

[Roll No. 56]

Ashley	Fraser	Pickle
Baldwin	Fulton, Tenn.	Pool
Bonner	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Casey	Harsha	Purcell
Clausen,	Hawkins	Redlin
Don H.	Holland	Reid, N.Y.
Conyers	Ichord	Roosevelt
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Senner
Dague	Kastenmeier	Smith, Iowa
Derwinski	Long, Md.	Sweeney
Diggs	Love	Todd
Edmondson	McMillan	Toll
Everett	MacGregor	Watkins
Ewins, Tenn.	Murray	Willis
Flood	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

U.S. DELEGATION TO CANADA-UNITED STATES PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section I, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from May 20 to May 23, 1965, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, chairman; Mrs. KELLY, of New York; Mr. DULSKI, of New York; Mr. MURPHY of Illinois; Mr. GIALMO, of Connecticut; Mr. JOHNSON of California; Mr. ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island; Mr. TUPPER, of Maine; Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota; Mr. WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania; Mr. STAFFORD, of Vermont; Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 284 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 284

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging". After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 284 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 3708, a bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the Administration on Aging.

The Administration on Aging will serve as a clearinghouse of information on problems of the aged and aging; will assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to the aging; will administer grants provided by the act; will develop, conduct, and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; will provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local government; will prepare and publish educational materials dealing with welfare of older persons; will gather statistics in the field of aging; and will stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 284.

This is an authorization for \$5 million for the next fiscal year and an additional \$3 million for the fiscal year following.

This bill originally was filed by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I know that through the years we have listened to Mr. FOGARTY, the able chairman of that subcommittee, with rapt attention because we admire his skill and his knowledge concerning all of those problems that have come before us.

He has given considerable study to this particular matter, having been chairman of that committee for many, many years, and he feels that this type legislation is necessary. Being the expert that we know him to be on the subject, all committees have been unanimous in their reports on this bill.

With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in his remarks concerning the interest of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in this type of legislation.

We went into this in some detail before our subcommittee in its hearings during each of the last 2 years. I believe that the record which was made before our subcommittee regarding the need for this separate agency is very clear.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it can be said at the outset that this bill has a very appealing title. It is called the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, there are undoubtedly some very excellent provisions that are contained in this proposed legislation.

In the scheme of things it is a rather modest bill as far as authorizations are concerned. As I understand it, a total of \$12.5 million would be authorized in the first 2 years of this program for various types of grants.

I believe it is important to note this, however, at this time: There is what I believe can be termed an open-end authorization for the last 2 years of the 5 years' operation provided for under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen grants to the States in this country grow during the last decade from something like \$3.5 billion to \$13 billion at the present time.

So in order to be quite realistic, we would have to assume that this bill, if enacted, would have some part to play in a further increase in various grants to the States and communities.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point that I would make. Perhaps, this can be discussed during the general debate that will follow.

I note that the bill does provide for grants as I said to the States for community planning and coordination and also for grants to public and private agencies for various purposes, as they are stated in the bill.

It is my impression that at the present time much of the community planning and coordination, demonstration projects, and pilot programs relating to community planning and coordination with respect to the older Americans are presently being carried on within the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I wonder whether or not it can be brought out during the general debate on this bill whether this bill envisions setting up new programs that might possibly overlap or duplicate programs already being administered by the HHFA?

I would sincerely hope that that would not be the case, as one of the avowed purposes of this bill is to coordinate what is described in this report as an already bewildering profusion of Federal programs in this particular area.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it might also be profitable to direct our attention to the extent to which this bill would have any impact on the programs that I understand will be carried on under title II of the Antipoverty Act, community action programs, and so forth. I think it might be worthwhile to consider the extent to which program grants carried out under this particular act might tend to duplicate programs that will be carried out under title II of the Antipoverty Act.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has already commented on the fact that this proposed

legislation would have the effect of setting up a new separate agency head who would be a Commissioner appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate, I think this is an eminently desirable provision of this bill.

There was, as I understand it, some opposition from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary Celebrezze, on the matter of appointing a Commissioner which would replace the Office of Aging which now exists in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under a Commissioner of Welfare.

However, the report says a great majority of the witnesses who testified were in favor of a commissioner with jurisdiction in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I support the granting of a rule and urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. I rise in support of H.R. 3708, the "Older Americans Act of 1965."

In January 1961 the White House Conference on Aging was held and under the responsible leadership of the Honorable Arthur S. Fleming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Honorable Bertha S. Adkins, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Honorable Robert W. Kean, former Congressman from New York, brought forth vital information on the problems of aging.

The Older Americans Act, like the White House Conference on Aging legislation, provides for the execution of its provisions through the States by encouraging the States, through their own programs, to actively participate in the search for solutions to the problems of the aged. This legislation, like the White House Conference on Aging legislation, recognizes, as we always have, that the problems of the aged, like so many other problems, are not just Federal problems that can be solved by Federal action only, but are problems that must be approached through combined Federal-State action.

This legislation is an outgrowth and a logical extension of the White House Conference on Aging which has served to augment the rising awareness of the growing problems of the aged and of the magnitude of the effort that will be required to meet them. This legislation not only encompasses the purposes and functions of the Conference, it goes several steps further, by utilizing the information obtained by the Conference to first, establish a full-time, high-level agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—an Administration on Aging—that would devote its full attention to the developments of solutions to the social and economic problems of the aged; second, give the aged a full-time representative in the upper echelons of the Federal Government; third, authorize grants to the States for community planning, demonstration projects, training of personnel, and related programs; and fourth, authorize grants to public or nonprofit private agencies,

organizations, or institutions for research, training, and demonstration projects in the field of aging. Only by so utilizing all of the information available can we build a legislative framework which will provide adequate means to cope with the problems of the aged.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the continuation of the present bipartisan support that is being given this legislation. A separate agency not under the direction of the Commissioner of Welfare is needed now. The present agency should be transferred and given the independent status provided in this bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Where are the hearings on this bill?

Mr. LAIRD. The hearings on this bill, as I understand it, were conducted some 16 months ago by the Committee on Education and Labor. I would like to hand the gentleman a copy of the hearings to look at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean there have been no hearings on this subject for a year and a half? The bill was brought here without up-to-date hearings?

Mr. LAIRD. The hearings were held some 16 months ago before the Committee on Education and Labor.

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while this bill holds the title of Older Americans Act of 1965, I notice it is known also as the "Fogarty Act." Fitting tribute will be paid to a man who has done so much for the children of America, the needy of America, and the aged of America.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3708, with Mr. DADDARIO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3708 is known as the Older Americans Act of 1965. The history of the bill tells us that it was introduced in the 88th Congress by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Hearings were held in 1963 for 3 days. It was ordered reported to the full committee with amendments on January 29, 1964, and ordered reported to the House on June 11, 1964. A rule was requested on June 12, 1964.

The committee also considered bills introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. Chairman, the Older Americans Act is the product of an evolution which began in 1958, when the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], became concerned about this very important subject and asked the question, "What are we going to do about the problems of the aged?" He introduced a bill known as the White House Conference on Aging Act which became law in August of that year. The purpose of that bill was to convene a national forum of the most knowledgeable people in the field of aging to distill their combined experience into a blueprint for action in aging. This forum convened in 1961 and a workable and carefully prepared plan for action was developed. The Conference made many specific recommendations. It is noteworthy that H.R. 3708 is an embodiment of the most significant of these recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, the older American has nearly 18 million individual faces. And, on each, the 20th century has drawn the lines of its progress and its troubles, its achievements and its failures; lines of worry over two world wars, a massive depression, a cold war; lines from work on brilliant medical and scientific successes, bountiful agricultural production, and amazing technical progress.

The faces are those of two ex-Presidents; nearly 10 percent of the entire U.S. population; nearly 1½ million people living on farms; more than one out of four U.S. Senators; almost 2 million people working full time; two of the nine U.S. Supreme Court Justices; more than 10,000 people over 100 years old; over 12½ million people getting social security benefits; over 2.3 million war veterans; more than 3 million people who migrated from Europe to the United States.

These are some of the faces of the older American. Behind them are the brains, the strengths, and the weaknesses of the men and women who have had a major part in bringing America into the jet and missile age.

There can be no composite picture drawn of the older American, but we know these facts about him:

He may be between 65 and 70, but he is probably older. He may have an adequate income, but probably not. He

may be working, but it is unlikely. He may have a high school education, but probably does not.

He may be in good health, but probably is not. He may not receive social security, but probably does. He would like to have more to do, but the opportunities do not exist. He may collect a private pension, but probably does not.

He may have adequate health insurance, but probably does not. He may live alone, but probably not.

How do we know these things about the older American?

Probably no other group in America has been more thoroughly studied in the past 15 years than the aging—his health, his housing, his employment, his happiness, his habits. Nearly everything about him. And more research is constantly being started, and still more will follow.

This study has not been prompted by idle curiosity. It grew mainly out of a recognition, shortly after World War II, that this country was developing a sizable population of older people, that they had unique problems and interests, and that very little was really known about them as a group.

Is there any doubt as to need for a centralized authority with its primary function and duties oriented to the problems of the aged? This is what we hope to accomplish with this legislation—H.R. 3708.

Mr. Chairman, the history of this legislation can therefore be said to date back many years. In the last Congress, the Select Subcommittee on Education held extensive hearings on the Fogarty bill and ordered it reported favorably. The Committee on Education and Labor likewise ordered the bill reported, and with overwhelming bipartisan approval. The bill, however, did not receive a rule in the rush of unfinished business toward the close of the session. It was therefore quite natural when this legislation received the high-priority attention and subsequent approval of the Committee on Education and Labor this year.

Mr. Chairman, it is the basic purpose of H.R. 3708 to create an operating agency known as the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the direction of a Commissioner on Aging who will be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

This new agency will serve as a clearinghouse of information on problems of the aged and aging; will assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to the aging; will administer grants provided by the act; will develop, conduct, and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; will provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments; will prepare and publish educational materials dealing with welfare of older persons; will gather statistics in the field of aging; and will stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services.

The bill authorizes \$5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; \$8 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and such sums as the Congress may appropriate for the next 3 fiscal years

in grants to the States for community planning and coordination, demonstration programs, and training of special personnel.

It further authorizes \$1.5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; \$3 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and such sums as the Congress may appropriate for the next 3 fiscal years in grants by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to public or non-profit private agencies, organizations, and institutions, for study, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects relating to the needs of older persons, and for the specialized training of individuals in carrying out such projects.

And finally, the bill provides for the establishment of a 16-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans with the Commissioner on Aging as Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, at the aforementioned hearings it became clear—particularly after testimony by Secretary Celebrezze of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Congressman FOGARTY—that the major point at issue was the creation of an operating agency within HEW, headed by a Commissioner, as opposed to the continued vestige of authority in HEW, under the Commissioner of Welfare, as an Office of Aging. During the hearings, 17 witnesses placed themselves on record as being in favor of creating a new operating agency in HEW to be known as the Administration on Aging. It is significant that 17 of the 18 witnesses who testified favored such a proposal. These witnesses came from local, State, and National organizations on aging, and they included representatives of unions, voluntary and professional organizations, and religious organizations.

In fact, the only dissenting witness favored the complete bill, but opposed only the necessity for creating the new agency—this was, of course, Secretary Celebrezze. At that time, the Secretary quite naturally was partial to the administration bill for the aged and aging—a bill introduced in the House by the gentleman from Arkansas [MR. MILLS] and a bill which involved the expenditure of millions of dollars more than did the Fogarty bill. It is significant to note, however, that this same administration bill was not introduced in this Congress, and that in fact, the administration is no longer offering an alternative solution.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would now like to address myself to some of the criticisms which have been directed at this legislation. As aforementioned, the hearings showed that the central source of controversy was the creation of a new Administration on Aging in HEW.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is basically one of planning and coordination so as to maximize the contribution which all agencies of Government, as well as those in the voluntary segment of our society, can contribute to the development of services and programs for older people with a minimum of duplication, overlapping, and confusion, and with a maximum contribution of their own resources and activities, not necessarily engendered by great amounts of additional money but a genuine and committed concern for

doing something to bring older people back into our society and into our community and to provide for them a meaningful plan and a meaningful role.

Mr. Chairman, in this context, the question of organization becomes extremely important. It must be recognized that there are many facets of Federal and State programming and local activities which are not in the welfare context and which cannot respond well to leadership which generates basically from the concept that public welfare is the central coordinating point around which these activities should be conducted. I submit that attention to the aging is one of these facets, and one that should be completely divorced from the welfare concept.

Mr. Chairman, we must remember that the organization of this program on the Federal level will set a pattern which the various States will tend to follow. If we acknowledge the older American as a welfare case on the national level, can we expect the States and communities to do otherwise?

Mr. Chairman, attempting to administer this program under the auspices of the Welfare Administration, and therefore inevitably in most places through the State welfare department, will mean we will be very seriously limiting the range and scope and effectiveness of the utilization of the total resources available to serve these people.

Mr. Chairman, an alternative solution is for the Secretary of HEW to establish an Administration on Aging within his Department—by Executive order—alike that called for in this bill. This would truly accomplish the same administrative purpose as would the bill. We must remember, however, that the next Secretary may have different administrative ideas about the older American, and with another Executive order, put this organization back under welfare.

This is why it is necessary for the Congress to meet this issue head-on. This is why a legislative authority must be created in this instance. We do not propose to go into every executive department to organize the department the way we think best. The departmental administrators are far more familiar with the peculiarities and subtleties of their individual departments. What we do propose, however, is to recognize a great need and provide for that need when it is not properly being met. In this context, it is not the right, but the responsibility of the Congress to act.

Mr. Chairman, there is criticism—which stems from misunderstanding—that the bill does not provide for matching funds from the States. This is entirely incorrect.

Section 302(c) in the bill expressly states that Federal funds will only be available to pay for State programs to the extent of 75 percent in the first year of the program, 60 percent in the second year, and 50 percent in the third year—after which a State program is the financial responsibility of the State.

In addition, section 304 provides that not more than 10 percent or \$15,000 of a State's allotment—whichever is the larger—shall be available for paying one-

half of the costs of the State agency in administering the State plan.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to one other issue before concluding my remarks. It has been asked—as though it were necessary—whether this legislation would put “bread into anyone’s mouth.” It is amusing to me that those who ask this question are the same Members who oppose so violently Federal funds being used for this purpose.

The answer to this question, Mr. Chairman, is obviously negative. It is not the intent of the bill to do so—not directly at least. This legislation is but a start in the direction of opening new avenues of opportunity for older citizens so that they will be in a position to help themselves—or, as some of my colleagues prefer, to “put bread in their own mouths.”

Mr. Chairman, there is great support for this legislation. In the appendix of the report, you will note several letters of approval from various State commissions on aging. These are but representative of the many that have been received.

Mr. Chairman, let us now look at areas of concern to the older American.

HEALTH

Millions of older Americans enjoy relatively good health and many of them can be almost as active as they were when they were years younger. Many of those with disabilities have learned to live with them and accept their limitations.

