans Act.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Even with these delays, Mr. Speaker, the Administration on Aging has already been able to report significant progress with respect to the nutrition program.

For within a month after receiving the fiscal year 1973 appropriation on July 1, 1973, the Administration on Aging allotted the \$99.6 million to each of the States.

And by December 31, 1973, when authority to expend the funds expired, each of the States had allocated its funds to 665 nutrition projects.

By February 1, of this year, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell my colleagues, 80,970 meals were being served daily to Americans aged 60 and over.

And by March 31, 199,529 meals will be served daily, and we anticipate that by June 30 of this year 212,000 meals will be the total served each day.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Administration on Aging's statistics indicate that 70 percent of the meals served are directed toward persons below the Census Bureau's poverty threshold, and 37 percent of the recipients are members of minority groups.

AUTHORIZATION

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today simply extends for 3 years the nutrition program for the elderly and provides for modest increases in the appropriations authorized totaling, over the 3 years, \$600 million.

The \$600 million, Mr. Speaker, is divided as follows:

For fiscal year 1975, the bill authorizes \$150 million, which we estimate will provide 319,277 meals per day;

For fiscal year 1976, the bill authorizes \$200 million, which we estimate will provide 425,702 meals per day; and

For fiscal year 1977, the bill authorizes \$250 million which would provide 532,128 meals per day.

INFLATION

Mr. Speaker, let me take just a minute to comment upon the modest increases in authorizations included in H.R. 11105.

We provided these increases, Mr. Speaker, because we felt, first, that even given the difficulties the program has experienced in its first years, it has still proven to be an overwhelming success.

For the testimony of participants in the programs—the elderly beneficiaries themselves, as well as project directors, advocates for the elderly, and the administration, clearly indicated overwhelming approval for, and support of, the nutrition program for the elderly.

But I want to tell my colleagues, also, Mr. Speaker, that the increases authorized by this bill are needed if we are to begin to make good on our promises to America's elderly citizens.

For the astonishing and unprecedented inflation which we have been witnessing in this society has, not surprisingly, already had a severe impact on the nutrition program—and we anticipate further corrosive effects of inflation upon the projects funded under title VII.

Indeed, I should tell my colleagues that although early in 1973 the administration estimated that the 1973 appropriation would provide 250,000 meals daily, inflation is taking food from the mouths of the elderly. For the latest estimates indicate a decrease in the number of meals that will be served to a new total of 212,000.

Mr. Speaker, commonsense tells us that inflation will continue to keep its hand in our pockets.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, to my great surprise, members of the administration appear ready to admit that hard times lie ahead.

Take the testimony of John T. Dunlop, Director of the Cost of Living Council, before the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 6.

Said Mr. Dunlop:

The inflation in the prices of primary commodities in 1973-74 has been worldwide, unexpected, and beyond the range of previous experience.

And he continued, citing one of the primary commodities which significantly affects the price we pay for food in the supermarket:

The cash price of No. 1 Hard Red Winter Wheat at Kansas City on February 25, 1974, was \$6.19 a bushel, the highest price recorded. Prior to 1972, the highest price was \$2.97 in December 1947.

Concluded Mr. Dunlop:

The full range of primary commodities—feed grains, fibers, metals, and energy—have reflected a virulent price inflation this past year.

Mr. Speaker, the "virulent price inflation" described by Mr. Dunlop had al-

ready, this past year, taken 38,000 meals, each day, from the elderly.

And given the rather shocking price increases for primary products cited by the administration's Cost of Living Director, we would be engaging in wishful thinking if we anticipate that inflation will cease in the short term.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor thought it prudent to provide for increased authorizations in H.R. 11105.

OVERWHELMING SUPPORT

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today has the overwhelming support of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor on both sides of the aisle.

It was reported out of the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, by a unanimous voice vote.

It was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor unanimously.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Caspar Weinberger, in speaking of the nutrition for the elderly program, wrote in a letter to former Commissioner of the Administration on Aging, John Martin:

I would like to assure you that the Administration would under no circumstances start such a substantial program and then propose it to lapse....

Mr. Speaker, I hope that there is equally strong support on both sides of the aisle for H.R. 11105.

I should like to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), the original sponsor of the measure.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been the original author of the present bill and to have been associated in the authorship of this bill with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) and others who support this worthy, very meritorious measure.

There are literally millions of elderly Americans who do not get enough food to eat every day. This bill is not going to buy all of the food that all of those needy people should have, but it is a good beginning toward that kind of a program.

This legislation not only provides at least one good meal a day for the elderly, it provides transportation to the site of the meals or for meals being sent to their homes if they are not able to get out. It also contemplates that there should be, in connection with the meals, a place where there would be social services rendered, recreational opportunities provided, and educational and cultural advantages enjoyed.

This bill envisages, in short, that eventually these places where the meals are served will be, in effect, clubs for older people, where they can receive enjoyment and stimulation as well as nourishing food. We know that simply providing a hot meal for a person does not appreciably alter a person's lifestyle. But providing the meal in a congenial social setting and exposing the elderly to other activities such as casework, health services, recreation and leisure time activities, can appreciably alter

their lives and enable them to remain self-reliant and independent.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the passage of this legislation to provide for a very modest extension and expansion of the nutrition program for the elderly for the next 3 years.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of H.R. 11105 as amended by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Initially, I want to compliment our distinguished colleague, JOHN BRADEMAS, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education. A great deal of time and activity of the select subcommittee has been devoted to bettering the lives of the elderly. Under the competent and dedicated leadership of JOHN BRADEMAS, the subcommittee has carefully monitored the implementation of the comprehensive legislation for older Americans enacted last year. The determined and careful manner in which the subcommittee has carried out its responsibilities is an excellent example of how oversight should be handled by the Congress.

The program that will be extended by the legislation being considered here today is a better program because of the continuing attention and study Chairman BRADEMAS and his subcommittee have given as the nutrition program has developed in the last 2 years I want to congratulate not only Chairman BRADEMAS but also the other members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for their work.

I would be remiss, however, Mr. Speaker, if I did not also mention the significant role our colleague from Florida—Mr. PEPPER—has played in the development of this program. He was the original sponsor of legislation to establish a nutrition program for our senior citizens. His foresight in seeing the need for this kind of program is matched only by his continuing interest in and strong support for the nutrition program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill and it is one in which every Member of this body can concur. There is absolutely no quarrel with the proposed extension of this program—that the program be extended has been universally accepted.

With regard to the length of the extension, I am in full accord with the committee bill, which extends the program for 3 years. To do less would in my judgment raise serious questions regarding the Federal commitment in this area. It is important that the Congress express its desire to continue the program and to provide it with stability. In proposing the 3-year extension, we will provide needed stability and continuity to a program which we support because of its documented benefits to elderly citizens in greatest need.

As to the authorizations proposed, we should know first that the proposed authorization for fiscal year 1975 is the same as the fiscal year 1974 authorization—\$150,000,000. The administration

has requested for fiscal year 1975 an appropriation of \$100,000,000. The proposed authorization is in excess of this but I believe it is wise and justified. As detailed in the committee report, this program is very vulnerable to inflationary trends, particularly insofar as basic costs are related to the price of food and the cost of transportation.

We all know of the spiraling inflationary rates for both items. It is, therefore, important and, in my view, necessary that there be sufficient flexibility in the authorization figure to allow for necessary increases.

The subsequent authorizations of \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$250,000,000 for fiscal year 1977 are, indeed, justified not only because the program should be expanded to reach more needy elderly citizens, but also in view of what appears to be continued increasing costs for food and transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this bill and accordingly, I urge all Members of this House to support this measure.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Indiana for bringing out this bill and for his leadership in connection with it, a bill which means so much to the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 11105 which is providing hot meals for the elderly in 33 of West Virginia's 55 counties. Right now, 760 West Virginians are receiving hot meals under the program which will be expanded in the next several months to feed 1,700 residents in the Mountain State. Our State received \$934,000 in Federal funds for the current fiscal year.

The program, which includes Meals on Wheels, operates 71 feeding centers in West Virginia. The meals, prepared at a cost of 80 cents to \$1.40, are available free to elderly citizens and at costs ranging from as little as 10 cents to 50 or 60 cents depending on the ability to pay.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, people aged 60 and over, together with their spouses, are eligible for this nutrition program, and there is no means test. Also, this legislation provides a portion of money to transport the people to the meal centers or the meals to the people. This is highly important in West Virginia because of a lack of sufficient public transportation facilities.

I am pleased to support this program which operates under the West Virginia Commission on Aging in my State, with two senior citizens groups and 10 community action programs handling the programs in the various counties including Cabell, Wayne, Logan, Raleigh, Mercer, and Mingo in my congressional district.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of this

bill, H.R. 11105, which would extend for three years the authorization for title VII of the Older Americans Act—the program of nutrition for the elderly. As the ranking Republican member on the Select Subcommittee on Education, which has jurisdiction over this legislation, I support this program wholeheartedly.

After a number of years of very successful pilot projects providing assistance for local nutrition programs for persons 60 years of age or older, the Congress in 1972 enacted title VII of the Older Americans Act with an authorization of \$100 million for fiscal 1973 and \$150 million for fiscal 1974. The President requested and the Congress appropriated the full authorization for fiscal 1973, but in the absence of final enactment of an appropriations act for fiscal 1973, the funds never became available. However, a supplemental appropriations bill was enacted late in 1973 providing \$100 million which was made available until December 31, 1973, and the program was able to get started. \$104.8 million has been appropriated for fiscal 1974. Despite this slow start in Federal funding, the program is now off to a good start because of the experience which had been built up at the local level and because of the very determined and skillful administration of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who is now Commissioner on Aging in that department.

In 1973 we completely rewrote the Older Americans Act to provide more support and more encouragement of State and local efforts to provide services for older Americans. The keystone of the new act is title III which reorganizes the State delivery systems for providing these services and makes substantial Federal assistance available on a regular basis, rather than through support for pilot projects. Title VII—the nutrition program—is closely tied into the new title III and is probably the most important component of comprehensive services for the elderly.

The objective of providing one hot meal a day in a social setting—and of "Meals on Wheels" services for those who cannot leave their homes—serves more than a nutritional need. The nutritional needs, and particularly of needy older persons, are particularly great. It is widely recognized that older persons as a group are particularly vulnerable to poor nutrition. But this program also serves social, medical, and informational needs which for many senior citizens are critical to their well-being. It provides a focal point for the delivery of other services.

We probably have just scratched the surface of meeting the needs of the elderly for nutritional and related programs, and it is important that we continue the authorization for title VII for several years at a time and at adequate authorization levels in order to give it a sense of continuity and priority which will reassure people at the State and local level of continued Federal interest. We must not lose sight of the fact that the Federal funds generate additional public

and private support at the local level, and that this is very largely a volunteer program in terms of the actual delivery of services.

Therefore, I see no problem at all with the authorization levels in this bill. The 1975 authorization is held at the 1974 level of \$150 million, with increases to \$200 million and \$250 million for fiscal 1976 and 1977. This allows room for an orderly growth in the program, which today is serving only 200,000 persons on a regular basis, and also for the effects of inflation which are being felt rather sharply in food prices. An unknown factor in possible cost increases in the program is the effect of fuel shortages on the availability of volunteers to work in these programs. My information is that 27 percent of the projects are reporting a severe impact on the number of volunteers available due to gasoline shortages. Hopefully this is a short-term situation, but we must be prepared for contingencies. As I have said, this program relies very heavily on volunteers, and that is one of its strengths.

For these reasons, and because this is one of the very effective things we are doing to help those who richly deserve our encouragement, help, and respect, I urge speedy enactment of H.R. 11105.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11105, which would extend for 3 years the authorization for the nutrition for the elderly program authorized by title VII of the Older Americans Act.

This will extend the authorization for this program 2 years beyond the expiration of the rest of that act. There has been this 2-year gap between the two since we added title VII in 1972—the year the rest of the act expired—with a 2-year authorization for 1973 and 1974. I hope that when we extend the rest of the act we make all of these programs coterminous, but I do not believe that our failure to do so is any objection to this bill. While it is true that the administration did suggest a simple 1-year extension of title VII, there is no suggestion that this will not be an ongoing activity, and I feel that State and local people who run the nutrition program—very heavily through the help of unpaid volunteers—need the assurance of continued support that this 3-year extension provides.

Similarly, for the reasons which have been discussed already and are outlined in the committee's report, I see no objection to increases in the authorization for fiscal 1976 and 1977. The fiscal 1975 authorization of \$150 million remains unchanged from that of 1974—under which we have appropriated \$104.8 million. We need to allow for an orderly expansion of this program. When we first authorized \$100 million for it for fiscal 1973, for example, there was nothing in the budget for it other than continued support for pilot projects—but the President amended that budget to request the full \$100 million authorization.

Not only do we need an orderly expansion of this program, but as has been pointed out, we need to be able to take account of inflation in costs and of the

possible impact of gasoline shortages on the availability of volunteers.

This program has been tested over a period of years all across the Nation in urban and rural settings and has proved to be an extremely useful instrument for the delivery of a wide range of services to the elderly—and particularly to those living on meager incomes. Our 1973 amendments to the Older Americans Act closely keyed title VII nutritional services to the whole range of services supported under title III of that act and provided through State and area programs. Since the provision of nutritional services frequently is the focal point for providing other needed assistance, the integration of these efforts and their coordination is extremely important. I think that Commissioner Flemming and his staff at the Administration on Aging have been doing an admirable job of helping the States to bring this about. But much more effort is needed.

And I would like to make a point about that greater effort which I think needs stressing; and that is that the Federal Government alone, and Federal funds alone, will not reach all the elderly who need the kind of services encouraged under the Older Americans Act.

Precise figures by congressional district are not available, but by the best analysis I can make there are at least 15,000 persons in my district who are 60 years of age or older and whose income falls below the poverty level. Yet this year we shall reach only about 250 individuals in my district with the nutrition program with an expenditure of \$45,000 in Federal funds and \$5,000 in local funds—with an additional \$9,100 available as income from the program from those recipients who pay for meals. Obviously, we could increase the Federal funds many times and not reach all the people who are in need of such assistance.

Therefore, it is very important that to the maximum extent possible Federal funds be utilized to stimulate public and private action at the State and local level. I think that is one of the things our committee should examine rather carefully when we again review the operation of the Older Americans Act—the extent to which this has occurred. This is one of the objectives of the present act, but I think that in terms of providing services to all who may need them it may be one we have not sufficiently stressed.

I think it is also necessary to examine the relative strengths of the so-called income strategy—by which we attempt through social security increases and other means to provide the income to people which will permit them to purchase the services they need—and the services strategy as exemplified by the Older Americans Act whereby we encourage the delivery of services to individuals in need. My guess is that we need a balanced use of both strategies to meet the needs of our senior citizens whose problems are complicated by such factors as isolation, loneliness, and physical infirmity. But we need to have a more informed examination of such issues, and many of the provisions of the

Older Americans Act are designed to help provide that sort of information.

But these careful evaluations are for the future. Meanwhile, the title VII nutrition program is producing excellent results for the individuals who are being served and is well worth our continued support. It is helping meet several of the most critical needs of our older population. I urge enactment of H.R. 11105.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, we pass many bills in this House and I oftentimes wonder whether the legislation we are passing is really having an impact on the people it is intended to. I can assure the Members that this legislation does have an impact on those who it is intended to benefit. In my congressional district 150 meals a day are being served. If anything we are looking for expansion of these programs because we still have many elderly who are not being reached under these programs. There is a constant need not only to maintain but to enlarge these programs for the needy elderly. I just hope the House will vote again unanimously to support this legislation.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11105.

One of the reasons I have been interested in this bill is that I come from an area where we have many senior citizens who in their twilight years oftentimes have to resort to relief.

This morning it was my privilege to address a group of about 500 senior citizens representing 65 units in the southern New Jersey area. They are the most appreciative and the nicest people. They are not looking for any charity but what they are looking for is some help whereby they might maintain their dignity and at the same time get the proper nutritive values they so richly deserve.

I commend the committee for bringing out this bill. I think it is one of the best things we have done so far this year as far as helping elderly people.

We talk sometimes about the elderly and neglect sometimes the fact they are among the most hungry of our people. They are sometimes too old to make a respectable living as far as the monetary returns are concerned. Sometimes it is the elderly who are hurt the most, those who are on fixed income who are hurt the most by the rising inflation.

The members of this committee richly deserve all the merit and reward they can get for this legislation.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's elderly have had much of the purchasing power of their food money stolen from them by inflation. The nutrition program for the elderly bill would authorize funds to continue to provide the elderly with low-cost meals served in community centers where these citizens can also benefit from recreational and other social services.

In my State of Maryland, response to nutritional programs has been favorable. The fledgling program provided nearly

3,000 meals daily last year, but—with an inflation rate of nearly 10 percent—the number of meals served will drop to 2,500 per day this year.

Last year in Baltimore County a meal cost an elderly person \$1.25—this year the same meal costs him \$1.55. The county received \$140,000 for its nutrition program this year, but that amount is not enough to reach the 8,000 older people in the county who qualify.

Continued funding of the nutrition program will accomplish two things:

First, it will allow for expansion of present programs so that more people will be reached; and

Second, it will help agencies to keep up with inflation.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11105, a bill to extend the nutritional programs for the elderly. Earlier this Congress, a compromise, but unnecessarily expensive, version of the "Older Americans Act" passed this body and became law. This legislation while expensive did not meet the needs of many older Americans and although that legislation contained budget busting excessive authorization levels and cost inflating duplicative programs, a singular failure of that compromise was the lack of authorizations for special nutritional programs for the elderly. The bill before us today remedies that defect by providing \$150 million in fiscal year 1975 increasing that amount by \$50 million each fiscal year through fiscal year 1977 under the program.

During this time of fuel shortages, the mobility of many older Americans has been curtailed. Funds are already authorized in the act for transportation, home health and recreation, however, without adequate nutrition, those services are next to meaningless for many who must remain indoors or are handicapped. Programs such as the one we are authorizing today can provide new hope for a significant segment of our population.

I strongly urge that the 3-year authorizations contained in this legislation be passed as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and congratulate the committee on bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, ever since coming to Congress, I have held senior citizens' forums in my district each year. The basic purpose of these meetings is to hear firsthand the concerns and problems of these constituents. One of the continuing concerns is the adequacy of their diet, particularly in view of the high rate of inflation. This measure helps provide adequate nutrition for a group of Americans who have done much for this country, and I am pleased to add my voice in its support.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to expand and improve one of the most beneficial programs for the elderly people of this Nation. Since its inception, the nutrition program for the elderly has proven to be a very valuable aid to our senior citizens. Through the legislation before the House at this time, the program can be improved and expanded to

serve additional older Americans who deserve this type of aid.

Although the program had a slow beginning, due primarily to the difficulties we had in arriving at an agreeable level of funding for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, in its limited existence it has progressed rapidly and holds great potential for the future in meeting the needs of our older Americans.

Food, shelter, and good health are basic needs of every American. Yet in this time of skyrocketing inflation, even these three basic needs are hard to obtain on the fixed incomes on which many of our senior citizens live. For many of the elderly, a small pension is the sole source of income.

Across our land, rents have been rising. In many communities rents have risen so rapidly that city fathers have had to enact rent control laws just to keep the situation under control. To further complicate the plight of the senior citizens, many of them are being displaced by urban renewal projects or apartment conversions to coops or condominiums, usually for higher paying tenants. When the money required for rent goes up, it means that the older persons must do without something else. Usually this means a reduction in food.

This highlights another of the problems facing every senior citizen. The cost of the food he needs to maintain a balanced diet has also gone up drastically in the last few years. On top of this, there are predictions of shortages of certain key foods and actual shortages of others. Therefore, it has become increasingly hard for the senior citizen to find the food he needs to maintain a healthy existence.

When his health does fail, he meets a new crisis. Today's medical costs are almost out of reach for many people. If the older American has a catastrophic illness, he knows his only hope is a quick death. There is no way that he can afford adequate medical care. It is difficult for many of them to afford the medicines they need on a regular basis for high-blood pressure, arthritis, or other common ailments among the elderly.

These three—shelter, food, and health—are necessities for us all. Many senior citizens must spend all of their monthly income on just these three items. This allows no opportunity for other expenses such as clothing, entertainment, or household upkeep. For some, their budgets are so tight that they most often cut down on one of these three necessities. The easiest to cut is food. Thus they develop, out of economic need, the bad habit of poor nutrition.

This is an oft repeated story which each of us has heard from our constituents. There is a ray of hope. That hope lies in the program being conducted as the nutrition program for the elderly. This program has produced favorable results. With additional funding, it can multiply its accomplishments.

In senior citizen centers, in churches, in schools, and in other nonprofit organizations meals are prepared daily for the elderly. Food is delivered to those who cannot come to the central serving unit. Through this program new friendship is

developed between the shut-in and the meal carrier. It provides the homebound an additional contact with the outside world which is so important to their continued existence. Often these persons are unable to cook for themselves. Through this program, commonly referred to as the Meals on Wheels, these older Americans are again able to enjoy the benefits of a hot meal and good nutrition.

For those who can get out to the various places where the meals are prepared, the program provides not only the benefits of a good hot meal and fellowship with other elderly people, but also an expanded program to provide them with recreation, nutrition education, and other activities designed to meet the particular needs of the elderly in that community.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the beginning of this great success story of the nutrition for the elderly program. Great joy is brought to the hearts of many citizens of our Nation through this program. That cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Neither can the improved health and well being of the people served by the program be evaluated in this way. I assure you and my colleagues that this program so ably conceived by the select subcommittee has proven itself to be of tremendous assistance to the aging. Through this program we can help a large portion of our American citizenry. I hope that we can demonstrate our solid support today by casting our votes for the expansion and improvement of this most worthy program.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the full continuation of the nutrition program for the elderly, proposed in H.R. 11105. As a member of the House Republican Task Force on Aging, I am fully aware of the importance of this bill. This program was conceived in recognition of the terrible circumstances involving some of our low-income senior citizens. It is a demonstration program, intending to serve as a comprehensive treatment of nutritional and service needs for these most deserving members of our population.

Although the program has been active for only 8 months, some very creditable achievements have already been recorded. As of March 8, 1974, for example, 62 percent of the first year's objectives have been reached. This amounts to 123,000 meals per day as measured against an objective of 212,000. Of course, these figures give no measure of the value of the many services that are being provided in conjunction with the meals, such as transportation, social services, home health, recreation, and aid to the handicapped. Further, it is certainly noteworthy that the program is currently active in all but one State.

With this great beginning, we must realize that we are serving only 1 percent of the identified need. We simply must continue this effort and we must succeed, for it is a critical and urgent need that we seek to fill.

We can do no less than continue this effort, at least at the level recommended in H.R. 11105. As we gain experience and find ways to combine Federal resources with State and local resources, we will find the opportunity to evaluate and re-

consider all aspects of this program. In the interim, we at least have the assurance that this program is working and in progress, and seeking to enhance the lives of our deserving older Americans.

The provisions of this bill allow us to show America's senior citizens they have not been forgotten. These are citizens who have worked all their lives and who now deserve, at least, the assurance of a decent meal and the supportive services contained in this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt enactment of this most important legislation.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the nutrition program for the elderly symbolizes our commitment to the elderly Americans who have given so much to this country. Since its passage in 1972, the program has offered hope and assistance in the fight against inadequate nutrition in the diets of older Americans. Unfortunately, the authorization for the program expires on June 30, and unless it is extended the programs will no longer be able to serve our senior citizens.

To insure the continuation of this vital project, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of H.R. 11105, a bill to extend the nutrition program for the elderly for 3 additional years. The bill would authorize \$150 million for fiscal year 1975, \$200 million for fiscal year 1976, and \$250 million for fiscal year 1977.

The elderly spend an estimated 30 percent of their income on food, and today's astronomical food prices have had a more devastating impact on them than on most consumers. Under present circumstances, many older Americans have been forced to make the unnecessary decision between food and fuel or other necessities. The nutrition program for the elderly provides grants to States to pay up to 90 percent of the costs of establishing "hot meal" programs for people 60 years of age or older and their spouses. These low-cost nutritionally sound meals are served in strategic locations such as community centers, senior citizen centers, schools, and churches. Here the elderly citizen may escape isolation and come in contact with other people in the same age and interest range. The program also arranges to provide meals for those people who are unable to leave their homes.

During this fiscal year, Connecticut is receiving \$1,360,000 for the nutrition program, or about one-fourth of what it could utilize. At the present time, 10 regional programs are operational throughout the State—two of which began last month—and serve about 1,925 meals per day. Additional programs are being funded and the full statewide program is expected to serve 2,500 meals per day.

In my Sixth District, the central Connecticut area is served by programs in the greater New Britain and Bristol areas. Another program in Enfield receives funds from the Capital Region program operated by the Community Renewal Team of Hartford. In addition, operations have begun for programs in Newtown, Thomaston, Southbury, Watertown, and the towns of the Litchfield Hills area.

Few people can deny the need for this program and few can deny the enthusiastic response which has accompanied the implementation of the 1972 law. Under these circumstances, not extending the nutrition program for the elderly would be tragic. The fact that so many of my colleagues on the subcommittee and full committee are cosponsoring this 3-year extension underscores the value of the program and the overwhelming support of the Congress for it.

Mr. Speaker, too many Americans are robbed of their dignity and independence in their later years by inflation and loneliness. By providing for the continuation of the nutrition program for the elderly, we will insure for our senior citizens the continuation of their self-reliance, health, and well-being.

In February 1972, the House passed the original authorization for the nutrition program for the elderly by a vote of 350 to 23. I am confident that today we will again show our overwhelming support for this beneficial program by suspending the rules and passing H.R. 11105.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11105. The nutrition program for the elderly is a worthwhile project which deserves our utmost support.

The Older Americans Act was a step toward fulfilling our responsibility to deal with the problems of older Americans by planning a comprehensive program. The nutrition program for older Americans is part of this effort. It deserves additional support so that a greater number of older people will be able to receive daily meals.

By the time this bill becomes effective, the cost of each meal is expected to rise to \$2. This means that approximately 100 million additional meals per year will be served as a result of this amendment. This in turn means that 20 million additional elderly will be fed by the nutritional program.

In my own city of Boston, the increased authorization means that 1,500 people would be added to the 1,000 fed by the nutritional program for the elderly at the present time. Although this will not solve all of the problems facing the elderly in Boston, or any other part of the country for that matter, it will certainly make a difference to the thousands who would otherwise go hungry.

We must look upon this bill not as a solution, but as a step toward a solution. This means that we must not only vote for this bill today, but we must commit our energies to an idea. We must assert our determination that the problems of the elderly are of vital importance. We must get on with the business of legislating relief for these people.

We must not look upon the large amount of money authorized by this bill as an obstacle. We must consider the millions of additional meals which senior citizens will receive. Many of these people would not otherwise eat a well-balanced meal at all.

It is equally important though, that we pass this bill, and go on to pass other legislation which will provide greater assistance to the senior citizens of our community. The elderly have devoted their

lives to making America work, and are now being left to starve and die, because they cannot afford to eat properly and take care of their health.

No country as rich as ours can justify treating their old in this manner. No responsible Congress should accept anything short of maximum relief for the greatest number of older Americans, I hope that this amendment points out to us the severity of the problem facing older Americans. It is solving those problems which we must direct our energies to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to act quickly and favorably on the legislation before the House today, H.R. 11105, which would extend title VII of the Older Americans Act, the national nutrition program for the elderly. This bill, which I had the honor to cosponsor, does not substantially change the program as first enacted in Public Law 92-258; it simply extends it for 3 fiscal years and provides modest increases in the authorizations for fiscal year 1975—\$150 million; fiscal year 1976—\$175 million; and fiscal year 1977—\$200 million. This bill is designed to provide permanent financing for projects across the country which will assist in meeting the nutritional and social needs of persons aged 60 and over. House passage of this legislation should help discourage the administration from phasing out this nutrition program or cutting its level of funding. Furthermore, favorable congressional action will help meet our responsibility to help the elderly of this Nation deal with the basic problems of old age.

Over 20 million people in this country are over the age of 60 and of these, 4.7 million or 20 percent live in poverty. When you include the near poor, especially in urban areas where rents and food are so high, this percentage is closer to 40 percent. In New York City alone out of a population of 1,300,000 aged 60 or older, approximately 300,000 are below the poverty level.

The plight of the elderly poor is tragic. Barred from most employment opportunities, plagued by inadequate fixed income, rising rents, increasing food costs, social isolation and health problems, they have few friends and family to turn to, and are reluctant because of pride, fear and lack of knowledge to utilize the governmental services available to them. In urban areas like New York City, their plight is even more tragic as rising crime makes many virtual prisoners of their homes, thus increasing the potential for malnutrition, mental, and physical deterioration. It would be unconscionable to ignore these problems of people who have contributed so much to this Nation's growth. One measure of a nation's greatness is reflected in its concern for its disadvantaged and elderly citizens.

The permanent programs established by Congress to meet the needs of the elderly are part of our commitment to fight the problems encountered by persons over 60. The Older Americans Act of 1965 set up a Federal Administration on the Aging and among other things authorized research and demonstration projects in many areas of elderly need.

One such program authorized the employment of elderly citizens to provide community services including the preparation of hot meals in either group settings or individual homes. One meals project which had particular success was established in Miami, Fla., represented in part by my colleague, Congressman PEPPER. The success of this project plus the testimony and support from various senior citizen groups and experts on the problems of the aged, prompted Congressman PEPPER to sponsor legislation in 1970 to expand this nutrition program to a nationwide basis. I joined him, Senator KENNEDY and many others that year in sponsoring the legislation which eventually became Public Law 92-258. Unfortunately due to controversies over the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, for 1973, the new title VII program was not funded until July of 1973, and is due to expire in June 1974.

When we passed the legislation in 1972, we hoped to have 2 years of experience behind us before amending and extending the program. Because of the delay in funding we now need more time to evaluate its implementation on a nationwide basis before making any major changes in the workings of the program. A 3-year extension is therefore essential.

One might ask why Congress considers nutrition for the elderly so important that it is singled out for special attention. Since 1965, in the course of numerous hearings on the Older Americans Act and related legislation, a central theme emphasized by experts on aging has been the importance of nutrition for the elderly. One expert noted that—

When poor nutrition exists and persists in the older adults, it serves to intensify the severity of other conditions which accompany the process of aging. By not specifically dealing with the problems of adequate diet in the elderly we encourage the spiral of chronic disease, physical and psychic disability, and ultimate institutionalization.

This basic fact prompted several White House Conferences and Advisory Committees on Aging to recommend a national commitment to eliminate older American malnutrition and isolation. As the former U.S. Commissioner on Aging, John Martin, noted in testimony on the original legislation:

I have reason to believe that any investment in improving the nutrition of older people will be substantially offset by savings in other publicly financed programs. We do not know how much poor nutrition is costing in Medicaid or Medicare dollars, let alone misery, illness and premature senility.

The success of the nutrition programs now in operation is encouraging. Hot meals are being provided across the Nation by senior citizen centers, schools, churches, synagogues, and other social settings in areas with concentrations of elderly poor. These programs offer not only nutritious meals, but friendship and companionship for many senior citizens as well. They also provide employment for many elderly people who still have the desire and the capacity to work, giving them the great satisfaction of being able to help their peers. This part of the program is especially satisfying to me, because I have been active in the ef-

fort with Senators WILLIAMS and KENNEDY since 1965 to provide Federal funds to support community employment for senior citizens. It is clear that through the operation of the nutrition programs for the elderly that we are providing a worthwhile outlet for this valuable energy.

It is important to point out that the present authorized level of funding is woefully inadequate. In New York City, for example, there are presently in operation many senior centers which provide one nutritious meal daily to the elderly. These programs are currently funded by the New York City and State governments with substantial Federal aid under title XVI of the Social Security Act and are feeding 10,000 seniors daily. Significant as these programs are, they do not come close to meeting the needs of the estimated 82,000 persons over age 60 in New York who need daily meals. Thus the nutrition programs for the elderly under title VII will be an important added boost for senior citizens in New York City. Under title VII New York City is to receive over \$4 million in Federal funds which will add some 10,000 meals daily, bringing the total to 20,000, but even this number is only one-fourth of the estimated daily meals needed for the elderly in New York City.

The New York City Office of the Aging, charged with administering the title VII nutrition program, sought applicants for the new program throughout the city. They could offer 63 sites for the programs, which would each be allocated \$68,000 annually and feed 150 seniors each day. They received an overwhelming response of more than 300 applications for the 63 sites, truly reflective of the enormous need of the elderly in New York City. The Office of the Aging is now selecting the best program sites from these 300 applications, taking into consideration those areas which need sites most desperately. This task has taken many months of careful selection and has resulted in severe disappointment for many groups which did not receive funding.

I have had the opportunity to visit several of the senior citizen centers operating in my district and have been deeply touched by what I have seen. The nutrition programs have brought out of isolation hundreds of senior citizens who formerly remained lonely and totally uninvolving with the world around them. The nutrition programs have encouraged numerous older Americans to participate actively in the affairs of their senior centers and have stimulated new and lasting friendships among the members. I might add however, how personally distressing it has been for me to see these centers forced to close their doors to so many elderly who need a hot nutritious meal. Unfortunately, there are limits to the amount of people a center can serve and, once that number is reached, the doors have to be locked and many hungry elderly people have to be turned away, a truly pathetic sight.

Just last week one of my staff members who spoke to the director of the Moshulu-Montefiore Senior Citizens Center in the Bronx—which is now funded by title

XVI—was struck by the concern of the director over the absence of another senior center in the area. Mr. Jay Roth, director of the program, confirmed our belief that the Montefiore Senior Center was operating extremely well and that the nutrition programs served as a link to the active participation of senior citizens in many of the center's activities. Yet Mr. Roth noted that the center was operating "too well." Registration at the Moshulu-Montefiore Senior Center is up to 600 persons, which mean that individuals who desire the lunch offered by the center can receive the meal 2 or 3 days a week at the most. Furthermore, there is a list of about 600 persons who would like to join the center. This would double the center's membership and reduce to one meal every 2 weeks the nutritional assistance that the center could supply for each senior citizen, all of whom need hot meals much more frequently. It is quite obvious that an additional senior citizens center is greatly needed in this area and in hundreds of other areas across this Nation. Unfortunately the funds are not yet available. The Bronx has been allotted eight centers to operate under title VII funds for its 245,000 citizens over the age of 60. This means for every 30,000 seniors there will be only one center. Obviously due to other programs in the Bronx the ratio is not quite that bad yet it is clear that the present funding is not sufficient.

A nation as affluent as ours should consider it a privilege to be able to offer its most respected citizens the chance to benefit from their long years of hard work by providing meals, employment, and social fulfillment on a daily basis. I trust that my colleagues will move swiftly to pass this legislation and follow up this action by increasing the funding for this vital nutrition program for the elderly.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 11105, to extend and expand nutrition programs for Americans over 60 years of age.

As one of the original sponsors of the Older Americans Act, I am delighted with the progress that has been made toward lessening the isolation of senior citizens and improving their diet.

The Puget Sound region and Snohomish County in particular have been in the national forefront of developing hot lunch and meals-on-wheels programs. Hundreds of older Americans receive one hot, nutritious meal a day in Snohomish County through senior centers in South County, Everett, and Arlington.

Nationally, the Administration on Aging estimates nearly 81,000 meals are being served daily to Americans age 60 and over. By the end of the fiscal year, that figure is to increase to 212,000 meals a day. Seventy percent of the recipients are below the poverty threshold.

One of the advantages of this program is that it brings senior citizens out of their apartments or homes and to a community center where other health or supportive services can be made available to them.

H.R. 11105 extends the nutrition program for the elderly for 3 years. It would authorize \$150 million for fiscal 1975,

\$175 million for fiscal 1976, and \$200 million for fiscal 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I have witnessed a lot of Federal programs, but none where Federal dollars are being put to better use.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the original Older Americans Act, I urge the House to overwhelmingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 11105, to extend the nutrition program for the elderly for 3 years with the limited appropriation increases that are required because of the inflationary spiral that has been most recently accelerated by the energy crisis.

In substance this bill reaffirms the original intent of the Congress to provide our older citizens, especially the needy, with at least one hot meal a day over 5 days a week in accessible community centers in an effort to assure our elderly of an adequate diet and to help reduce the depressing loneliness that too often and unnecessarily overcomes our aged people.

I am gratified that the authoritative testimony of the Administration on Aging demonstrates the efficacy of the nutrition program and their statistics show that 70 percent of the meals served are directed toward persons below the Census Bureau's poverty threshold and that 37 percent of the recipients are members of minority groups.

Mr. Speaker, it is only too obvious that in this unfortunate period of our history, inflation, a limited, fixed income, poor diet, and lack of transportation to essential services represent a real and tremendous threat to the physical health and spiritual morale of millions of our older citizens.

In the face of these factors I think it is very clear that enabling our elderly citizens to eat a good meal in a congenial surrounding and providing them with the opportunity to observe and participate in other activities such as casework, health services, recreation, adult education, and leisure-time programs can and will substantially improve the quality of their lives in those years when such wholesome encouragement is so urgently needed.

Mr. Speaker, any country that lays claim to being civilized has a great responsibility to reasonably care for and encourage its older people who have, in their time and turn, contributed and sacrificed so much for the continuing freedom and progress of their fellow citizens. This bill is intended to partly fulfill that national responsibility and obligation and I again urge its resounding approval.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11105, the bill amending title VII of the Older Americans Act to extend nutrition programs for the elderly, and call upon all Members to vote for its approval.

On October 25, 1973, I joined with the Congressman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) and others in cosponsoring introduction of H.R. 11124, which proposed a 3-year extension of the special nutrition programs for the elderly with an authorization of appropriations of \$150 million for fiscal year 1975, \$175 million for fiscal year 1976, and \$200 million for fiscal year 1977. The House Select Subcommittee

on Education studied H.R. 11124 and identical bills including H.R. 11105, and amended the legislation to increase the authorization levels to \$200 million for fiscal year 1976 and to \$250 million for fiscal year 1977. I concur in these amendments and commend the Subcommittee and the House Education and Labor Committee for reporting this legislation favorably to the House.

I supported the original legislation providing nutrition programs for the elderly. Based on a recommendation of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, authorized in 1972 and implemented in fiscal year 1973, the original nutrition program for the elderly had an authorization of \$100 million for fiscal year 1973 and an authorization of \$150 million for fiscal year 1974.

This program enables low-income elderly to enjoy a low-cost, nourishing, and well-balanced hot meal each day. These meals are provided in senior citizen centers, churches, and other public and private nonprofit centers. The program affords an opportunity to provide other educational, recreational, and counseling services to the elderly as they gather for these daily meals. Meals may also be provided to the homebound elderly.

Under the program, the Federal Government underwrites the cost of equipment, labor, management, supportive services, and food on a 90-10 matching basis with the States. The elderly participant pays a low cost for the meal, or, in accordance with the policy of the local sponsors, the balance of the cost is provided from other public or private sources.

This program has become one of the most important and popular of the several programs initiated under the Older Americans Act, not only because it helps assure that participating senior citizens receive the nutrition needed for continued good health, but also because the personal contacts provided by participation in the program helps break up the isolation and loneliness which otherwise afflicts too many elderly citizens. Its value far outweighs its costs to the Federal and State governments and to the local sponsors.

As an early cosponsor, I strongly endorse the extension and increased funding proposed in H.R. 11105 as amended and urge its passage by the House.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill H.R. 11105 to provide appropriations for the older American nutrition program for the next 3 fiscal years. Passage of this legislation will insure that this highly successful program, which has thus far benefited millions of older Americans, will continue.

Since its inception in 1972, the nutrition program has received a great amount of support and acclaim from senior citizens across the country. In my own congressional district in New York City, I receive mail continuously from senior citizens expressing both their gratitude and support for this program.

The benefits for the average senior citizen go far beyond the mere providing of one hot meal a day, 5 days a week. The content of these meals is such that

it promotes better health among its participants by providing them with a balanced and regular diet of high quality food.

In addition, many of the participants in the nutrition program are people living on fixed incomes. In light of the dramatic rise in food costs, a rise which hit 20 percent in New York City alone in 1973, the distributing of one full meal a day provides these individuals with real relief from the crushing burdens of inflation.

The nutrition program provides an additional equally as important benefit. Being that most of the meals under the program are distributed at clubs, churches, and schools, these senior citizens, who might otherwise face life of complete isolation, are now able to meet their friends and acquaintances at least once a day. This regular contact does a lot to lift the cloud of loneliness which covers so many of our elderly citizens today.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 11105, and a strong supported entire older American nutrition program, I am pleased at the opportunity to speak on behalf of this legislation. This bill will insure the continuation of this worthwhile program at least through 1977. The increased authorizations in the bill will allow for increased participation in this program by those senior citizens who are presently not included.

Mr. Speaker, millions of elderly Americans have come to rely on the nutrition program to provide them both with decent meals and meaningful social contact. Let us in the Congress continue our commitment to improving the quality of life for older Americans, a commitment which has this far resulted in an 11-percent increase in social security benefits, the establishment of a supplemental security income program for blind and disabled older Americans, and increases in annuities for retired Federal employees. The older American nutrition program has proved itself to be a meritorious program, worthy of continued funding. I recommend and expect its overwhelming approval this afternoon by my colleagues.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 11105, to extend the nutrition program for the elderly. As Chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Aging, I am well aware of how effective this program is, both in preventing malnutrition among the elderly and in bringing people together for needed social contacts.

The nutrition program allows the elderly to seek vitally important help with dignity. All participants are given an opportunity to pay all or part of the cost of the meals that they receive. There is no degrading means test to be met and no one is turned away, because of the inability to pay.

My own State of Connecticut provides a solid example of the role this program can play. Connecticut received \$1.3 million in the last fiscal year under this program, and set up 11 regional projects with those funds. Seventy separate meal sites were encompassed by these projects, and this program is now serving

between 2,500 and 3,000 nutritious meals a day.

Mr. Speaker, so far a total of \$98.6 million has been released to the States under the nutrition program for the elderly. Today's legislation will double that amount by 1977. In my view, this money is well spent. In this land of great affluence, there is no excuse for any of our elderly to go hungry, and this program goes a long way to prevent that from happening. I strongly support this legislation as a sound step toward establishing a permanent program of elderly nutrition, and urge its passage.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1972, Public Law 92-258 was enacted adding title VII to the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a nutrition program for older Americans. In fiscal 1974 the Congress appropriated \$104,800,000 for this program—\$5,200,000 more than the President had requested.

The purpose of this program is to provide older Americans, particularly those with low incomes, with low-cost, nutritionally sound meals served in local community centers, such as schools, churches, and senior citizen centers. Besides promoting better health among the elderly through improved nutrition, the program is aimed at reducing the isolation of old age and meeting the social needs of our older citizens.

Many elderly persons do not eat adequately. First, in many cases, they cannot financially afford to do so; second, they lack the information and encouragement to select and prepare nourishing and well-balanced meals; third, they have limited mobility which may impair their capacity to shop and cook for themselves. Additionally, many of our senior citizens have feelings of isolation, rejection, and loneliness which sometimes discourages the preparation of a meal that will be eaten alone.

I am pleased that the Congress has recognized the need for and generously supported a national program to promote better health among the older segment of our population through improved nutrition. I am hopeful this program will go a long way in reducing the sense of isolation among our older Americans.

I rise in support of H.R. 11105. Mr. Speaker, I include an article from today's Christian Science Monitor in the RECORD at this time:

MORE AND MORE ELDERLY REBUILDING LIVES OF ACTIVITY

(By Florence Mouckley)

Five years ago Moshe Dove was asked to retire from his job as a maintenance engineer in a hospital. Soon after, he joined a senior citizens group in Venice, California.

Then he learned about a pilot project on the needs of the elderly at the University of California at Los Angeles—and today, well-read but with a modest formal education, he is teaching a course on the problems of aging at UCLA. Most of his students are undergraduates.

A Monitor survey finds that more and more elderly Americans are radically changing the stereotyped image of old people as lonely and aimless.

Older people are becoming active, involved with people and with life around them, and are giving of their skills, knowledge and expertise that they have accumulated over a lifetime, the survey shows.

ATTITUDES CHANGE SLOWLY

It is not happening in a flash. Ingrained attitudes of older people as "useless" are held by many elderly people themselves, as well as by a large segment of American society.

And "too many retirees just want to sit and be entertained," complains an official of one senior citizens' organization. "It's a constant struggle to get them involved in the community. We try to encourage volunteerism in our local chapters, but it's awfully hard to get new retirees involved."

Nevertheless, thousands of programs across the country—both public and private—are working at widening opportunities for the elderly.

Organizations such as the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., are out to give senior citizens a political voice and clout. Groups like the Gray Panthers are determined to change the image of "old people" and upset society's "putdown."

A SECOND CAREER

In New York City, Joseph Simon, a retiree with a chemical engineering degree and 52 years' experience in operating his own business, is now fully engaged in a second career.

He is a volunteer in the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) sponsored by the Community Service Society of New York, a non-profit, federally funded social agency.

He works in RSVP's "two-together" program, which provides tutoring for children referred to it by the city's probation office.

One day recently, Mr. Simon was all smiles as he announced that one of his pupils—a 14-year-old who had reached the eighth grade but who could only read on a first-grade level—"knew 48 out of the 55 words that I tested him on. These are all the words he had difficulty in reading previously."

"I FEEL GRATEFUL"

Mr. Simon has very simple words to explain why he devotes his time to these youngsters: "I feel grateful that life has been good to me and I want to give some of it back."

Many older people, say those professionals who work with them have two basic priorities: to maintain their health and to supplement meager Social Security benefits. But beyond that they want significant relationships with other people, and activities that "mean something."

"What happened," says gerontologist Dr. James Peterson, "is that our society defined older people as socially 'useless' and they accepted that classification and they withdrew. It's partly their fault and partly society's fault for putting them on the shelf. Now, when we give them the opportunity to become part of the mainstream they love it."

Dr. Peterson, of the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center of the University of Southern California, came up with these findings from a study he undertook of middle-class older people in which there were 70,000 respondents:

Older people's interests and concerns are no different than those of the middle-aged or young people. They want to live an active life where they can put their skills and abilities to meaningful use. Their hobbies are pursued, not so much as hobbies, as for bringing them into contact with other people.

"We have determined from other studies," says Dr. Peterson, "that the difference between older people who get sick mentally or physically and those who don't is whether or not they have close friends or family. Good, meaningful relationships seem to be very basic to their well-being."

This is what Dr. Peterson sees for older people in the future: "They will be active, they will be learning—we've already proved that there is no serious diminution of mental ability with age. They will have 'senior

power—that is they will be advocates for their own position—they never have been up to now.

"Through organizations like the American Association of Retired Persons, which has legislative councils in every state in the union, the older person is beginning to feel not only involved but powerful and I think that's enormously important—a sense of their own worth and esteem."

What Dr. Peterson predicts is beginning to take hold.

A CASEWORKER'S EXPERIENCE

Julian Marcus, a retired businessman who needed to supplement his income and keep his mind active, took a job as a caseworker with the Council on Aging in Columbia, Ohio.

He helped establish the Senior Citizens Placement Bureau of Franklin County, an offshoot of the Council on Aging funded by the Columbus Foundation and private enterprise. The placement bureau, of which Mr. Marcus is executive director, tries to find jobs for people over 55. The service is free. Mr. Marcus says the bureau has had good success.

"We found that these older people had talents because whatever you've done all your life is not taken away from you the day you retire."

Mr. Marcus says that the bureau is placing two out of every five people who apply for jobs. This is a much better record than many professional agencies, he claims.

Mrs. Lorraine Boardman, a retiree of San Diego, California, who taught school for 33 years, disproves the myth that all older people need sedentary jobs.

BUSY PAINTING HOUSES

Mrs. Boardman now earns \$30 a day house-painting, remodeling kitchen, bedrooms and garages, and enclosing breezeways, among other things. She has always been interested in working with her hands. As a youngster on the farm, she made sleds. And in her off-hours as a teacher, she helped colleagues with "handywoman" jobs.

Mrs. Boardman invites other senior citizens to get into this kind of work: "It's wide open. Anybody who has skill can usually find work right in his own neighborhood."

The teacher turned handywoman says she gets the same satisfaction out of her second career as she did from her first one—"a sense of creativity and accomplishment."

(Contributing to this survey are: George Moneyhun in New York, Curtis J. Sitomer in Los Angeles, Judith Fruittig in Chicago.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues in the House today to give my fervent support to H.R. 11105, a bill which will amend title VII of the Older Americans Act to provide for the extension and increased funding of the nutrition program for the elderly.

In this day of increasing economic difficulty for all Americans, it is incumbent on us to do all we can to help our senior citizens in every way that we can. Most of our senior citizens have struggled a lifetime to provide for their basic human needs, but now find that the money they have worked a lifetime to accumulate is being eaten up with every passing day as a result of inflation and the ever increasing cost of living.

The nutrition program for the elderly currently serves 70 percent of its meals to persons below the Census Bureau's poverty threshold. Thirty-seven percent of these recipients are members of minority groups. Surely our senior citizens must, at the very least, be allowed the right to have access to federally provided meals if they cannot provide these

meals themselves. But more than just providing meals, the nutrition program for the elderly gives our senior citizens a chance to meet and socialize—a chance to share memories, and a chance to help each other cope with the problems of old age. Thus, the program is also aimed at reducing the isolation of old age by making available possible opportunities for citizens to meet on a regular basis in community centers that provide, in addition to nutritional services under title VII, recreational, health, and other social services.

In closing, let me remind my colleagues that our entire society today owes its entire existence to our senior citizens. We cannot, as human beings, ignore their needs. They have done so much for us, more than any one of us will ever realize. We must allow them the right to live out the rest of their years in peace, happiness, and contentment. It is for these reasons that I urge an immediate extension and an increase in funding for the nutrition program for the elderly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as I said on March 13, 1973, a little more than a year ago, the Older Americans Act is a full-blown demonstration of what a little financial pregnancy means when attended by congressional spenders.

I pointed out then that in 1966, when the act received its first funding, the appropriation was \$7.5 million.

The bill before us this afternoon, March 19, 1974, authorizes an expenditure of \$150 million in fiscal year 1975; \$200 million in fiscal year 1976, and \$250 million in fiscal year 1977.

That is a total of \$600 million.

Not a single Member of the House knows what the financial situation of this Government will be 6 months from now much less 3 years hence.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is fiscally irresponsible and, therefore, unacceptable. With 68 other Members of the House I voted against it a year ago and I have no alternative but to vote against it today.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 11105, nutrition program for the elderly.

The 3-year authorization we are voting on today will serve to underscore our national commitment to a program of nutritional assistance to the elderly. Under the provisions of this legislation, one hot meal can be served 5 days a week, in congregate settings, to those individuals in the community 60 years of age and older. Because the program is designed to aid the needy this effort is having and can continue to have a tremendous impact in assuring that a larger number of our elderly obtain at least a minimum number of nourishing balanced meals each week. Since its inception, the program has accomplished much, and the increased authorizations provided for in this legislation quite correctly reflect the toll inflation has taken on the foodstuffs necessary for the program.

Plans are well underway in my district, as they are across the country, to take full advantage of this nutrition program. In Bucks County, for instance, four sites

have already been designated to serve specific geographic areas with large populations of needy elderly. A conservative projection of senior citizens to be served initially under the hot lunch program is 115. Not only will meals be served to groups in the various churches and senior citizen centers, but 10 percent of the meals will be delivered to the homebound elderly. This phase of the program will complement an ongoing privately funded Meals on Wheels program which serves two meals each day to approximately 40 persons whose circumstances are such that they are unable to get around and must stay home. The lady who has supervised this program so well, Mrs. Elizabeth Ackley, has assumed the responsibility for organizing the county's elderly nutrition effort and will apply her expertise in this new but related activity.

The county's program will also provide supportive services which will strengthen the basic objective of bringing balanced meals to the elderly. Transportation to the congregate settings, nutritional education, health and welfare counseling and referral services and shopping assistance will all supplement the nutrition program. We cannot overlook a highly significant side benefit of this entire effort which is the opportunity it provides for companionship and daily contacts with other individuals among a segment of our population which tends to become increasingly isolated with advanced age.