But, most have become the prey of at least one disease that will stick with them as long as they live. It is part of the toll the years have taken. It is grim evidence that the causes and cures are still to be found for the diseases that come with age.

And it is dramatic proof of the health-care problem faced by older Americans who are caught between rising medical and hospital costs and their low, relatively fixed incomes.

Statistically, here is the health report of today’s older Americans:

More than 12 million have at least 1 chronic condition such as high blood pressure, arthritis, diabetes, heart disease, or mental disorder.

More than half of those with a chronic ailment have some limitation on their activities.

More than 800,000 older people are in institutions.

About 1,250,000 elderly people are invalids who, though not in institutions, are unable to get along without help from others.

Tragically, many of those with serious conditions would be better in health if known preventive and restorative services had been promptly used. Until more is known about the causes and cures of chronic diseases, the most potent weapon against them is early detection and prompt treatment.

Part of the problem lies with the older people themselves. They delay going to a physician until it is too late. This is obvious from one of the studies of the Natinal Health Survey which showed one out of four people 65 or over had not been to a physician for 2 years or more.

Sole responsibility, however, cannot be placed on the older people for this. They have not been made fully aware of the

need for regular checkups, the dangers of self-doctoring, or the methods of accident prevention.

Many older Americans do not get the care they need because they are too proud to accept charity or other outside financial help. And they do not want to be a burden on their families.

Many make the mistakes of treating themselves when they really need to see a doctor. Others use medications which have worked on similar symptoms in neighbors or friends. They want to avoid the cost, or they may be afraid of treatment and hospitals.

Others are the victims of poor nutrition because they are caught by food fads, poor food habits, or lack of interest in eating, primarily because they have to eat alone.

Accidents—many of them preventable—also take a high toll among older people. They have nearly twice as many home accidents as the average adult and three times as many fatal accidents.

Part of the fault for the poor health of many of the aged also must be borne by physicians, communities, States, and the Federal Government, which have been slow in starting health programs for them.

A positive recent step was the passage of the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, designed to help States and communities start or expand comprehensive care services outside hospitals for the chronically ill.

But for this generation, as well as future generations or older Americans, much remains to be done both in detecting chronic diseases early and in finding their causes and cures.

A great deal of research is already underway. With the brilliant success of science during the 20th century in controlling infectious disease and in improving nutrition and sanitation, the main spotlight of research has now been trained on the diseases of the later years.

In the past 10 years, hundreds of millions have been spent by Federal, State, and local governments and by scores of voluntary agencies for research on diseases affecting older people.

Surgery, medicines, and medical care never dreamed of in 1900 are now in use. They have done much to ease the pain and sufferings of illness. And, they have helped to add 21 years to the average life expectancy at birth since 1900. But these marvels of science have also made the treatment of illness—both for the old and for the young—increasingly complex and costly.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment plays varying roles in the lives of older Americans. For many, it is a principal source of income to provide the necessities of life. For others, it provides the therapy of usefulness, belonging, and well-being. To many older people, employment is the badge of status in the family and the community and the center from which social contacts radiate. To some, it is one of these things and to others it may be all of them.

Employment, thus, has different meanings for different older Americans, depending upon their individual needs and

wants. It means full-time remunerative work for one; for another, a part-time job to supplement a pension income; for still another, voluntary work in his home community or even abroad in the Peace Corps. To others, employment means a place to go everyday—and the paycheck is a minor consideration.

As the needs and wants relating to employment differ among older Americans, so do the opportunities for satisfying those needs and desires. For the opportunities of obtaining or retaining employment are subject to many severe restrictions. A major restriction lies in the practices in our society. Many older persons are barred from work by age discrimination in hiring or in selection for retraining. Others are forced to quit work because of compulsory retirement policies.

A sample survey in 1956 of job orders placed in State employment service offices showed that 58 percent had an upper-age restriction. A new survey is now being conducted and hopefully will show some improvement. According to recent surveys of firms with pension plans, 9 out of 10 companies employing 1,000 or more workers have mandatory retirement policies, and there appears to be little or no inclination on the part of employers to discontinue these policies. In fact, available evidence points to an increasing number of employers who are establishing compulsory retirement at a fixed age—this in an era when the span of life is growing.

Opportunities for employment are limited also by the climate of the labor market. There is the increasing competition from mounting numbers of young jobseekers for whom new jobs cannot be created fast enough in an economy which has experienced an average annual unemployment rate of 5.5 percent for the past 5 years. Complicating the situation are new job requirements created by new technology, geographical movements of industry, and the accompanying movements of jobs and plant mergers.

Limitations in job opportunities arise also from the qualifications of the elderly person himself. They may include such factors as declining health and physical ability on the part of some, limited skill or skills no longer in demand in the fast-changing labor market, lack of sufficient education for many of the new jobs, and waning ability to move about to seek work where it may be. Many an individual creates his own restrictions by the limitation he puts on wages, hours, working conditions, and the location of work.

If the problem of employment of older Americans is to be dealt with adequately we must understand not only their varying needs for employment but also the many obstacles and difficulties standing in their way. To make opportunities in employment available for elderly persons, we need to do two things. First, we need to identify those elderly persons who want to earn money and concentrate our job development efforts for this group. Second, we need to provide opportunities for other elderly Americans to satisfy their needs for useful activity through

community, public service, and other kinds of noncompensatory activities.

Enlarging work opportunities for older people will require action on a number of fronts. It will involve—

Gaining acceptance of the principle of employment on the basis of ability rather than age.

Gaining an understanding on the part of employers of the qualifications of many older persons for available employment.

Providing opportunities for retraining older workers and upgrading their skills and providing more opportunities for vocational rehabilitation.

Encouraging the adoption of flexible retirement policies based on an individual's capabilities, needs, and desires, rather than his age.

Developing part-time employment opportunities for those who need or desire work but who cannot or do not wish to work full time.

Steps also need to be taken to provide more adequate counseling, placement, job development, physical restoration, and other services to assist older people in choosing and retraining or reentering employment. To often such services are denied the older work on the erroneous premise that age alone makes such help fruitless.

A more positive outlook is needed on the part of those serving older persons and on the part of the older persons themselves.

HOUSING

A suitable place to live—a house, an apartment, whatever it may be—is necessary for the older American who wants to live a useful and independent life, just as it is for a younger person.

Housing for older people today is for active, self-reliant persons who are living longer, healthier, and more meaningful lives. It is designed for efficient, dignified living and avoids the needless struggle to maintain large homes.

But, an adequate home for an older person is often quite different from what would be adequate for a younger person. Older people have smaller incomes, their health is usually poorer, and, of today's nearly 18 million people 65 or over, nearly one out of four lives alone.

It is important, therefore, that older people have access to housing which is adequate but low cost, is modest in size and efficient to maintain, and is so designed that it will help them avoid accidents.

It is also particularly important that their homes be close to public transportation, since many of them do not have cars; that it be close to adequate shopping facilities, so that normal activity is sustained; and that it be near recreational, church, cultural, and other community centers, so that they can be active in community life.

By these basic standards, much of today's housing for older people is far from adequate.

Of the people 65 or older who head households, about one-third live in dilapidated housing, deteriorated housing which may or may not have all plumbing facilities, or in housing that, though

sound, lacks some or all plumbing facilities.

In addition, many older Americans live in housing units which are too large, too costly, or too inefficient or unsafe for the special needs which come with age.

A recent foundation-financed study of quality of housing of persons receiving social security payments showed that—

Forty-five percent of all aged living in households were classified as being in need of better accommodations, based on the quality of the housing or the living arrangements with relatives.

Eighty percent were living in houses at least 30 years old, and 40 percent living in houses at least 51 years old.

The aged in poorest health, by and large, occupied the poorest housing.

Despite the unpleasant view these facts conjure, the outlook for improvement is bright. For in no area of Federal housing programs has progress during the past 2 years been more dramatic than in housing for the elderly. The progress has been based on cooperation between private groups and governmental agencies with emphasis on local initiative and local action.

RETIREMENT PLANNING AND COUNSELING

The adjustments many older Americans face when they retire are as drastic as any they have ever faced in their lives.

Consider, for a moment, the adjustments an older person would need to make if his income was cut at least in half; leisure time replaced the hours he worked; the regularity of his work no longer existed; his association with co-workers ended; he no longer had his work to occupy his mind.

Many of today's older people have successfully made the adjustments associated with retirement. Many others have not.

Recognizing the difficulties in getting used to retirement, some of the Nation's employers, unions, and civic and government leaders have set up retirement planning and counseling programs in recent years.

The programs have generally had two purposes: To tell the people nearing retirement about the adjustments they will have to make and to help change their attitudes about retirement; and to give them factual information about social security, health, housing, social welfare, investments, recreation, civic activities, legal matters, community resources, and other matters with which they may have had no previous experience.

How extensive retirement planning and counseling are among employers and unions is difficult to measure. But it has been estimated that about one-third of the large employers have some type of program. Two of the Nation's biggest unions have a full-time staff working on such programs. Local school systems, recreation departments, and libraries have offered assistance.

Several of the Federal Government's agencies have retirement preparation programs and others are considering them.

The development of retirement preparation has been led by a dozen or so uni-

versities, which have been influential in getting employers and unions interested.

The results are hard to measure because the programs have been in operation only a short time and because they vary considerably in quality. But there is no doubt these efforts have been helpful in many cases and should be expanded.

EDUCATION

Education offers many opportunities for an adult to continue as part of the community. One of the less obvious but important values of preretirement education is the reminder to persons approaching full retirement that education for education's sake can be stimulating and enjoyable. Some older people welcome the chance to learn a new language, to be guided into greater appreciation of music or art, or to experience for the first time the joy of painting, modeling, orchestration, or discussion. Basic elementary education, when classes are offered in convenient neighborhood locations, is eagerly accepted by older adults who lacked educational opportunities when they were growing up.

Colleges and universities, community colleges, and public school adult education agencies in several States are offering courses especially designed to meet these increased needs. Many libraries have developed special services and programs for their older patrons.

For the majority of older Americans, the financial barriers to continuing education must be removed—or drastically lowered—if all who want to follow this road to a place in the community are to have the opportunity to do so.

CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RECREATION

Retirement offers unlimited opportunities to enjoy old hobbies or to develop new ones. Retirement also means that people have time to learn and practice new skills in a wider range of arts and crafts, home repair, maintenance, and beautification—things that many people have wanted to do before but never had the time to do until they retired.

Travel, participation in organizations, and recreation also open up ways for older people to make new friends and meet new people. One of the demonstrated values of senior citizen centers is the chance they offer many older persons to find new interests after retirement. Many persons no longer feel at loose ends after being welcomed into an activity center. The companionship, acceptance, and interest of his peers are often all that an older person needs to renew interest in life and the world around him.

For some, the extent of their participation is limited by fear of involvements that will make too many personal demands on their time or energies. They may go no further than thumbing through the available reading material or listening to a discussion or watching a movie. But gradually, the warmth of others' interests brings more response. A card game may be tried—or a simple responsibility accepted. Soon, a satisfying activity is found, and some degree of community participation follows. For

many, the centers become the doorways to an active, outgoing role in their community, as a volunteer there or elsewhere, as a participant in political activity, as a student, or as an active church member.

There are now over 700 senior activity centers in the country offering opportunities in arts and crafts, education, and recreation. Similar opportunities are offered by approximately 3,000 clubs sponsored by welfare and recreation departments, local chapters of national voluntary organizations, religious groups, and labor organizations. While there has been a phenomenal increase in the number of such centers since the White House Conference on Aging in January 1961, many more are needed to provide bridges to community participation for the older Americans who have not yet discovered a way to adjust to their newfound leisure.

One fact stands out as we grow older: The years force our body to pay a toll. We may be rich. We may be poor. We may have the best medical care. We may have none. We may carefully choose our diet. We may not.

But, the toll for each added year is inevitable, and the effect is at least a gradual decline in our ability to be active.

Medical science and the other sciences each year are discovering new ways to slow down the decline and new ways to rehabilitate us if we are incapacitated by sickness or injury. But scientific inquiry is a slow and painstaking process, and many of the secrets of life and health are still locked in the value of time.

Thus, we see among our older Americans several million—mostly in their seventies, eighties, and nineties—whom the toll of the years has made frail and disabled. They need special care and attention to be active at all or to regain lost strength and ability. They need someone to care.

Out of their needs and the needs of other older people in the past, special kinds of health services and living arrangements have grown—nursing homes, for the aged, home health care, homemaker services, foster homes.

Unfortunately, the need for such services and home arrangements far exceeds the supply, and those available are often very inadequate or too expensive.

The result: Many disabled older Americans are in their own homes when they should be in homes for the aged, or in nursing homes, getting more care and medical attention. At the same time, some are in nursing homes or other institutions when they could be at home if help were available there. Others live with their families because help in their own homes is lacking.

But, with the growth in the number of older people and the realization that they have special needs, the situation is gradually improving.

This is mainly due to an increased interest in disabled older people on the part of States, communities, and private organizations.

The kinds of services and living arrangements for the dependent older person vary widely.

In some cities, a wide variety of service is available to the older person who is well enough to stay at home but too disabled to do such chores as cook, clean, or shop.

Examples of good services, excellent care, effective rehabilitation, coordination of programs and facilities could be cited. But for the most part such services are spotty, fragmentary, not nearly adequate to the need.

CARE FOR AGED

Services in the home should include such aids as homemaker services, meals on wheels, shopping aid, visiting-nurse services, and counseling and other social services.

Homemaker services usually consist of sending a trained woman into private homes to help with the shopping, cooking, and cleaning, perhaps to help the older person dress and get about the house, and to provide a friendly link with the outside world. The homemaker may be needed only a few hours several times a week, or she may come more regularly.

It is a flexible service and a beacon of hope to many aged people.

But there are homemaker services for the aged in only 40 States and in only 134 communities. Even where the service exists, the number of homemakers actually available is often very small.

The prospects of expanding these services appear encouraging, through both voluntary organizations and public agencies. Starting July 1, 1963, 75 percent of the costs of such programs can be provided by Federal funds in local public assistance programs. Also, funds for research and demonstration projects in this field are available to health and welfare agencies.

A homemaker program for older people in every community is now a reasonable goal, a justifiable hope.

"Meals on wheels" is the usual term given a variety of portable meal services by which warm meals are made available to older people in their own homes, usually once a day. But at the last count, only 25 of these programs were in effect.

This service is sometimes combined with shopping aid and homemaker service. The combination makes it possible to help both those who like to prepare their own meals and those who need to have them prepared.

Visiting-nurse services have been provided in most urban communities since 1900, but many more visiting nurses are needed. Their job is to check on the physical condition of the older person, to be sure his medicine prescription has not run out, or to provide any other care that might be needed and that they can professionally give.