As an early supporter of the nutrition program title added to the Older Americans Act in 1972 and as a cosponsor of elderly nutrition legislation in this Congress, I urge passage of this most beneficial and valuable measure.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11105, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HILLIS. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 380, nays 6, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—380

Abdnor	Bauman	Brinkley
Abzug	Beard	Brooks
Adams	Bell	Broomfield
Addabbo	Bennett	Brotzman
Anderson,	Bergland	Brown, Calif.
Calif.	Bevill	Brown, Mich.
Anderson, Ill.	Biagi	Brown, Ohio
Andrews,	Biesler	Broyhill, N.C.
N. Dak.	Bingham	Broyhill, Va.
Arends	Blackburn	Buchanan
Armstrong	Boggs	Burgener
Ashbrook	Boland	Burke, Mass.
Ashley	Bolling	Burleson, Tex.
Aspin	Bowen	Burlison, Mo.
Padillo	Brademas	Burton
Eafalis	Bray	Butler
Baker	Breux	Byron
Garrett	Breckinridge	Camp

Carney, Ohio	Helstoski	Podell	Winn	Yates	Young, Tex.
Carter	Henderson	Powell, Ohio	Wolff	Young, Alaska	Zablocki
Casey, Tex.	Hicks	Preyer	Wright	Young, Fla.	Zion
Cederberg	Hillis	Price, Ill.	Wyatt	Young, Ga.	Zwach
Chamberlain	Hinshaw	Price, Tex.	Wydler	Young, Ill.	
Chappell	Holifield	Pritchard	Wylie	Young, S.C.	
Chisholm	Holt	Quie			
Clancy	Holtzman	Quillen			
Clark	Horton	Railsback	Archer	NAYS—6	
Clausen,	Hosmer	Randall	Crane		
Don H.	Howard	Rangel	Gross		
Clawson, Del	Huber	Rarick			
Clay	Hudnut	Rees	NOT VOTING—46		
Cleveland	Hungate	Regula	Alexander	Goldwater	O'Brien
Cochran	Hunt	Rhodes	Andrews, N.C.	Gude	Patman
Cohen	Hutchinson	Riegle	Annunzio	Hanrahan	Reid
Collier	Ichord	Rinaldo	Blatnik	Hastings	Reuss
Conable	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts	Brasco	Hogan	Rooney, N.Y.
Conlan	Johnson, Colo.	Robinson, Va.	Burke, Calif.	Jarman	Rostenkowski
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Robison, N.Y.	Burke, Fla.	King	Ryan
Conyers	Jones, Ala.	Rodino	Carey, N.Y.	Lehman	Steed
Corman	Jones, N.C.	Roe	Collins, Ill.	Lott	Stubblefield
Cotter	Jones, Okla.	Rogers	Dorn	Luken	Walde
Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Roncalio, Wyo.	Dulski	McClory	Whitten
Cronin	Jordan	Roncalio, N.Y.	Fountain	Metcalfe	Wilson
Culver	Karth	Rooney, Pa.	Fraser	Minshall, Ohio	Charles, Tex.
Daniel, Dan	Kastenmeier	Rose	Frelinghuysen	Moss	Wyman
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Kazan	Rosenthal	Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.	Yatron
Daniels,	Kemp	Roush	Gibbons	Nix	
Dominick V.	Ketchum	Rousselot			
Danielson	Kluczynski	Roy			
Davis, Ga.	Koch	Royal			
Davis, S.C.	Kuykendall	Runnells			
Davis, Wis.	Kyros	Rutte			
de la Garza	Lagomarsino	Ruth			
Delaney	Landrum	St Germain			
Dellenback	Latta	Sandman			
Dellums	Leggett	Sarasin			
Denholm	Lent	Sarbanes			
Dennis	Litton	Satterfield			
Dent	Long, La.	Scherle			
Derwinski	Long, Md.	Schneebeli			
Devine	Lujan	Schroeder			
Dickinson	McCloskey	Sebelius			
Diggs	McCollister	Seiberling			
Dingell	McCormack	Shipley			
Donohue	McDade	Shoup			
Downing	McEwen	Shriver			
Drinan	McFall	Shuster			
Duncan	McKay	Sikes			
du Pont	McKinney	Sisk			
Eckhardt	McSpadden	Skubitz			
Edwards, Ala.	Macdonald	Slack			
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Smith, Iowa			
Eilberg	Mahon	Smith, N.Y.			
Erlenborn	Mallary	Snyder			
Esch	Mann	Spence			
Eshleman	Maraziti	Staggers			
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Nebr.	Stanton, J. William			
Evans, Tenn.	Martin, N.C.	Stanton, James V.			
Fascell	Mathias, Calif.	Stark			
Findley	Mathis, Ga.	Steele			
Fish	Matsunaga	Steiger, Ariz.			
Fisher	Mayne	Steiger, Wis.			
Flood	Mazzoli	Stephens			
Flowers	Meeds	Stokes			
Flynt	Melcher	Stratton			
Foley	Mezvinsky	Stuckey			
Ford	Michel	Studds			
Forsythe	Milford	Sullivan			
Frenzel	Miller	Symington			
Frey	Mills	Talcott			
Froehlich	Minish	Taylor, Mo.			
Fulton	Mink	Teague, T. N.C.			
Fuqua	Mitchell, Md.	Thompson, N.J.			
Gaydos	Mitchell, N.Y.	Thompson, Wis.			
Gettys	Mizell	Thone			
Gilman	Moakley	Thornton			
Ginn	Mollohan	Tierman			
Gonzalez	Montgomery	Towell, Nev.			
Goodling	Moorhead, Calif.	Treen			
Grasso	Moorehead, Pa.	Udall			
Gray	Morgan	Ullman			
Green, Oreg.	Mosher	Van Deerlin			
Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Myers			
Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.	Natcher			
Grover	Murtha	Nedzi			
Gubser	Myers	Neisen			
Gunter	Obey	Nichols			
Guyer	O'Hara	Obey			
Haley	O'Neill	Owens			
Hamilton	Owens	Parris			
Hammer-schmidt	Parrish	Passman			
Hanley	Patten	Patten			
Hanna	Pepper	Whitehurst			
Hansen, Idaho	Perkins	Perkins			
Hansen, Wash.	Pettis	Pettis			
Harrington	Peyser	Wilson, Bob			
Harsha	Pickle	Wilson, Charles H.			
Hawkins	Hechler, W. Va.	Pike			
Hays	Hechler, W. Va.	Poage			
Hébert	Hicks				
Hechler, W. Va.	Hicks				
Heckler, Mass.	Hicks				
Heinz	Hicks				

Podell	Winn	Yates	Young, Tex.
Powell, Ohio	Wolff	Young, Alaska	Zablocki
Hicks	Preyer	Young, Fla.	Zion
Hillis	Price, Ill.	Young, Ga.	Zwach
Hinshaw	Price, Tex.	Wyatt	
Holifield	Pritchard	Wydler	
Holt	Quie	Wylie	
Holtzman	Quillen		
Horton	Railsback		
Howard	Randall		
Huber	Rangel		
Hudnut	Rarick		
Hungate	Rees		
Hunt	Regula		
Hutchinson	Rhodes		
Ichord	Riegle		
Johnson, Calif.	Rinaldo		
Johnson, Colo.	Roberts		
Johnson, Pa.	Robinson, Va.		
Jones, Ala.	Robinson, N.Y.		
Jones, N.C.	Rodino		
Jones, Okla.	Roe		
Jones, Tenn.	Rogers		
Jordan	Roncalio, Wyo.		
Karth	Roncalio, N.Y.		
Kastenmeier	Rooney, Pa.		
Kazan	Rose		
Kemp	Rosenthal		
Kluczynski	Roush		
Koch	Rousselot		
Kuykendall	Roy		
Kyros	Royal		
Lagomarsino	Runnells		
Landrum	Rutte		
Latta	Ruth		
Leggett	St Germain		
Lent	Sandman		
Litton	Sarasin		
Long, La.	Sarbanes		
Long, Md.	Satterfield		
Lujan	Scherle		
McCloskey	Schneebeli		
McCollister	Schroeder		
McCormack	Sebelius		
McDade	Seiberling		
McEwen	Shipley		
McFall	Shoup		
McKay	Shriver		
McKinney	Shuster		
McSpadden	Sikes		
Macdonald	Sisk		
Madden	Skubitz		
Madigan	Slack		
Mahon	Smith, Iowa		
Mallary	Smith, N.Y.		
Mann	Snyder		
Martin, Nebr.	Spence		
Martin, N.C.	Staggers		
Mathias, Calif.	Stanton, J. William		
Mathis, Ga.	Stanton, James V.		
Matsunaga	Stark		
Mazzoli	Steele		
Meeds	Steiger, Ariz.		
Meider	Steiger, Wis.		
Mezvinsky	Stephens		
Michel	Stokes		
Milford	Stratton		
Miller	Stuckey		
Mills	Studds		
Minish	Sullivan		
Mink	Symington		
Mitchell, Md.	Talcott		
Mitchell, N.Y.	Taylor, Mo.		
Mizell	Teague		
Moakley	Thompson, N.J.		
Mollohan	Thompson, Wis.		
Montgomery	Thone		
Moorhead, Calif.	Thornton		
Moorehead, Pa.	Tierman		
Morgan	Towell, Nev.		
Mosher	Treen		
Murphy, N.Y.	Udall		
Murtha	Ullman		
Myers	Van Deerlin		
Natcher	Vanik		
Nedzi	Veysey		
Neisen	Vigorito		
Nichols	Wagoner		
Obey	Walsh		
O'Hara	Wampler		
O'Neill	Ware		
Owens	Whalen		
Parris	White		
Passman	Whitehurst		
Patten	Widnall		
Peyser	Wiggins		
Perkins	Williams		
Pickle	Wilson, Bob		
Pike	Wilson, Charles H.		
Poage	Calif.		

We must recognize that without equipment and weapons from the United States, the South Vietnamese could not resist the North Vietnamese, whose arms come from their Communist neighbors to the north. The current campaign led by Miss Fonda has the purpose of demoralizing our resolve to continue to provide weapons for the self-defense of the South Vietnamese people. The Paris Peace Accords have not led to any relaxation of the North Vietnamese invasions, nor has it produced the promised information as to the fates of thousands of Americans missing in action.

So it is clear that what Miss Fonda is up to now is the further propagandizing on behalf of victory for the North Vietnamese. Her recent use of congressional committee rooms to advocate a halt to U.S. aid to South Vietnam is another scandalous step in her road to "peace by default." I will not quarrel with the right of other Members of Congress to entertain whom they please in Government facilities or to promote whatever cause, because I would rather their alliances be clearly known to the public. But her so-called Seminar in American Imperialism is no less shameful, whatever its sponsorship.

Dissent has its rightful place, but I object that the U.S. Capitol is not that place for revolutionaries whose actions would have been considered treasonous had they occurred in 1918 or 1944 instead of 1972.

Along with other Members of Congress, I attended luncheon yesterday with eight American servicemen who were held prisoners of war in North Vietnam for a combined total of 55 years. They reported that the most devastating weapon used against them to break their resistance was not the physical or psychological mistreatment, but it was the recordings of anti-American statements by Americans visiting in North Vietnam. They cited particularly filmed statements by Miss Fonda, telling Hanoi, "I come to you as your comrade," and her radio appeals to American servicemen to refuse their orders and not prepare airplanes for combat missions.

Several of these men expressed the belief that her visit and propaganda contributed to prolonging the war and their captivity.

We are proud of these eight Americans and their fellows who served and sacrificed in Vietnam, and we resent the insult to them and to this Congress that was occasioned by the forum for Miss Fonda.

PREVIEWING FUTURE CITIZENS

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

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere pleasure to introduce in the Halls of Congress today and in the Nation's Capital this week 60 future citizens from my hometown area of Cincinnati, Ohio. They are seniors in Cincinnati area high schools, selected for their interest in Government, their examples of citizenship, and their scholarship. This is the third year that selected seniors have been

brought to Washington by the First Congressional District, the Second Congressional District of Ohio which I am proud to represent, and the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.

This week, these young people will meet and talk with many of our colleagues. They will attend seminars with administration officials, view our committees in action, talk with lobbyists, question our staffs, and meet with Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart, of Cincinnati.

There will be some social occasions in addition, but mainly, these young congressional scholars will be accelerating their education this week. As a result, they will be better prepared following high school graduation to understand our Government and take their place as good citizens in the operation of it.

I commend this third annual congressional scholarship program to you, my colleagues, and suggest that you explore the possibility of establishing similar programs, perhaps in conjunction with the chambers of commerce in your districts. This is the finest program of this type that I have encountered. Its chief value is in teaching the basic fundamentals of our Government. Its usefulness to future citizens is inestimable.

Today, I am especially proud to introduce the latest congressional scholars:

James F. Lay and Sally Werner of Aiken High School; William Dickhart, Charles Porter and Susan Wolf of Anderson High; Brian Friedman of Roger Bacon High; Barbara Ullman, College Preparatory; Vicki Lynn Jenkins, Deer Park; Rick Kreinist, Elder High; Leonard Weber, Elder; Kerry Donahue, Finneytown; Stan J. Armitage, Forest Park; Richard J. Mawhorter, Greenhills; Mark Jellison, William Henry Harrison Senior High.

Darrell Guerrant, Hughes; Evelyn Thompson, Hughes; Holly Williams, Indian Hill; Mark A. Meyer, LaSalle; Barry Mesley, Lockland; Diana Undercoffer, Loveland; Jane McGoron, Marian; David Paris, Mariemont; Vicki Steigelman, McAuley; Leo Gorman, McNicholas; John George, Moeller; Linda Spitznagel, Mother of Mercy; Donald Eugene Burke, Jr. and Dennis Listermann, Mt. Healthy.

Judi West, Mount Notre Dame; David Thompson, North College Hill; David Pitman, Northwest; Tom W. Grace, Norwood; Barbara Fluegeman and Steven Sykes, Oak Hills; Jayne Treinen, Our Lady of Angels; Cynthia Bradley and Gail Dekker, Princeton; Theodore J. Jones, Purcell; John Stirnkorb, Reading; Brigid Ferguson, Regina; Tina M. Sewell, St. Bernard; Joan Luttmer, St. Ursula.

Daniel J. Burke, St. Xavier; Terri Corcoran, Seton; Mary Helen Babbit, Summit Country Day; Randy Fort, Sycamore; Brenda Wright, Taft; Richard Klaus, Taylor; Marianne Budde, Ursuline Academy; Nancy Godenberg, Walnut Hills; Scott Ehrnschwander, Walnut Hills; Greg Louis and Alan Trenz, Western Hills; Ernest Lee Harris and Lisa Jane Anderson, Withrow.

And, Frank A. Johnson and Donald Wietmarschen, Woodward; Albert Genry, Wyoming, and Stephen Hester and Stephen Zoz of Colerain.

Adults accompanying them are Steve Baker of Anderson High; Elvin Turner, of Hughes; Jerry Junker of McAuley; Charles Payne, Lockland; Georgia Sanford, Taft; Arleth Cawdrey, Parent-Teachers Association president of North College Hill; Jeannie Brock and Lorraine Cooper of the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.

CAMPAIGN REFORM LAW

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, some members of the press have been speculating that there will be no campaign reform this year. I just want to advise them that there will be. Perhaps it may become an annual event, who knows. We had a bill 2 years ago, but the committee is working on a new bill which will set strict limits on expenses for campaigns, which will publicly finance the Presidential campaign insofar as people are willing to voluntarily contribute a dollar by checking it off on their income tax form, which will put a limit of \$20 million on each party for expenses in the Presidential campaign and which will put a severe limit on contributions to either House Members, Senators, or Presidential candidates if the public does not choose to finance them totally, by placing a top limit of \$2,500 on a contribution to a Presidential campaign.

There will be no more \$1 million and \$2 million and \$500,000 and \$100,000 contributions. Any contribution over \$100 may not be in cash but must be in the form of a check.

There are other salutary reforms of this type.

The bill also will do away with some of the reporting now necessary. It will not require reporting in an off year in any quarter in which a candidate does not spend in excess of \$1,000. It will do away with the 15-day and with the 5-day period. The 5-day period is useless. By the time the 5-day report becomes public the election is over. It will require one quarterly report in addition to the 10-day prior to election and report after election.

I think the bill the committee is working on will be an improvement and we hope to have it on the floor in the next few weeks. The President's suggestions of last week are too little and too late.

INFLATION

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed yesterday when I heard the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency announce that in his view there is no chance for any extension of wage and price controls beyond their scheduled expiration date of April 30.

I cannot believe that this Congress will simply throw in the towel in the most

important issue facing this Nation. Inflation is raging across this country. We had a rate of inflation of over 8 percent last year. If present indications are correct, inflation for this year may easily run as high as 10 percent, unless we take some action.

I know that this issue is at the front of the minds of my constituents. I think this is probably true of the constituents of every Member of this House.

I am well aware of the fact that the AFL-CIO and other labor organizations are strongly opposed to the extension of controls, even on a standby basis. And their opposition is entirely understandable, because the controls have been administered in such a way as to penalize working people. Wage controls have been stiff, while controls over prices have been largely ineffective and controls over profits have been nonexistent.

But in the long run it will be working people, as well as retirees and others on fixed incomes, who will be hurt the most by inflation. In the short run, organized labor may make big gains in wage levels, but these will be passed on, with extras, to the consumers, and real wages will go down, not up.

Because the controls have been unfairly administered up to now does not absolve Congress of the responsibility of trying to halt inflation. We in the Congress must make a vigorous and honest effort to see that the administration does a better job.

I respectfully submit that the Banking and Currency Committee must report out a bill, even if it does so with an unfavorable recommendation. Then at least the House can work its will. How can any of us face our constituents this spring, summer, and fall, when they ask us what we have done to stop the constantly rising prices of food and other necessities, and we have to say: "the committee in charge would not even give us the chance to vote on price controls."

I urge the Banking and Currency Committee to report out a bill that will not only extend the President's powers to impose controls, but will provide mandatory procedures for correcting the distortions and inequities of the past and preventing their recurrence and set realistic goals for the leveling off of the inflationary spiral. Then at least the Congress will have met its responsibilities to the American people.

LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for 9 years Roy Owens has owned his own home in Eureka Hollow, in the heart of the McDowell County coalfields at Eckman, W. Va. Roy Owens is a disabled coal miner in his sixties, drawing compensation for black lung. I visited Roy and his wife on Saturday, and also talked with many of Roy's neighbors who own their own homes in this former coal camp.

Shock waves broke through Eureka Hollow when 21 families received eviction notices to get out of their own homes within 60 days. It seems that the Pocahontas Fuel Co., a subsidiary of Consolidation Coal Co. plans to slice the top off the mountain and build a strip mine above Eureka Hollow. Although Roy Owens and most of his neighbors actually own their homes, the land is owned by the coal company. So in a cruel, callous two sentence letter they were told to get out and take their houses with them if they wanted. The letter included this brutal sentence:

"You have the privilege of moving the house or any materials within," they were told. They were not offered any compensation, were not told where to go, just told get out.

What about Lawrence Mitchem, who suffered a broken hip in a coal mining accident, who raised a family of 10, and who is now retired on disability? Mr. Mitchem asked me this question about his house: "If I was able to tear it down, where would I take it?"

Meanwhile, the strip mining operation will go forward, as the coal company proclaims it will mine about 6,000 tons of coal a day.

Mr. Speaker, the rights of human beings are fundamental in the United States of America. It is time we stop pushing people around in the name of the energy crisis. Is Eureka Hollow going to be the symbol of what the coal companies do to the people's rights in this country?

What excuse does the coal company have for this cold, heartless, callous and cruel conduct? First, they have called me a "publicity hound" for having exposed their outrageous scheme. Then, they suggested I ought to get them "help from the Federal Government for relocating these people." What kind of subsidy do they expect? Who caused the problem in the first place? Whose property rights are being violated?

The following article from the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Dispatch of March 18, 1974, includes some comments on this situation in the West Virginia coalfields. The story is still unfolding. I hope that knowledge of this terribly unjust situation will help protect the rights of others threatened by exploitation in the coalfields:

LIFE IN THE COALFIELDS—NEW W. VA. STRIP MINE TO FORCE PEOPLE OFF THE LAND
(By H. Ray Evans)

ECKMAN, W. VA.—Plans for a new strip mining operation at Eureka Hollow near this McDowell County community have brought notices to 23 families to move out of an old coal camp.

The situation was termed "cruel and heartless" by Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va., in a news release yesterday. Hechler said he has sent a "strong telegram of protest" to the Pocahontas Fuel Co. Division of Consolidation Coal Co. and the Northfork Land Co. about the situation.

"If that doesn't produce results, I plan to take other steps to insure that these people who are helplessly being pushed around have their rights protected," Hechler said.

Contacted for comment yesterday about Hechler's charges, officials of the coal com-

pany and the land company denied any evil intent or any violation of the rights of the residents, many of whom were termed "squatters."

Haze Cochran, vice president of public relations for Consolidation Coal Co., said in Pittsburgh that he had not known of the situation until contacted yesterday but upon checking into it he found that most of the residents involved "are squatters or trespassers."

"I think the thing to do here is for all the parties concerned to sit down and see what could be worked out. It's the first I've heard of it. If someone had called me and said, 'Look, there's a hardship being created for these people,' then probably we could work something out," Cochran said.

"We probably still can work something out. I don't think it's fair to paint us as the big, dirty landlord. I intend to get into this thing a little deeper with our people and see what we can work out," he added.

Hechler said in his news release that the families have been notified to move their own homes and many have lived in the community for 30 or more years.

"It is outrageous that the coal company is trying to throw them out on the excuse that the land isn't owned by those who have full ownership of the houses on the land.

"These families, which include many disabled coal miners, widows, crippled people and children, were brutally informed in a cold, two-sentence letter from the Northfork Land Co., dated March 5: 'Our lease will be canceled and the lessor wants possession of property within sixty days or by May 4, 1974. You have the privilege of moving the house or any materials within.'

"In other words, these people are being told they can jack up their own house, put it on a mule, and move it wherever they want to move it but the land belongs to those who want to strip mine," Hechler charged.

Mrs. Ruby Dalton, secretary-treasurer of Northfork Land Co., confirmed, when contacted at her home in Kyle yesterday, that she had delivered the notice mentioned by Hechler.

But she said the land company had no choice in the matter since it leased the land from Pocahontas and Pocahontas canceled the lease because it wanted to open a new strip mine.

The land and most of the housing units on it originally comprised a coal camp connected with the Old Eureka Mining Co. which operated there in the 1920s, according to a resident.

Mrs. Dalton said Northfork originally leased the land from Crozier Coal and Coke Co., then from Pocahontas after Pocahontas bought all of Crozier's holdings.

She said Northfork never has owned the land but it did sell some of the old coal camp houses through the years and rented other units. Occupants of the housing units also have been charged \$20 a year to lease the land on which the houses are located, she said.

"When they bought these houses, they knew it was on leased property and we couldn't sell them the land," she said explaining that the leases on the land are on a 30 to 60 day cancellation basis.

"They fixed up some of the houses but many didn't even bother to pay the lease on the land. When Pocahontas Fuel told me they were cancelling the lease, what was I to say? I felt bad, but what could I do?"

"Some of them came to see me and raised a lot of sand, but I went over the books and out of 20 some notices I issued there were only four people that had paid their rent. A lot of them were squatters—they move in with no lease agreement at all," she said.

Mrs. Dalton said she did ask Pocahontas for an extension until school is out and this

was granted so that the residents now have until sometime in June to move.

Mrs. Dalton said many of the houses are very old and wouldn't be worth moving to another location. "Three-fourths of the housing is terrible."

Asked why Northfork never evicted those tenants who have failed to pay their leases in the past, she said "because I just didn't go up there to evict them."

She said two families already have moved out since getting the notice and she has made efforts to help others find housing elsewhere. "I'm just trying to help them as a friend," she said.

William Graham, one of the residents notified to move, said he bought the house he now lives in from Robert Miller, now deceased, in 1961 for \$750 and leased the land for \$20 a year. He said he made payments on the house and received receipts for his payments and still owes less than \$100 on the purchase price.

Roy Owens, another resident, said he has lived in his house for about 20 years, renting it until 1960 when he bought it for \$900. He said he made the last payment in 1965. He said he has paid his lease on the land but added that some residents haven't.

Owens said he is in his 60s and he remembers the houses being in the hollow when he was a boy going to school. His is an eight-room house which he said was "in bad shape when I got it."

Owens said he has invested about \$3,000 in siding, paneling and other improvements on the house. Now, he said, he does not know what to do about his situation.

Joseph M. Richards, president of Pocahontas, said, when contacted at his home in Bluefield yesterday, that the firm plans to open a completely new strip mining operation to remove the top of a mountain overlooking Coalbank Creek.

He said the mine operation will not involve where the housing is located but the proximity of the occupied hollow and the coal-bearing mountain is such that the law would not allow dynamiting because of possible blast damage.

He said the mine is planned to produce 6,000 to 7,000 tons of coal per day.

Richards said the coal is for metallurgical use but the demands of the energy crisis do figure in the plan to open the operation.

Hechler said in his release that most of the families in the area were promised when they bought the houses "that eventually they would also be able to buy the land."

"That promise made by Robert Miller of the land company, was never put in writing and Mr. Miller is now no longer living. Now the land company, without offering any compensation or any advice whatsoever, tells these God-fearing people that they can just pick up their big houses and get out of there. Did you ever hear of anything so callous?" Hechler said.

Consolidation executive Cochran expressed anger at this statement from Hechler, saying "If the Congressman has any ideas about how we can help these people he could come to us and tell us."

"All too often Ken tries these cases in the press where I think the better solution would be to call upon the company if he has a complaint like this and we could sit down and see what we could work out."

"Ken Hechler is a publicity hound and probably saw a chance to make something of this without talking to the people at the company first."

"If these people have a problem in moving we would certainly like to hear from them."

"But I think since Congressman Hechler has brought it up now I would think there should be some help from the federal government for relocating these people," Cochran added.

POLITICAL CORRUPTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the revelations in Maryland regarding alleged payoffs, kickbacks and political contributions tied to award of design contracts, have sparked concerns in my State as well as in many other States and jurisdictions along the lines, "What can be done to prevent such improper practices in this area?"

The architectural and engineering professions are deeply embarrassed and distressed by the highly unfavorable publicity stemming from the Maryland scandals since they seem to center on the influencing of the award of architectural and engineering contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which is aimed at reducing the inclination and opportunity to engage in kickbacks in all Federal negotiated contracts.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I spoke at the 1974 Architects-Engineers Public Affairs Conference on this matter. I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point, my speech which will clarify the basis and the need for this legislation which also includes the text of the bill which I introduced today.

ANNUAL ARCHITECTS-ENGINEERS PUBLIC AFFAIRS CONFERENCE SPEECH

(By Representative LAWRENCE J. HOGAN)

It will not come as news to any of you that my State has a serious problem which it shares with the architectural and engineering professions. I am referring, of course, to the investigations, testimony, public statements and news stories dealing with alleged kickbacks, bribes, payoffs or illegal political contributions by architects and engineers seeking contracts in Maryland.

Our current Governor says these shenanigans ended when he became Governor. However, those who contributed to Governor Marvin Mandel's 1970 campaign received overwhelming returns on their investments in State business. The largest single group contributing to his campaign was architects, engineers, contractors and those renting space to the State. 293 of these contractors in the over-\$1,000 category provided 37% of the total amount he reported spending, and 40% of this amount came from those who profited by decisions of the board of public works. These architects and engineers received contracts from the State totaling \$14.8 million, for a return of \$100 for every 67¢ contributed. Contributing contractors did even better. They were granted extras and changes totaling \$13.7 million, or \$100 in unbilled work for every 39¢ contributed.

I am not here today to prejudge those mentioned in the Department of Justice statement filed at the time of former Vice President Spiro Agnew's resignation. I don't have to remind you that in the wake of Mr. Agnew's resignation and nolo contendere plea to a tax evasion charge, the Justice Department issued a statement accusing him of receiving kickbacks on State contracts while he was Governor of Maryland. Nor am I here to condemn the nearly 25 engineering and architectural companies which have been mentioned during the trial of the Baltimore county executive now underway in my State. And I am certainly not here to suggest that in spite of the extensive adverse publicity that all architects and consulting engineers

doing work in Maryland are dishonest . . . and certainly, if there are extensive kickbacks by A-E's, they are not restricted to my State of Maryland. In fact, scandals appear to be cropping up in Pennsylvania, Kansas, New Jersey, Louisiana and several other States.

What I am here to say is that we have a problem, you as an architect or engineer and I as a public official. We know that the vast majority of those in our respective professions are conscientious, honest, responsible individuals, but we have an obligation to try to demonstrate to the general public, as well as to each other, that we do not condone award of design contracts on the basis of political favoritism, or kickbacks, or any other corrupt procedure. To do this, I believe that we need to say dramatically and publicly that we do not want to be associated with professional services contracts that are awarded on any basis other than professional qualifications.

I am aware that several of my colleagues in the Congress and in State legislatures have suggested that this problem can be easily resolved by requiring that all architectural and engineering work be performed by in-house government staffs or by directing that all architects and engineers be selected for work on the basis of competitive bidding. That approach is somewhat appealing, to those who seek simplistic solutions. You ask several architects and engineers to bid on a hospital complex or a sewage treatment plant or something else; award the contract to the low bidder, and you eliminate all hanky panky or favoritism.

Unfortunately, life is not quite that simple. By asking architects and engineers to bid, the government will also be eliminating (or at least seriously reducing) any incentive to the winning A-E to be innovative and imaginative or to advance the state of the art. Ask for competitive bids and you encourage the cheapest (rather than the most economical or best) design. Furthermore, with poor designs you run the risk of the attendant higher cost of construction, or maintenance, or both, and you may be jeopardizing public health, safety and welfare by dealing with the architectural and engineering company which may not be the best qualified for that particular job. Just as I would not seek bids for the performance of open heart surgery, I would be reluctant to utilize this method to find the most competent designer of a medical laboratory or an airport control system. As a lawyer, I can imagine the chaos to the legal profession which would result if attorneys were selected on a competitive bid basis.

Unfortunately, many elected officials disagree with me. In the wake of the scandals, there is a great haste to do something, even if it's wrong.

On March 12th the Maryland House of Delegates passed such a competitive bidding by a vote of 124 to 0 without any debate. If it's enacted, it would be the first such statute in the country, but you can bet it won't be the last.

The Maryland bill would establish two professional services evaluation boards, one for the Department of Transportation and one for the Department of General Services, which would oversee all negotiations for contracts on State projects. For contracts in excess of \$25,000 firms would be selected on a competitive basis. The bill would also prohibit paying architects and engineers a percentage of the total construction costs.

Governor Mandel, who always seems to be very late in "getting religion," created "watchdog" professional boards by executive order in January. The Governor's order merely allows price consideration while the House bill puts the emphasis on competitive bidding.

Competitive bidding is not the answer. The obvious question, then is . . . what is? After discussions with architects and engineers in my district, and after talking to the staffs of your national organization, my own staff and legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, it is my opinion that one means of both reducing the opportunity and inclination to engage in kickbacks or political contribution schemes would be to make such practices a negative factor in all Federal negotiated contracts. I have drafted and am introducing today a bill directly aimed at accomplishment of this goal on all negotiated Federal Government contracts.

Because it is relatively short, I would like to read you my bill. It states:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all negotiated contracts entered into by the United States Government shall contain the following clause set out in a conspicuous manner as an integral part of said contracts:

"The United States shall have the right to terminate this contract without liability, and, at its discretion, recover the full amount of any fees or payments made or due under this contract, and any other contract negotiated by the government with said contractor, as well as any additional costs incurred by the United States in completing or obtaining the thing or service contracted for, upon the conviction of the contractor, or any person acting on behalf of the contractor, for violation of section 201 of title 18 of the United States Code. This right to terminate and recover is in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other rights and remedies which may be available to the United States under the terms of this contract or as otherwise provided by law."

What this legislation will do is to spell out the fact that firms providing services for the Federal government have been awarded jobs on the basis of their professional-technical qualifications and not on a basis of how much they contributed, or for whom they performed favors.

This is not a completely new idea. In fact, there is already a federal law on the books which prohibits anyone who is negotiating, or performing work for the United States Government from making or soliciting any contribution, donation or gift, or promising to make any such political contribution or gift, to any political party, committee or candidate for public office. The fine for violation is not more than \$5,000, or five years imprisonment, or both.

But, as far as I know, this law has never really been enforced. It is, however, currently being tested in the courts. But I think it is safe to say that it was not intended to prohibit the Chairman of the Board of General Motors from making a contribution to any federal candidate so long as the government was purchasing GM cars, nor do I think it would keep any of you from making a contribution to the Congressional candidate of your choice if your firm was performing or negotiating work on any project in which federal money was involved.

Since the law covering this subject is being ignored, my proposal is a prescribed contractual provision that cannot be overlooked. It will be part of the contract itself. Several federal agencies have for years required certifications by architects and engineers to the effect that their contracts have not been obtained via a contingency or commission arrangement. The language of my bill goes somewhat further—it warrants that no fee, commission, percentage, brokerage, gift, contribution or consideration of any kind has been paid in an effort to obtain the contract. I propose to require this wording in every negotiated federal contract.

If a government agency discovers some sort

of illicit practice, it would not have to wait for the General Accounting Office or the Justice Department to initiate an investigation and possible prosecution. The contracting officer could halt the work based upon the fact this provision is contained in his contract with the architect engineer, and an investigation could be immediately undertaken at his direction. Plainly and simply, every contract between an A-E and the government would spell out the fact that the A-E has made no political contributions or other payments as a prerequisite for being considered for the performance of that particular job. If the government can show that this is not the case, i.e., that the architect engineer did, in fact, make a political contribution or offer something of value in hopes of being selected as the professional services contractor, the penalty would be substantial and, to my mind, would serve as a strong deterrent.

Under these circumstances, the owner of that firm, if he engaged in unprofessional or illegal practices, stands to: (1) lose the job; (2) be required to repay the government all profit earned on that job, or any other job he has with the government; (3) assist the government in locating a replacement for his firm, and (4) probably jeopardize all future potential for performing work for that particular government agency and probably any other government agency.

It seems to me that very few government contractors would risk loss of profit, loss of fee, loss of prestige, all in order to improve their chances of getting a particular contract.

This legislation may be very tough, but I think that we all need to recognize that the problem which prompts the introduction of my bill is one which demands stern measures. For the first time in this nation's two hundred-year history, we have had a Vice President forced to resign due to questionable activities. The American people have been shocked to learn that numerous contracts (not just architectural and engineering contracts) are being awarded on the basis of political contributions, or payoffs, or kickbacks or some other corrupt practice. The American people deserve some assurance that this procedure will not be permitted to continue.

As tough as my bill might be, I think it is far preferable from your point of view and the Government's point of view to competitive bidding.

For the honest, dedicated, hard-working architect-engineer—and I am sure that includes the majority in the A-E profession—this contract provision represents no hardship whatsoever because I'm confident this is the way most of you operate anyway. All of your legal rights are preserved. No one can take any punitive action against you until it has been proven that you have offered or given some contribution or gift tied to award of a job.

But, for those firms which substitute competence with payoffs to elected officials, they should be penalized and I am hopeful that all of you will join me in wanting to see such practices and attitudes terminated forever.

Let there be no misunderstanding. I am in no way suggesting that this legislation alone will solve the political-influence-in-contracting problem. We should be addressing ourselves to other methods for coping with this concern, but I think this could be an important beginning. I see this legislation as the first step in discouraging any illicit practices on Federal contract awards similar to those procedures which have been so widely publicized and condemned in my state. Hopefully, similar legislation will be adopted in Maryland and elsewhere.

I accepted your invitation to come down to this meeting because I felt it was important

to explain my position to you. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss my bill with you and I invite your support. I think we both have much to gain through its adoption.

For you, enactment of this bill will provide a positive and aggressive answer to those persons who have erroneously come to assume that all A-E contracting is dishonest. I know better; . . . you know better; . . . with adoption of this bill, the public will hopefully also begin to know better.

Thank you for inviting me.

A NEW FACE FOR APARTHEID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues an article entitled "A New Face for Apartheid" by Jennifer Davis of the Africa Fund; a second article entitled "Voices for Disengagement" also produced by the Africa Fund; and a third article, a bulletin by the director of special projects of the American Committee on Africa.

These articles relate to the continuing debate on U.S. business involvement in southern Africa. Their text is as follows:

A NEW FACE FOR APARTHEID

(By Jennifer Davis)

Three advertisements appeared in the New York Times and Washington Post in September. Their political implications are analysed below but it is also necessary to point out that the advertisements are full of distortions and half-truths. Thus Lucas Mangope is quoted as saying: "I have often expressed my differences with the white government of Pretoria in no uncertain terms. But the mere idea of total economic sanctions . . . makes me shudder." In fact the men and women who have expressed real radical opposition to the South African Government have found themselves banned, house arrested or imprisoned for their actions, and to advocate, even verbally, the imposition of sanctions against South Africa is a crime under the Terrorism Act, punishable by a minimum five year jail sentence and the possibility of a death sentence.

Lucy Mvubelo, the signer of the second advertisement, is identified as "General Secretary National Union of Clothing Workers (S.A.)". The advertisement fails to point out that under South African law Ms. Mvubelo, an African woman, can only be a member of a non-recognised, non-registered Trade Union, which has no official right to participate in collective bargaining. Nor does the advertisement indicate that it is still virtually totally illegal for a black worker to strike under any circumstances.

As for Buthelezi's claim that what the Black people of South Africa need is "full foreign participation in South Africa's economic development" he knows quite well that foreign investment has increased dramatically in the last decade without leading to changes in the exploitation, misery and oppression imposed by Apartheid. In the ten years to 1971 in which U.S. investment grew from less than \$300 million to \$964 million another record was set—90 new discriminatory laws were passed, all designed to perpetuate racial discrimination. White-black wage gaps have grown, not narrowed, and the average wage paid to Africans in all sectors of the economy is lower than the Poverty Datum Line—i.e. the level needed for bare survival.

DEFENDERS OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAY OF LIFE

The South African regime's hitherto subdued public relations campaign, built around the use of black spokesmen and women, took a large step into the open in September in the United States. Big, expensive advertisements with appeals against economic and political sanctions signed by Lucas Mangope and Gatsha Buthelezi, both Bantustan Ministers, and Lucy Mvubelo, a "trade union leader", appeared in two of America's most influential daily newspapers, the New York Times and the Washington Post. Both advertisements were sponsored by the Trust Bank—a bank dominated by Afrikaner capital and on whose Board sit many of the ruling Nationalist Party's leaders.

The South African Government has always tried to persuade the outside world that Blacks were happy under the system of Apartheid, exploitation and exclusion practiced by the white rulers. That way Western factory owners, British ship builders, United States motor corporations and computer sellers could all continue to invest, do business and make profits in South Africa with an easy conscience. The South African Government continued to tell this story despite the evidence of 69 people shot at Sharpeville in 1960 and 12 strikers killed at Carletonville in September 1973, despite hundreds of political prisoners and the one million arrests every year under the pass laws, despite the 80% of the African working population that is still paid below poverty datum line wages, despite the fact that no black woman or man has any hope of ever having any say in shaping the laws and policies of their own land as long as the present system of government survives.

But the myth of the happy black man has become more and more difficult to maintain in the face of increasing internal and external opposition to the system, and the South African Government has had to adopt new and more sophisticated tactics to project a favorable image internationally. "Dialogue" with independent Africa, the visit of President Banda to South Africa, attempts to project an image of multi-racialism via sports events, the new willingness to allow prominent black U.S. visitors into the country—all these were sign-posts on the road the South Africans were taking in an attempt to maintain external credibility and strengthen internal control. No one will believe whites who defend South Africa any more, as the racists have been forced to seek credibility by using black spokesmen and women. Few people in the world would believe the voice of Prime Minister Vorster or mine-owner Oppenheimer (Chairman of the Corporation which owns the mine at which the 12 workers were shot this month) when they promise that "things are changing and getting better." Hence the new tactic of using black voices to tell the story.

SAFETY VALVE

In fact the South Africans are attempting to do more with this new tactic than just pull off a giant international confidence trick. They are beginning to understand the usefulness of allowing the development inside South Africa of a black elite, which, by being given some freedom to criticise the Government, will capture the following of the black majority and curb the militancy of the people, acting as a safety valve for popular anger and frustration. Perhaps the clearest expression of this role is afforded by Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, who has at times made very strong speeches attacking various aspects of Government policy, and who has emerged as one of the most publicised black figures in the current controversy about African wage levels. In a recent speech Buthelezi said: "We need a complete re-orientation in our thinking about black workers. We cannot

have industrial workers who do not get any, or so little, of the benefits of industrialization. If we do not do something about it we are asking for trouble. I wish to appeal to South African industry to ward off a bloody revolution by making our people feel that they have something to lose if anything went wrong in South Africa. A few million Rand set aside now to meet the aspirations and needs of black workers is a big investment in the long run. It is better to lose a few million Rand now than everything later."

The tactic of using this rising black elite as spokesmen, nationally and internationally satisfied a number of different needs at the same time, and coalesces the interests of a number of very different forces. It meets internal white interests politically, as described above. It also provides a strong platform for preserving international credibility. This is crucially important for South Africa. Apart from the importance of international military and strategic support, South Africa is still extremely dependent on foreign capital for its economic prosperity and growth. It is estimated that the total value of foreign capital invested in South Africa had reached \$8,160 million by the end of 1972; \$805 million dollars of new capital flowed into South Africa in 1972 alone. It is vital to keep that stream flowing. But corporations have been coming under increasing attack in the United States, as well as in Europe, for their role in supporting the white minority and colonial regimes in Southern Africa. It has become embarrassing for many of the giant U.S. corporations to have their role in southern Africa continually exposed and attacked. They are looking for a way back to respectability, seeking a way to justify their continued involvement in South Africa in terms of a "contribution to the process of peaceful social change". Not surprisingly, they have seized on men such as Buthelezi to provide them with the needed justification. Thus Buthelezi has recently been hailed by the prestigious American business newspaper, the *Wall Street Journal* as "the most prominent black leader in South Africa," in an article which launched a strong attack on "reformers, particularly in the United Nations and American and British churches, who dream of eradicating apartheid through an anathema that would strangle the South African economy." Branding those who support international actions, such as corporate disengagement and economic sanctions against apartheid, as people adopting a "posture of total moral purity" whose purpose is concerned less with correcting the specific evils than with "demonstrating the virtue of the posturer," the *Journal* indicates its preference for men of reason, such as Buthelezi. It concludes, "We can't help believing that if any good does come out of the unhappy situation in that nation, it will be less the result of the far-away critics than of the political prudence of men like Chief Buthelezi" (*Wall Street Journal*, August 27, 1973).

VISITS SPONSORED

South Africa's new black spokesmen have been receiving support and encouragement not only from the U.S. business world, but also from significant political circles. Thus the U.S. State Department has been sponsoring an increasing number of visits to the United States by black South Africans. The list of such visitors is interesting because it focuses heavily on men involved in one way or another with the Bantustan administrations... or with the parallel government institutions in the cities. The list of such sponsored visitors in 1972/73 included Chief Kaiser Matanzima (Chief Minister of the Transkei) Dr. David Thebhali (Johannesburg Urban Bantu Council) Mr. Lennox Sebe (Executive Counselor for Education, Ciskei), Mr. B. L. Dlalda (Executive Counselor, Kwa-

zulu), and Professor and Mrs. Ntsanwisi (Chief Counselor, Machangana—Tsonga Territorial Authority). Chief Lucas Mangope and Chief Gatsha Buthelezi also spent time in the United States, the latter having been especially invited, the last time he came, in order to help lead the argument against Church leaders calling for an end to U.S. corporate involvement in Southern Africa, in a struggle being fought out within the Synod of the United Church of Christ.

Two points of particular interest might be stressed in connection with all these visits. First that these black leaders travelled with the consent of the South African Government. Secondly, that the United States Administration, which has consistently refused to recognize the legitimacy of the liberation movements in Southern Africa, and which has steadfastly adhered to the position that it can only support "peaceful methods of change" has been quick to welcome these new "leaders."

There can be no doubt that the "change" being sponsored by the South African Government is not the kind of change being fought for by the black majority of southern Africa. Thus, whatever their motives, the so-called black leaders who lend their names to the South African propaganda campaign are giving support to the stability of that very authority which will have to be destroyed before there is real liberation in southern Africa. In this context their own personal honesty or sincerity is irrelevant, and the effect of their action is a betrayal of the freedom struggle in South Africa.

VOICES FOR DISENGAGEMENT

Recent years have seen growing pressure on U.S. Corporations involved in Southern Africa, generated by public exposure of their complicity with the white minority, apartheid and colonial systems of South Africa, Rhodesia, and Portuguese-ruled Africa. Many companies have responded by developing a rationale which seeks to justify their initial investment, continued presence and ongoing expansion in these racially oppressive countries.

The most universal corporate defense raised is the argument that U.S. companies act as catalysts for peaceful and constructive change of the racist systems by investing inside Southern Africa.

There is nothing in the history of South Africa's economic development to bear out these arguments that increasing industrialization must inevitably lead to improvement in the quality of life for everyone. For the black people of South Africa the last 20 years of intensive economic development have also been years of intensifying oppression and exploitation. White-black wage-gaps widened, pass laws were tightened and extended to cover African women as well as men and the Bantustan design was used to transform the whole African population into a rightless "temporary work force" in the "white" areas. The 10 years between 1961 and 1971 set a record for the number of new discriminatory laws passed—98 of them—all based on the intention to perpetuate racial differences.

South Africa now has all the apparatus of a police state... and that framework was being built at the same time as were the great new factories and roads and bridges that heralded economic prosperity.

Despite well-financed attempts by the South African Government and many major corporations to sell the image of the U.S. Corporation as a force for good in Southern Africa the chorus of African and other voices raised to contradict this argument continues to grow. The statements we have quoted below come from people representing a great diversity of background and experience. They have one important common theme—the re-

jection of the delusion that corporate expansion will lead to significant change in the oppression of the peoples of Southern Africa, and the conviction that the logical response in support of the struggle for self-determination should be immediate disengagement by U.S. business from South Africa.

"Resolution: (1) To reject the involvement of foreign investors in this exploitative economic system . . ." Black People's Convention, South Africa, December, 1972.

"There has been great publicity given recently to moves by South African business circles and foreign investors in South Africa, ostensibly designed to bring about changes within the existing order. It must be pointed out from the outset that these changes which would consist in the improvement of the social policies of the firms, increment in Black wages and vocational training, in no way affect the basic tenets of apartheid. They are but a devious attempt at perpetuating white domination and maintaining one of the highest rates of exploitation in the world under the guise of welfare politics, . . . [the] dubious premise that economic progress and accrued investment will gradually transform and corrode the apartheid system from within . . . is upheld neither by history nor statistics. Recent statistics show a widening gap between white and black wages. The earning gap between white and black mine-workers rose from 15.2 to 1 in May 1966 to 17.9 to 1 in 1970. Black wages in the mines did not go up once in real terms between 1911 and 1970." Ambassador E. O. Ogbu, Chairman, U.N. Special Committee on Apartheid 1973.

"Our call for disengagement of foreign investment is supported by a large number of organizations and movements who are against those who advocate violence as the only solution to gain political and social freedom for the millions of oppressed and underprivileged people in South Africa." Sonny Leon, Leader of the Coloured Labor Party, 1972.

"The ANC has long called for the ending of all foreign capital investment in South Africa. We see the economy as essentially structured by a colonial-type relationship between the white minority and foreign capital interests on the one hand, and the African people on the other.

"South Africa is an attractive center for profitable foreign investment, precisely because migrant labor in abundance is organized and made easily available to business by the regime as a conscious act of policy . . . companies are not motivated by the desire to bring employment to the African people or to improve the economic condition of African workers [but] . . . largely by considerations of profit, their share of the market and the sources of the raw material supplies they require." Oliver Tambo, Acting President-General of the African National Congress, South Africa.

"The economic boycott of South Africa will entail undoubtedly hardship for Africans. We do not doubt that. But if it is a method which shortens the day of blood, the suffering to us will be a price we are willing to pay. In any case, we suffer already, our children are often undernourished, and, on a small scale (so far), we die at the whim of a policeman." The late Chief Albert J. Luthuli, Nobel Prize winner and President of the African National Congress.

"All investments are a direct contribution to the colonial war. I understand how Gulf can say that investment brings progress. Some even say that after independence Africans will have the fruits of this investment. But this progress is not real for the African population. The increased economic interests of Western countries will bring about a need to defend these interests.

"To invest in Angola, Mozambique, and

Guinea Bissau is to delay our independence. We are against it.

"At the United Nations we stated that we will consider any agreement between Portugal and these companies invalid. These investments are immoral acts against our people." Marcelino Dos Santos, Vice President of FRELIMO, New York, October, 1972.

"The apartheid government grows stronger by the day because of its solvency, which it gets from foreign investors. If the government had an economic shock, things might begin to change. . . ." Mrs. Fatima Meer, Indian Congress of South Africa, January, 1973.

"SASO sees foreign investments as giving stability to South Africa's exploitative regime and committing South Africa's trading partners to supporting this regime. For this reason SASO rejects foreign investments.

"Further SASO sees the ameliorative experiments like those of Polaroid as at worst, conscience salving and at best, resulting in the creation of a change-resistant middle class amongst the few blacks employed by foreign firms." Statement of Policy of the South African Student Organization (the national Black student organization) 1972.

"The Africans accept sanctions as a price for their freedom and declare as our enemy any person who claims on our behalf that sanctions should be withdrawn to alleviate African suffering through lack of employment. The African National Council calls upon the Security Council and all States which support the cause of human freedom to intensify sanctions." Methodist Bishop Abel Muzorewa, President, the African National Council of Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) before the UN Security Council, January, 1972.

"Disengagement from these territories (Angola and Mozambique) will no doubt mean financial loss to Gulf, but it will at least provide it with moral leadership and set a valuable precedent for social responsibility among other corporations. This leadership will put Gulf in a position of strength especially at this time when African States are beginning to pose incompatible alternatives: either investment in Southern Africa or in independent Africa or in other progressive States, not in both." Executive Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity at the United Nations, 1970.

"The basic fallacy in the argument of those who hold out any hope of political change through economic expansionism is that they fail to understand a single fact of history: in authoritarian societies economic forces are controlled by political forces, not the other way about.

"It is naive to suppose that South Africa's white society would give up its power, its privileges and its present system of more rapid economic expansion. The change-through-expansion argument should be seen for what it is—a rationalization to justify what is in the best economic interests of those who employ it. Hard-headed political analysis shows that it is almost certain to be a dangerous delusion." Colin Legum, born and raised in South Africa and respected author and journalist on African affairs.

"Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of South Africa to self-determination and freedom. . . . Condemns the continued and increasing cooperation of certain States and foreign economic interests with South Africa in the military, economic, political and other fields, as such cooperation encourages the South African regime in the pursuit of apartheid in the defiance of the United Nations; . . . Requests States members of international agencies and organizations, particularly the members of the European Economic Community, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the International Monetary Funds, to take the necessary steps to deny all assistance and commercial or other facilities to the Government of South Africa so long as it pursues its policies of apartheid and racial discrimi-

nation and continues to defy the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council; . . . Invites all organizations, institutions and information media to organize . . . intensified and coordinated campaigns in 1973 with the following goals:

(a) Discontinuation of all military, economic and political collaboration with South Africa;

(b) Cessation of all activities by foreign economic interests which encourage the South African regime in its imposition of apartheid;" Extracts; United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2925E (XXVII) 1972

"I believe that apartheid has to come to an end. I believe that America itself, with its industries and business can no longer underwrite apartheid, whether it be General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, or 300 other companies that are there. The tide is moving in the direction of freedom and opportunity in the world, not in the direction of apartheid, and I am saying that the United States government ought to declare an economic embargo against the Union of South Africa. . . ." Rev. Dr. Leon Sullivan, Director of General Motors Corporation "Meet the Press", March 7, 1971

"To the extent that U.S. corporations are agents which support and strengthen the South African economy they are also responsible for the strength of apartheid. A healthy economy strengthens white control, white imperviousness to economic sanctions, white ability to keep blacks oppressed. . . . If indeed U.S. investment in South Africa assists in maintaining the overall system of white control then the only legitimate demand possible by those wishing to challenge that control is that U.S. companies must withdraw from South Africa." Timothy H. Smith, Executive Secretary, the Interfaith Committee on Social Responsibility in Investments

"American business as it increases its economic involvement in South Africa becomes a partner of the South African state as it maintains its control over the great mass of non-white people living within its boundaries. This economic aid has helped South Africa on its way to a self-sufficient economy, has and continues to provide important political and psychological support to the racist system, and now helps the South African economy in its process of economic, military and political expansion into the rest of Africa. . . . To think that a few remedial changes made by U.S. corporations allowing a few more Africans to get skilled positions and to allow some increase in wages (even as the cost of living goes up) will challenge the pattern of apartheid and minority control is naivete of the worst order. . . . Some of us oppose this. . . . Thus we take the view that all sorts of pressure must be brought to bear on U.S. companies to get out of South Africa, and urge truly concerned people to look toward the struggle of the liberation movements and the mass of oppressed peoples for fundamental change in South Africa." George M. Houser, Executive Director of the American Committee on Africa, "An Open Letter to Ulric Haynes, Jr.", April 18, 1971

"I must report that the idea of doing business in South Africa is *totally unacceptable*; we could not be true to the basic principles on which we run our business and we should lose our integrity in the process. We should have to operate within a social climate where the colour of a man's skin is his most important attribute and where there is virtually no communication between the races; we should be locked into this system. We should have to operate within an economic climate which is deliberately designed to demoralize and to maintain an industrial helotry; we should in turn profit from such exploitation and ultimately end up with a vested interest in its maintenance." Mr. Nell Wates, Managing Director of Wates, Ltd. after visiting

South Africa in 1970 and rejecting an invitation to invest in that country.

"Most of us believe that American corporations should totally disengage from southern Africa; that the presence of American corporations in which we are shareholders undergirds the system of racism, colonialism and apartheid which prevails in southern Africa . . . even progressive employment on the part of American companies will not bring the basic changes in society that we support because of our Christian commitment to freedom, justice and self-determination." From the report by an ecumenical church team of 14 person who visited South Africa in October-November

"The basic change sought is majority rule. Accordingly, the Chairman (of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Congressman Charles Diggs) supports the principle that U.S. business should disengage from South Africa. . . . External pressure reinforced by the tinderbox nature of South African society may ultimately force withdrawal." Hon. Charles Diggs, Jr., Report of Special Study Mission to Africa, February 1971-January 1972

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA,
New York, N.Y., March 7, 1974.

BULLETIN

The white government of South Africa is in the middle of another slick public relations ad campaign in the *New York Times*—2 have appeared already—February 27, and March 6—with two ads still to appear. The uniform headline to the ad is—"Should the Black People of South Africa Rule Themselves?"

I'm afraid too many readers of the *New York Times* are going to be taken in by that regime's talent for perverting, twisting, distorting and torturing the truth—not to mention the outright lies.

Our statement "we say no to apartheid" has appeared widely in the Black press: Columbus, Georgia; St. Louis; Buffalo; Evanston, Illinois; St. Petersburg, Florida; New York City, etc., and as a full page ad in Encore Magazine.

We hope that it will be possible for you to: print it in your publication, publicize it, reproduce it, circulate, post.

Let us know what you can do and how we can help. Also, if you need additional copies we will be happy to send them to you by mail.

The best,

RAY GOULD,
Director, Special Projects.

WE SAY NO TO APARTHEID

We take this pledge: in solemn resolve to refuse any encouragement of, or indeed, any professional association with the present Republic of South Africa, this until the day when all its people shall equally enjoy the educational and cultural advantages of that rich and beautiful land.

Dick Gregory, Joanne Woodward, Frederick O'Neal, Pete Seeger, Ossie Davis, Brock Peters, Barbara Walters, Karl Menninger, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., Arthur Miller.

Paul Newman, Leonard Bernstein, Ashley Montagu, Jerome Robbins, Al Hirschfeld, Clive Barnes, Rex Reed, Elia Kazan, Betty Friedan, Norman Corwin.

Norman Rockwell, Oscar Brand, Ruby Dee, Eli Wallach, Peter Bogdanovich, Stephen Sondheim, Terry Southern, Harry Golden, Zero Mostel, Kay Boyle.

Sidney Lumet, Richard Schickel, Erskine Caldwell, Galway Kinnell, Carey McWilliams, George Price, Denice Leverett, Roy Lichtenstein, Katherine Anne Porter, Partial Listing.

Will you say no to apartheid?

South Africa—where there is total denial of civil, political and human rights for the Black majority (80% of the population)—where there is racial discrimination, segreg-

tion and control of every movement from birth to death—that is the law of apartheid—that is the law of the land.

If each reader were to join the growing cultural and economic boycott of South Africa, it could make a difference. The people of South Africa who say NO to apartheid, many in prison or exile, will be heartened by this expression of support from the U.S.

The American Committee on Africa, formed in 1953, is the oldest U.S. organization effectively and responsibly supporting African people in their heroic struggle for dignity and freedom. ACOA is a non-profit organization. Hon. William H. Booth, President, George M. Houser, Executive Director.

National Committee: Arthur Ashe, Bella Abzug, Thurman Arnold, James Baldwin, Roger N. Baldwin, Stringfellow Barr, James B. Carey, Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Hon. Donald Fraser, Donald S. Harrington, Clarence B. Jones, Eugene J. McCarthy, Frank C. Montero, Wayne Morse, F. D. Patterson, Sidney Poitier, A. Phillip Randolph, Hon. Charles B. Rangel, Victor Reuther, Cleveland Robinson, Robert St. John, Hope R. Stevens, Howard Thurman, Stanley V. Wright (partial listing).

LABOR—FAIR WEATHER FRIEND— XII

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I come from 1 of 19 States that have so-called right-to-work statutes, which enable States to prohibit labor contracts that require union membership as a prerequisite for being hired. This prohibits the closed shop. These laws are allowed under the Taft-Hartley Act, and are as vigorously opposed by labor as they are supported by management.

One of the effects of these statutes is that they make it very difficult for a union to maintain the membership of every employee in an organized company. In my State, organized labor represents only a fraction of the working force, thanks in part to statutes like this.

Regardless of how one might feel about the merits of this particular issue, the right-to-work issue is almost universally regarded as the litmus test of one's feelings about organized labor. Opponents of unions use it as a test of loyalty to business and management. Labor sees the issue as basic to its own survival—and so does business. There is no middle ground on this issue.

When it came time for the House to consider repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, labor made repeal its top priority. Management made defeat of the repealer its top priority. If ever there was a time when the bedrock friends of labor came to a test, it was on this issue.

When the votes were counted, only four Texans supported repeal. Out of 19 States with right-to-work laws, only 18 Democrats voted for the repeal of 14(b). Fifteen of those votes, including mine, came from areas where there was heavy opposition to the repeal.

It was a close vote. It was an issue in which labor counted its friends. It was an issue where there was no middle ground. Either you were a friend of labor or you were not. I was a friend.

That is one hard vote; one of many hard votes on which I stuck out my neck to say that I believe in the right of men

and women to organize and bargain collectively, and that this is a right that should not be unduly abridged.

Now, having been attacked publicly by that same AFL-CIO that so anxiously courted me on that issue, I wonder whether it was worth it. Today I wonder whether I would do it again, because I wonder whether the AFL-CIO really cares about its friends—its very few friends in my part of the country. I supported labor on a position that they thought was vital, when the temperature was hot, and the vote as close as they come. Today I wonder if they would support me in a close contest, with the votes close and the issues equally hot.

And I wonder what I would do if 14(b) ever came to a vote again. I wonder, not because I feel any differently about my principles, but because I would like to know if the AFL-CIO really cared about that very crucial and painful vote. They were my friends then, when the need of my vote was very great. Are they now? And if they are, why do not I get some answers from them? If labor really cares about me, I will know when the lies of their Labor Council for Latin American Advancement have been retracted. That's when I will really know whether it was worth while.

Today, I expressed my sentiments in a reply to a letter concerning legislation sent me by Andrew J. Biemiller, director, Department of Legislation, AFL-CIO, who has never replied to two letters I have written him since December. I submit this letter for the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
March 19, 1974.