In a few communities, coordinated home-care programs are offered in order to extend many hospital services directly into the home. Under such programs, the older person's needs are met primarily by his family, with the help of a team of professionals—nurse, doctor, social worker, nutritionist, and physical or occupational therapist. In 1960, however, only 33 such programs had been established in the United States.

Even broad home-care services do not assure everything a disabled older person might need. He may require a friendly visitor, or legal protection of one kind or another. If he is receiving public assistance or other financial aid, such help may be readily available, but, otherwise, he or his family may have difficulty in finding it.

Information and referral services are of great assistance to older persons and their families, but again complete services of this kind are offered by only a few communities. For the older person, more is frequently needed than the information and advice. He may also need help in getting to the agency which can assist him, or he may need guidance in order to avail himself of the services set up for him.

Casework services, while a part of the total welfare program, are only beginning in many places to be extended to persons who are not currently receiving public assistance.

Recent changes in the social security law have broadened the possibility of these services reaching people whose needs are not complicated by lack of money for the basic necessities. But in far too many places today no casework or counseling services exist for other older people or those concerned with their care.

Even if adequate community services were available—which would permit many older Americans to remain in their homes long after their physical abilities had diminished—some would eventually need more supervision or more intensive care than can be brought into their homes.

The next step for some would be a special type of home, such as a boarding home, group-care residence, foster home, or home for the aged—or in many cases a nursing home.

HOMES FOR THE ILL OR DEPENDENT

Homes for the aged, foster homes, and other group residences today give hope that a much better situation will exist in the future than we have seen formerly—when all too often the home was institutional in character and provided little more than basic shelter and food to the residents. We see, today, experimental designs and imaginative architecture, and the development of programs of services that show much more regard to the very real needs of older people—to enable them to live with dignity and in comfort.

Church groups and fraternal orders have been leaders in pioneering new concepts and designs in varied types of housing for the elderly. The Federal Government has played an important role in the program of mortgage insurance for residential facilities, in working with local housing authorities to build public housing especially designed for the elderly, and in the direct loan program of the Community Facilities Administration to assist in construction for low-income residents.

In 1961, more than half a million older Americans lived in 23,000 nursing or other types of homes provided nursing or supportive services.

Many of these nursing homes, unfortunately, are unsatisfactory by any modern standard. Many are converted residences. Many are deteriorated and actually unsafe. The number of "acceptable" nursing home beds is far short of the need.

All States have licensure programs for nursing homes. Because of the shortage of well-designed, well-equipped, and well-staffed homes, however, the licensing standards often represent scarcely minimal requirements.

The Public Health Service defines the various kinds of homes serving the aging according to type of care provided:

Skilled nursing homes which provide skilled nursing care as their primary and predominant function. In 1961, there were 9,700 of this type with 338,700 patients.

Personal care homes which primarily provide domiciliary or personal-care functions but may also provide some skilled nursing care. In 1961, there were 11,100 with 207,100 residents.

Residential care homes which have primarily residential or sheltered care functions, but which also provide some skilled nursing care. In 1961, there were 2,200 with 47,000 residents.

Very few of even the best skilled nursing homes provide restorative and rehabilitative services.

Yet, there is evidence that physical rehabilitation for chronically ill bed patients over 65 could restore many within a year to ambulation and partial self-care and that many so restored would not require continued institutional care.

Some of the inadequate medical-care and restorative service in nursing homes are due to the traditional attitude toward them as the last stopping place, the point of no return.

Mr. Chairman, our approval of this legislation is the careful result of years of study. Much of this study was conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor; and printed in testimony and report form. A Special Committee on Aging was created in the Senate, and this body has been responsible for much of our useful information. Outside the legislative branch, the late President Kennedy, by Executive order, created the President's Council on Aging to report annually and to make related information available to interested parties. The total of these instances undoubtedly represents the largest and most authoritative body of information on older citizens ever developed, assembled, and published. It is time to take these ideas from the books and translate them into programs of action.

Mr. Chairman, there are presently some 18 million Americans who collectively share the problems of the older American. This represents nearly 10 percent of our population. It is estimated that by 1975, as many as one out of every eight Americans will be aged 65 or over. It is time to acknowledge the existence of these good citizens with an agency, not associated with welfare, but singular and responsible. There are now some 10 departments or agencies of Government who in some small way are con-

cerned with the older American. No one of them ventures from its baliwick. The needs demand one agency with the authority and ability to speak on all matters of interest to the aged; and the capability to initiate and foster programs designed for the benefit of the older American.

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

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for his work on this legislation and on this problem, and above all the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the author of this bill for the years that have been put into this piece of legislation.

Hearings were held under our former colleague, Mr. Bailey, and the hearings that have been held recently are all indisputable proof that the Nation is waiting for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, over 6 years ago, in September of 1958, Congress passed the White House Conference on Aging Act. The following 2 years were devoted to studies, meetings, and planning at the local and State levels in preparation for the National Forum which was held in Washington, D.C., January 9 to 12, 1961.

An estimated \$3 million was reported to have been spent for the Conference. The final report included over 600 major recommendations for positive action to meet the needs of America's 18 million older persons.

Mr. Chairman, 4 years—wasted years—have elapsed with the promises still unfulfilled. Funds have not been available for training programs and demonstration projects. Many of the States that were ready to move forward have faltered and their commissions of councils on aging have terminated or become inactive.

The entire field of aging suffered a serious setback when the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reorganized and downgraded the programs on aging by placing them under the direction of a Commissioner of Welfare. This announced to the Nation that hereafter "all older persons shall be regarded as welfare clients."

Mr. Chairman, the Older Americans Act is the answer to the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging, the considered judgment of national leaders in the field of aging, and national organizations of older persons.

In summary the act would achieve the following:

First. Working together on problems of mutual interest to the Federal, State, and local programs, grants would be available for training, demonstration programs, and research.

All of the grants would be made on the basis of the program or project becoming self-supporting or continuing as a shared responsibility among appropriate agencies.

Second. The appointment of a Commissioner on Aging would give the Federal program a statutory basis that would make it possible for it to work with

Congress and other Federal agencies at an administrative level that would prevent or eliminate the bureaucratic stalemates that exist under the present organization.

Third. Removing the program on aging from the welfare setting would create a more favorable attitude toward appropriate action that would not be regarded as public assistance on the welfare level.

Private industry as well as public agencies have indicated their reluctance to be associated with welfare activities.

The older person also has been rightfully resentful to be cast in the role of a second-class citizen. Most of them have never been and are not now welfare clients.

Fourth. The Advisory Committee would bring together the top administrators of departments with programs affecting the aging and representatives of leading organizations working in the field to give a dimension of citizen participation and cooperation not before known in the national program on aging.

Fifth. An Administration on Aging would give a focal point to the broad Federal program that has not existed in spite of attempts to rename or revitalize the Federal Council on Aging now known as the President's Council on Aging. There has not been a dynamic, positive program on an interdepartmental basis at the Federal level.

Sixth. Passage of the Older Americans Act would establish an organization and set an example that State and local governments could adapt to give meaning to the added years and make available the manpower reserve that is vital.

Mr. Chairman, let us not waste any more years by delaying positive action on this bill. The numbers of our elderly do not wait until the Congress is ready to act. The problem is a present one. Let us acknowledge our responsibility to these citizens who have contributed so much. Let us acknowledge that responsibility here and now.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I want to say that throughout all the hearings and debates and discussions and work on this up until the moment of having this opportunity to present this bill to the House of Representatives for consideration, the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has given us every consideration and every cooperation, unstintingly.

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

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill and to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that brought this bill to the floor for his leadership and diligence on behalf of the legislation. I had the privilege to serve with him during the 88th Congress on this subcommittee where we held extensive hearings on the bill.

This is certainly timely legislation. Many groups of people and many of our aged people helped to put this bill together. Of course, no one deserves more credit and commendation than our dis-

tinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for his great leadership and direction.

So we are pleased that on this day the people who are in the aged group and who are looking forward to the passage of this legislation can now see the great interest of the Congress in their behalf, and to see this legislation being put into law.

Mr. Chairman, I wish also to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] who is now in the well.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman from New York. I want to say I appreciate his efforts and the work that he has contributed toward the successful conclusion of this operation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

(Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this bill should not even be on the floor of the House today for consideration by the Members. There are nine members of the subcommittee which considered this bill, six on the majority side and three on the minority side. Five of these nine members are first-termers. One additional member of the subcommittee did not serve on this subcommittee in the last Congress. As a consequence, there were only three of us who were familiar with this legislation when it was considered in the subcommittee, in the Congressman from Pennsylvania's office one morning. We gave a total amount of consideration to the reporting out of this bill, without any hearings in this Congress—we gave a total amount of 5 minutes' time to reporting this legislation out, six members of the subcommittee not even being familiar with it. The only hearings which were held—and I have them right here in my hand—were in September 1963. We are considering legislation here without any hearings being held in the subcommittee and without any consideration or very little consideration given in the full committee before this bill was reported out to the floor of the House.

Now, let me read you some of the objectives of this bill. This is a foot-in-the-door approach. This seems to be a subject like motherhood. We are all in favor of helping these people. From title I of this bill, here are the objectives:

(1) An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.

(2) The best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status.

(3) Suitable housing, independently selected, designed and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.

(4) Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.

(5) Opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.

(6) Retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy.

(7) Pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

(8) Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.

(9) Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.

(10) Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that covers the entire waterfront. True enough, there is a \$17.5 million authorization for the first 2 years, but if you look carefully at these objectives, this program could come out from this commission in future years to the tune of a program running to hundreds and thousands of millions of dollars and even billions of dollars, if we are to go into all of the 10 points covered by the objectives of this legislation.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, testified before us. He had some very definite objections to one section of this bill which has not been changed. I quote from his testimony:

Establishment by statute of the internal organizational arrangements of the department would deprive the Secretary of that control and flexibility, and accordingly I recommend that section 201 be deleted and deferred for further consideration.

In addition to this, there is no recommendation nor approval that has been submitted in the report from the Bureau of the Budget for this legislation.

Because of the testimony of Mr. Celebrezze in regard to section 201, which has not been changed in the bill of the House, and because of the fact that no hearings were held and no consideration was given in this Congress to this legislation and because it was reported out in a matter of a few moments' consideration in subcommittee with a majority of the members not even familiar with the legislation—for these reasons I feel this legislation should be rejected by this body.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. I just wanted to correct one statement that the gentleman made and that was with reference to the budget. I have before me the correspondence which states that the Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of H.R. 3708 is in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Why was not that included in the report? Was that received just recently?

Mr. DENT. I might say to the gentleman that I would have been happy to have it in the report if we had received it in time, but it arrived on March 31, 1965, which is as of today.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. That goes along with the manner in which this bill was considered. There was so much rush to get it out so that it could be reported by the full committee that we did not have time for hearings or proper consideration.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

(Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965, assuming, of course, that the amendments to be offered by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], are approved.

Since the White House Conference on Aging, convened by President Eisenhower in January 1961, an ever-growing awareness of the varied problems of the aged has become noticeable. Yet this awareness has not brought forth the means for seeking, or coordinating, possible solutions for the mitigation of the problems of the elderly.

Almost every branch of the Government is concerned with these problems, since they involve health, employment, recreation, education, income maintenance, and housing. Yet at the present time, no Government agency effectively devotes its full attention to the development, or coordination, of the social and economic problems of the aged. The Office of Aging is not suited to this task because, among other reasons, of its subordinate position under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Welfare.

The program contained within the Older Americans Act is not a welfare program and should not be administered by any agency under welfare jurisdiction. This legislation is designed to provide a representative for the elderly in the Federal Government and to provide a means to gain an insight or a perspective into the problems of a responsible and respected segment of our population by, first, establishing a high level agency—an Administration on Aging—that would devote its full attention to the developments of solutions to the social and economic problems of the aged, and, second, authorizing funds for a 5-year period for research and training programs designed to promote the well-being of our older citizens.

Since the problems to be dealt with in this area are as complex and as significant as those dealt with by the other agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administration on Aging should be on a coequal basis with these other agencies. Thus, the Administration on Aging must have coequal status with the Social Security Administration and the Welfare Administration so that the older population can be meaningfully represented in the upper echelons of the Federal Government. In the words the Committee on Education and Labor:

The proposed Administration on Aging would establish a specific high-level agency with power and responsibility to take action. It would have full-time responsibility, backed by professional knowledge and ability, and the strong desire to represent effectively in the Federal Government our 18 million older Americans.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with strong bipartisan support. Considering the ever-increasing need for this legislation, I hope it continues to receive strong bipartisan support.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the sponsor of this legislation.

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for its consideration of this legislation. I wish also to thank the full Committee on Education and Labor as well as the Committee on Rules for permitting this bill to come before the House today.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see anything unusual in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today. This legislation has been in the mill since 1958. For the past 6 or 7 years we have been talking about legislation along this line.

Mr. Chairman, the first bill for holding a White House Conference on Aging was introduced and passed by this House by unanimous vote back in 1958.

Then after all of the 53 States and territories had held meetings at the local community and State levels on the White House Conference, nearly 3,000 delegates from all over the country assembled in Constitution Hall here in Washington in January 1961. They had over 300 voluntary organizations dealing with this aging legislation at this Conference. Out of the Conference came over 600 positive recommendations as to what to do in this particular area.

It was then, Mr. Chairman, after that Conference was held, that same month, I introduced this legislation, back in 1961.

In 1962 under the leadership of our former colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Bailey, complete hearings were held for a period of 4 or 5 days. The only person who appeared before that subcommittee at that time with any opposition at all to the proposed legislation was the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He did not want a separate agency. He had relocated the office of aging problem under the Welfare Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Chairman, older Americans in this country do not want to be dealt with as welfare cases. They do not like the word "welfare," and I do not blame them. This bill was reported out unanimously in 1962 and then again in 1963 under the very able leadership of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], and complete hearings were held. Again, the only one who had any question about this kind of legislation was the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze. He voiced this opposition because he had placed the Office of Aging under Welfare and preferred it kept there. That was the one reservation which he had at that time, and the hearings will so show.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that after 6 years of working on this particular subject we have basic legislation here that will help in this field of aging. The administration has changed its mind and the Secretary of the De-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare has endorsed all of the provisions contained in this bill. But he did say that he would prefer that the administration of this program be left in the Secretary's office.

Mr. Chairman, a request for a report on this legislation was made on the first of February this year and was not received by the committee until this morning. That is why the recommendations of the administration were not included in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] covered about everything that I was going to say in regard to this program. I think he did an excellent job. I do not want to keep the House any longer or the membership.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a very clean basic piece of legislation.

I know that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] has two or three amendments to offer. It is my understanding that some accord has been reached between the minority side and the majority side on these amendments. I am pleased to go along with them. This would represent a truly bipartisan measure passed by the Congress this year to do something for the older Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that when we have 18 million people in our country today over the age of 65 and 1,000 more being added every day, we owe something to them. They deserve it. This is their kind of legislation. Almost every major organization dealing with the elderly people in our country has endorsed this legislation. This is their preference.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will pass this bill today, and by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, today we have an opportunity to act on a bill that will restore the 18 million Americans over 65 years of age to their rightful places as citizens, first class. We shall also reclaim their wisdom, knowledge, and experience so essential if we are to achieve and maintain the aims of a truly great society.