Mr. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: I have your letter in support of the 1974 Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I am sure that you are aware of my consistent record in support of legislation of this nature, so your letter is entirely unnecessary. I am glad to know that you are concerned about justice for others and I cannot comprehend your continuing failure to act in any way to obtain justice for me. You know that the AFL-CIO has consistently provided financial support to persons who are dedicated to my defeat, and if they succeed, I am one friend of Labor who just wouldn't be here any more. Of late, the AFL-CIO has given more than financial support to these individuals—it has endorsed their public assaults on me and even carried them in its official newspaper. I have directed many protests to you and others in Labor, who are in a position to correct this injustice, but I have never received so much as a reply from anyone other than the Editor of your official organ.

I believe that I have borne this insidiousness long enough and I don't intend to remain silent about it any more. I enclose herewith eleven statements which are part of the series in which I will outline my feelings.

It is curious to me that you solicit my support in the name of justice, while denying anything like justice to me and, indeed, insist on supporting financially, and every other way, some of my most dedicated opponents. There must really be a curious kind of thinking in the penthouse of the AFL-CIO these days. Maybe you would be more successful if you supported your friends once in awhile.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

ON INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROHIBIT INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES AMONG LARGE CORPORATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in 1912, a congressional committee reported:

When we find common directorship in banks and other businesses located in the same area and representing the same class of interests, all further pretense of competition is useless.

Two years later, in an attempt to preserve competition among major American corporations, Congress passed the Clayton Act. Section 8 of this legislation provides that—

No person at the same time shall be a director in any two or more corporations . . . if such corporations are or shall have been theretofore, by virtue of their business and location of operation, competitors, so that the elimination of competition by agreement between them would constitute a violation of any of the provisions of any of the antitrust laws.

However, this narrow provision does not forbid indirect ties among competing corporations. For example, it is perfectly legal for two competing firms to each have a director on the board of a third business entity which has business ties with both of them. The effect of these interlocks may inhibit competition among all three companies.

In fact, in 1969, a Federal Trade Commission report on corporate mergers maintained—

The existing law on interlocking directorates is inadequate, and interlocks among our great corporations are especially inimical to competition because the economy has become increasingly concentrated among a few hundred corporations.

The gregarious nature of American industry is well demonstrated by the extent of direct interlocks among major petroleum companies. An FTC study released earlier this year claimed that the U.S. eight largest oil firms are, to some extent, "commonly rather than independently owned." For example, the FTC pointed out that the Chase Manhattan Bank, through various nominees, is both the largest shareholder in Atlantic Richfield and the second largest shareholder in Mobil. The FTC reasoned that it is certainly not in the interest of Chase Manhattan to promote vigorous competition between these firms.

The practice of having directors of oil companies serve on the boards of directors and advisory committees of our American financial institutions is widespread.

For example, "Interlocking Oil: Big Oil Ties with Other Corporations," a study authored earlier this year by Angus McDonald of the Center for Science in the Public Interest, found the major, integrated oil firms to be sharing 163 indirect interlocks—in which theoretically, competing entities have members sitting as directors on the corporate boards of third parties.

McDonald discovered the following:

The Bank of America, largest in the United States, has a total of 16 directors,

4 of whom are oil men. Another oil executive is a member of the bank's advisory committee. The individuals are: E. Hornsby Wasson, director of Standard of California; John G. McLean, director of Continental; Chauncey J. Medberry III, chairman of Getty Oil; Robert DiGorgio, director of Union Oil; Prentiss Cobb Hale, director of Union Oil.

Chase Manhattan, the second largest bank in the United States, has a total of 25 directors, 4 of whom are oil men. Another oil man is a member of Chase Manhattan's advisory board. The individuals are: John Kenneth Jamieson, chairman and chief executive of Exxon; William P. Tavoulareas, director of Mobil; William A. Hewitt, director of Continental; Robert O. Anderson, director of Atlantic Richfield; and John E. Swearington, chairman of Standard of Indiana.

The First National City Bank, third largest in the United States, has a total of 26 directors, three of whom are oil men. The individuals are: Albert L. Williams, director of Mobil; William I. Spencer, director of Phillips; William G. Gwinn, director of Shell.

The Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., fifth largest in the United States, has a total of 24 directors, 4 of whom are oil men. Another oil man is a member of the advisory committee. The individuals are: Bert S. Cross, director of Exxon; Emilio G. Collado, director of Exxon; Elmore C. Patterson, director of Atlantic Richfield; Thomas G. Gates, director of Cities Service; and J. Paul Austin, director of Continental.

The Chemical Bank of New York, sixth largest in the United States, has a total of 22 directors, 4 of whom are oil men. Five members of the advisory committees are also oil men. The individuals are: Ralph Warner, Jr., chairman of Mobil Oil; James G. Riordan, director of Mobil Oil; T. Vincent Learson, director of Exxon; Howard W. McCall, director of Texaco; Monroe Edward Spaght, director of Shell; H. I. Romnes, director of Cities Service; William C. Renhard, director of Amerada Hess; William S. Boothby, director of Getty Oil; and Joseph A. Thomas, director of Getty Oil.

In all, 132 of the 460 oil firm interlocks, McDonald found, involve banks, and another 31 involve insurance companies, which has especially ominous implications for competition.

In order for a company to enter the petroleum industry, or any highly capital intensive business, enormous amounts of capital are required. As I have indicated, financial institutions capable of funding such endeavors share common concerns with the large vertically integrated oil firms. Hence, for these banks to finance a new corporation interested in competing in the petroleum industry would not at all be in their best interests. Thus, as the independents find it increasingly difficult to get the requisite financial assistance, the prospects of increasing competition become increasingly limited.

Management interlocks are not limited to the oil industry, and neither are the anticompetitive implications of such interlocks. In 1965 the House Antitrust Subcommittee conducted a study on in-

terlocks in American corporations generally. Although this study is 9 years old, its findings and conclusions undoubtedly suggest the magnitude of our current problem. In 1965 the 26 directors of General Motors Corp. held management positions in 22 banks and financial institutions, 4 insurance companies, and 32 industrial-commercial corporations. Through its directors, General Motors has two ties each with Melon National Bank & Trust Co., Canada Life Insurance Co., A.T. & T., International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd., and Gulf Oil Corp. In addition, it had single interlocks with United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., Gillette, Rail Trailer Corp., Gar Wood Industries, Harshaw Chemical Co., and Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

The study indicated that the Ford Motor Co. had 19 directors who took part in the management of 12 banks and financial institutions, 3 insurance companies, 38 industrial-commercial organizations, and 3 other companies. Among the banks and financial institutions, members of Ford's management participated in two interlocks each with Morgan Trust Co. and One William Street Fund, Inc., and in three interlocks with Federal Street Fund. Three of Ford's directors served with General Foods Corp., and two with Continental Can Co. Other companies linked with Ford's management were Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp., Trans World Airlines, Pan American World Airways, B. F. Goodrich Co., and Sears, Roebuck & Co.

In general, interlocks generate several potential problems, according to the House study:

The impairment or elimination of competition between firms which use interlocking directorates as effective liaisons;

Preferential treatment in the supply of material and credit to favored companies;

Withholding of capital and credit from "outside" competitors;

Where an individual serves in the managements of differing corporations, his conflict of interest may result in "inside dealing" for his personal gain, at the expense of either or all of the corporations he serves. In a broader framework, his loyalties to the stockholders of each of the respective corporations are divided; and

Finally, by means of interlocks, control over the major part of American commerce could be concentrated among the hands of so few individuals that in the committee's words, "normal social and political forces relied upon to maintain a free economy would be ineffective to control abuses."

It is important to note that the Holding Company Act of 1935 prohibits both direct and indirect interlocks in utility holding companies. While the Federal Trade Commission staff recommended several years ago that indirect interlocks be prohibited in industrial corporations as well, no law has yet been passed making them illegal.

In an attempt to correct this shortcoming in law, I am introducing legislation today prohibiting—

First. Interlocks between competitors achieved by means of: Directors of one

company acting as officers of another; and directors of one company being large stockholders in another;

Second. Interlocks between potential competitors;

Third. Vertical interlocks between buyers and sellers, including industrial firms and various kinds of financial institutions providing lending or investment services; and

Fourth. Indirect interlocks achieved through third party organizations of any form—whether partnerships, proprietorships, associations, or corporations.

After years of investigation by such groups as the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress, and private research organizations, it seems imperative that we learn from our recent bitter experience in the energy area and correct these anticompetitive abuses.

ECONOMIC JUSTICE FOR WESTERN IOWA POWER CONSUMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have been visiting in the western part of Iowa to discuss at first hand many of the economic problems and potential of that important region of my State.

These are independent-minded people who neither want nor expect any special favors from the Federal Government. They do resent Federal stupidity, however, and rightly so. That is why I have been so incensed to learn of the arbitrary treatment they have received at the hands of the officials who set public power rates in the Missouri River Basin.

Both the rural electric cooperatives and the municipal power systems who buy and resell Missouri Basin hydropower from the Bureau of Reclamation have been put in a serious bind by unjustified rate impositions scheduled to go into effect April 1. These have been calculated to cost Iowa consumers alone some \$180,000 for the balance of the year, without even taking into account the effect of punitive penalties—which by their nature are totally incalculable but could be disastrous to Iowa consumers—for so-called overuse of hydropower.

How we can speak of "overuse" of a natural and constantly replenished resource in these days of fossil fuel scarcity is to me entirely beyond explanation. It also appears to make no sense to the seasoned professionals in the Bureau of Reclamation, who have had no justification to offer in the face of repeated questions from their REC and municipal customers. The Bureau has been forced to waffle and duck, seized as it seems in the grip of some political decision made by an officeholder who knows not what he does. I am inserting the most recent example of a nonanswer dictated by the Assistant Secretary level in the Department of the Interior.

In company with several of my Missouri Basin colleagues in the House and Senate, I have directed a letter to Secretary Morton to turn around this folly.

The fact is, contrary to the latest Interior letter, that there has been no "full disclosure and consultation with the interested parties." Until there is, we insist that the unjustified rate changes must be suspended. I personally go further and insist that future procedures must be devised and published that will insure consumer interests the right to be consulted and to participate in public power rate decisions from the outset.

Our people have had enough inflation for energy costs without enduring governmental price gouging as well. In my judgment, the Department of the Interior has behaved in this episode exactly as if it were one of the giant and secretive oil companies it is supposed to monitor. It looks as if bad habits are infectious.

I am also inserting the letter I have signed to Secretary Morton. Hopefully, this will have the effect of sparing our consumers unnecessary and unjustified further increases in their monthly bills. The letters follow:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1974.

Mr. FRED G. SIMONTON,
Executive Director, Mid-West Electric Consumers Association, Inc., Evergreen, Colo.

DEAR MR. SIMONTON: Assistant Secretary Morton has asked us to respond to your letter dated February 7, 1974. Your letter has been reviewed and your views concerning the Department and its policies regarding the power rate increases are noted.

You are correct in your understanding that we still are of the opinion the power rate increases announced on November 1, 1973, are necessary. The new rates will become effective April 1, 1974.

Our policy on matters such as this is to carry out our responsibilities with full disclosure and consultation with the interested parties. Your views will be given full consideration as we continue our management of the Reclamation power program.

Sincerely yours,
G. G. STAMM, Commissioner.

MARCH 14, 1974.

Hon. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is to request your personal and immediate attention to the Department of Interior's proposed power rate increases for consumer-owned electric systems receiving their wholesale power supply from the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri River Basin service area. We ask that you reconsider and countermand the decision to make new and higher rates effective April 1, 1974.

At the very least, Mr. Secretary, this rate increase should be postponed for a minimum of eight or nine months, which would permit sufficient time for the Department to more thoroughly and carefully coordinate its policy with its power customers.

There is a special reason that this should be done in this area of the country. Under these proposed new rates, customers of this power will be penalized for using an excess of certain amounts—one of the principal objections of these customers.

In this area of the Nation, the customers of the Bureau of Reclamation, almost without exception, use electric power for purposes without which they would use some form of petroleum product—gas, oil or propane. The effect of these penalties and the higher rates would aggravate the shortage of other fuel supplies. Making maximum use of electric power by the existing rate sched-

ules has the effect of providing energy needs from hydro-electric generators or electric power generated by lignite steam plants. We can ill afford, Mr. Secretary, to take any step that will use our short supplies of petroleum for purposes that can be provided by these other energy sources.

We feel there are other strong reasons to defer a decision on these new rate schedules, principally:

1. The Department has not responded to requests from Members of Congress and Bureau customers for adequate information and supporting data.

2. Our review of the information supplied to us and the preference customers leaves us unconvinced that the rate increase proposed by the Department is required to meet the pay-out criteria established by the Congress.

3. We object in the strongest possible terms to the penalty provisions included in the proposed new rate schedules. Department spokesmen have acknowledged that they are punitive and an attempt to assess liquidated damages in advance. These penalties would impose impossible management decisions on both the Bureau and its customers.

We urge that you give this matter your personal attention and will inform us of your favorable decision as soon as possible.

THE GROWING OF OPIUM IN TURKEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of the House are aware that not too many years ago the streets of New York and the major cities throughout this country were plagued with the highest quality and quantity of heroin this country had ever seen. Through the office of the then Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs we were able to determine that approximately 80 percent of this drug was then being grown in Turkey and processed in France. After many months of negotiations with the Government of Turkey an agreement was finally reached between our Government and the Turkish Government whereby Turkey would ban the production of opium. This Congress then awarded \$35.7 million to make certain that the transition of giving up the growing of this crop by the Turkish farmers would be made easy, and we would provide not only economic assistance, but the technical assistance necessary for those farmers to become engaged in a substitute crop.

Recently it was aired in our New York papers, as well as papers throughout the country, that the Turkish Government had decided that they would no longer be bound by that agreement, and indeed would resume the growing of poppies.

The gentleman from New York, Congressman LESTER WOLFF and myself, then took off for Turkey on Thursday of last week in an effort to determine the facts as to whether or not the Government was actually going to breach what we consider to be a binding executive agreement between those two

governments. We were met with a great degree of hostility because it was thought that this Government had placed this ban on the people of Turkey without any degree of sensitivity for the plight of the Turkish farmers.

Today I will be sharing this special order not only with other colleagues, but with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), as we try to state for the record the perilous possible confrontation that these friendly nations may have. The fact of the matter is that the agreement to impose the poppy ban was entered into between our Government and a military government of Turkey. While there is no question with the presently-elected government that agreement is binding, there is some question as to the equity and the fairness of the agreement because out of the \$35.7 million we still are holding \$20 million in escrow. Also, several months ago when the political campaigns in Turkey were in full swing, all of the seven political parties promised the Turkish people and, more specifically, the Turkish farmers, that they would remove the ban on the growing of poppies.

So now we find the Turkish Government faced with the commitment that they made to their people, and at the same time recognizing that in the long end of a negotiating tunnel the only tools that we have in the U.S. Congress are to enforce the amendment that was made to the Foreign Assistance Act. It stated that when the President of the United States finds that any nation is not co-operating with our efforts to curtail the international flow of drugs, he is mandated to cut off both foreign and military aid to that country.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York and I found out that the poppy is not considered to be a poison by the people of Turkey because the idea of its misuse is foreign to their concept because for centuries they have used that plant as a staple, they have used it for oil, for flour, indeed, for seasoning.

The agreement did not take into consideration the fact that while the military Turkish Government was always concerned with the illegal growing of poppies, that it was considered not to be immoral for the farmers, in addition to the poppy crop that they had grown for the Turkish Government, to be able to have also additional poppies that they would sell right in their local community.

We now find ourselves without having really done anything to change or to improve the quality of life for the Turkish opium farmers.

We do find Turkey itself indicating that at some future date they may consider resuming in whole or in part the opium crop. We believe that, in order for the people that are going to be adversely affected by this decision since there is no indication that the French connection will be broken in any way, if they start to resume the poppy growing. What is necessary at this time is that this Nation and the executive branch of the Government through its State De-

partment place this on the highest foreign affairs priority to make certain that we avoid the collision that these two friendly nations would have.

It is now apparent that there will not be a spring planting, but because of

commitments made by the Turkish Government to its farmers, it is clear that plans are underway for the resumption of full scale production by the fall and certainly next spring. It may be that, because of what is now considered to be a

top Turkish priority in their domestic efforts to show their independence of all nations, including this one, our only tool will be the severe tool to cut the military and economic ties that these two nations have enjoyed for many decades.

TABLE 1.—USAID/TURKEY STATUS OF \$10,400,000 POPPY GRANT

Date of request	Project title	Project duration	Project cost	Cumulative project cost	Requested release	Actual release	Date of release	Cumulative releases	Cash balance available for release
July 7, 1972	Coordination committee	Unspecified	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	July 20, 1972	\$500,000	\$9,900,000
Aug. 4, 1972	Irrigation projects in poppy area	1 year	640,786	1,140,786	640,786	640,786	Aug. 17, 1972	1,140,786	9,259,214
Aug. 26, 1972	Livestock fattening project	do	864,786	2,005,572	864,786	864,786	Sept. 6, 1972	2,005,572	8,394,428
Sept. 19, 1972	Wheat production in development area	do	58,036	2,063,608	58,036	58,036	Oct. 3, 1972	2,063,608	8,336,392
Nov. 18, 1972	USDA/ERS	1 year	105,890	2,169,498	105,890	105,890	Nov. 28, 1972	2,169,498	8,230,502
Dec. 8, 1972	Forage-pasture and fodder crops culture	1 year	316,008	2,485,506	316,008	316,008	Dec. 18, 1972	2,485,506	7,914,494
Do	Survey of existing oil processing places	1 month	14,593	2,500,099	14,593	14,593	do	2,500,099	7,899,901
Feb. 20, 1973	Determination of loss of poppy growers	6 months	21,429	2,521,528	21,429	21,429	Mar. 12, 1973	2,521,528	7,878,472
Apr. 9, 1973	Sunflower agriculture development	3 years	778,095	3,299,623	778,095	542,857	May 28, 1973	3,064,385	7,335,615
May 25, 1973	16 irrigation projects	1 year	726,126	4,025,749	726,126	726,126	June 13, 1973	3,790,511	6,609,489
June 1, 1973	Handicraft research	Unspecified	4,693	4,030,442	4,693	4,693	do	3,795,204	6,604,796
June 13, 1973	Research on suitable products for Afyon and Uşak	3 months	9,286	4,039,728	9,286	9,286	June 27, 1973	3,804,490	6,595,510
July 25, 1973	Cattle development	5 years	4,295,518	8,335,246	750,122	341,875	Sept. 17, 1973	4,146,365	6,253,635
Aug. 28, 1973	Dairy products factory	2 years	725,858	9,061,104	725,858	212,587	Oct. 2, 1973	4,358,952	6,041,048
Do	Wheat production	do	1,837,715	10,898,819	2,855,715	855,715	Sept. 17, 1973	5,214,667	5,185,333
Oct. 3, 1973	USDA/ERS (2d release)	do	93,593	93,593	93,593	93,593	Nov. 16, 1973	5,308,260	5,091,740

¹ For 1 year. Total cost unknown.

² 1st year requirement.

TABLE 2.—U.S. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY ADMINISTERED BY AID, U.S. FISCAL YEARS 1972-74

	[In thousands of dollars]		
	U.S. fiscal year		
	1972	1973	1974 planned
Development loans	40,000	9,000	6,000-20,000
Eregli steel mill expansion (stage 1)	40,000		
Industrial investment and credit bank (SYKB)	9,000		
Irrigated agriculture	1,600-10,000		
Tourism development	10,000		
Technical assistance and related grants	3,700	3,771	2,611

	U.S. fiscal year			U.S. fiscal year
	1972	1973	1974 planned	
On-farm water development	127	122	118	Food donations (Public Law 480, title II)
Cereals production	220	244	264	CARE school feeding and maternal child health programs
Agriculture administration and planning	171	270	129	Narcotics related programs
Bosphorus University	650	225		Compensation
Development administration training	415	552	717	Control
Technical support	863	774	817	Development
Robert College and Admiral Bristol Hospital (American schools and hospitals abroad)	1,100	1,000		Grand total
Terminating projects	804	68		68,100
Population	91	341		23,871
				26,411-40,411

¹ Not yet obligated.

TABLE 3.—TRANSFERS OF U.S. RESOURCES TO TURKEY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			Fiscal year—
	1972 actual	1973 estimated	1974 proposed	
Total of all U.S. resources transferred	227,765	193,897	287,158	71,956
Security assistance (subtotal)	155,809	136,916	223,054	56,981
Military assistance program	60,731	58,450	85,501	40,000
Country costs	(60,731)	(58,450)	(85,501)	3,263
International military education and training program			2,499	93
Military Assistance Advisory Group—administration and training costs	3,449	3,566	3,554	15,700
Excess defense articles (legal value)	35,100	36,400	50,000	1
Ships transfers (loans, leases)	41,416	18,500	6,500	12,515
Real property transfers	113			477
Foreign military credit sales	15,000	20,000	75,000	8,973
				415
				482

Source: Foreign assistance and related programs appropriations for fiscal year 1974—Senate hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, May 31, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I now should like to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his efforts on this recent trip that we made to Turkey. As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Narcotics Control, I, as well as Mr. RANGEL, was very disturbed about the press reports received relative to the breaking of the ban and Turkey's going back into opium production. However, we are happy to report a successful mission.

After a 2-hour meeting with Turkish Foreign Minister Gunes, he told us he had reached the decision, on behalf of his Government, not to break the opium ban at this time and that his country will forgo the spring planting of poppy seeds for the production of opium.

Additionally, we were informed that discussions between Turkish authorities, U.S. Ambassador William Macomber, and American officials will be continued in an effort to resolve the differences.

No promises were made, no new "deals" were reached. However, a greater mutual understanding of the problem was attained.

We found deficiencies on both sides. A lack of appreciation of the true impact on the peoples of both countries has undermined the original executive agreement whereby the United States was to pay Turkey approximately \$36 million to get out of the opium business.

The farmers we visited in the opium region of Afion—by the way, "Afion" means opium, and that is the name of their city—in their simple ways did not know of the destruction wrought by the poppy crops they grow. The average farmer realizes between \$35 and \$50 per year from the sale of legal morphine or opium gum to the Government of Turkey. Poppy byproducts are the farmer's

prime product—the poppy seeds which are made into cooking oils and native bread.

It is the parasites, the illegal drug peddlers, who reap the real harvest with their illicit purchases from some of these farmers. And corrupt local officials greased the way for substantial quantities to be diverted into illegal channels to provide the link to the so-called French Connection that before the ban supplied—as my colleague said—more than 80 percent of all the heroin destined for the United States.

Today the Turkish people are almost totally unaware of the real success of the opium ban in breaking up the French Connection and cutting off the flow of heroin to the Eastern United States. Shortages in the East, higher prices for heroin, and a deterioration in the quality of available heroin proves out the success of the ban. The effect, however, has not reached the average Turk in the street or on the farm. In fact, we learned that there are forces at work, including some greedy American pharmaceutical manufacturers, whose names are being turned over to OMB and DEA, and demagogic Turk politicians, attempting to make the opium culture an issue of "national independence from U.S.A. influence," by calling for a repudiation of the executive agreement entered into by both governments.

Also contributing to this situation is the talk of United States attempts to induce India to increase her production of opium for pharmaceutical purposes. The Turks say, "Why single us out?" and we cannot say they are wrong.

We must seriously question the validity of India's ability to exert the necessary constraints to control present production, no less any added volume. And, how does one explain this double standard on the part of the United States?

Mr. RANGEL. I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

PANAMA CANAL: DIPLOMATIC TRICKERY REQUIRES ACTION BY THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSE). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1974, in Panama City, Republic of Panama, U.S. Secretary of State, Henry A. Kissinger, and Panama's Minister of Foreign Relations, Juan A. Tack, signed a joint statement of principles to govern the negotiation of an entirely "new" and "modern" treaty for the Panama Canal. This would replace the 1903 treaty under which the Canal Zone was acquired by the United States, the canal constructed, and has been subsequently maintained, operated, sanitized, and protected.

To make the status of the U.S. Canal Zone absolutely clear, attention is invited to the following elemental historical facts:

First. The Congress in 1902 authorized the President to acquire perpetual control of a Canal Zone for the construction

and perpetual operation of an isthmian canal.

Second. Following the secession of Panama from Colombia on November 3, 1903, such zone was acquired from Panama, a successor state, for \$10,000,000, which is more than was paid for either Florida or Alaska. The small annuity in the treaty was the obligation of the Panama Railroad assumed by the United States and not a "rental" as so often erroneously stated.

Third. In addition to the purchase price for the necessary "sovereignty and jurisdiction" over the Canal Zone, the United States obtained title to all privately owned land and property in it from individual owners, making the Zone our most costly territorial acquisition.

Fourth. The 1903 Treaty uses the term, "in perpetuity," seven times, conclusively showing that the "grant" by Panama of the "use, occupation, and control" of the Canal Zone was intended to be perpetual as provided by the 1902 statute.

Fifth. The total investment of the United States in the canal enterprise, including its defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1971, was \$5,695,745,000.

Sixth. The Congress has not authorized the disposal of either the Canal Zone or any land or property in it.

The signing of the Kissinger-Tack joint statement at Panama, which treats such historical facts as matters of little consequence, was followed by enormous publicity in the United States and abroad, causing many questions to be raised by concerned U.S. citizens and users of the canal as to precisely what that document means. Some of those questions have been studied by Edward Hunter, editor of *Tactics*, the only professional "spy war" journal, Box 3541, Arlington, Va. 22203.

In his analysis, Mr. Hunter describes the purposes of the statement as follows:

To create a situation that would make rejection of the so-called principles by the United States "acutely embarrassing" and thus, assure that the document will be accepted as a "treaty signed, approved and promulgated."

To invite a "propaganda attack" in the event of nonacceptance of the "principles" by the Congress with the expectation that such attack would have the effect of giving the "principles" legitimacy.

To serve on a basis on which a treaty embodying such "principles" could be negotiated in the normal manner.

Mr. Speaker, as explained by Mr. Hunter, such procedure is diplomatic trickery in the highest degree for it makes the sovereign people of the United States and their Congress the "enemy" against which elements in the executive branch of our Government and the pro-Red revolutionary dictatorship of Panama are allied in a power struggle against the people and the Congress over control of one of the world's most strategic waterways.

It is, indeed, an interesting coincidence that 2 days after the appearance of Mr. Hunter's article that *Twin Circle* an outstanding New York weekly, published a perceptive column on the same subject by Dr. Robert Morris, former Counsel of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and now presi-

dent of the University of Plano of Texas. In this article Dr. Morris charges that Secretary Kissinger and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker are acting as if they and not the Congress have the authority to take the step that was taken on February 7 at Panama, and urges thorough hearings in both Senate and House.

The issue, Mr. Speaker, is not U.S. control over the Panama Canal versus Panamanian but continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone versus U.S.S.R. domination. This is a question that no amount of sophistry can remove and it must be faced.

In order that the indicated articles by Mr. Hunter and Dr. Morris may be readily available to the Congress and more likely read throughout the Nation, I quote both as parts of my remarks:

[From *Tactics*, Mar. 20, 1974]

PANAMA CANAL—WHERE WE STAND

What actually did Secretary of State Kissinger sign on Feb. 7, 1974 in Panama City concerning the Panama Canal? Where does this put the United States as regards the canal? What is the validity of whatever document he signed? Is our status as of now any different than before he signed? In what way, if any, are we bound by its language or stipulations?

Is the canal still ours, in perpetuity, and if this is so, is it only technically so because of the signing? Has some doubt now been cast on what hitherto had been accepted as indisputable?

These questions and more have been consistently asked of this editor ever since the signing ceremony in Panama. Many persons were assuming that the canal, for all practical purposes, was being given up.

The intent of this article, therefore, is to provide in as objective a manner as possible, as "intelligence," the answer to these questions. Obviously, great confusion persisted on the subject.

WHAT ACTUALLY WAS SIGNED?

The first question that arises, of course, is what actually was signed, as regards validity, not contents.

The document is officially called a "statement of principles." After listening to explanations from varied sources, from the State Department to Congress, and by influential activists without official standing, it boils down to this:

The document is not binding, but insofar as the two governments will be able to accomplish it, the principles are binding. This is not a treaty, which requires Senate approval, nor an agreement for an abandonment of sovereignty over the Canal Zone, as this would require the approval of both the House and the Senate, but it is an understanding to this effect, constituting a convenient framework for future negotiations.