The Older Americans Act of 1965, H.R. 3708, is basic legislation. It will, for the first time, create a foundation for practical action programs that will add purpose and dignity to the later years. I regret that we have been so long delayed in bringing such a bill before the Congress for your consideration.

The need for a dynamic organization to devote full time to the complex, compelling problems of aging was well documented by the White House Conference on Aging held here in Washington, January 1961.

More than 2,500 delegates participated in this forum. Behind them lay nearly 2 years of preconference study and analysis by thousands of professional and lay persons in the States and communities. The delegates represented 53 States and territories, and more than 300 national voluntary organizations interested or active in the field of aging.

In the foreword of the report of the White House Conference, Robert W. Keane, its Chairman wrote:

The report will have real and enduring value only to the extent that it is used by these groups and individuals as a guide to action in the coming years. It is these people who now must convert the Conference findings into specific actions that will help America's older citizens cope with their problems, fulfill their potentials, and make their full contribution to the life and strength of the Nation.

This report, a clear mandate for action has been to date ignored or so inadequately implemented as to be little more than a token effort.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 would salvage this \$3 million expenditure and convert it into the blueprint for action—many times promised—but never produced because there was not an organization in aging at the Federal level sufficiently independent, properly financed or action-oriented.

An examination of the Older Americans Act of 1965 will reveal how closely it adheres to the recommendations made in the Conference report:

It is recommended that the Federal coordinating agency in the field of aging should be given—

(a) A statutory basis and more independent leadership;

(b) Adequate funds for coordination and other assigned functions through a "live item" appropriation;

(c) Responsibility for formulation of legislative proposals for submittal to Congress; and

(d) Responsibility for periodic reviews of and reports on the various Federal programs, departments and agencies working in behalf of older people to achieve their effective coordination and operation.

In determining the ratio of State funds that must match Federal funds used to finance Federal-State programs in behalf of older people, the Federal Government has a responsibility to take into consideration the varying degrees of fiscal capacity or ability of the several States of the Union as related to the program.

Without attempting to detail the six titles of the Older Americans Act, it will be helpful to understand how each meets a need that not only complies with the directives of the Conference report—but which have since been endorsed by every major organization of older persons, religious groups, labor and industry leaders, and by State and local commissions and committees on aging.

Title I contains a 10-point declaration of objectives "in keeping with the traditional American concept of the inherent dignity of the individual under democratic society."

The governments at the Federal, State, and political subdivision levels have a duty and responsibility to assist older people to secure equal opportunity to the full and free enjoyment of the objectives outlined in the bill.

Title II corrects one of the greatest injustices and misrepresentations perpetrated against the older American.

For reasons unknown nor made clear to me in hearings on the subject, the Office of Aging was relocated from the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and demoted to a subordinate place in the Welfare Administration, thereby attaching a label of

"welfare" to the Nation's older persons and the programs planned for them.

Admittedly there is and will always be a need for old age assistance programs but the Nation's aging have rightly resented the connotation or inference that they were socially underprivileged, or public assistance recipients.

Under title II the Administration on Aging will be established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It will be under the direction of a Commissioner on Aging to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

This new Administration on Aging will give prestige, balance, strength, continuity and visibility to Federal activities in aging. It is intended to stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services both within and without the Federal Government.

An Administration on Aging will at long last establish a focus and organization that will not be dominated or overshadowed by programs assigned higher priorities or lower interest. The re-naming, revitalizing, and reviving of units, committees and councils on aging have been the history of such programs to date.

Surely any activity of Government that touches the lives of 10 percent of its citizens is deserving of greater recognition and stability.

Grants for community planning services and training are provided in title III.

A 5-year grant program will be carried out with 5 million to be appropriated for the year ending June 30, 1966, 8 million on 1967 and sums for the next 3 years to be appropriated by the Congress.

It should be noted that the sums appropriated under this title will bear the same ratio as the population aged 65 or over in the State bears to the total population aged 65 years or over in all of the States.

There is a matching provision in this title that reduces the States allotment from 75 percent of the cost of a project for the first year, to 60 percent for the second year of such project and to 50 percent for the third year.

From State's allotment for a fiscal year not more than 10 percent or \$15,000, whichever is larger, shall be available for paying one-half of the costs of the State agency designed to administer the plan.

The project grants for research and development project under title IV and training projects under title V require the recipient to contribute money, facilities or services for carrying out the grants. Because of the nature of the projects and their broad national implications a matching grant formula was not used.

An Advisory Committee on Older Americans consisting of the Commissioner and 15 persons not otherwise in the employ of the United States will be established under title VI. Members shall be selected from among persons who are experienced in or have demonstrated particular interest in special problems of the aging. They shall hold office for a term of 3 years.

It must be obvious that this is a bill without frills, directed toward practical

action, nonwelfare centered administration with modest but limited appropriations and grants and provisions for citizen participation.

This bill is urgently needed to compensate for the omission of a meaningful place for older persons in the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, and will serve as a companion piece of legislation to a health care bill which does not in any way duplicate or overlap the purposes and objectives of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

The hearings held by the Select Subcommittee in Education, chaired by Representative DENT in September 1963 resulted in overwhelming bipartisan approval by both the subcommittee and the Committee on Education and Labor.

I cannot imagine any bill that could do more to encourage, stimulate and assist States, territories, and local communities as well as organizations both public and private in the field of aging to assume their fair share of responsibility in initiating and promoting programs that will create opportunities for meaningful living in the later years.

To the 1,000 persons who join the ranks of those persons 65 years of age or over each day we will add a new spark of hope and aspirations for a responsible role in the Great Society.

It has been said that if that spark goes out of the breast of its citizens nothing can save the Nation. When a civilization is on its way to greatness, the individuals are growing.

Your favorable vote on H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965, might well achieve the goal that the late President Kennedy had in mind when he said:

We shall be judged in the eyes of the world not only by what we do in outer space, but also by what we do here on earth for our older population.

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

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I rise in a spirit of bipartisanship to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who is now in the well of the House, for his leadership in connection with this legislation which I am glad to support.

In particular, I favor the reorganization features of the bill—the establishment of an Administration of the Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This new office will remove the welfare stigma from the activities of the office dealing with these problems. To establish an Administration for the Aging is an important step in the right direction. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the overall cost to the taxpayers of the activities contemplated in this bill will not exceed by any substantial amount the sums already being expended for similar purposes.

With the amendments that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] will offer, which will be accepted, I am pleased to support this legislation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gen-

tleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in favor of H.R. 3708, The Older Americans Act of 1965, which was introduced in the House by my colleague and fellow-Rhode Islander, Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, who has long had a deep interest in this area.

This bill will create the framework for the most constructive approach to the problem of the Nation's elderly since the White House Conference on Aging.

The establishment of an Administration on Aging—removing the responsibility for the programs of aging out of the Welfare Administration will restore dignity and independence to those who have resisted and resented the "welfare label" that has downgraded their status as responsible citizens.

The grants available under H.R. 3708 allocated through a single State agency will promote a coordinated and integrated program to meet the needs that are characteristic and peculiar to each State.

With the matching of funds there will be a partnership approval to positive action that has been very much needed and will indeed stimulate and promote projects and programs that will bring security and meaning to the later years.

The benefits to society that will accrue from the harnessing of the wasted resources of the Nation's 18 million older adults will more than repay the modest investment that H.R. 3708 authorizes. Not only will society be enriched by the experience and abilities of the older Americans—we will have restored the faith of each of these individuals in his government—and his role as a responsible individual.

I urge your support of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

(Mr. ST GERMAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to go on record in favor of H.R. 3708.

This legislation under the sponsorship of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been before the House Committee on Education and Labor for several years. The bill makes provisions for grants to the States for community planning and coordination in order to enable our older people to secure better community facilities and enjoy an adequate income on retirement. To my way of thinking, the legislation is properly entitled, "The Older Americans Act of 1965," and I am delighted to support legislation making available funds in the nature of demonstration programs for the training of special personnel for work with the elderly.

Likewise, I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for the great work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee, and for the thorough study that he has given this great piece of legislation in steering it to the floor today.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to thank the chairman for granting me this privilege to participate in the discussion of this great bill. I am one of the new members on the subcommittee and, therefore, consider it a great privilege to be able to participate in the inauguration of this great program.

Mr. Chairman, this bill we are considering today would inaugurate a great advance toward recognition of the needs of our senior citizens.

In the past few years, the Nation has become highly aware of the mounting problems that face 18 million Americans who are over 65 years of age.

Although advances in medicine have lengthened our life span, the failure of parallel advances in our progress and attitudes toward the elderly has left all too many of our senior citizens in dire straits of loneliness, apathy, and unheeded misery. This situation will worsen as the years go by unless we act now to refashion these archaic patterns of the past.

At the present time, nearly 10 percent of our population is over 65 years of age. The best estimates available indicate that this will grow in one in every eight persons by 1975.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 would seek to meet the needs of these persons by setting up a clearing house for information on problems of the aged and aging, and coordinating efforts to solve them. This Commission would broaden and strengthen the efforts now being made to develop meaningful effective programs of help to our senior citizens.

The needs of the aging are indeed many. Many of these people, still able to contribute to this society, are now cruelly shunted aside from all meaningful activity.

Forced to retire from their jobs, they not only face a drastic cut in income but they are cut off from the meaningful and worthwhile activities that formerly filled their lives.

Many of them find the infirmities of age hastened by the disheartening effect of idleness and neglect. Their efforts to find new jobs are balked by arbitrary age limits, lack of guidance and training activities, and by ignorance of the inadequate aids now available to them.

Lack of income forces many into grossly inadequate housing, and curtails their opportunities for recreation and other leisure opportunities.

Some efforts have been made to correct this deplorable situation. The very scope of the needs of the elderly is reflected in the multitude of experimental programs to help the aging that have sprung up across the Nation. States and cities, voluntary agencies, unions and large business firms have tried to help.

There are programs designed to ease the impact of retirement. Special housing has been developed to meet their particular requirements, including special recreation and educational programs.

All too often funds have been lacking to insure that the knowledge gained from experimental programs can be disseminated. The facilities themselves are too limited to do more than ameliorate slightly the lot of relatively few persons.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 can go far in helping to meet this challenge by serving to coordinate this upwelling of concern and activity into a meaningful and cohesive national program.

For the first time, a national agency will be established with the principal aim of developing solutions to the social and economic problems of the elderly. This, in itself, will be a great advance. It would prepare and publish badly needed information and statistics, which could be distributed to local agencies as well as the elderly themselves.

It could, for instance, correlate and help advance efforts to identify those elderly who want to and are able to continue working. And it could help those now trying to provide opportunities for useful service to older Americans who want to take part in community and public services.

And, very importantly, this new Administration on Aging, would stimulate more effective use of the existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

This bill would provide a 5-year system of Federal grants with \$13 million authorized in the first 2 years, to allow the States to set up community plans and coordinate programs of help for the aged within their borders. It would allow the establishment of demonstration programs and the training of needed personnel to broaden the scope of successful activities.

In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to initiate other studies on the problems and needs of the aging.

This bill is not a cure-all. But it does enable the Nation to start on a well-coordinated, cohesive program. This program could broaden the scope of current activities to help the aged, speed the pace of such activities and allow rapid dissemination of the information acquired through them.

It would be of tremendous benefit to the growing numbers of our aged Americans in need of assistance. It could also help return to the national mainstream many of those now forced into unwanted idleness by directing their energies and interest into many meaningful programs.

This is a bill of high and noble purpose. I urge my colleagues to support it and join in this great program.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce that when we get back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, by 1975, 1 out of every 8 people in America will be over 65. Since 1900 the population of persons over 65 has grown from 3 million to nearly 18 million today. In terms of percentages we are talking about 9.2 percent or almost one-tenth of our total population.

After 65 can be the golden era of a person's life, or it can be a period of frustration, desperation and apathy toward life itself. Today in America all too many of our senior citizens face it as the latter.

While medical science has added years to the lives of our citizens, we as a society have largely failed to fill those added years with purpose and dignity.

Recognizing this shortcoming, in 1958 Congressman JOHN H. FOGARTY introduced a bill, the purpose of which was to convene a national forum of the most knowledgeable people in the field of aging. After study and work, this group convened as the White House Conference on Aging and brought forth some very specific recommendations that President Kennedy presented to the Congress in his message on elderly citizens. Among other things he said:

The Federal Government can assume a significant leadership role in stimulating such actions. To do this, I recommend a 5-year program of assistance to State and local voluntary organizations for planning and developing services; for research, demonstration, and training projects leading to new or improved programs to aid older people; and for construction, renovation, and equipment of public and nonprofit multipurpose activity and recreational centers for the elderly.

The legislation before us today embodies these suggestions and others, Mr. Chairman.

I do not think there is a Member who does not want to help with this problem, but how is the best way to do it? Certainly we all know from personal experience that to adequately cope with a complex situation we must know precisely what that problem is and then coordinate our efforts toward solutions. Today many programs are dedicated to helping our elderly citizens, but unfortunately they are uncoordinated efforts.

One of the most important aspects of this legislation is that it creates a high level agency whose whole attention can be directed at these problems. The agency can act as a clearinghouse of information and coordination of programs so that our knowledge of these problems will not only be enlarged but our efforts at solution will be precisely directed.

Mr. Chairman, studies have amply demonstrated that much of the frustration and apathy of many older people come from a feeling of hopelessness; hopelessness created when they no longer go to work each day, when they no longer associate daily with fellow workers. Above all, Mr. Chairman, there is a hopelessness born of a feeling that they are no longer useful in society.

Retirement brings major adjustments that must be made if the years after 65

are to be rich and rewarding rather than despised and degrading.

Recognizing this very real need, this bill authorized grants for programs designed to facilitate this adjustment, grants for community planning, reconstruction projects, training of personnel and related programs.

I would like to quote from a letter I received from Glen F. Hallman, one of my constituents.

As chairman of the northwest area committee of the Governor's council on aging and codirector of our local community services for older adults projects, I feel passage of this act will meet a great need that exists in local communities of our State. The technical and financial assistance this act could provide would assist local senior citizens' groups to establish effective and vitally needed programs for its senior citizens. Whatcom County, and particularly Bellingham, has struggled to provide services and opportunities for its older people since 1940 and particularly 1957 when the Whatcom County Council on Aging was established. I feel that the Older Citizens Act of 1965 will enable many communities in our State to provide for the needs and opportunities of its older citizens at the grassroots level by local community effort if they can obtain a relatively small amount of financial assistance to enable them to get started. We are particularly interested in section 301, paragraph 4, page 6 of H.R. 3708 because it would provide financial assistance to help establish and expand such a center as ours.

I know many of these people personally and I have visited their golden hour clubs and witnessed their efforts to enrich their own lives. They need our assistance to do this. The passage of this bill would provide a strong helping hand.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY].