If this sounds strange, it is; rather, as a State Department officer who participated in the ceremony expressed it colloquially, the document has a "funny status." Actually, what the Nixon administration has attempted to do through Henry Kissinger is to create a situation which would make it acutely embarrassing for the United States to reject the so-called principles.

This is expected to assure that we will accept the document as if it were a treaty signed, approved and promulgated. If anyone has a feeling as if this were flea market bargaining in which the tourist seems to be "taken for a ride," one could hardly deny it.

Two observations warrant mention. The far left-type government of Panama can be expected to raise an international furor, supported by the usual pro-red propaganda

orchestration worldwide, if we later decide, upon the insistence of the Congress, that one or more of the so-called "principles" simply are not acceptable.

The expectation is that such a propaganda attack, if considered necessary, would have the effect of giving the "principles" the legitimacy of a treaty. They would become the basis on which a pact could be negotiated in the normal manner.

The seeming fait accompli would assure approval by Congress. That is, if this propaganda climate could be maintained. This is the trickery in the signing.

The enemy, under such circumstances, becomes the American Congress and people, against whom the U.S. and Panamanian government would be allied.

The second observation is that, through such an acceptance of so-called "principles," negotiations assume a procedure characteristic of the communist method of negotiating, as contrasted with that of other countries.

What we call a negotiation, with its give and take, precedes negotiations under communism. Whereas we traditionally leave all issues up to discussion and resolution at a negotiating conference, the reds consider the negotiating table merely the place where delegates sign what already has been determined beforehand by exercise of persuasion and power, as on a battlefield or in a propaganda war.

We can be sure Panama will insist that so-called negotiations formalize into treaty form what already was signed by Kissinger as a set of "principles."

STATE DEPARTMENT'S VIEW, TOO

The State Department view is that what Kissinger signed constitutes a convenient framework for future negotiations, but "cannot conceive" of a situation in which any of the "principles" would be abandoned.

Congress, buttressed by what the people desire, will have to be heard from on this, of course.

The State Department considers the "principles" to be a guide in reaching treaty agreement, but if the principles are inflexible, they constitute a treaty, in effect, by themselves, and this is contrary to Constitutional requirements.

State Department officers also employ the phrase, a statement of philosophy, in reference to the document. Semantics cannot change facts, though; they can only mislead, confuse and defraud.

Washington might have accomplished one result that frequently is the only viable one in an impossible situation, and that is to gain time, to stall when anything else would only create embitterment and solve nothing.

A statement was issued on Feb. 7, jointly by Kissinger and Juan Antonio Tack, Panama's minister of foreign affairs, containing the list of eight principles.

"The new treaty," the statement said, "would abrogate the treaty existing since 1903, and its subsequent amendments, establishing the necessary conditions for a modern relationship between the two countries, based on the most profound mutual respect."

TEXT OF THE EIGHT PRINCIPLES

The statement declares:

The principles to which we have agreed, on behalf of our respective governments, are as follows:

1. The treaty of 1903 and its amendments will be abrogated by the conclusion of an entirely new interoceanic canal treaty.

2. The concept of perpetuity will be eliminated. The new treaty concerning the lock canal shall have a fixed termination date.

3. Termination of United States jurisdiction over Panamanian territory shall take place promptly in accordance with terms specified in the treaty.

4. The Panamanian territory in which the canal is situated shall be returned to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama. The

Republic of Panama, in its capacity as territorial sovereign, shall grant to the United States of America, for the duration of the new interoceanic canal treaty and in accordance with what that treaty states, the right to use the lands, waters and airspace which may be necessary for the operation, maintenance, protection and defense of the canal and the transit of ships.

5. The Republic of Panama shall have a just and equitable share of the benefits derived from the operation of the canal in its territory. It is recognized that the geographic position of its territory constitutes the principal resource of the Republic of Panama.

6. The Republic of Panama shall participate in the administration of the canal, in accordance with a procedure to be agreed upon in the treaty. The treaty shall also provide that Panama will assume total responsibility for the operation of the canal upon the termination of the treaty. The Republic of Panama shall grant to the United States of America the rights necessary to regulate the transit of ships through the canal, to operate, maintain, protect and defend the canal, and to undertake any other specific activity related to those ends, as may be agreed upon in the treaty.

7. The Republic of Panama shall participate with the United States of America in the protection and defense of the canal in accordance with what is agreed upon in the new treaty.

8. The United States of America and the Republic of Panama, recognizing the important services rendered by the interoceanic Panama Canal to internal maritime traffic, and bearing in mind the possibility that the present canal could become inadequate for said traffic, shall agree bilaterally on provisions for new projects which will enlarge canal capacity. Such provisions will be incorporated in the new treaty in accord with the concepts established in principle 2.

WILL SERVE AS GUIDELINES

The accompanying joint statement declared:

"The principles will serve as guidelines for the next round of treaty talks which are expected to get under way in the near future. The principles are general in character and do not address the many specific issues involved in defining the new treaty arrangement. These remain to be negotiated."

In other words, semantics aside, this is a treaty that looks forward to its expansion. Actually, it has only such validity as it can get away with, barring the Congressional consent, by both houses of Congress, that is required for it to become binding in our law.

The Administration's prestige is put on the line by it, yet it gives the government an out, if it needs it. The State Department can say, "Very sorry; we forgot to get Congressional assent."

Maybe President Nixon has decided that the Communists are not the only ones to get the best of both worlds. Let us hope so, or make it so! Public and Congressional pressure can make sure, at least, that we do not give up our world.

(From Twin Circle, Mar. 22, 1974)

PANAMA CANAL IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Robert Morris)

Perspective is so important. It enables one to see clearly. That is why the sly but successful propagandists are always throwing dust in our eyes.

For seemingly inexplicable reasons the U.S. State Department has been trying to take and turn it over to the Panamanian government which is run by political bandits allied with the Panama Canal from the United States to Fidel Castro and Colonel Qaddafi and other enemies of the United States.

They have no legal authority to do so since sovereignty over the canal was formally ceded

to the United States "in perpetuity" in 1903. The ceding was wrought by treaty which under our Constitution becomes the law of the land, equal to the Constitution.

No president, much less the State Department, has the power or authority to change this deeply ingrained constitutional enactment by executive agreement.

To amend or to annul this treaty which is what Dr. Henry Kissinger, through Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, is trying to do, legislative action must be taken by a two-thirds vote in the Senate and possibly even a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives.

SELF-DESTRUCTIVE STEP

But Kissinger and Bunker are acting as if they and not the Congress have the authority to take this step which a clear perspective would show to be suicidal and self-destructive.

If Panamanian dictator Torrijos is given sovereignty and authority over the Canal, he and his allies will see to it that we will not use the Canal at all or else we will be blackmailed into outrageous payments and conditions. That is the booming lesson of contemporary history. To try to safeguard our interest by agreements after surrendering sovereignty is fanciful.

All of which points up the folly of our present policy of detente. The Communists and their allies (of which Torrijos is one) are driving ahead toward their goal of Sovietizing the world. We are peacefully and unilaterally co-existing with them, even to the extent of foregoing any educational implementation of our posture.

We sent troops into Vietnam to stem the Communists but we could not indoctrinate them that Communism was an evil force of aggression. When soldiers know not for what they fight, they lose their morale. And when parents know not for what their sons fight and die, they do more than lose morale.

How can we possibly survive in a world with aggressive Soviet power when all our agencies of government are precluded, by authority on high, to educate our people on the true nature of Communism?

Every Soviet bureaucrat is imbued with a sense of dedication to Communist advancement. Every bureaucrat of ours must be neutral to Communism (or worse) to be eligible for service.

It necessarily follows that our present policy will take us into one retreat after another. The enemy can implement its aggressions with propaganda and demonstrations. We can only implement our position with abstract, often inane and now thoroughly incredible protests and pretensions.

Let there be thorough hearings in the Senate and even the House of Representatives on the issue of the Panama Canal. Then let the Congress make its decision. Let us not engage in the secret diplomacy that has led us into one disaster after another.

OPIUM PRODUCTION IN TURKEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

I want to congratulate the gentlemen from New York, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. WOLFF for undertaking their recent mission to Turkey, appealing to the Turkish government to refrain from breaking the ban on growing opium in their country.

I had occasion to visit Turkey last year

and to discuss the narcotics problem with Turkish officials and with our own drug enforcement officials.

At that time I found that our Government's efforts and expenditures had helped significantly in drying up opium trade in that part of the world—and that these efforts have had an impact upon heroin traffic in our Nation.

We have expended over \$35 million dollars in inducing Turkey to subsist its poppy growing operations. This was money well spent. My own recent visits to drug treatment centers in my congressional district involved in complex rehabilitating programs substantiate the need for an all out effort to stop the cruel monster of drug addiction at its source, the poppy.

While the success of my colleague's visit to Turkey was a partial victory in our firm resolve to stop the villain at its source, we cannot let our efforts end at this small success. We must continue to lavish our attention on the vacillating situation in Turkey.

If the problem lies with the parasitic illegal drug peddlers described in Mr. WOLFF's statement, we need to go beyond our current efforts, using our good resources of men and money, by sending some of our agricultural experts out into the Turkish fields where they will be able to train and advise Turkish farmers in producing other crops—cash crops that will assure the farmer's livelihood while not harming our youth here at home.

The problem mandates action. We cannot for a minute rest our heads or turn our backs to this creeping plague. We must do whatever we can to assure our coming generations that narcotic addiction is an unpleasant but distant memory.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for his contribution and his work in this area.

In continuing the dialog that took place between my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and me, we cannot succeed in this Nation in our fight against drug addiction and related crime in this country by employing any half measures. They will not work.

Perhaps like the energy crisis there is a contrived shortage of opium being foisted on the world by some pharmaceutical manufacturers. However, if Turkey at some future time does go back to opium poppy production, even on a limited basis, it will open up a Pandora's Box. Everyone concerned with narcotics and crime knows that we do not grow the opium poppy in this country.

One way to stop the heroin abuse is to stop the heroin at its source, the opium poppy. This is why the decision by Turkey is so important.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and I arrived at a time of elevated tension between the United States and Turkey, created by widespread reports that the ban on opium production was to be lifted. Our visit was heralded

by statements in the Turkish press with statements attributed to us, of a possible cutoff of U.S. aid. This impression was the result of an answer to a reporter who asked us at the airport on our arrival what remedies were available if Turkey did break the ban.

We replied that there was existing legislation on the books sponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and me to require the President to cut off all economic and military assistance to any nation which does not fully cooperate in our efforts to combat illegal narcotic traffic. This provision was also included at my instigation in the new United States trade bill, so now we have an even greater weapon with which to fight this drug war.

That it is not now necessary to invoke these provisions is certainly welcome and clearly due to the fact that Turkey has long been a friend and ally of the United States and it is in the interest of both nations to encourage this relationship. But ally or not, our children are our first priority and if any nation refuses to cooperate with us in this drug war and makes it through the illegal production of opium unsafe for us to walk the streets of our Nation, we will be compelled to take this sterner course of action.

Last year when the elections were being held in Turkey, as a result of the interests that I had in the statements being made by various members of the political parties who were competing in the election, I asked the chairman of the President's Committee on Narcotics Control, Mr. Handley, who was formerly the Ambassador to Turkey, for permission to go to Turkey and talk to some of the people. Many impediments were put in my way. In fact, I was told at the time that if I went there, I would rock the boat.

Well, I think it is about time that somebody did rock the boat and let the people know over there that we are determined in our efforts to stamp out this menace to our people.

The whole question of mutual assistance is not a one-way street. Mutual assistance implies that both nations participate and cooperate.

Therefore, it is a happy occasion that we are able to report that Turkey has decided to forego the spring planting; however, that does not imply for one moment that they will not go into production again in the future.

It is my hope that they will see the importance that we attach to this and the importance that, really, this has in the moral context of the increase of the supply of narcotics that would be available if Turkey went back into the business of producing the opium poppy.

It took a marathon of meetings with Turkish officials, farmers, and members of the Turkish Parliament, to change an atmosphere of hostility into mutual understanding and to convince the Turks that we want to stop this narcotics traffic. Future meetings will benefit from this understanding.

I want to thank my colleague from New

York (Mr. RANGEL) for the cooperation and assistance that he has rendered in making possible this new agreement.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for making it possible for us to have had the contacts that we did have in Turkey, so that we could get the story, not only from the members of the Turkish Parliament, but from the peasant poppy farmers as well.

While Members of this Congress recognize fully well the adverse effect that the growth of poppy seeds and the growth of poppy in Turkey will have on the general American population, I think we should know that we are not alone in this fight, because it was President Nixon that elevated this question of international drug trafficking to one of priority as it relates to foreign affairs.

We did have an appeal from our Ambassador in Turkey, Mr. William Macomber, who certainly has been fighting to break this assault on our country.

I think one of the pioneers in our legislative efforts has been our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, (Mr. PETER RODINO) who was able to get the support of our colleagues in New York and get the happy ending referred to by my colleague from New York (Mr. WOLFF) in our foreign policy. So I am glad we had this exchange with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF). I hope we can encourage our State Department to get some laws on this subject.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I must echo the sentiments of the gentleman on the work of Ambassador Macomber, who has been a giant in these efforts. He has certainly turned around some of the problems we have had with Turkey. I am sure his continuing conversations with the Turkish Government will provide the climate for the continuation of the ban.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENDING THE OIL EMBARGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, after months of anguished waiting, the good news finally came from Vienna. The Arab oil producing States, or at least a majority of them, have decided to forgive the United States for past sins, and resume shipping oil to us. Well, I am less than delighted at this turn of events. The reason for the resumption in shipments, as Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Al-Yamani stated, was to repay the United States for changing her Middle East policy. Continued oil shipments are dependent on our maintaining an "even-handed" policy.

Even though the U.S. Government may protest from now until doomsday that our actions in the Mideast since

September were motivated solely by a sincere interest in bringing about a peace settlement and a feeling that this was the most propitious time for beginning a strong peace effort, the timing of the Arabs' decision, and statements accompanying that decision, have created a sentiment that is going to be extremely difficult to overcome, which is that the United States knuckled under to Arab oil blackmail.

I cannot be pleased about the resumption of oil shipments because it seems like a reward to a recalcitrant child for taking a medicine he did not like. It makes the United States look like the kind of nation that can be pushed around by anyone, like the kind of nation that is so fearful for its economic well-being that it will go to any lengths to maintain that well-being. Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is not such a nation. But the timing of recent events may lead the rest of the world to think it is.

I strongly doubt that the resumption of oil shipments from the Middle East will stem the rise in oil prices. In fact, key spokesmen in the industry have already predicted continued rises in gasoline prices, until the cost of a gallon of gas at your favorite local pump may reach 75 or 80 cents by this summer. Such predictions should lay to rest the idea that the severe shortages we have been experiencing recently were the direct result of the Arab oil embargo.

We must not be carried away with delight simply because the Arabs have temporarily relented, Mr. Speaker. Rather, we must remember that they are still playing their carrot-and-stick game, with the United States as the donkey they hope to lead along by the nose. If this country does not persist in its efforts to force Israel to accept a peace settlement, which may or may not be in Israel's best interests, they threaten to cut off the flow again.

It is significant that the only combatant with whom Israel has not yet reached a disengagement agreement, let alone a workable cease-fire agreement, is also one of the only two nations at the Vienna conference who refused to end the embargo. I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, of Syria. Syria has steadfastly refused, with a virulence that makes Egypt's attitude look almost timid by comparison, to deal reasonably with the Israeli Government. While hosting our Secretary of State and talking outwardly of peace, they continue to provoke incidents along the Golan Heights, and then they say that the United States is not meeting her burden in bringing peace to the Middle East and talk about refusing to lift the embargo.

It is because of attitudes such as this, Mr. Speaker, that I am extremely skeptical of the benefits we hope to receive now that the embargo is lifted. Let us not forget for a moment, that this weapon is perceived by the Arabs as having been used successfully against the United States, and that therefore they feel they will be able to use it successfully again.

It would be the height of folly for this country to relax now and think that we can return to our former patterns of energy consumption.

It has never been more important for each of us, both as public and private citizens, to realize that what America needs most is not an increased supply of oil, but a decreased demand for it. We should not be lulled into complacency by the temporarily increased oil shipments. Rather we should keep in mind that these shipments are temporary, subject to disruption at any time the Arab States become dissatisfied with the United States, and we should learn how to get along with less gas for our cars, and a generally lower level of energy consumption all around.

We should realize that the oil embargo alone did not create the recent shortages and astronomical price rises, but rather it was the concerted actions of the giant oil companies in combination with the embargo, that resulted in so many of the consumer's problems.

I hope that we will never again be lulled into thinking that oil is plentiful, ever-flowing river. We have seen that it is a scarce and valuable commodity, and more importantly, that it is a weapon of political blackmail of the worst kind. This Nation and her leaders can no longer afford to be naive about the meaning of oil. It is not just something to power cars and tractors, and heat your homes and offices. It is something that can be used against us. It is urgent that we do all we can in the next few years to greatly decrease our dependence on imported oil, else this great Nation will be dangerously vulnerable to manipulation by any country with a political grudge against us.

IN MEMORY OF ALFRED F. BEITER

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I just learned of the passing last week of my friend and former Member of this House, Alfred F. Beiter, at Boca Raton, Fla., where he retired 10 years ago.

Mr. Beiter was born in Clarence Center, N.Y., attended Williamsville High School and Niagara University, which in 1942 awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree. Following the footsteps of his grocer-feed merchant father, he was in the feed business in Amherst, N.Y. from 1915 until 1929 when he began his public service by being elected Town Supervisor in Amherst.

After reelection to another 2-year term in 1931, he entered the congressional race in 1932. It was a strongly Republican district, but Democrat Beiter was one of the many carried into office with the Roosevelt landslide.

An uproar ensued in Amherst when he refused to resign his post as Town Supervisor, insisting on completing the term which expired in late 1933. A true party man, he knew his resignation would re-

sult in the Republican Town Board's appointment of a Republican successor and in Republican control of the Erie County Board of Supervisors. The fight was carried to the courts, but the Appellate Division of the New York State Supreme Court agreed that he could legally serve in both positions, and he commuted almost daily by train from Buffalo to Washington until his supervisor's term expired.

His next two terms in Congress demonstrated his concern for the district's growth, as he fought for legislation to deepen and dredge Buffalo Harbor and the feeder streams such as the Black Rock Channel.

Defeated for reelection in 1938, he was again elected in 1940 for his final 2 years in Congress. In 1949 he began 12 years of service in Washington as president of the National Customs Service Association, and then was chosen by President Kennedy in 1961 for the post of Deputy Commissioner for policy planning in the U.S. Customs Bureau. He was chairman of the Customs Service's steering committee for the 175th anniversary in 1964.

Many of my colleagues will recall his wife Margaret, long-time key aide on the House Public Works Committee before retirement in 1964 led the Beiters to Florida.

Alfred Beiter had a long and distinguished career in public life. Our deepest sympathy is extended to his wife, his son David of Stillwater, N.Y., and his daughter, Nancy Beiter of Washington, D.C.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE FOR VIETNAM ERA SPOUSES

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to correct a technicality in the law which denies veterans' preference to certain unremarried widows or widowers of the Vietnam era, while granting it to others.

The Disabled American Veterans requested this amendment to the law in Resolution No. 389, adopted at their national convention last year.

The bill amends section 2108(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, redefining veterans to include "Vietnam era" veterans. This will entitle otherwise eligible Vietnam era spouses to veterans' preference points in appointments to Federal jobs, according them the consideration intended by Congress but heretofore denied by a quirk in the language of the law.

AGAINST "PROGRESSIVE" SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been given recently

to alternate methods of financing the social security program.

If anyone should know of the possible pitfalls regarding alternate methods of financing, Mr. Robert M. Ball, who was Commissioner of Social Security for over 11 years, should.

I ask that the clear and concise article written by Mr. Ball appearing in the Star-News for Sunday, March 10, "Against 'Progressive' Social Security Taxes," follow my remarks.

AGAINST "PROGRESSIVE" SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

(By Robert M. Ball)

In the name of "tax reform" there is a movement afoot which would seriously undermine the contributory nature of the social security system.

One current proposal is to finance social security by a progressive tax, with complete exemption for low-wage earners. Under this proposal the present flat-rate social security deductions from earnings would be dropped, and the loss of income arising from the failure of low-wage earners to make contributions would be made up by higher payments from middle-level and higher-paid wage earners. As a consequence such earners would be called on to pay more for social security than their protection is worth to them.

Proposals to finance all or the major part of social security out of the general revenues of the United States are also being advanced.

I believe that such changes would be dangerous to the stability of the system and would threaten contributors' rights to future benefits.

A good argument can be made for direct government assistance to low-income workers, but this can be accomplished without making radical changes in the nature of our popular and successful social security system. Social security is a social *insurance* system similar to those found in major industrial countries throughout the world and is based on a long tradition of self-help. The fact that those who get protection for themselves and their families pay specifically toward the support of the system, together with the absence of a means test, are the main features of social insurance which sharply distinguish it from "welfare."

The proper financing principles for such a program—really a government-operated, contributory, retirement and group insurance plan—are by no means the same as the financing principles one would want to follow in raising money for the support of general government expenditures. Social security financing should not be considered separately from social security benefits or approached solely as a tax issue.

If the financing principles of social security are changed so that large numbers of people are paid benefits without contributing, while large numbers of other people are charged much more than they would have to pay for obtaining the protection elsewhere, fundamental changes in the benefit side of the program are almost bound to follow. Without a tie between benefit rights and previous contributions, questions would undoubtedly arise about the basis for paying benefits to those who can support themselves without the benefits. If financing were related to ability to pay, it is very likely that benefits would be related to need. Thus as a result of a change in financing, we could find that social security had been turned into a welfare or negative income tax program designed to help only the very poor and that it no longer was a self-help program serving as a base for all Americans to use in building family security.

The analysis of social security financing separately from social security benefits and solely in terms of taxation principles seems

to me to be based on a misunderstanding of the nature of social security—a misunderstanding that grows in part out of the fact that social security today is lumped in with other government programs, both organizationally and in the presentation of the budget. I believe it would help make the nature of social security clear if it were operated by a separate government corporation or instrumentality and if social security transactions were kept separate from the rest of the federal budget.

Before considering this proposal, however, it would be well for the reader to have in mind the scope and nature of our social security system as it is today.

During 1974 the social security programs—cash benefits and Medicare—will pay out \$75 billion in benefits.

Approximately 100 million working people will make social security contributions during 1974 and in return will receive credits toward benefits for themselves and their families designed to partly make up for the loss of earned income during retirement, during periods of extended and total disability before retirement age, or because of death. They also will receive credits toward paid-up hospital insurance during periods of extended and total disability and after age 65. Nearly 30 million people—one out of seven Americans—now receive a social security check each month, and practically all Americans are heavily dependent upon the system for future retirement, disability, survivors', and health insurance protection.

The social security system is a compact between the federal government and those who work in employment covered by the system. In return for paying social security contributions while earning, the worker and his family receive certain benefits under defined conditions when those earnings have ceased or may be presumed to have been reduced. As in all insurance, the covered individual exchanges the uncertainty of a relatively large potential loss for the certainty of a relatively small payment.

Social security involves very long-term commitments; not only are beneficiaries paid on the average over many years once they come on the rolls, but contributors today are being promised benefits which may not begin for 40 or more years in the future.

The system is almost entirely compulsory, and the employee contributions which are similar to employee contributions to private pension plans and group insurance are legally a tax—a benefit tax paid by the persons, who together with their families, are protected by the program. By law the income of the system can be used only for social security benefits and the administrative expenses of the social security system.

Unlike individual annuities under private insurance, social security does not, and indeed should not, build up reserves held to each worker's account sufficient to pay off accumulated rights. Social security is financed on a current-cost basis, with nearly all contributions in a given year ordinarily being used in that year to meet benefit payments and administrative expenses. The social security trust funds that do exist are contingency reserves designed to avoid the need for sudden and disruptive contribution rate increases that might otherwise be required by a sudden dislocation in the nation's economy which brought a cut in payrolls and consequently in social security income.

Precisely because the honoring of expectations now being built up is dependent on future contribution income, it is essential to establish the inviolability of benefit rights and to guard the financing source from other uses or erosion. To a very considerable extent this has been done. To help make certain that the obligations now being created are honored in the distant future, the management of the system by the Executive Branch and the Congress has been conservative. All

costs have been carefully estimated over the long run (for 75 years in the case of cash benefits and for 25 years in the case of hospital insurance) and earmarked financing designed to meet the estimated cost has been provided for by law.

But the security of future benefit payments not only derives strength from there being some kind of long-range plan to fully meet cost, but is also greatly reinforced by the concept of a social security tax or contribution paid by the people who will benefit under the system. Putting it another way, the moral obligation of the government to honor future social security claims is made much stronger by the fact that the covered workers and their families who will benefit from the program made a specific sacrifice in anticipation of social security benefits in that they and their employers contributed to the cost of the social security system and thus they have a right to expect a return in the way of social security protection.

This is true in social security, railroad retirement, civil service, and state and local retirement systems, even though there is not ordinarily in any of these programs—nor, for that matter, in private group insurance—an exact relationship between the amount of protection provided and the contributions made by the individual. Very importantly, the contributory nature of the system helps to make clear that it would be unfair to introduce eligibility conditions to people who have paid toward their protection.

I believe it would add significantly to public understanding of the trustee character of social security as a retirement and group insurance plan if the program were administered by a separate government corporation or instrumentality and if its financial transactions were kept separate from other government income and expenditures.

Social security now, with 70,000 employees and some 1,300 district offices across the country, is one of the very largest direct-line operations of the federal government. It accounts for nearly 60 percent of the personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and pays out \$1 for every \$3 spent by all the rest of the federal government.

It does not make sense administratively to have this huge program, which intimately touches the lives of just about every American family, operated as a subordinate part of another government agency. The management of social security could be made more responsive to the needs of its beneficiaries and contributors if it were freed from the frequent changes in the levels of service to the public which grow out of short-term decisions about employment ceilings and the varying management value systems which follow the frequent changes of HEW secretaries and their immediate staffs.

Until the fiscal year 1969 budget, the financial transactions of the social security system were kept entirely separate from general revenue income and expenditures, except for purposes of economic analysis. Today they are a part of a united budget, which lumps together general revenue income and expenditures and the separately financed social security system. This is leading to confusion on just how separate from other government programs social security really is. In the interest of protecting social security's long-term commitments, the separateness of social security financing should be made unmistakably clear.

The purpose of the annual budget is, on the one hand, to make choices among expenditures, giving preference in the budget period to one expenditure over another and, on the other hand, to determine who pays what and how much for the expenditures. Social security promises—stretching into the

distant future, resting on past earnings and contributions, and with separate financing—are not a proper part of this essentially competitive process.

The inclusion of social security transactions in a unified budget is bad for other reasons as well. It leads to a distortion of the decision-making process on non-social security programs. Occasional excesses of income over outgo in social security operations in the short run tend to be used as an excuse for financing additional general revenue expenditures since social security income, though legally reserved for social security expenditures, is treated in the budget in the same way as general revenue income and shows up as if it were available money.

Just about every American has a major stake in protecting the long-term commitments of the social security program from fluctuations in politics and policy. The administration of social security by a separate government corporation or instrumentality and the separation of social security financial transactions from other government income and expenditures would strengthen public confidence in the security of the long-run commitments of the program and in the freedom of the administrative operations from short-run political influence. It would give emphasis to the fact that in this program the government is acting as trustee for those who have built up rights under the system. Such changes would not only help to preserve social security as our most effective anti-poverty program—keeping some 12 million people out of poverty and doing so under conditions that protect their dignity and self-respect—but would also help to preserve social security as a universal retirement and group insurance plan on which all Americans can rely.

ANSWER TO ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the prospective end of the Arab oil embargo does not alter the fact that the United States faces a long-term energy crisis if it does not begin now to develop domestic alternatives to massive amounts of costly foreign oil. It was with this in mind that I introduced H.R. 12045 and companion bills to establish an Emergency Coal Administration to mobilize the development of our enormous coal reserves. While the United States has half of the world's coal deposits, there is no reason for us to be dependent on foreign oil. We have but to organize our coal development effort as we did war production in World War II, and this is what my legislation proposes.

I am pleased, therefore, that some attention is being given in the media to the possibilities of coal. An especially outstanding contribution is the article by Jep Cadou in the April issue of the Saturday Evening Post on "Coal: An Answer to the Energy Crisis." I believe this article will be quite revealing to many Members of Congress, as well as to others who read this RECORD, and I request permission to include it at this point:

COAL: AN ANSWER TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

(By Jep Cadou)

With the energy crisis being cussed and discussed by just about everyone in the world, it seems most appropriate that the solution may lie in a four-letter word. It is C-O-A-L. Coal is black and beautiful. But

more important, it is bountiful; so bountiful that the United States has a supply which would last nearly 800 years under the present rate of consumption.

It is also phenomenally versatile. You can make just about anything you desire in the way of energy—petroleum, natural gas or electricity—from coal, providing you are willing to pay the price. The technology exists to use coal as the keystone of a national "crash program" to make up our energy shortfall, not in a decade or two but within the next two or three years.

The main ingredients needed to make such a dream become a reality would be an investment in billions of dollars' worth of sophisticated mining equipment and a recruitment program to add upwards of 100,000 miners to the national work force.

Coal mining has undergone something of an industrial revolution of its own since World War II. "It's pretty hard to find a coal shovel around a mine now—and nobody's looking for them," say Don Stiffler, superintendent of the Chinook Mine near Brazil, Indiana. This is the oldest operating mine in Indiana and has been producing coal since 1927.

Manual labor has been replaced to an amazing degree by machinery. The general public's mental picture of a miner as a begrimed mole clawing the coal out of the ground with a pick and shovel is as obsolete as a photograph of a professional golfer playing with hickory shafts. You are likely to find today's miner pressing buttons or pushing levers to operate expensive equipment which removes the coal from the earth, cleans and sizes it and ships it to the user.

The United States is in prime position to exploit coal as Answer No. 1 to the energy crisis because it is by far the most coal-rich nation in the world. Total U.S. coal reserves are estimated at more than three trillion tons. That is more than seven times as much as the 425 billion tons of reserves estimated for Russia. It is almost fourteen times as much as the 217 billion tons estimated for China. It is more than sixty-three times as much as the 48 billion tons estimated for the United Kingdom. It is seventy-five times as much as the 40 billion tons estimated for Canada.

The Arab oil boycott fell upon us with almost the same lightninglike surprise as the Japanese betrayal at Pearl Harbor. Like that event, it has galvanized the American people's attention to a single purpose, combating the common enemy. In this case, however, the enemy is an abstraction—the energy shortage—rather than a nation such as Japan or Germany.

The United States, in snapping back from the initial catastrophic blow in the Pacific, demonstrated its ability to get even the most monumental of tasks done quickly when its people work with a single purpose. In 1941, we were retreating on all fronts with the flower of our Navy on the harbor floor at Pearl. Scores of our aircraft had been destroyed and the nation was in disarray. Two years later, fighter, bomber and cargo aircraft were pouring from our factories in production numbers unprecedented in world history. Millions of men were in uniform, a large percentage of them overseas. Many squadrons of our planes darkened the skies over Europe and Asia. This nation, almost singlehandedly, smashed the tyranny of the greatest juggernaut the earth had ever seen.

All this was accomplished despite considerable loss of life and property visited upon us by formidable enemies. Without death and destruction to dilute our efforts, we could now concentrate all of our skills and other resources on building our assets and minimizing our liabilities.

Must it take us five years to build the Alaskan pipeline?

It certainly wouldn't take that long if the

nation were at war and the oil from the Alaskan oil fields were needed to power our war machine. The job could surely be done in two years with an absolutely all-out "crash" effort.

Must it take us until 1980 to develop our energy independence as a nation from the Arabs, or anyone else who might take a nation to suddenly dry up our oil supplies? Not if our machine-tool industry and manufacturing plants were to be geared up to the processes of extracting, transporting and refining coal products.

Perhaps the time is ripe for the President and Congress to declare a national emergency and to mount an all-out mobilization to cope with the energy crisis.

Dr. Carroll Wilson, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who drew up a "Decade Program" for energy independence in *Foreign Affairs*, said: "It is a big job, but no bigger than the Manhattan or Apollo projects—in fact it's substantially less in proportion to the scale of the American economy in the 1970's and 1980's."

Wilson cited the adaptability and transportability of pipeline-quality coal gas as the basis for a massive crash program and capital investment in coal gasification plants. At the same time he recognized the environmental issues involved, including the need for federal standards covering strip mining, a provision for land restoration and a provision for pollution controls on coal gasification plants.

The area of strip-mining land restoration now is left almost entirely to the states, and the effectiveness and stringency of the state laws vary greatly. As a result, so does the relative quality of the restoration performed in various states.

The AMAX Coal Company, a division of American Metal Climax Company, is a recognized leader in the field and has won many awards for its work in land restoration. One subsidiary of the company, Meadowlark Farms, Inc., is charged with land management before mining and land reclamation after mining. The progress that has been made in the reclamation area in recent years is apparent from a visit to one of the company's mines in Indiana.

As you enter the 8,000-acre mining property, evidence of the "old way" of land reclamation is visible—literally millions of scrub pine trees planted on land that is still distinctly "lumpy" in terrain.

Nearer the "pit" where the strip-mining operation is being conducted, the terrain changes abruptly to a typical farming landscape with neat rows of crops planted on land that is quite level. This is the "new reclamation" as practiced by Meadowlark. In 1972 Meadowlark harvested over a million bushels of grain and marketed more than a million pounds of beef and pork. So, instead of the gouged, jagged earth that most persons associate with strip mining, you will see peaceful pastoral scenes of cattle and hogs grazing or feeding on grain in the wake of the AMAX operations.

Harry Mayle, who operates a dragline, a \$5 million piece of equipment as big as a four-apartment unit, is a miner of thirty-two years' experience who likes to play golf in his spare time. Mayle compares the company's reclamation efforts with the courtesy shown by the thoughtful golfer who replaces his divot after he swings and takes turf. As Mayle's giant shovel scoops up a huge "bite" of earth and then deposits it on the top of a fill that will soon be planted in crops, he says, "That soil is called glacial till; it's great for growing alfalfa."

When Mayle started out as an "oiler" on mining equipment in 1941, he was making \$1.12 per hour. He is now drawing \$6.89 per hour as a dragline operator. And the oiler who assists him on the mammoth piece of equipment is making \$6.34. The prevailing

top wage rate for deep miners is \$6.25 per hour.

Of course, the price of food that Mayle and his family buy at the grocery store and the other items that make up the cost-of-living index also have increased greatly during the last thirty-two years, but not to the extent that the wages have. Like many of the workers employed in the U.S. coal industry, Mayle is a second-generation miner. His dad worked thirty-three years for the same company that now employs him. The senior Mayle lived on pension for fourteen years after his retirement and died at age eighty. When the younger Mayle, who now is fifty-six, started as a miner, there was no such thing as a pension; nor were there paid vacations.

So, the economic lot of the coal miner has definitely improved, and the back-breaking labor of yesteryear has been taken over by Gulliver-sized machines, almost in its entirety. One of these is the unit train—a train of 100 or more cars which hauls the coal from the preparation plant, after it is mined, cleaned and sized, to the user, which in most cases now is an electric generating plant. Its loading is entirely automatic.

Like the proverbial mountain coming to Muhammad, many of the larger electric utilities in the national have built new plants close to existing mines, which greatly cuts the cost of hauling the coal. Huge diesel-powered transport trucks with capacities of 100 tons or more carry the coal from the mine to the preparation plant when there are considerable distances involved, as there usually are in strip mining. Conveyor belts or automated miniature trains may be used for shorter distances.

From the preparation plant, it may be sent to the utility in a unit train or by one of several other methods under newly developed technology. If the plant is very close, conveyors may be used. For greater distances, it can be sent by pipeline. One coal pipeline 108 miles long was built to carry a mixture of coal and water from a mine near Cadiz, Ohio, to a power plant in Cleveland, where the coal was separated from the water and fed into the boilers of the power plant. This operation was closed in 1963 when railroads lowered the rate for coal hauling, making it uneconomical. But further installations have been put into operation in Britain and other countries.

Pipeline transmission of coal is economical between areas where a large supply of coal is available and specific markets where large tonnages of coal are used at a fairly uniform rate. Electric power plants are a good example of such markets. Another pipeline for coal transmission has been built to carry the fuel from the Black Mesa area in the northern part of Arizona to Clark County (where Las Vegas, Nevada, is located) and is now in operation.

Coal can be converted into gas and petroleum to help make up for the shortfall in these two vital energy sources. The two most promising methods for conversion are known as gasification and liquefaction. There are several processes available in each area.

Most prominent of the gasification techniques is the Lurgi process, which has been demonstrated in fourteen commercial plants which treat and purify gases originating from coal. It consists basically of cooking the coal. Altogether, fifty-nine different grades of coal from all over the world have been processed successfully. They include coke, anthracite, bituminous, lignite and peat. The five-step process has been performed with a wide variety of gasification agents including mixtures of steam and oxygen, air and carbon dioxide. Two full-size Lurgi process plants now are under construction in New Mexico.

The end product of the process is synthetic natural gas (SNG), which can be used to make up the shortfall resulting from our limited quantities of available natural gas. Methanation is another promising process

of making SNG. Several groups are now working to develop the commercial aspects of methanation. At least four major projects are underway.

The Conoco project is intended to demonstrate methanation on a large enough scale to establish its commercial practicality. Thirteen partners have joined Continental Oil Company to support a demonstration plant built at the Scottish Gas Board's Lurgi coal gasification installation at Westfield, Scotland. The plant will take a slip-stream of 10 million cubic feet per day of synthesis gas, pass it through a gas purification train and produce 2.6 million cubic feet of SNG.

Liquefaction is the process of making petroleum substitutes from coal. There are several methods, including dissolving the organic matter in a suitable solvent, addition of hydrogen to produce a hydrocarbon, or synthesis of petroleumlike compounds from hydrogen and the carbon monoxide produced from coal.

Pilot plants to demonstrate the liquefaction process have been built or are under construction now at Fort Lewis, Washington; Princeton, New Jersey; and La Verne, California. These projects hold forth possibility of burgeoning new industries to process billions of tons more coal and to create hundreds of thousands of jobs to feed the economy and to replace jobs lost through cutbacks in the space industry, the airlines and other highly technical fields.

A huge training program would be required to get the job done. Not just anybody can mine coal, any more than just anybody can extract petroleum or natural gas from coal. The United States now has an estimated 150,000 coal miners. In order to mount the kind of effort that would be needed to launch a meaningful "crash" program to solve the energy shortage, their ranks would have to be nearly doubled.

That, in turn, would probably require a substantial public relations program in order to make coal mining more attractive to the youth of America. The psychological stereotype of moles clawing out coal in pitch darkness under creaking timbers and in constant fear of their lives is too firmly implanted in the national mind to be easily erased.

Working conditions for miners have improved tremendously during the last quarter century, largely through the efforts of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) and through federal and state laws and regulations.

Mining is still a hazardous occupation, but it is growing safer all the time. The miners say so. And so do the cold statistics. There were 325 fatal injuries in coal mining in the United States in 1960, according to the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior. There were 260 such deaths in 1970 and 180 in 1971, the last year for which statistics have been reported.

Such occupational diseases as the dreaded "black rot" still do exist in the mines, but there have been great strides in improved ventilation in the shafts to reduce the inhalation of coal dust. Much more progress is needed if the mines are to be able to attract the large numbers of new miners needed to meet the energy crisis demands.

Skilled engineers to build the necessary conversion plants and to find improvements over present methods also will be vital. The possibilities for creating new industries and new jobs appear almost unlimited. In the big energy poker game, it appears it's time for Uncle Sam to play his black ace—coal.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH TO CONDUCT ANTI POLLUTION TESTS ON HIGH-SULFUR COAL TO GENERATE POWER

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with our long term as well as short term energy limitations, the United States must accelerate both its exploration and usage of new energy sources. While we panic over the fuel needed for the very next day, enormous reserves of coal and oil lie untapped beneath the ground.

What is especially troublesome to me is that while the United States has half of the world's known reserves of coal we continue to import a sizeable amount of the coal we use from Poland and other foreign countries. For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 12045, the Emergency Coal Administration Act of 1974. The Coal Administration established would have the power to develop greatly expanded energy resources for the American people in the future.

The prospect of setting a high level national priority for the exploitation of coal has been frightening to many environmentalists. These people fear that in our zeal to develop coal resources the environment will be neglected. However, the necessary technology currently exists to minimize the resulting environmental damage. H.R. 12045 would provide for loans and grants to make the best production methods approved by the EPA available to those involved in coal production.

The Office of Coal Research has been particularly active in funding the research and development of such anti-pollution devices. In a Department of the Interior news release issued on March 11, the Office of Coal Research announced that it has awarded a \$1.4 million contract to the Combustion Power Co. The company will test the pollution effects of new methods for burning high sulfur coal to generate electrical power. Below, I include that release and call it to the particular attention of my colleagues.

OCR WILL CONDUCT ANTI POLLUTION TESTS ON HIGH-SULFUR COAL TO GENERATE POWER

The Office of Coal Research (OCR) has awarded a \$1.4 million contract for testing the pollution effects of high-sulfur coal burned directly to generate electrical power through new technology, Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton announced today.

Under the 16-month contract awarded to Combustion Power Company of Menlo Park, California, more than 1,000 tons of very high-sulfur coal will be burned in a new system with full test capabilities.

"We are hopeful," said Dr. S. William Gouse, Jr., Acting Director of OCR, "that clean and safe combustion of high-sulfur coal will gain us several years in the effort to combat the energy problem in the field of electricity. We are thinking of an economical plant in the 300,000 to 400,000 kilowatt range that can be constructed in about 2 years to meet the needs of some 200,000 people. Most States in the Appalachian and Midwestern coal regions have tremendous potential for yielding this kind of coal."

The Combustion Power Company tests will use 4 to 5 percent sulfur coal which is readily available.

The testing contract was agreed to as a result of combustion innovations achieved while Combustion Power was conducting research and development work for the Environmental Protection Agency in burning municipal solid wastes without pollution.

General Bernard A. Schriever, board chairman of Combustion Power, said the com-

pany's CPU-400 experimental facility was being made available because "utilization of our coal reserves offers our people the best guarantees for national defense and energy supplies. We are confident our system can handle coal. And we appreciate the combined efforts of the EPA and OCR working together on the national problem."

The Combustion Power system utilizes a pressurized fluid-bed reactor in which high-sulfur coal is burned in a thermo-chemical process, releasing heat energy while chemically reacting the sulfur into inert sulfates. The hot combustion gases are cleaned by removing particulate matter and then expanded through the gas turbine to produce electricity.

Direct combustion of coal in a gas turbine is a method of obtaining electric power directly from the heat energy of the coal and eliminates the necessity of first converting coal into a fuel gas or a liquid. Demonstration of the coal-fired gas turbine is part of OCR's overall program for producing clean forms of energy from the U.S.'s abundant coal reserves.

NEED FOR CONGRESS TO REGAIN CONTROL OVER U.S.-OWNED LOCAL CURRENCIES GENERATED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480

(Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the executive branch of our Government recently entered into an agreement with the Government of India which resulted in the relinquishment of \$2.3 million in American-owned Indian rupees. Many of our colleagues have denounced this agreement as "one of the greatest giveaways America has had." If nothing else, the agreement stands as a monument to the further usurping of congressional power by the executive branch as it has long been held that—

There can be no doubt that only the Congress is legally empowered to give away the property or money of the United States . . . (State of Indiana v. Ewing, 99 F. Supp. 734, cause remanded 195 F. hd 556.)

Mr. Speaker, I met with Ambassador Moynihan last September shortly after the proposed United States-India Rupee Settlement Agreement surfaced in the newspapers. During that meeting, I expressed to the Ambassador my deep concern over the questionable legal authority for the executive branch to enter into such an agreement without specific authority from the Congress. I stressed that—

The State Department should submit the proposed agreement to the Comptroller General for a firm decision on the legality of the proposed agreement before it was signed.

Ambassador Moynihan indicated that he thought this might be a sound procedure and that he would consider it further. Unfortunately, however, during the next 4 months, officials of the State Department made no effort to refer this agreement to the Comptroller General for a firm legal decision.

Subsequently, on February 8, 1974, Representative HAMILTON, Democrat of Indiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia, Com-

mittee on Foreign Affairs, and I, as chairman of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, wrote to the Honorable Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State, again urging State Department officials to obtain an immediate, firm decision from the Comptroller General. In an attachment to our letter, we pointed out, in part, that:

The final proviso of section 104 of Public Law 480—which reads, in pertinent part:

Paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the foregoing proviso shall not apply in the case of any nation where the foreign currency or credits owned by the United States . . . are determined . . . to be in excess of the normal requirements of the departments and agencies of the United States.

Would appear to preclude the use of paragraph (2) of the penultimate proviso of section 104 of Public Law as statutory authority to enter into the proposed agreement.

The 1966 House and Senate Agriculture Committee reports, House and Senate floor debate, and conference reports clearly showed that the Food for Peace Act of 1966 provided for a major redirection of Public Law 480 by embodying two basic revisions in the food for peace law—the elimination of the surplus disposal principle, and—the emphasis on self-help in hungry lands.

The final proviso of section 104, known as the "Mondale-Poage proviso," was added to Public Law 480 in 1966 as a result of an amendment offered by Senator MONDALE to place increased emphasis on the "self-help" provisions of the food for peace law. Senator MONDALE's floor statement clearly described the purpose of his amendment as being:

Aimed at freeing our excess holdings of foreign currencies, so they can be put to work attacking the problem which caused their accumulation—inequate farm production. In India, for example, we held \$586 million in rupees in a restricted "U.S. uses" account at the close of last year. And this fund has been growing at a rate of over \$100 million a year, while our spending from it has been limited to about \$38 million a year.

My amendment frees these rupees and other excess currencies, for use to support farm progress, by waiving legal restrictions on them in countries where our currency holdings are greater than our needs over the next 2 years. (Emphasis supplied.)

Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, speaking strongly in support of the Mondale amendment further clarified the intent of the "Mondale-Poage" proviso:

Under the bill as we have presented it, our Government can more or less force India to use more funds to develop its agriculture; and under the agreements that will be entered into, there can be a provision that India shall use so much of its resources to develop agriculture. After the amount that it usually uses is reached, then we can insist that some of these counterpart funds be used in order to assist India to further increase its agricultural program, so as to make India more or less self-sustaining in that regard.

In the past, much of the aid was used to develop industrially. But under this bill, we can now insist that it be used to develop agriculture. It is my belief that if this new policy is followed through by our Govern-

ment, it will only be a question of a few years until India should be self-sustaining.

For instance, under this new law, we can insist that instead of putting up, let us say, a plant to make steel, they make fertilizer—something to aid agriculture.

Another feature, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, is that we can insist that some of these funds be used to develop education along agricultural lines.

Under this bill the emphasis is being put on agriculture. These funds can be used to further develop agriculture, and thereby make it possible that we will soon be out of India, insofar as our selling surplus food for her to carry on. (Emphasis supplied.)

The Senate Committee report Senate Report 1527, 89th Congress, 2d session, page 11, 1966—clearly spells out the intent concerning use of excess currencies:

(16) Exempts "excess currency" countries from the requirements described in items (14) and (15). Requires the amount of the excess to be devoted to the acquisition of buildings and grounds for U.S. purposes and to additional agricultural self-help. Requires Presidential reports on the extent and use of the excess. (Emphasis supplied.)

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the February 8, 1974, letter Congressman HAMILTON and I sent to Secretary Kissinger, the General Counsel of the Agency for International Development finally wrote to the Comptroller General on February 11, 1974, requesting his views concerning the legal basis for the proposed rupee settlement agreement between the United States and India. In his letter, the General Counsel of the Agency for International Development points out that:

The legal analysis at issue turns on the following words at the start of the Mondale-Poage proviso: ". . . paragraphs (2), (3) and (4) of the foregoing proviso [including appropriation, waiver and laying before Congress] shall not apply in the case of any nation where [there is] excess foreign currency] . . . (emphasis added.)

This language, on its face, could be construed in two ways: either to state that resort to the first proviso is not permitted or to state that such resort is not required. In our opinion, the former construction would ignore the permissive, liberalizing and supplementary intent of the amendment. The Committee report quoted in the Congressional staff memorandum states the amendment "[e]xempts 'excess currency' countries from the requirements . . ." of the first proviso. We believe that the Mondale-Poage proviso was not intended to prohibit resort to the requirements of the first proviso, but only to remove the mandatory nature of their application."

In arriving at his opinion—that the Mondale-Poage proviso was permissive rather than mandatory—the General Counsel of AID relied on the first sentence of a paragraph numbered "(16)" on page 11 of Senate report 1527, 89th Congress, 2d session, 1966. For the benefit of our colleagues, the paragraph referred to follows in its entirety:

(16) Exempts "excess currency" countries from the requirements described in items (14) and (15). Requires the amount of the excess to be devoted to the acquisition of buildings and grounds for U.S. purposes and to additional agricultural self-help. Requires Presidential reports on the extent and use of the excess. (Emphasis supplied.)

Faced with a situation which for all

March 19, 1974

essential purposes represented a fait accompli, the Comptroller General of the United States rendered a decision on February 26, 1974, in which he concludes:

While the matter is not entirely free from doubt, this Office would interpose no objection to AID's entering into the subject agreement under the authority of the penultimate proviso, but that that agency should obtain congressional clarification of the intent of the two subject provisos prior to entering into any similar agreements.

In arriving at this decision, the Comptroller General comments, in pertinent part, as follows:

The issue presented for decision as to whether assistance under the authority of the first proviso may be furnished, arises by virtue of language in the Mondale-Poage proviso stating, in pertinent part, that paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the first proviso 'shall not apply' to the expenditure of foreign currencies or credits in excess currency nations. A literal reading of the statutory language makes the first proviso unavailable as authority for the entering into the subject or similar agreements which involve the grant of excess currency (here, rupees) to an excess currency nation (here, India). There is some support in the legislative history for this literal interpretation and for the proposition that the Congress wished to exercise a degree of control—such as that contained in the Mondale-Poage proviso—over the uses made of United States-owned excess currency by recipient countries.

However, reading the legislative scheme as a whole and recognizing that a primary purpose of the Mondale-Poage proviso was to furnish added means for dealing with the use of large reserves of excess currencies, it would seem somewhat anomalous to conclude that Congress intended to make unavailable previous authorities and procedures under which grants could be made without using appropriated funds. It seems more reasonable to conclude when Congress provided that paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the first proviso were to be inapplicable to excess currency countries, that it intended only that the restrictive provisions of those paragraphs not apply, leaving the agency free to make grants of excess currency without the requirement for Presidential waiver of the appropriation requirement of 31 U.S.C. 724 and the presentation of the proposal to the appropriate committees of Congress, if the recipient nation agrees to utilize, to the extent practicable, the funds for agricultural self-help projects as defined by section 109 of Public Law 480.

Accordingly, and while the matter is not entirely free from doubt, inasmuch as the provisions and procedures set forth in the first proviso have been fully complied with, this Office will not object to AID's entering into the proposed agreement under the authority of the second and third paragraphs of such proviso, rather than the Mondale-Poage proviso, if the cognizant congressional committees interpose no objection thereto. However, due to the uncertainty caused by the language of the Mondale-Poage proviso that the subject paragraphs of the penultimate proviso 'shall not apply' in excess currency nations, we believe congressional clarification as to the intent of the Mondale-Poage proviso should be obtained before AID enters into any similar agreements.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General in his decision has concluded that the legality of the United States-Indian Rupee Settlement Agreement "is not entirely free from doubt," but that his office "would interpose no objection to AID's entering into the subject agreement." His decision also admonishes the Agency for International Development to "obtain

congressional clarification of the intent of the two subject provisos prior to entering into any similar agreements." Mr. Speaker, in view of this Comptroller General decision, it is time our colleagues started thinking of changes to Public Law 480, as follows:

Revising the opening sentence of section 104 to read:

SEC. 104. As may be provided for annually in Appropriation Acts, the President may use or enter into agreements with foreign countries or international organizations to use the foreign currencies, including principal and interest from loan repayments, which accrue in connection with sales for foreign currencies under this title for one or more of the following purposes.

Deleting the provisos following section 104(k).

Adding as section 106(c):

(c). Any loan made under the authority of section 104 shall bear interest at such rate as the President may determine but not less than the cost of funds to the United States Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturity comparable to the maturity of such loans, unless the President shall in specific instances after consultation with the advisory committee established under section 407 designate a different rate.

The letters referred to follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 8, 1974.
Hon. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We wish to convey to you three areas of major concerns we have about the proposed Indian rupee settlement agreement and on which we would like to have your comments by the close of business on February 14, 1974. Your responses will be included as part of the record of the hearing by the Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia on the proposed agreement, at which Ambassador Moynihan testified.

The first major point of concern relates to the statutory authority for the Indian rupee settlement agreement. As indicated in the attached paper, this matter was discussed with Ambassador Moynihan during his meeting with Congressman Moorhead on September 27, 1973. We believe that this matter should be carefully resolved before the agreement is signed and once again urge appropriate State Department officials to obtain an immediate, firm decision from the Comptroller General.

Second, we believe that the list of development projects for which the rupees returned to India under the provisions of the agreement would be available should be recast to take into consideration the energy crisis and the problems the world petroleum price increases have caused the Indian economy. We would propose that item (vii) of the agreement listing agreed-upon projects include, in addition to the projects mentioned, the following:

"a. methane demonstration projects with the view of expanding its uses as a fuel in India;

"b. the development and exploitation of oil and coal deposits that may exist in India or offshore; and

"c. the utilization of ground water deposit."

Third, serious consideration should be given to implementing the objectives through this agreement of the Moorhead-Broomfield plan to expand American export to India by utilizing U.S.-owned excess rupees to pay Indian import duties on such products not exceeding 10 percent. This would apply only to developmental goods and services. Ambassador Moynihan and the Department already have been given details of the plan.

The Ambassador assured the congressional proponents of the plan that he has no problems with it and would try to implement its objectives if given such instructions.

We would appreciate your prompt consideration of this letter and the attached memorandum.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
Chairman,
Foreign Operations and Government
Information Subcommittee, Committee
on Government Operations.
LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman,
Subcommittee on the Near East and
South Asia, Committee on Foreign
Affairs.

QUESTIONABLE STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR
THE PROPOSED INDIAN RUPEE SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT

The Subcommittee Chairman and staff met with Ambassador Moynihan, at his request, on September 27, 1973, to discuss the proposed rupee settlement agreement. During the course of the discussion, the Chairman and staff stressed that "the State Department should submit the proposed agreement to the Comptroller General for a firm decision on the legality of the proposed agreement before it's signed." Ambassador Moynihan indicated that he thought this might be a good idea and that he would consider it further.

Subsequently, on December 4, 1973, State Department officials submitted a copy of a "Memorandum of Law From the Office of the General Counsel, AID". Concerning the statutory authority, AID/General Counsel conclude as follows:

"We conclude that the rupee proceeds of the P.L. 480 loan agreements involved in the proposal may be granted to the GOI to support its economic development budget without appropriation by the U.S. Congress under the conditions established in paragraph (2) of the penultimate proviso of section 104 of P.L. 480 (hereinafter referred to as Paragraph 2).

"Paragraph 2 authorizes grants of P.L. 480 foreign currencies for economic development purposes under section 104(f) of P.L. 480 and permits such grants to be made without appropriation if the President determines that it would be inconsistent with the purpose of Title I of P.L. 480 to require appropriation. The authority to make such a determination has been delegated to the Administrator of AID. Paragraph 2 does not impose any 'additionality' requirements for grants made pursuant to section 104(f).

"The final proviso of section 104, known as the 'Mondale-Poage proviso,' was added to P.L. 480 in 1966. Mondale-Poage applies in the case of excess currency countries such as India, and was designed to facilitate the use of such currencies by eliminating the generally applicable appropriation requirement. Under Mondale-Poage, excess currencies may be used for section 104(f) purposes, but a requirement of 'additionality' is imposed.