(Mr. TUNNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the bill now before the House, H.R. 3708, known as the Fogarty Act of 1965. This legislation which I am hopeful will be passed today, will mark an important step forward in identifying and meeting the needs of the elderly citizens of our Nation.

This bill has two separate facets. First, the bill creates an operating agency to be known as the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Second, it provides grants to States and public and nonprofit private agencies for the development of new or improved programs to help aged citizens.

There has been a longstanding need for such a department. Our Nation has grown both large and complex and so have the problems of our senior citizens. During the last 40 years the number of persons in the United States over 65 has jumped from 5 million to 18 million. By 1970 there will be over 20 million persons 65 years of age or older. By the year 2000 our aged population will more than double. Most of our senior citizens have contributed a great deal to our Nation's development during their lifetime. This large, heterogeneous group can continue to contribute a great deal to our country. In fact if we do not attempt

to tap this resource of talent and experience, we can only hurt the Nation now and in the future. As Henry Wadsworth Longfellow once said:

For age is opportunity no less
Than youth itself, though in another dress,
And as the evening twilight fades away
The sky is filled with stars, invisible by day.

Because the Administration on Aging will be operating under legislative authority, it will be able to focus on the future as well as on the present—to make present plans for future needs. Activities pertaining to the problems of our ever-increasing number of senior citizens can be coordinated. This will provide better opportunities for investigation and meaningful studies.

As all of you know, the problems of the aged are many and varied. The most important include problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, assistance, and protection.

The average median income of married couples over 65 is a very low \$2,700. The problem of inadequate income is clear, but the solution is not clear. This is one of the matters that can be taken up by a coordinating agency for the aged.

Lack of decent housing is another major problem that must be examined and a solution found. Over 30 percent of all deficient housing is occupied by persons 65 or older.

There is also a great need to expand employment opportunities for our senior citizens. Adequate employment is probably the key to a decent standard of living.

One thing that I feel has emerged from all of the studies on the aged is their desire for independence and a feeling of being able to make a continued worthwhile contribution to their society and country.

The needs of 18 million aged citizens deserve the same consideration now being received by any other group in our society.

This bill recognizes that States as well as public and nonprofit private agencies can make a substantial contribution to improving the lot of senior citizens at the local level. Over a 2-year period, \$13 million in grants to States are authorized so that States may train personnel and develop and demonstrate their own programs to enhance the lives of the aged. An additional \$4½ million is authorized over 2 years in grants to public and nonprofit private agencies for essentially the same purpose.

By involving States and public and private nonprofit agencies in the struggle to promote well-being amongst elderly persons, the legislation before us takes cognizance of the fact that individual communities have to shoulder local responsibilities. It seeks uniform solutions, yet recognizes a diversity of problems. It stimulates research and development of programs at local levels, while providing for assimilation, coordination, and dissemination of information at the Federal level. It is, in sum, effective legislation which can help remove many of the uncertainties and frustra-

tions that shroud the lives of 18 million Americans who are in or approaching their twilight years.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS].

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat taken aback in my first committee assignment when this bill was not discussed and was quickly voted out without any discussion in our subcommittee.

I do not rise in opposition to the bill at all. As a matter of fact, I am rather attracted to it, and I am pleased to find that the other new members of our committee seem to have studied the bill and are themselves enthusiastic in their praise of the bill.

There are, however, some questions which have been posed in today's comment to which I should like an answer, if I may have it.

I am impressed by Mr. ANDERSON'S inquiry about whether or not there are a lot of duplications in this bill with regard to programs which already exist, such as in the poverty program.

May I address my question to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DENT]?

Mr. DENT. So far as I can see, there are no duplications, since there are no particular programs today under any act of Congress which are specifically oriented to the problems of the aged.

We recognize, I believe, that their problems are different and separate from those that come under the general operations of the poverty bill, or the veterans legislation, or Appalachia, or any other all-encompassing legislation that has been passed to date.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Do you believe and could you assure me that in your opinion this bill, which really has as its main thrust the final coordination of programs, which is the same question I just posed, would in effect work toward that end?

Mr. DENT. I think this is the only way that we can start toward the complete unification of a departmental agency that will take all of the problems and handle all of the situations which arise pertaining to the aged without having to run helter-skelter to the many different departments.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. One more question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am impressed by the inquiry and by the opposition expressed early in the development of this legislation by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am wondering if the method of appointment of this Commission as a separate commission in HEW under this bill without the direct supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the way it is being done by this bill, and having the Commissioner appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, would not confuse the operation of that Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself. Also, is the Secretary in accord with this matter now?

Mr. DENT. No. The situation is exactly as it was before. We have no official sanction nor agreement by the Secretary himself to the creation of a

commission type of agency with the approval of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes in order to answer the question.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. The purpose and the main thrust of any legislation designed such as this is, is to give continuity to the activities within the agency. As you know, Secretaries change at the will and the whim of the Executive. You can say that a commission does, too, but there is the conformation safeguard. There is that entity and singleness of purpose in a commission designed strictly for this purpose. If a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at this moment has a feeling that there ought to be many activities in the field dealing with the problems of the aged, then he would select the type of agency that he would want that would follow that line. However, if the next Secretary happens to be one who does not believe that the problems of the aged and aging are paramount and important, then he could name somebody to head that agency who would take exactly the opposite point of view and the programs and all of the studies and work that have been done heretofore would go for naught. We believe we are creating an agency that will have a continuity to it and which will have some substance to it and become recognized by all of the aged people as the place which they can apply to for redress of any wrongs they may fancy they have or actually may have done to them or any problems that arise.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Then, in the gentleman's opinion, the extra Commissioner appointed over and above and separate from the Secretary himself, you think, will help to coordinate all of the affairs of the Secretary even with the independent type of appointment given in this bill?

Mr. DENT. Yes, I do believe that.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

(Mr. SICKLES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for yielding to me this time. I rise today in support of H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965. Nineteen hundred and sixty-five is the year in which this Congress was given the opportunity to fulfill the promise of the poet Browning when he said: "Grow old along with me. The best is yet to be." This is the year in which we are given the opportunity to see that some of the needs—the most important ones—of our senior citizens are being met. A bill establishing health insurance for the aged, medical care for the needy, and social security benefit increases will soon be brought before this body. But today we are here to consider another facet of the

needs of our elderly; we are seeking to establish a program of grants to the States, to public or nonprofit agencies, institutions or individuals for study, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects that will enhance the objectives set forth in title I of the bill. These objectives are: an adequate income; the best possible physical and mental health; suitable housing; full restorative services; opportunity for employment without age discrimination; retirement in health, honor, and dignity; pursuit of meaningful activity; efficient community services when needed; immediate benefit from proven research knowledge; and freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative.

These objectives might be regarded as a bill of rights for our senior citizens. They include most of the things that most of us in this Nation take for granted as part of our rights as Americans. I do not think it is too much to ask that we give our elderly the chance to obtain them. As President Kennedy said in his message to the Congress on February 21, 1963:

Place, prestige, status cannot be legislated. But we can see that legislation enhances the opportunity to obtain them.

President Kennedy began his message with a quotation from the historian Toynbee which I should like to repeat here today. Toynbee wrote that a society's quality and durability can best be measured, and I quote, "by the request and care given its elderly citizens." As of 1963, our Nation's elderly population—by that I mean those individuals 65 years or over—numbered some 17½ million. By 1980, this figure is expected to increase to 25 million. Thanks to the wonders of modern medicine, our life expectancy at birth has been increased to 70 years. Thanks to modern medicine, those of us who live to be 65, if we are men, can be expected to live an additional 13 years. If we are women, we will outlive men by an additional 2 years. The medicare bill, if passed, will see to it that our senior citizens are given the opportunity to take advantage of the wonders of modern medicine without sacrificing every cent they have earned and have saved. The bill we are considering today will see to it that our senior citizens find it possible to live their "golden years" with the services and the opportunities they deserve as citizens of this great Nation.

Let us briefly examine some of the needs of our elderly and the services that might be utilized under this bill to meet those needs. The average annual income of a couple over 65 is approximately one-half that of a younger two-person family. Roughly 50 percent of our elderly citizens have incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. If you examine this figure rather closely you see that it amounts to less than \$20 a week to be spent on food, housing, medical expenses, clothing, transportation, and recreation. Twenty dollars a week does not go far in a country where the cost of living has increased almost steadily since 1958. Thirty percent of the elderly live in inferior housing—housing

which lacks a private bath, toilet, hot running water or is dilapidated or deficient in some other respect. These are the physical needs; it is not possible to calculate the needs that can be categorized as emotional. I sometimes think that it is a shame that the days of the extended family have disappeared with the modern age. It used to be that there was a definite place for grandmothers and grandfathers in the home. Their services were useful in caring for the children and in helping with the household chores. But the days of the vacuum cleaner, the self-cleaning oven, the dishwasher have eliminated the need for this kind of help. And the modern generation prides itself on its independence.

But grandma and grandpa find themselves excluded from places other than their children's homes. They find the doors of employment are also closed to them. They find compulsory retirement laws that rob them of their sense of usefulness besides depriving them of their usual income. It is a fact that the number of persons over 65 has doubled since 1940. But in 1940, 50 percent of them were in the labor force. In 1965, only 13 percent remain in the labor force. Retirement should be a matter of choice, not of necessity, and it is high time we realized what an extravagant waste of manpower is going on by this discrimination against employment of the elderly. In 1963, President Kennedy issued a directive to all Federal agencies to consider job applicants and employees on the basis of ability rather than of age. There is much to be said for a society that can place some trust in the wisdom of its ancestors. There is much to be said for a society that is not fearful of some respect for its elders.

We have made many strides in the past few years with legislation to benefit the elderly. But there is still much that remains to be done. Enactment of this bill will be a great stride in the right direction. It will enable each State to develop a State plan to coordinate the State programs on aging. It can support community planning and coordination of programs for the aged; set up pilot projects to develop new programs; train professional and technical personnel needed to meet the terrible shortage of those trained to work with the aged. Pilot projects could be developed and existing programs improved in such areas as preretirement education, the staffing and operation of multipurpose activity centers, the teaching of creative skills in the arts and crafts, social and recreational programs, provision of meal centers and home-delivered meals. Grants to organizations and communities for demonstration and research projects could include educational and recreational programs, concerted social services, and other services in senior housing projects to determine what services are most effective in maintaining independence, mental health, community participation, and good family relationships among older people.

The bill before us today establishes an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We have had a Children's Bureau to coordinate programs dealing with the needs of children for many years now. It is time we recognized and accepted the fact that as people get older, their needs change, and they must be given the same opportunity to meet those needs that they were given as children. This does not seem to be too much to ask. Let us enact this bill so that our golden years, our parents' and our children's may be happy and comfortable years without the loneliness and emptiness and discomfort that so often accompany advanced age today.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and its members for the expeditious action taken on this bill; and I rise in support of H.R. 3708, the "Older Americans Act of 1965."

I submit that the bill before the House is in many respects similar to the legislation we passed a few days ago after vigorous debate. I refer to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. That particular legislation is intended to give hope and self-respect to the young who come from impoverished homes. The present bill is intended to provide hope and self-respect to another segment of our population—Americans of advanced age. Both bills are designed to make useful and productive citizens if those Americans who come within their scope.

It is a well-known paradox of our modern society that, on the one hand, medical science and technology has made noteworthy advancements in combating disease and increasing the lifespan of our citizens, while on the other hand, our science and technological advancements have been such that the young and vigorous applicants now occupy preferred status in the quest for employment. The older workers are often rejected on the basis of age alone. I use the term "older" in a relative sense, for industry has come to look upon the man or woman of 40 as being too old. No longer is it true that "life begins at 40"; it generally ends at 40 for the unfortunate person who, at that age, is compelled by circumstances to look for a new job.

The fallacy that productivity and usefulness in life necessarily declines with advancing age is refutable by overwhelming evidence. For example, we have only to look around us today and note the presence of our esteemed senior colleagues in this august body. How fortunate for the Congress and the United States of America that we have the benefit of their wisdom and experience. How tragic it would have been if age alone had kept them from these revered halls.

The committee's report indicates a need for the proposed legislation. A rapidly changing world has created sociological, psychological, and economic problems which the older Americans particularly have found difficult to solve without technical assistance. These

problems exist in our island State of Hawaii just as they do elsewhere in these United States. These Americans need our help just as much as, if not more than, the youngsters from impoverished homes.

The proposed legislation embodies a recognition of the fact that the so-called "oldsters" have a definite role to play in our present-day society. It should not by any means be a passive role. It should not be marred by a feeling of rejection and dejection. Rather, it should be characterized by a sense of belonging, of contributing to our complex and rapidly advancing society.

Many States, including Hawaii, have recognized the growing problems of the elderly and have recently instituted limited assistance programs. These programs, however, have already shown a need for implementation and coordination. I firmly believe that the problem is national in scope and that any attempted solution will be meaningful to elderly Americans only by the enactment of national legislation such as this.

I respectfully urge that we give H.R. 3708 a favorable vote.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I take great pride and pleasure in having played some small part in this effort, which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] have done so much to advance over the years. I can recall being a member of the subcommittee that recommended passage of this bill several years ago. But it is because of the efforts of these three gentlemen that we have this bill before us today.

Mr. Chairman, this is the Congress of the older American. We have the opportunity, and the responsibility, to see that justice is given to the aged. The past few years have shown a tremendous increase in concern for, and information about, the problems of our citizens over 65. We have, in previous Congresses, given the aged special tax relief, help in finding adequate housing, new opportunities for employment, and service through VISTA, and necessary assistance in paying medical bills through the Kerr-Mills program. We have found that this is not enough. The income of senior citizens still does not cover necessities, and hospital costs are rising steeply with no end in sight. Our older citizens have fewer resources with which to pay the bills which result from the more common illnesses and accidents of old age. Retirement, instead of meaning years of sunshine and pleasant activity, brings growing financial fear and often anxiety and loneliness. Employment opportunities are slight, even though many of the elderly are capable and willing to work: only 17.3 percent of those over 65 are in the work force. Too often our old people have nowhere to go: no recreation centers where they might meet and make friends, and only the bare four walls of a small apartment or nursing home room to keep them company.

We will pass a medicare bill this session, which will give the elderly new hope that their later years can be relatively free from want. They will have the assurance that a part of their medical bills will be paid—and without charity—through the assistance of a country which is grateful for the prosperity that their generation has brought us.

We are considering H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965, which will help the elderly solve many more of their pressing problems. We must give adequate and long-needed recognition to the growing role of the elderly in our society, and their need for certain basic assistance.

We have discovered, in recent years, that problems can best be solved through a comprehensive attack on the causes for the problem: Through research, training of special personnel, projects to develop new resources. The Older Americans Act should give efforts to improve the conditions of the aged the added impetus they need. It has been under consideration since we first began to study the living conditions of the aged, and it is time that we acted on these well-drawn, thoughtful provisions.

The Older Americans Act would create an Administration of Aging, which would be located within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This seems only sensible: the Administration of Aging would coordinate and supervise all existing programs in the field of aging, thus insuring that there would be no duplication of effort and expenditure. The Administration would also provide the necessary information and studies on the problems of the aging, especially advising State and local governments.

The bill authorizes, for the first 2 years, a total of \$13 million in grants to the States for community planning and coordination, demonstration programs, and the training of special personnel. The bill further authorizes a total of \$4.5 million in grants to public or nonprofit private agencies organizations and institutions for study, development, demonstration projects relating to the needs of older persons and the best ways of satisfying these needs. Through the Older Americans Act we will assure our senior citizens the kind of retirement years they deserve: years filled with independent activities, the warmth of good friends and people who care, and freedom from harsh financial problems. Let us make this a year of great achievement, a year that Congress recognized the duty we owe our older citizens.

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

(Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 3708. I think this legislation is overdue. I want to compliment the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and also the gentleman from

Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], for their fine work in handling this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is an auspicious occasion. The creation of an operating agency, known as the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a total of \$13 million in grants to the States for the first 2 years, for community and other activities on their behalf—and for activities in which they will directly participate—marks a major step forward in American life. For we face a new situation in our country today—one which our older Americans could hardly have anticipated when they were young. The fact that the number of people 65 and over has more than quadrupled since 1900 is viewed with alarm in some quarters. But to my mind, this increase represents a largely untapped natural resource of knowledge, skill, and demonstrated courage which can add immeasurably to the wealth and wisdom of our country. By establishing an Administration on Aging, under a Commissioner concerned solely with the varied programs they need we can help to create a new and better life for them—the veterans of a half century of unparalleled industrial development who are, today, too often relegated to the obscurity and loneliness of a furnished room—their lives constricted by inadequate income and illness.

We know that indifference to these new problems of older peoples creates its own form of erosion not only for the aged themselves but for all members of the community. We know, too, that many American communities are becoming aware of their obligation to these senior citizens—that they are finding that senior service centers, adult education projects, improved health facilities, and increased job opportunities for older people are demonstrating that retirement years can be years of creative activity and community service.

The enactment of this legislation is, therefore, a broad step forward in Federal recognition of our national responsibilities for developing more opportunities for more abundant and rewarding life for older Americans. There have been proposals that we "study" the aged. I am glad to say that this legislation takes the far more positive approach that we must also do something.

We know that the problem of income maintenance for the elderly of the Nation has become one of the serious problems of our century. This is because a smaller percentage of over-65 population is in the work force at the same time that life expectancy has been increased by astonishing proportions. In 1900, 36.2 percent of those over 65 were in the work force. By 1963 this had declined to 17.3 percent. In 1900, the life expectancy of 65-year-old American men was 11.5 years, and that of 65-year-old American women was 12.22 years. By 1962, it had lengthened to 12.9 years for men and 15.9 years for women. If this trend continues it means, for most Americans, more years of living after they reach the age of 65, in which they will not be able to depend upon gainful employment as a source of income.

We know that there are problems of housing. According to the 1960 census data nearly 2,750,000 households where the head was 65 or over were deficient; that is dilapidated, deteriorating, or lacking some or all plumbing facilities. And these are just two of the many problems they face.

The declared objectives of this legislation suggest the broad scope of its goals to meet the multiple problems of older men and women. These objectives are: First, an adequate income; second, the best possible physical and mental health; third, suitable housing; fourth, full restorative services; fifth, opportunity for employment without age discrimination; sixth, retirement in health, honor, and dignity; seventh, pursuit of meaningful activity; eighth, efficient community services when needed; ninth, immediate benefit from proven research knowledge; and tenth, freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative.

The new Administration could serve as a clearinghouse of information and on problems of the aged and aging; administer grants provided by the act; develop, conduct, and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments, and stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services, among other activities.

This legislation is concerned with a problem which, in one way or another, reaches every family in the Nation. It is legislation written in terms of the particular problems which face our parents, our grandparents, our in-laws, our uncles or our aunts. I believe that the Congress will recognize that creating an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is in the interest of each one of us, and of our Nation as a whole. I think we will enact this legislation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with this wonderful bill, H.R. 3708. I concur in the remarks made by the very able sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM].

(Mr. FARNUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, in rising to the support of H.R. 3708 it might be more fitting to say I rise in support of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, my esteemed colleague from Rhode Island, and in support of the philosophy that guides his service to the Nation.

As a new member serving under him on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, it has been my privilege to watch him in untiring hours, both by day and by night, laboring to serve the well-being of his fellow men.

I have come to the realization in this process that they were not exaggerating who had told me that his service in this century to the common good would be almost impossible to duplicate in another individual.

With this background I have watched carefully, and studied, the manner in which he approached an objective dear to the hearts of both of us. This is relief for the person with sociological, psychological, or economic problems growing out of the passing of the years.

As I would expect in anything involving Mr. FOGARTY, the preparation that led to the bill we consider today has been painstaking and thorough. It has resulted in proposals at once concrete, practical, creative, and imaginative.

The bill is, in effect, a new declaration of independence—a declaration that those who helped build the Nation that is the wonder of the world are not to be cast aside to wither and wait for an unappreciated end.

The key to the bill, and enough excuse for passing it, is in the declaration accompanying it that "the older people of the Nation are entitled to freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives."

That is a statement that I believe would have won applause from the architects of our Nation. For it is a new way of saying what the bill insures, which is that the pursuit of happiness is not to be curtailed by reason of the mere passage of years.

Others have told of the debt we owe those who preceded us in building our country and have either directly or by inference discussed the technicalities of income, health, housing, employment, community services, research, and all the rest covered in H.R. 3708.

In the course of this discussion some areas of possible weakness have been explored and some possible faults pinpointed.

Less than this would hardly be expected from this body with its vast experience in meeting governmental problems. But my hope would be that all of us will be able, amid these justifiable and necessary distractions, to ever keep our eyes on the main goal: Mr. FOGARTY's splendid and yet entirely practical proposal that age not be allowed to dilute the right of Americans to enjoy the full rights of citizenship in our democracy.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, may I say on behalf of the freshman members of this subcommittee what a pleasure and a privilege it has been for us to work with and enjoy the guidance and leadership of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. His knowledge in depth, his keen insight into the whole panoply of the problems of the elderly, his human compassion, has been a source of inspiration to all of us. We have greatly enjoyed not only his high

professionalism, but the warmth of his friendship as well.

In adopting the Older Americans Act, we are not just discussing another welfare program. We are considering how we can provide a meaningful role in our society for our senior citizens to make sure that their talents and accumulated wisdom are employed to the full, and at the same time make sure that those who are infirm and ailing do not fall into poverty but are helped to live out their allotted years in moderate comfort and real happiness.

In my lifetime, the average span of life in the United States has increased from 54 years to more than 70. At the turn of the century there were 3 million U.S. citizens over 65 years of age; in 1961 there were 16 million, and in 1985 there will be an estimated 25 million. People whose lives have been prolonged by the enormous strides of the revolution in science and technology should be offered other alternatives to the sorry prospect of simply existing in lonely isolation apart from the mainstream and frequently on the borderline of poverty and dependency.

Mr. Chairman, title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 promises that our program will be more than a series of welfare handouts.

One of the most obvious needs of the aging is for more money to spend both on the very necessities of life and for a few of life's comforts as well.

Almost half of those over 65 living alone receive \$1,000 a year or less and three-fourths receive less than \$2,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, the main source of income for the great majority of those over 65 is one or more of the public benefit programs.

Seven out of ten elderly folk now receive earned social security insurance payments averaging about \$76 per month for a retired worker, \$66 per month for a widow and \$129 per month for an elderly worker and spouse.

With proper imagination we can find paid and nonpaid jobs, full time and part time, for many of our senior citizens who have much to offer in skill and experience. We can do this without in any way narrowing the total job market. Productive jobs of many kinds can be found for our elderly in the antipoverty program, in private industry, in nonprofit community, civic, and welfare organizations.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has been active in the professions, in a wide variety of civic and community organizations, and in business, I can state from my own knowledge that many elderly folk who have passed the age of 65 and finished their active full-time working careers, are nevertheless rich in knowledge and insight; in highly useful management and executive skills, and in deep understanding of their fellow citizens as well as the problems of their communities.

We should take advantage of these talents, of the wisdom and insight which only age and experience can bring, and we should mobilize these talents, and exploit them in the drive in which the Congress and our Nation is engaged in today

in the fields of mass education, and in the eradication from our national life of the blight of poverty.

This knowledge and insight, compassion and wisdom can and must be harnessed productively and richly to help us achieve these great national goals.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program in which a small investment can pay large dividends in knowledge and insight into how to channel the skills and talents of the elderly into useful, productive activities. In thus honoring and ennobling our senior citizens, we honor and enoble our own society.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal this afternoon that one of the prime purposes of this bill is to provide for coordination; to bring all of the numerous activities in behalf of the aged under one tent, one umbrella, or whatever you want to call it.

I wonder if we could have from the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee who, I assume, will be dealing with this subject in the matter of funds, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], assurance that he will tighten the purse strings when he has the opportunity in order to stop some of the proliferation that obviously will take place if this bill is passed, and if the gentleman will lend a hand toward bringing about the coordination that we hear so much about this afternoon?

Mr. Chairman, could we have some assurances from the gentleman that he will cut back on funds already being expended to support councils, advisory boards, and other similar functions and concentrate this in the hands of one agency?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we are going to take a good look at it, I will tell the gentleman from Iowa, but I cannot guarantee that there will be a savings in something like this. The budget which we are considering now I believe is too frugal and I think we ought to spend more money in many of these areas such as education and health and other areas, as the gentleman from Iowa knows.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the advisory bodies; the administrative functioning of this thing. I am not talking about the specific programs. I am talking about the administrative end of it. I believe the gentleman can do much better than to say he hopes his committee will be able to do something.

Mr. FOGARTY. The administrative expenses will not be much. There is only a commissioner. We do provide for a 15-member advisory committee.

Mr. GROSS. What is the \$17 million to be expended for?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is to be expended in the gentleman's State, in my own State, and every State in the Union where they have adopted a State plan. They have these demonstration projects in every State. This money is not going to be spent in Washington. This is going

to be at the State level. This is a real State rights bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that, but I want to know that we are not going to compound a bureaucratic setup and spend the taxpayer's money for more duplication.

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot say now we are going to save a certain amount of money, but we are going to save some money.

Mr. GROSS. Why could we not have in this bill a repeal of some of the functions presently carried on? I find no language repealing or restricting any activity that is being presently carried out even in a year or 2 years from now. I am fearful that we may be adding another layer of fat.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know of any legislation that could be repealed.

Mr. GROSS. Do we not already have a multiplicity of bureaucrats administering related programs now?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have a group on aging at HEW putting out pamphlets and other things. That probably will be cut back, yes.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have all the assurance I can possibly get from the gentleman that he is going to tighten the purse strings now being carried on if we are going to set up another agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dealing with this subject.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think I can agree with the gentleman, but I am not going to recommend spending more money than the President has asked to be spent for Health, Education, and Welfare. I think the gentleman knows my position over a long period of time, anyway. I happen to think we can save money by spending money in some of these areas.

Mr. GROSS. That is a new twist, that you can save money by spending it. I do not find in my personal affairs that I have been able to save very much by spending. Maybe it can be done in the Great Society.

The list of objectives is quite interesting. No. 1 is "an adequate income in retirement in accordance with American standards." I would like to see that written in every bill. I am glad to have the aging enjoy an American standard of living, but I would like to see every American enjoy an American standard of living, whatever that may mean.

Then No. 10 of the objectives is this: "Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives."

Almost every day around here we pass another law that delegates authority to the executive branch in this huge, Central Government taking from our citizens their freedom and independence. The words sound fine, but they are meaningless in the light of what we do almost every day, taking freedom and independence from the people of this country, concentrating control and the dictation in the hands of the bureaucrats and others in Washington. They are delightful words, but I am afraid they are meaningless in the light of what we are doing around here.

Above all, let us not kid the aging and aged into believing that this or any other

program handed down from Washington will be free from controls and regimentation. This is implicit in the road we are traveling and it is unfair to try to make people believe otherwise.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and also that Mr. CLEVELAND be permitted to extend his remarks at the conclusion of Mr. FINDLEY's remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member on the minority side of the subcommittee which has been dealing with this legislation, I should like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], the chairman of the subcommittee, and to thank him for his never-falling courtesy and cooperation with the minority side, and to extend the same greetings to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the author of the bill.

Mention was made earlier about this legislation being a foot in the door. We ought to acknowledge that the foot is already in the door to the extent of several billions of dollars by way of programs dealing with problems of the elderly people in our population.

One of the purposes of this legislation is to try to coordinate and correlate already existing multibillion-dollar programs and bring about a little more efficiency and better direction.

Mention was also made of the danger of duplication between what is authorized in this bill and what has been previously authorized in the poverty programs and in similar programs. Let there be no doubt about it, there is a very distinct danger of duplication.

One reason why I consulted with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] about amendment which I shall offer later was to bring about as much coordination as possible among programs, those initiated at the State and Federal Levels in this bill and those authorized through the Federal poverty program and any other programs.

The effect of two of these amendments will be to provide that before any contracts or grants for whatever purpose can be consummated, the approval of the appropriate State agency will be required. Therefore, these amendments hopefully will help to avoid to some degree, at least, the duplication of present efforts in this field.

Mention was also made of the fact that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is anything but enthusiastic about this proposal. I believe the record will show that he is less than enthusiastic and probably opposed to it, especially the proposed reorganization within the Department he heads. We should accept his attitude as prima facie evidence that there is anything wrong with the proposal. In fact, I think it is a healthy sign. The Congress in this instance is showing a bit of independence and demonstrates that it is possible for Congress

to act without always taking directions from the other end of the avenue.

I have been here 4 years now. I cannot recall another piece of legislation that has gotten this far on the floor of the House of Representatives which did not actually originate in the White House. So I think this is a historic amendment. We can take a little bit of pride in the fact that Congress is showing some initiative in the legislative field.

I want to compliment my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] on the success our subcommittee has had on a couple of measures. The bill dealing with school problems in Puerto Rico went through without objection, and now it looks as if we are going to have as good success with this bill. I certainly hope so.

I noticed with delight that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], has introduced a farm bill which I am in accord with. The Committee on Agriculture this morning had a very, very brief chance to discuss it and similar measures. I want to wish my colleague from Pennsylvania every bit of success with his farm bill. I hope it is going to equal the success I am sure he is going to have with this bill.

The purposes of the bill have been adequately presented. The only additional item I should like to call to your attention is the statement of objectives that appears on pages 2 and 3. Reading this statement more carefully than was the case when the bill was before the committee, I discovered that the language seems actually to commit the Congress in blood, so to speak, to very sweeping objectives stated. I am sure no one, certainly not the author of the bill, intended that this legislation would commit the Congress to undertake full responsibility to achieve the goals set forth.