"There is some question as to the dimensions of the 'additionality' requirement in Mondale-Poage. It is possible, given the magnitude of the grants contemplated in the proposal, that it might be difficult to comply with that requirement. Accordingly, the question arises as to whether Mondale-Poage was intended to restrict the pre-existing authority set forth in Paragraph 2 to use grants for section 104 purposes without appropriation and without any additionality requirement. In our opinion Mondale-Poage has no such effect. Paragraph 2 and Mondale-Poage stand in the statue as independent authorities which supplement, but do not restrict each other. We find nothing in the legislative history which would suggest otherwise.

"The purpose of Mondale-Poage was to give

the Executive Branch additional flexibility in disposing of foreign currencies in excess currency countries. It was not intended to restrict pre-existing flexibility. The general purpose of the amendment is reflected in Senator Mondale's floor statement in support thereof (Cong. Rec. 20234 daily ed. August 29, 1966):

"My amendment frees these rupees and other excess currencies, for use to support farm progress, by waiving legal restrictions on them in countries where our currency holdings are greater than our needs over the next two years."

Comparable statements in the legislative history uniformly support the expansive intent of the amendment, e.g., Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 338-40 (1966); S. Rep. 1527, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 11 (1966); H.R. Rep. 2075, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 17 (1966).

"Due to the additionality test, if the Mondale proviso were construed as the exclusive means of making 104 grants without appropriation in excess currency countries, the anomalous result would be that there would be more flexibility to make such grants in non-excess currency countries (pursuant to Paragraph 2) than in excess currency countries under Mondale-Poage. This would clearly be inconsistent with the Congressional intent as set forth above."

"Section 104(f) grants pursuant to Paragraph 2 may only be made in accordance with the procedures set forth in the paragraph which immediately follows it. That paragraph requires that any agreement not be entered into or carried out until 30 days after it is transmitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture. (The time period is 60 days if Congress is not in session when the agreement is transmitted.)"

The sections of law referred to by the AID/General Counsel follow:

"Provided, that—

"(2) Section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, shall apply to all foreign currencies used for grants under subsections (f) and (g), to not less than 10 per centum of the foreign currencies which accrue pursuant to agreements entered into on or before December 31, 1964, and to not less than 20 per centum in the aggregate of the foreign currencies which accrue pursuant to agreements entered into thereafter: Provided, however, That the President is authorized to waive such applicability of section 1415 in any case where he determines that it would be inappropriate or inconsistent with the purposes of this title,

"Provided, further, That paragraph (2), (3), and (4) of the foregoing proviso shall not apply in the case of any nation where the foreign currencies or credits owned by the United States and available for use by it in such nation are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be in excess of the normal requirements of the departments and agencies of the United States for expenditures in such nations for the two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such determination is made. The amount of any such excess shall be devoted to the extent practicable and without regard to paragraph (1) of the foregoing proviso, to the acquisition of sites, buildings, and grounds under paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of this section and to assist such nation in undertaking self-help measures to increase its production of agricultural commodities and its facilities for storage and distribution of such commodities. Assistance under the foregoing provision shall be limited to self-help measures additional to those which would be undertaken without such assistance. Upon the determination by the Secretary of the Treasury that such an excess exists with respect to any nation, the President shall advise the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agricul-

ture of such determination; and shall thereafter report to each such Committee as often as may be necessary to keep such Committee advised as to the extent of such excess, the purpose for which it is used or proposed to be used, and the effects of such use."

Staff review of the 1966 House and Senate Agricultural Committee reports, House and Senate floor debate, and Conference reports indicates that the Food for Peace Act of 1966 embodied two basic revisions in the Food for Peace law:

The elimination of the surplus disposal principle, and

The increased emphasis to be placed upon encouraging and promoting expanded farm production overseas to meet rising world food needs was repeatedly made in Committee and during floor debates. During the Senate Committee consideration of the bill, an amendment, offered by Senator Mondale, was considered and adopted, and is reflected as the final proviso of section 104. The Senate Committee report—S. Rept. 1527, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 11 (1966)—describes the intent of the Committee concerning usage of local currencies as follows:

"(11) Restores the existing provision limiting the use of foreign currencies without appropriation for emergency relief to non-food relief and \$5 million per year.

"(12) Permits sales of foreign currencies for dollars to U.S. citizens in nonexcess, as well as excess, currency countries.

"(13) Provides for the use of foreign currencies to finance the planning of nutrition programs in friendly countries.

"(14) Restore the existing limits on grants and uses of repayments so as to subject them to Appropriation Act or committee approval.

"(15) Restores the existing minimum interest rate on foreign currency loans (the cost of funds to the United States).

"(16) Exempts "excess currency" countries from the requirements described in items (14) and (15). Requires the amount of the excess to be devoted to the acquisition of buildings and grounds for U.S. purposes and to additional agricultural self-help. Requires Presidential reports on the extent and use of the excess."

During the Senate floor debate on the bill, both Senator Mondale and Senator Ellender spoke in favor of the "Mondale-Poage proviso." In speaking for his amendment, Senator Mondale clearly described the purpose of the amendment as being:

"aimed at freeing our excess holdings of foreign currencies so they can be put to work attacking the problem which caused their accumulation—inequate farm production. In India, for example, we held \$536 million in rupees in a restricted 'U.S. uses' account at the close of last year. And this fund has been growing at a rate of over \$100 million a year, while our spending from it has been limited to about \$38 million a year."

"My amendment frees these rupees and other excess currencies, for use to support farm progress, by waiving legal restrictions on them in countries where our currency holdings are greater than our needs over the next 2 years."

Senator Ellender further clarified the intent of the "Mondale-Poage" amendment:

"Under the bill as we have presented it, our Government can more or less force India to use more funds to develop its agriculture; and under the agreements that will be entered into, there can be a provision that India shall use so much of its resources to develop agriculture. After the amount that it usually uses is reached, then we can insist that some of these counterpart funds be used in order to assist India to further increase its agricultural program, so as to make India more or less self-sustaining in that regard."

"In the past, much of the aid was used to develop industrially. But under this bill, we can now insist that it be used to develop

agriculture. It is my belief that if this new policy is followed through by our Government, it will only be a question of a few years until India should be self-sustaining.

"For instance, under this new law, we can insist that instead of putting up, let us say, a plant to make steel, they make fertilizer—something to aid agriculture.

"Another feature, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, is that we can insist that some of these funds be used to develop education along agricultural lines.

"Under this bill the emphasis is being put on agriculture. These funds can be used to further develop agriculture, and thereby make it possible that we will soon be out of India, insofar as our selling surplus food for her to carry on."

In view of the foregoing, it would appear that:

The final proviso of section 104 of P.L. 480—contrary to AID/General Counsel's belief—precludes the use of paragraph (2) of the penultimate proviso of section 104 of P.L. 480 as statutory authority to enter into the proposed agreement,

And further restricts the use of excess U.S.-owned rupees to "the acquisition of sites, buildings, and grounds under paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of section 104 and to assist such nation in undertaking self-help measures to increase its production of agricultural commodities * * * additional to those which would be undertaken without such assistance."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1974.
Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
Chairman, Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of February 8, also signed by Chairman Hamilton of the Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia, Committee on Foreign Affairs concerning the Indian Rupee Agreement. I am sending the same reply to Chairman Hamilton.

First, on the legal issue, we believed that our own thorough legal study and determination of the statutory authority for entering into the Agreement provided us with a firm basis on which to proceed. Consequently, we had not felt that referral to the Comptroller General was necessary or warranted.

Nevertheless, in accordance with our desire for the closest consultation with you and other concerned Congressional Committees and Members, we sought an immediate, firm decision from the Comptroller General on the legal issue by letter dated February 11 (enclosed). The Comptroller General has informed us by telephone today that the General Accounting Office has reviewed the matter and that his office has no objection to our proceeding with signature of the Agreement on February 18. He also told us that a written response would follow. We will forward to you a copy of this response as soon as we receive it.

Second, as concerns the direction of the use of our rupee grants to India, we agree that the energy crisis will have a most serious impact on Indian economic development and that the areas you identify are well suited for Indo-US cooperative endeavors. After careful study and consideration of your suggestions we propose to treat them as follows:

We will seek to encourage expansion of the use of methane as a fuel in India through joint Indo-American research projects and the study of the manufacture of this low-cost fuel in Indian technical institutes. We will raise with India the desirability of allocation of a portion of our rupee grant to India for such purposes. We have instructed our Embassy in Delhi to open discussions with the Indian Government to explore how we may most effec-

March 19, 1974

tively cooperate to secure the expansion of the use of methane in India.

We have already been consulting with the Government of India on ways to step up India-American cooperation in the search for oil off India's coast and the exploitation of any deposits located. We believe this is a field ideally suited for private U.S. firms, contracting directly with the Indian Government. The Indian Government has called for international bidding on such contracts and we have been encouraging qualified U.S. firms to participate.

Similarly, we have encouraged the Indian Government to act promptly on the application of a major U.S. company to develop a coal gasification project in India. Here again, there is great scope for private U.S. firms to contribute to Indian development.

The utilization of ground water deposits in the vast, fertile plain across which the Ganges River flows has long received attention as part of U.S. technical assistance programs to India. We have indicated to the Government of India our willingness to discuss the nature of any future assistance program and expect that, following signature of the Rupee Agreement, this general subject will be taken up in New Delhi. In that context, we believe that appropriate attention should be given to the question of ways to optimize the use of India's enormous ground water resources. In the meantime, however, we will raise with India the question of allocating a portion of our rupee grant to improving the utilization of ground water deposits.

We believe that all of these ideas, and others, for ameliorating India's economic development performance in the wake of the sudden steep rise of world petroleum prices will be the more readily discussed with India in the improved atmosphere following the conclusion of the Rupee Agreement. We believe this atmosphere will be conducive to the resolution of various outstanding questions in the areas of trade and investment.

In this context, we will be giving serious consideration to implementing the objectives of the Moorhead-Broomfield plan to expand American exports to India. After thorough study of the implications of this proposal, legal as well as commercial, we propose to take it up with appropriate Indian officials with a view to what can be done to give it effect.

We have noted your request for our comments by February 15 and that our responses will be included as part of the record of the January 29 hearing of the Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia on the proposed agreement. As you are aware, we intend to sign the Agreement with India and to have it enter into force on February 18, 1974.

Sincerely yours,

STANTON D. ANDERSON,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1974.

PAUL DEMELING, ESQ.,
General Counsel,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DEMELING: As you know, the United States Government has recently had negotiations with the Government of India to settle the long-standing matter of the large rupee balances the U.S. holds there. The agreement to resolve this, signed ad referendum in New Delhi on December 13, 1973, is summarized, and favorably commented on, in the Comptroller General's letter to Congressman Hamilton, January 28, 1974, B-146749.

On February 8, 1974, Congressman Hamilton and Congressman Moorhead addressed a letter to Secretary Kissinger (attached), indicating a concern regarding the legal basis

for the settlement agreement, and suggesting that the Department obtain a decision from the Comptroller General. Since the matter appears to be a question of legal interpretation, and in view of the timing needs involved, I write directly to you. (The agreement is scheduled to be formally signed February 18, 1974, before the re-opening of India's Parliament.)

There is, basically, one principal legal question pertinent here. That question, which arises under the provisos to section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (P.L. 480), relates to how, other than by specific appropriation by Congress, we may use such currencies for, e.g., grants to the host country. There are two routes to achieve this. Under paragraphs (2) and (3) of the first proviso, this may occur if there is both a Presidential waiver of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953 and the grant agreement is laid before the committees of the Congress for thirty days (sixty if Congress is not in session). This is the route we have taken in this case.

The agreement has been laid before the Agriculture Committees, hearings have been concluded, and no objection has been registered. (The agreement has also been presented to the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees.)

Another route, pursuant to the final proviso of section 104 (the Mondale-Poage proviso), is available only for excess-currency countries. Under this proviso, no appropriation is required (nor waiver, nor laying before Congress), but issues exist as to the extent the assistance must be additive to self-help measures which would have been undertaken without such assistance.

The critical question the Congressmen's inquiry raises is whether, in an excess-currency country, *only* the second route is available. This would mean, for instance, to follow the logic of the staff memorandum accompanying the inquiry, that the ability to use local currency in excess currency countries would be far more restricted than in other countries. We believe that such a construction of the Mondale-Poage proviso would contradict the purpose of the Congress in enacting Mondale, which was to facilitate the use of excess currencies.

The legal analysis at issue turns on the following words at the start of the Mondale-Poage proviso:

"... paragraphs (2), (3) and (4) of the foregoing proviso [including appropriation, waiver and laying before Congress] *shall not apply* in the case of any nation where [there is excess foreign currency] ..." (emphasis added).

This language, on its face, could be construed in two ways: either to state that resort to the first proviso is not permitted or to state that such resort is not required. In our opinion, the former construction would ignore the permissive, liberalizing and supplementary intent of the amendment. The Committee report quoted in the Congressional staff memorandum states the amendment "[e]xempts 'excess currency' countries from the requirements ..." of the first proviso. We believe that the Mondale-Poage proviso was not intended to prohibit resort to the requirements of the first proviso, but only to remove the mandatory nature of their application.

We have chosen, accordingly, to take for the settlement agreement the more conservative route of the first proviso, laying the agreement before the Congressional committees and invoking the authority to waive appropriation, which we believe appropriate in this case.

We have consulted extensively with Congress concerning this rupee agreement with India. In July 1973, when Ambassador Moynihan was first instructed to open negotiations, Department of State officials met with

the Chairmen of the House and Senate Agriculture and Foreign Affairs/Relations Committees. Again, in September 1973, as the outlines of a possible settlement became clearer, Ambassador Moynihan consulted with over two dozen concerned Congressmen, once again including members of the Agriculture and Foreign Affairs/Relations Committees but also including members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the House Committee on Government Operations. Finally, after the agreement was initialled in New Delhi, Ambassador Moynihan, accompanied by State, AID, and Department of Agriculture officials, met formally with the Near East and South Asia Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Agriculture Committee and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as well as with other individual members interested in this agreement. In all, we have consulted at least once with over 60 members of Congress. The Congressional reaction throughout has been generally favorable.

I attach papers that may assist in establishing the background of the arrangement proposed, including my memorandum on the subject. I regret that we are under pressure of time to consummate this arrangement, as I have mentioned, and hope that we may resolve the matter together before the end of the week. We should be happy to assist in any way we can.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR Z. GARDINER, JR.,
General Counsel.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 26, 1974.
Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
Chairman, Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By letter dated February 8, 1974, as well as in prior informal contacts, you requested the Secretary of State to obtain the opinion of this Office as to whether the Agency for International Development (AID) may enter into a proposed excess rupee agreement with the Government of India pursuant to the authority of the first proviso of section 104 of Public Law 480, 83rd Congress, 7 U.S.C. 1904, or whether AID is required to use the authority contained in the second (or so-called Mondale-Poage) proviso of that section.

The General Counsel of AID requested our decision in the matter by letter dated February 11, 1974. Enclosed for your information is our decision of today to the Secretary of State in which we state that while the matter is not entirely free from doubt, this Office would interpose no objection to AID's entering into the subject agreement under the authority of the penultimate proviso, but that that agency should obtain congressional clarification of the intent of the two subject provisos prior to entering into any similar agreements.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 26, 1974.
File: B-146749

Matter of: Excess rupee agreement with India.

Digest: AID may enter into excess rupee agreements with India (excess currency country) pursuant to first proviso of section 104, Public Law 480, even though literal reading of second (so-called Mondale-Poage) proviso makes procedure of first proviso inapplicable to excess currency nations, since matter is not free from doubt and intent of second proviso was apparently to remove excess currency from restrictions of first proviso and not

to eliminate applicability of alternate procedure.

This decision to the Secretary of State is in response to the request by the General Counsel of the Agency for International Development (AID), Department of State. He requested our views concerning the legal basis for a proposed settlement agreement between the United States and India concerning the large rupee balances held by the United States in India.

The question arises under the first and second provisos of section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), 7 U.S.C. 1704. These provisos which immediately follow subsection 104(k) were added by section 2(B) of the Food for Peace Act of 1966, Public Law 89-808, November 11, 1966.

The first proviso is, in effect, a restatement of prior law. The second paragraph thereof authorizes grants of Public Law 480 foreign currencies for economic development purposes under section 104(f) of that law without the need for specific appropriations, if the President determines that it would be inappropriate or inconsistent with the purposes of Title I of Public Law 480 (7 U.S.C. 1701 *et. seq.*) to require appropriation. The third paragraph thereof provides that no agreement or proposal to grant any foreign currencies or to use any principal or interest from loan repayments shall be entered into or carried out until the expiration of thirty days (or sixty days when Congress is not in session) following the date on which such agreement or proposal is transmitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture.

The second or ultimate proviso, also known as the Mondale-Poage proviso, provides—

"Provided, further, That paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the foregoing proviso shall not apply in the case of any nation where the foreign currencies or credits owned by the United States and available for use by it in such nation are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be in excess of the normal requirements of the departments and agencies of the United States for expenditures in such nations for the two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such determination is made. The amount of any such excess shall be devoted to the extent practicable and without regard to paragraph (1) of the foregoing proviso, to the acquisition of sites, buildings, and grounds under paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of this section and to assist such nation in undertaking self-help measures to increase its production of agricultural commodities and its facilities for storage and distribution of such commodities. Assistance under the foregoing provision shall be limited to self-help measures additional to those which would be undertaken without such assistance. Upon the determination by the Secretary of the Treasury that such an excess exists with respect to any nation, the President shall advise the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture of such determination; and shall thereafter report to each such committee as often as may be necessary to keep such Committee advised as to the extent of such excess, the purposes for which it is used or proposed to be used, and the effects of such use." (Emphasis supplied.)

The proposed settlement provides, in part, for India to prepay all outstanding rupee obligations, including principal and interest, up to the date of settlement. Outstanding principal and interest would not be prepared for commercial loans except for some of the Public Law 480 Cooley loans. The United States will then grant the major part of the Public Law 480 generated rupees—equivalent to about \$2.2 billion—to the Indian Government for projects as specified in the settlement. The projects, which are to be chosen by the Government of India, are in the areas

of agriculture, housing, family planning, health, technical education, power development, and rural electrification. AID proposes to enter into the subject agreement with India under the authority of the first proviso of section 104 of Public Law 480.

The issue presented for decision as to whether assistance under the authority of the first proviso may be furnished, arises by virtue of language in the Mondale-Poage proviso stating, in pertinent part, that paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the first proviso "shall not apply" to the expenditure of foreign currencies or credits in excess currency nations. A literal reading of the statutory language makes the first proviso unavailable as authority for the entering into the subject or similar agreements which involve the grant of excess currency (here, rupees) to an excess currency nation (here, India). There is some support in the legislative history for this literal interpretation and for the proposition that the Congress wished to exercise a degree of control—such as that contained in the Mondale-Poage proviso—over the uses made of United States-owned excess currency by recipient countries.

However, reading the legislative scheme as a whole and recognizing that a primary purpose of the Mondale-Poage proviso was to furnish added means for dealing with the use of large reserves of excess currencies, it would seem somewhat anomalous to conclude that Congress intended to make unavailable previous authorities and procedures under which grants could be made without using appropriated funds. It seems more reasonable to conclude when Congress provided that paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the first proviso were to be inapplicable to excess currency countries, that it intended only that the restrictive provisions of these paragraphs not apply, leaving the agency free to make grants of excess currency without the requirement for Presidential waiver of the appropriation requirement of 31 U.S.C. 724 and the presentation of the proposal to the appropriate committees of Congress, if the recipient nation agrees to utilize, to the extent practicable, the funds for agricultural self-help projects as defined by section 109 of Public Law 480.

Although the provisions and procedures of the first proviso are more restrictive and more difficult to comply with than those of the Mondale-Poage proviso, the executive branch has decided to enter into the instant agreement pursuant to the authority of the first proviso. In the instant situation, the President has determined that the appropriation of these funds would be inappropriate or inconsistent with the purposes of Public Law 480 as required by paragraph (2) and the agreement has been submitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture as required by paragraph (3) of the penultimate proviso without, insofar as we are aware, any objection to the agreement being raised. Moreover, the Department of State advises that it has met and consulted, both formally and informally, with the Near East and South Asia Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Agriculture Committee and the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, as well as with other interested members of Congress, with respect to the full scope of the proposed agreement.

Accordingly, and while the matter is not entirely free from doubt, inasmuch as the provisions and procedures set forth in the first proviso have been fully complied with, this Office will not object to AID's entering into the proposed agreement under the authority of the second and third paragraphs of such proviso, rather than the Mondale-Poage proviso, if the cognizant congressional committees interpose no objection thereto. However, due to the uncertainty caused by the language of the Mondale-Poage proviso that the subject paragraphs of the penulti-

mate proviso "shall not apply" in excess currency nations, we believe congressional clarification as to the intent of the Mondale-Poage proviso should be obtained before AID enters into any similar agreements.

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

MR. O'BRIEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of death in the family.

MR. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), 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. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

MR. HANSEN of Idaho, for 5 minutes, today.

MR. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

MR. HOGAN, for 30 minutes, today.

MR. CARTER, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

MR. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

MR. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

MR. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.

MR. CULVER, for 5 minutes, today.

MR. RANGEL, for 10 minutes, today.

MR. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

MR. WOLFF, for 15 minutes, today.

MR. PODELL, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

MR. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$940.50.

MR. GROSS immediately preceding the vote on H.R. 11105.

MR. GROSS, immediately preceding the passage of H.R. 12417 today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

MR. STEELMAN.

MR. BROOMFIELD.

MR. ESHLEMAN.

MR. ZWACH in two instances.

MR. BROTHMAN.

MR. KEMP in three instances.

MR. HOGAN.

MR. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

MR. WYMAN in two instances.

MR. HUBER.

MR. DERWINSKI in two instances.

MR. FRENZEL.

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. ABDNOR.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE), and to include extraneous matter:—)

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. O'HARA in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. CAREY of New York.

Mr. STOKES in six instances.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. BINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE.

Mr. DENT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20, 1974, 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:

2068. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for a research, development, and evaluation program to be known as Follow Through for the purpose of developing and testing various approaches to the education of children from low-income families in kindergarten and early elementary grades who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar preschool programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2069. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 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 [8 U.S.C. 1154(d)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2070. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, for fiscal year 1973, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 93-243); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2071. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing fund for fiscal years 1972 and 1973, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 181; 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. WALDIE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 628. An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the annuity reduction made, in order to provide a surviving spouse with an annuity, during periods when the annuitant is not married; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Select Committee on Committees. House Resolution 988. Resolution to reform the structure, jurisdiction, and procedures of the committees of the House of Representatives by amending rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, with amendment (Rept. No. 93-916). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 991. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11929. A bill to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that expenditures for pollution control facilities will be credited against required power investment return payments and repayments; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-917). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 992. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12412. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize an appropriation to provide disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance to Pakistan, Nicaragua, and the Sahelian nations of Africa; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-918). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 993. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12435. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rates under that act, to expand the coverage of that act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-919). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 994. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12920. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to carry out the Peace Corps Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-920). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIGGS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8747. A bill to repeal section 274 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, requiring compulsory vaccination against smallpox for public school students (Rept. No. 93-921). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIGGS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12109. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to clarify the provision relating to the referendum on the issue of the advisory neighborhood councils (Rept. No. 93-922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIGGS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12473. A bill to establish and finance a bond sinking fund for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIGGS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12832. A bill to create a Law Revision Commission for the District of Columbia, and to establish a municipal code for the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-924). 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. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 13574. A bill to commemorate the American Revolution Bicentennial by establishing a meetinghouse program, by making grants available to each of the several States for the purpose of acquiring and restoring certain historic sites with a view to designating and preserving such sites for use as meeting-houses in connection with such Bicentennial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 13575. A bill to authorize a 5-year extension of the period of temporary admission into the United States for certain residents of Chile who are in the United States as nonimmigrant aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan (for himself and Mr. ASHLEY) (by request):

H.R. 13576. A bill to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to provide for the orderly transition from mandatory economic controls and continued monitoring of the economy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 13577. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to increase the amount of the annuities payable thereunder to widows and widowers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 13578. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the status of preference eligible to certain spouses of veterans who served on active duty in the Armed Forces in the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 13579. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide service pension to certain veterans of World War I and pension to the widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUNTER:

H.R. 13580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no individual shall pay an income tax of less than 10 percent on his income and to provide that industrial development bond income shall not be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself,

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. GUDE, Mr. STARK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ROYAL, Mr. STUDDS, and Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 13581. A bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act to prohibit certain corporation management interlocking relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself,

Mr. REED, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ROYAL, Mr. ST GERMANY, Mr. SARASIN, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 13582. A bill to insure that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced, or entitlement thereto discontinued, because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. HOLT (for herself, Mr. WINN,

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. STEELMAN, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 13583. A bill to establish a national

homestead program under which single-family dwellings owned by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may be conveyed at nominal cost to individuals and families who will occupy and rehabilitate them; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUBER:

H.R. 13584. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to temporarily reduce the excise tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels by 2 cents per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13585. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a beneficiary who dies shall (if he is otherwise qualified) be entitled to a prorated benefit for the month of his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 13586. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax credit for any individual who performs voluntary service for any organization engaged in the treatment, care, or rehabilitation of the physically handicapped or the mentally ill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 13587. A bill to assure that weather modification activities and the collection of hydrometeorological information necessary to the management of water resources can be conducted in conjunction with the management and administration of wilderness areas and other Federal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 13588. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to establish a new urban transportation formula grant program, to amend related provisions of law dealing with mass transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.R. 13589. A bill to expand the Glendo Unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program to provide for the rehabilitation of a road relocated by the Bureau of Reclamation in the vicinity of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, Platte County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 13590. A bill to direct the U.S. Postal Service to issue regulations prohibiting the use of collect-on-delivery mail service for the mailing of certain animals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13591. A bill to amend the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13592. A bill to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to authorize and require the President of the United States to allocate plastic feedstocks produced from petrochemical feedstocks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 13593. A bill to provide for the termination of certain oil and gas leases granted with respect to land located in the Ocala National Forest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 13594. A bill to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. CLARK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUDOS, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. GROVER, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. BAWMAN):

H.R. 13595. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, to authorize appropriations for bridge alterations, to authorize for the Coast Guard and end-year strength for active duty personnel, to authorize for the Coast Guard average military student loads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 13596. A bill to improve the quality of health care for American Indians by providing health care educational opportunities encouraging maximum involvement of Indians in the creation, planning, and implementation of health care programs directly affecting their needs, by improving substandard health care facilities, by encouraging research into all facets of Indian health care problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER VEEN:

H.R. 13597. A bill to reimburse the States for all unemployment compensation paid to individuals whose unemployment is attributable to the oil crisis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13598. A bill to amend the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13599. A bill to provide for a temporary program of special unemployment compensation in areas of high unemployment and to amend the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 13600. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of certain political campaign advertising expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. WINN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FULTON, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr.

BELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. BURGENER, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 13601. A bill to establish a Bureau of Missing Persons to strengthen interstate reporting and interstate services for parents of runaway children and to provide for the development of a comprehensive program for the transient youth population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 13602. A bill to provide assistance and full-time employment to persons who are unemployed or underemployed as a result of the energy crisis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDDNUT):

H.R. 13603. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide adequate financing of health care benefits for all Americans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 941. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 942. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Res. 989. Resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of a report of the Select Committee on Committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WAGGONNER (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BREAUX):

H. Res. 990. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

388. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the tuna industry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

407. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Congress of Micronesia, Saipan, Marian Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to the appropriation of additional funds to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESEARCH AND TREATMENT FOR THE PROBLEMS OF HUMAN GROWTH

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to call the

attention of my colleagues to Mrs. Bill J. Schneider and her views on the relative funding priorities in the field of health research, training, and care. Her son was successfully treated for his problem as a part of a National Institutes of Health program in St. Louis, Mo., for research and training of doctors.

Mrs. Schneider was concerned that this program and similar ones would be cut back to provide increased funding for the war on cancer which has

received so much publicity. I was of course happy to check on this matter for her and even happier to be able to report back such positive news from the National Institutes of Health on the future of human growth research and training.

Mr. Speaker, I request that Dr. Donald Whedon's letter to me be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to bring attention to this work. I think any effort to share this good news and to call atten-