So for this reason at the appropriate time I will offer an amendment to soften the language of the bill so it will not be quite as apparent that the Congress is authorizing services and programs to bring about the stated goals objectives.

I think it is appropriate that we show a concern for the problems of the elderly citizens and that we participate with the States in helping to study these problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965, is the culmination of years of expert study initiated under President Eisenhower and carried forward by his successors. This legislation represents a sound, realistic response to the multiple needs of the substantial and growing segment of our population of citizens over the age of 65.

This legislation creates a central place at the Federal level for concentrating statistics and for coordinating programs for the aged. This new center, the Administration for Aging, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will administer grants and develop, conduct, and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments; prepare and publish educational

materials dealing with the welfare of older persons; gather statistics in the field of aging; and, generally, will stimulate the most efficient use of all available resources and services.

The bill also authorizes funds for a 5-year period for programs to help our older citizens. The major part of these funds would be used for grants to the States for community planning, demonstration projects, training of personnel, and related problems. A smaller percentage of the money would be used for grants to public or nonprofit private agencies for the same sort of work.

The special problems of our 18 million older citizens merit permanent attention at the Federal level. I am pleased to support this legislation, which is the product of bipartisan cooperation in dealing with an urgent national need.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] such time as he may require.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, when Robert B. Meyner was Governor of New Jersey, the division of aging was created in our State in 1957.

I am familiar with that program, because it was under my jurisdiction as New Jersey secretary of state. Mrs. Eone Harper is doing a fine job directing the program and I am proud to inform the House that the division is of tremendous help to the senior citizens of New Jersey.

The recommendations made by the White House Conference on the Aging, and also by the President, are incorporated in this necessary and meritorious bill.

I believe very strongly that all levels of government—local, State, and Federal—should provide the vigorous leadership needed to help our senior citizens live a healthier, longer, and happier life.

The senior citizens of this Nation—which consists of almost 19 million persons—are one of our most valuable assets. Unfortunately, they are often taken for granted—or ignored.

The Older Americans Act, sponsored by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], would help our senior citizens in such vital fields as good physical and mental health, housing, employment, community activities, freedom and independence through individual initiative, and several others.

I am confident that this program would succeed and benefit not only our senior citizens, but also our Nation.

I also believe that if we do the right kind of job for our older people under the numerous opportunities this program presents, the benefits—physical, mental, spiritual and financial—will exceed the cost.

If this bill is enacted, the United States would indeed be a more healthier, happier, wealthier, and compassionate Nation.

(Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate my colleagues on the passage of H.R. 3708, better known as the Older Americans Act,

This act, as we know, will help older persons by providing limited grants to the States for community planning, research, and demonstration. It will also establish training projects for sound and efficient implementation of the act.

These gains, by themselves, would make the act worthy of passage. But what makes the act particularly noteworthy to me is that it removes Federal programs for our older people from the Welfare Administration and puts them under a new agency, known as the Administration on Aging, also in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It means more than just the creation of another agency. It represents a breakthrough in enabling our senior citizens to retire in health, honor, and dignity after years of meaningful contribution to our economy.

I particularly want to emphasize the words honor and dignity. Too often, as we well know, many senior citizens have been reluctant to take advantage of the services available because of their uneasiness over seeking out an agency which includes the word "welfare" in its title. Considering the onus this word has come to have in the public mind, we can hardly blame them.

Now, hopefully, this barrier will be lowered and 18 million older adults will be able to take advantage of opportunities for independent and purposeful living in a manner that will reaffirm our belief in the concept of the inherent dignity of the individual.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3708. We have before us today a remarkable measure—an enlightened contribution to the letter and spirit of the Great Society.

For too long we have let our elderly citizens live in neglect and loneliness. Every so often, the Congress passes measures designed to improve their material condition. Every so often programs are proposed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Every so often private organizations representing the interest of the elderly succeed in arousing the conscience of the country to the special and compelling needs of older Americans.

And then, for a while, the concerns of the aged return to the area of neglect where so many of our social problems wait for attention.

The legislation before the House today will make certain that our attention to the elderly will not be cursory and erratic.

By establishing an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this bill will set up a permanent office of concern for the aged—designed to anticipate as well as alleviate needs.

We ought to realize that the needs of our elderly citizens are not static. They develop in conjunction with the development of the entire society. It would be irresponsible and remiss for the Government not to recognize this truth. For it is a sobering fact that the problems of an old person do not allow for tardy replies and late solutions.

H.R. 3708 attempts to introduce into the Department of Health, Education,

and Welfare an office designed to promote comprehensive planning for the aged. Such planning will make sure that the contributions of the Federal Government are not disparate and disorganized.

Such planning should attempt to coordinate programs which provide for income benefits, health services, housing facilities, leisure activities, employment opportunities and so on. Only with such coordination can we assure that the good life we hope to promote for the aged will reveal systematic and interdependent benefits. This coordination will involve the sort of planning that can only be accomplished by a Federal agency with full financial resources and the authority to supervise the full cooperation of all relevant organizations, public and private, local and national.

The measure's request for funds is modest. Its goals are idealistic yet practical. Its spirit is that of the Great Society. It should be passed without delay.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the problems confronting both our younger and older citizens are among the most critical facing any Americans today. This last week we passed a long-needed and farsighted bill to improve the educational opportunities of many of our children. Today we are offered a significant opportunity to improve the future prospects of many of our older Americans.

The problems of our aged and aging are not limited to a single area. If they were, solutions might be easier to find. They are not limited either to the more than 18 million persons in this country today who are 65 and over. These problems are of concern to the many young people with aged parents to support; to the middle aged who find employment opportunities closing to them; and to those who are about to step over the threshold into the new and often uneasy world of retirement.

These problems range the entire span of our daily existence. They include health care, housing, employment, income and the productive use of time.

In the area of medical care, studies show that our senior citizens go to the hospital more frequently and stay longer than their younger neighbors; that their physical activity is limited by six times as much disability as the rest of our population; and that their annual medical bills are twice that of persons under 65, although their average annual incomes are only half as high.

In the area of employment, data developed by the U.S. Department of Labor provides ample evidence of discrimination because of age, and of the irrelevant nature of such discrimination. This discrimination is not only degrading for the able individual, it is a severe and unwarranted loss to our economy and to our society as well.

The average annual income received by aged couples is half that of younger two-person families. Almost half of those over 65 and living alone receive \$1,000 or less a year, and three-fourths receive less than \$2,000 a year.

A far greater proportion of our senior citizens live in inferior housing than is true of the houses occupied by younger

people. According to the 1960 census, one-fourth of those aged 60 and over did not have households of their own but lived in the houses of relatives, in lodging homes or in institutions. Of the remainder, over 30 percent lived in substandard housing which lacked a private bath, toilet or running hot water or was otherwise dilapidated or deficient, and many others lived in housing unsuitable or unsafe for elderly people.

During the last 65 years the life expectancy of Americans has increased from an average of 49 to 70 years. But these and other sobering statistics make it clear that our remarkable scientific achievements prolonging the life span have not been translated into effective human achievements. It is not enough for a great society merely to have added new years to life—our objective must also be to add new life and new purpose to those years.

The primary responsibility of seeking solutions to these grave problems quite properly rests with State and local governments, with private organizations, and individual citizens. But because the problems are nationwide they entail a Federal responsibility as well.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, will enable us to meet that responsibility. It quite properly recognizes that the problems of older people are not isolated; that they are in fact closely related and intertwined. And it will enable us to coordinate our efforts and mount the comprehensive plans which are essential if we are to be effective in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3708, one of the most important measures to be considered in this session of the 89th Congress.

Since 1900, the number of persons in this Nation over the age of 65 has risen from about 3 million to almost 18 million in 1965. This, I think, gives substance to the claim that the number of senior citizens merits a separate agency of the Federal Government to handle their needs.

Two years ago, the late John F. Kennedy sent this first Presidential message ever given to the Congress on the problems of the aging, indicating clearly, the fact that the problems of the older Americans was reaching serious proportions.

In this message, the late President noted that the average income received by couples over 65 was half that of younger couples and that half of those individuals living alone after 65 have an income of \$1,000 a year or less. Three-fourths, he pointed out, of the latter bracket receive less than \$2,000 a year. How much more convincing argument do we need?

Several investigations have been conducted by committees of both Houses of Congress and by Presidential study groups as well. Each of these study groups has underscored the need for action to coordinate and strengthen the various programs for the aging.

The basic purpose underlying this bill is to provide cohesiveness to the many programs for the aged which at present are administered by various agencies

whose responsibilities cut across jurisdictional lines. Further, this bill will provide more leadership in this area than can be accomplished under the present system of administration.

H.R. 3708 would set up a separate agency, the Administration on Aging, to handle the various problems which beset our senior citizens.

This agency could provide a vital service by functioning, on the one hand as a line agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in administering departmental programs, and, on the other hand, a staff agency preparing statistics and performing research into the problems of the aging.

The Administration set up by this bill would be headed by a Commissioner appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The Administration would be on a par with the Social Security and Welfare Administration.

Further, the bill sets up a 16-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans with the Commissioner on Aging as the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this bill has been amply demonstrated. There is no question about the number of people involved nor about their need. An impressive case has been presented for the passage of this bill. I strongly urge passage of H.R. 3708. Our senior citizens deserve, at very least, this much consideration from us.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to lend my support to H.R. 3708—the Older Americans Act of 1965. We are spending billions of dollars a year to develop our natural resources and I consider our people to be the best of our natural resources. We need to be concerned with a most precious and largely untapped human resource—the skills and experience of our senior citizens.

I am therefore glad to see that the legislation before us today recognizes this problem. Only a cruel society takes the best out of a man for 65 years and then abruptly consigns him to an occupational scrap heap. Why should we herd these Americans into senior citizen compounds where they are forced to live out their remaining years in sustained idleness? Do we contend that President Kennedy's stirring inaugural challenge—"ask what you can do for your country"—applies only to Americans under 65? I think not.

We must find ways and means to draw upon the skills and knowledge of older persons for our benefit as well as theirs. A beginning has already been made. Many companies have started gradual retirement programs which permit a worker to reduce his activities over a period of years. The contribution of elder Americans has also been recognized and proven in Federal programs such as the Peace Corps. Undoubtedly the program of demonstration grants authorized by the bill now before us will come up with many new ideas for realizing the full potential of our senior citizens.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, will establish a separate agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to concentrate upon the problems of the aging. The bill will authorize \$6.5 mil-

lion in the next fiscal year for grants to State and private institutions. These funds will be used to develop programs that will meet all of the needs of our senior citizens, including those of health, welfare, housing, employment, meaningful activity, and participation in community affairs.

Mr. Chairman, in 1951 I introduced a resolution calling for a special committee to study the problems of the aging. Since then, we have had numerous studies, committee reports, White House conferences and the like. The time now is for action. We must build into our machinery of government, a permanent agency charged with the job of finding solutions to the problems of the elderly. We already have huge bureaucracies addressed to the problems of the farmer, the veteran, or the businessman. Surely the needs of the elderly are no less compelling. I therefore urge my colleagues in support of this important bill.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my full support for the Older Americans Act of 1965, which I hope will be known as the McNamara-Fogarty Act. This bill is the product of long study and dedicated work by my good friend, the senior Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA, and by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY.

I want to commend these two distinguished Members of Congress for their work on this much-needed legislation, which would create an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I supported the McNamara-Fogarty bill in committee meetings, and I urge its approval by the House of Representatives.

There are some 18 million senior citizens in our country, and their social and economic problems have gone unrecognized for too many years. This bill will enable the Federal Government to begin an immediate program to study these problems and seek solutions to them.

The Administration on Aging, proposed in this bill, would serve as a clearinghouse of information on problems of the aged and aging; it would administer grants provided by the act; promote research and gather statistics in the field of aging; publish educational material dealing with the welfare of older persons; provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments, and seek more effective use of existing resources and facilities.

I speak to you today to urge your support of the Older Americans Act of 1965. This legislation presents us with an opportunity to serve America's elderly, a group who often find their later years less than happy and more than bitter.

The problems of aging have been too little considered in this young Nation. We have been so concerned with our national coming of age that the maturity of a large segment of our population has been virtually ignored. In this modern society, for example, scientific and technological innovations have granted many of the elderly immunity from the diseases

and chronic ailments that once cut short the life span. But this precocious technology has not given us the answer to one very important question: How do we assure that a longer life will be a fuller life, free from the pressures and fears caused by the fact of being old? Are we granting added years to people's life spans only to allow them to live them out in bitterness, deprivation, and loneliness?

This legislation which we consider today proposes to create an agency called the Administration of Aging to study the problems of the elderly and to propose and support solutions to these problems. To achieve this purpose, the Administration would be empowered to award grants to States for community planning, demonstration programs and personnel to serve the elderly and seek to alleviate the hard conditions under which many of them live. Public and private organizations are also eligible to receive grants for this purpose.

With a growing number of older citizens in the population, we can no longer afford to ignore their welfare. We can no longer cherish the illusion of old age as peaceful, golden years. We can no longer be blind to the problems and the adversity that confront older citizens just because they are old.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 will speak for the interests of aged citizens. For example, the aged of this richest of all nations constitute a large proportion of the poverty stricken. There are 6.8 million heads of families over age 65 in this country. Half of them have incomes of less than \$3,000 annually. And half of those with incomes below \$3,000 support themselves and their families on less than \$1,000 yearly. One cannot afford dignity, health, and honor on this income. One cannot afford to grow old gracefully on \$1,000 or less a year.

The elderly also lack other important elements in their old age. They can generally not afford the amount and intensity of medical treatment they need. Older Americans need twice as much health care as the average citizen, yet they are in little position to afford this care. Older Americans lack adequate housing, community services tailored to their needs, and a respect for their capacities and abilities as well.

We have not used the talents and skills of the aged as we should. Elder citizens are discriminated against when they seek employment; they are not encouraged to use the experience they have gained through their long lives to serve the community and to help each other. This is an area where change is needed. This is an area ripe for experimentation. For this is not only a program to give aid to the elderly. There is much we hope to gain from them as well. The demonstrations and grants under this legislation could show us many ways in which we can utilize the powers of the elderly.

The Older Americans Act is an essential adjunct of the Great Society. The problems of the elderly should be a matter of deep concern to a nation which feels rich enough to assure a full life for all of its people. We must have a focus

for the elderly, a spokesman within the Government. The Older Americans Act fills these needs and I urge that we give it our full support.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as supporting my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and his bill H.R. 3708 because I want it known I am in favor of its enactment. I feel it is extremely important to provide Federal funds for, first, community planning and services; and, second, research, training, and demonstration grants to enable the States and local communities to provide better services.

I would like to have added to H.R. 3708 the Federal grant provisions of my bill H.R. 4409 which permits the construction and operation of senior activity centers or, as an alternate, I would like to see early enactment of this additional important legislation, which will make it possible for our older people to enjoy more meaningful, useful, and independent lives in their later years.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965. I think that this legislation is long overdue and should be an integral part of a comprehensive program of assistance to our older citizens. I trust that, within the next few weeks, we shall pass a comprehensive medical assistance program for our older citizens. In the future, perhaps the data and knowledge made possible through H.R. 3708 will help to diminish patterns of employment discrimination based on age.

The Older Americans Act establishes an Administration on the Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, headed by a Commissioner. It would provide a new departure in development of assistance to the elderly by coordinating programs now in existence; arranging for research and demonstration projects; collecting data, and giving technical assistance to State and local governments for demonstration projects to aid the aging.

This bill authorizes modest grants to the States for programs designed to deal with the problems that are unique to the elderly, and also authorizes grants to public or nonprofit private agencies for research, demonstration projects, and training of special personnel.

Finally, it calls for the establishment of a 16-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans.

The sums of money in this bill are not so great that we can reasonably look for any dramatic improvement in the life of our older citizens. The legislation really looks to development of a body of information and of new techniques for providing programs for the aging. If our effort is successful over its 5-year term, we must anticipate that there will be new requests for Federal, State, and municipal programs to effectuate the recommendations that should flow from these studies. It is at that point that our elderly citizens will really reap the benefits of the bill we are considering today.

I am gratified that two of the objectives of the bill are to help our older people in their "pursuit of meaningful ac-

tivity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities," and in their quest for "freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives." These objectives, coupled with the other aims of the bill—which look to development of programs dealing with the income of retired people and housing and health services—promise a more balanced approach to a severe social problem.

I have long been concerned about the fact that, at best, most of the existing programs for the elderly have been designed only to extend their lives and to maintain and protect their physical health. I am not satisfied with a world in which retirees have only the steady diet of television, movies, chess and checkers to fill their hours. They have earned the right to an opportunity to participate in more dynamic activities, compatible with their physical limitations.

The inability to pursue active employment does not mean that the retiree has lost all physical facility or is ready simply to vegetate. I look forward to a society in which the man or woman nearing retirement can anticipate new activities and a rewarding life. Retirement should be a promise—not a threat. I think this bill is a notable start in achieving that goal.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my particular approval of the actions of the House of Representatives today in passing H.R. 3708, the Senior Citizens Act of 1965.

Because of my belief that such legislation was necessary, I have myself introduced a similar measure, known as the Senior Citizens Act of 1965.

While the aged, to some extent, have always had difficulties with housing, health care, and employment, these problems have become of acute national concern in recent years because the number of older Americans has risen sharply, and continues to rise.

According to census statistics, the population of the United States has increased 2½ percent since 1900. At the same time the population of those 65 years old and older has increased six times.

It is estimated that the number of persons over 65 increases by 1,000 each day. By 1980 they will number nearly 25 million.

My own State of Wisconsin provides an excellent example of projected increases in this segment of our society. In 1961 there were some 412,000 persons over 65 in Wisconsin.

In 1970, according to estimates, there will be 482,000 such persons in the State, marking a 20-percent increase in just 10 years.

These figures indicate the danger that existing programs to assist the aged soon may become inadequate or outmoded.

The Older Americans Act, in my opinion, is a modest start toward solving some of the problems which beset our aged.

This legislation authorizes Federal project grants to the States, to local communities, and to private nonprofit groups for the study and improvement of

programs intended to assist older persons in securing—

Proper medical care and nutrition.

Equal opportunity to find gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform.

Adequate housing within their means.

Retirement planning and counseling and, where necessary, rehabilitation and assistance.

Assistance in achieving fuller, richer lives through participation in the life of their community.

Mr. Chairman, I was proud to have supported and voted for the legislation before the Congress today. It will be a concrete step toward making the lives of our senior citizens more fruitful and rewarding.

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

I want to take a minute or so just to say that as chairman of this committee I have had the utmost cooperation from the minority side, and the ranking member particularly, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY, who has been very cooperative and helpful. Every suggestion that he has made to me and to others on the committee, I found to be constructive, rather than the usual type of a delaying nature and of a destructive nature. I think all of us have worked together, and I assure the gentleman from Illinois while we have had two successes, I have a third bill, as he knows, in the Committee on Agriculture. It is a well-known rule on the farm that you do not get a crop from all the seed you plant. Some of it falls on foul ground. So I will just do the best I can with the two that I have.

However, at this time, Mr. Chairman, if no more time is required for debate, I want to thank all of those who have helped us in this work on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Older Americans Act of 1965".

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES:
DEFINITIONS

Declaration of objectives for older Americans

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that, in keeping with the traditional American concept of the inherent dignity of the individual in our democratic society, the older people of our Nation are entitled to, and it is the joint and several duty and responsibility of the governments of the United States and of the several States and their political subdivisions to enable our older people to secure equal opportunity to the full and free enjoyment of the following objectives:

(1) An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.

(2) The best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status.

(3) Suitable housing, independently selected, designed and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.

(4) Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.

(5) Opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.

(6) Retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy.

(7) Pursuant to meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

(8) Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.

(9) Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.

(10) Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

Definitions

SEC. 102. For the purposes of this Act—
(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging.

(3) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa.

(4) The term "nonprofit institution or organization" means an institution or organization which is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Establishment of Administration

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Administration to be known as the Administration of Aging (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration").

(b) The Administration shall be under the direction of a Commissioner on Aging to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Functions of office

SEC. 202. It shall be the duty and function of the Administration to—

(1) serve as a clearinghouse for information related to problems of the aged and aging;

(2) assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to problems of the aged and aging;

(3) administer the grants provided by this Act;

(4) develop plans, conduct and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging;

(5) provide technical assistance and consultation to States and political subdivisions thereof with respect to programs for the aged and aging;

(6) prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons;

(7) gather statistics in the field of aging which other Federal agencies are not collecting; and

(8) stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING, SERVICES, AND TRAINING

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 301. The Secretary shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a program of grants to States in accordance with this title. There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law, for—

(1) community planning and coordination of programs for carrying out the purposes of this Act;

(2) demonstrations of programs or activities which are particularly valuable in carrying out such purposes;

(3) training of special personnel needed to carry out such programs and activities; and

(4) establishment of new or expansion of existing programs to carry out such purposes, including establishment of new or expansion of existing centers providing recreational and other leisure time activities, and informational, health, welfare, counseling, and referral services for older persons and assisting such persons in providing volunteer community or civic services; except that no costs of construction, other than for minor alterations and repairs, shall be included in such establishment or expansion.

Allotments

SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sum appropriated for a fiscal year under section 301 (A) the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa shall be allotted an amount equal to one-half of 1 per centum of such sum and (B) each other State shall be allotted an amount equal to 1 per centum of such sum.

(2) From the remainder of the sum so appropriated for a fiscal year each State shall be allotted an additional amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population aged sixty-five or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty-five or over in all of the States, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce.

(3) A State's allotment for a fiscal year under this title shall be equal to the sum of the amounts allotted to it under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State notifies the Secretary will not be required for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates as the Secretary may fix, to other States which the Secretary determines (1) have need in carrying out their State plans so approved for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under subsection (a) and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts for projects approved by the State during the period for which the original allotment was available. Such reallocations shall be made on the basis of the State plans so approved, after taking into consideration the population aged sixty-five or over. Any amount so reallocated to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).

(c) The allotment of any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be available for grants to pay part of the cost of projects in such State described in section 301 and approved by such State (in accordance with its State plan approved under section 303) prior to the end of such year or, in the case of allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, prior to July 1, 1967. To the extent permitted by the State's allotment under this section such payments with respect to any project shall equal 75 per centum of the cost of such project for the first year of the duration of such project, 60 per centum of such cost for the second year of such project, and 50 per centum of such cost for the third year of such project; except that (1) at the request of the State, such payments shall be less (to the extent requested) than such percentage of the cost of such project, and (2) grants may not be made under this title for any such project for more than three years or for any period after June 30, 1972.

State plans

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary shall approve a State plan for purposes of this title which—

(1) establishes or designates a single State agency as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan, which agency shall be the agency primarily responsible for coordination of State programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act;

(2) provides for such financial participation by the State or communities with respect to activities and projects under the plan as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in order to assure continuation of desirable activities and projects after termination of Federal financial support under this title;

(3) provides for development of programs and activities for carrying out the purposes of this Act, including the furnishing of consultative, technical, or information services to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations engaged in activities relating to the special problems or welfare of older persons, and for coordinating the activities of such agencies and organizations to the extent feasible;

(4) provides for consultation with and utilization, pursuant to agreement with the head thereof, of the services and facilities of appropriate State or local public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations in the administration of the plan and in the development of such programs and activities;

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

(6) sets forth principles for determining the priority of projects in the State, and provides for approval of such projects in the order determined by application of such principles;

(7) provides for approval of projects of only public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations and for an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency for any applicant whose application for approval of a project is denied; and

(8) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under this title and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

The secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan, or any modification thereof submitted under this section without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of a State plan approved under subsection (a), finds that—

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

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no

longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State under this title (or payments shall be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(c) A State which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Secretary under subsection (a) or (b) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Secretary may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Secretary's action.

Costs of State plan administration

SEC. 304. From a State's allotment under section 302 for fiscal year, not more than 10 per centum or \$15,000, whichever is the larger, shall be available for paying one-half (or such smaller portion as the State may request) of the costs of the State agency (established or designated as provided in section 303(a)(1)) in administering the State plan approved under section 303, including the costs of carrying on the functions referred to in subsection (a)(3) thereof.

Payments

SEC. 305. Payments under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE IV—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Project grants

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized to carry out the purposes of this Act through grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution and contracts with any such agency, organization, or institution or with any individual—

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

(b) to develop or demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods (including multipurpose activity centers) which hold promise of substantial contribution toward wholesome and meaningful living for older persons;

(c) to develop or demonstrate approaches, methods, and techniques for achieving or

improving coordination of community services for older persons; or

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

Payments of grants

SEC. 402. (a) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Secretary shall require the recipient of any grant or contract under this title to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant or contract was made.

(b) Payments under this title pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE V—TRAINING PROJECTS

Project grants

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to or contracts with any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution for the specialized training of persons employed or preparing for employment in carrying out programs related to the purposes of this Act.

Payment of grants

SEC. 502. (a) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Secretary shall require the recipient of any grant or contract under this title to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant or contract was made.

(b) Payments under this title pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE VI—GENERAL

Advisory committees

SEC. 601. (a)(1) For the purpose of advising the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on matters bearing on his responsibilities under this Act and related activities of his Department, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Advisory Committee on Older Americans, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and fifteen persons not otherwise in the employ of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. Members shall be selected from among persons who are experienced in or have demonstrated particular interest in special problems of the aging.

(2) Each member of the Committee shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (B) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at the time of appointment, five at the end of the first year, five at the end of the second year, and five at the end of the third year after the date of appointment.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, such technical advisory committees as he deems appropriate for advising him in carrying out his functions under this Act.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee or of any technical advisory committee appointed under this section, who are not reg-

ular full-time employees of the United States, shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such committee or otherwise engaged on business of such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary who appointed them, but not exceeding \$75 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Administration

SEC. 602. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide consultative services and technical assistance to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions; to provide short-term training and technical instruction; to conduct research and demonstrations; and to collect, prepare, publish, and disseminate special educational or informational materials, including reports of the projects for which funds are provided under this Act.

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

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 603. The Secretary shall carry out titles IV and V of this Act during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments at the Clerk's desk and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 2, line 10, strike out "enable" and insert in lieu thereof "assist".

Page 14, insert after line 24 the following: "(c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a)(1) unless such agency has approved such grant or contract."

Page 15, insert after line 19 the following: "(c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a)(1) unless such

agency has approved such grant or contract."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the first amendment that was read is self-explanatory.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, after discussing the amendments with the committee and those on the committee at the table here, and with the sponsor of the act, we see no objection to the amendments and the committee accepts the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Illinois now in the well is the oldest Member of this body in point of accumulated years, I trust there will be no question raised as to his qualifications to speak on the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I might need the time to unfold fully my reflections, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am proud that I will be 83 years old next month.

I have felt a little chastened, however, as I have listened to the problems of the aged being discussed and analyzed. I do not like to think of them as problems. I like to think that for all of the aged—and that includes this youngster of almost 83—what is ahead is a world of promise and of richness, and not of problems, and one does not reach the western slope merely to look back over his shoulder.

I have asked for this time because I am concerned. This is a good bill. It is one of the good works of that messenger of God on earth, the gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY. I believe JOHN FOGARTY has done more for mankind than any other man I have known in my lifetime. This is one of his good works.

I know the gentleman from Nebraska is a fine and able legislator. He raised a question about the promise of this legislation, the objective, the language of the bill that promises an abundant life for the aged. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with a fair compensation for the aged? What is wrong with opening the door for a new, a fuller, a richer life for all the aged?

Oh, youth of America, you have much on your conscience, as have I, who once was young. You have been so anxious to get ahead. You could not wait. You have been so anxious to reach out and take the jobs and the offices. How many hearts you have broken, how many lives you have put in shambles, how grievous the mischief you have wrought by compulsory retirement systems that forced into unwanted idleness by an arbitrary

rule of age all, one and all, just because they have reached an age after which you in your self-esteem said they were worthless and unfit.

Yes, you lawyers want to be judges before your time. So in some States you have laws passed that after a certain age a person cannot be a judge. Some of our greatest judges have been 90 and past. That you know but try to forget.

Well, they did not do that in Illinois. Thank God for the Bar Association of Chicago and the lawyers of Chicago who every time they are asked to vote their rating of the judges place on top the judges who are old in years and experience and rich in knowledge. Judge Hugo Friend will be 88 or thereabouts when his present term expires, and he is one of the most respected and able judges in Chicago and in Illinois. I am told that everytime the Chicago bar takes a poll the names of Judge Friend and others of advanced years top the lists.

Some of the newspapers are saying there should be an age limit on service in the Congress of the United States. One-tenth of American citizens are past the age of 65, yet some newspapers and some people are saying they should have no representation in the Congress of the United States. I wonder if they understand the meaning of democracy.

Yes, the issue was raised against me last November. Perhaps someone got tired waiting for me to die. I do not know. Someone said to me: "BARRATT, when you are getting senile, will you know it?" "Oh," I said, "Of course I will know it. Whenever I split an infinitive, I will know I am getting old."

Then some of the newspapers which had previously supported me, fine newspapers, said, "BARRATT O'HARA has been a pretty good Congressman, but he is getting pretty old. Why, he is 81 and soon he will be 82, and he talks about running again in 1966; and then, my goodness, he will be 84, and he is going to run 2 years after that. We have to stop it."

Well, I am going to run in 1966. I am going to run in 1968. Now, I am not making any plans ahead of that, but I hope I will keep going on.

You know, when I was a young fellow, Blaine's book "Twenty Years in Congress" was the talk of America. I read every word of it, still have the old volume in my library and now and then reread some of the pages. I resolved then if I ever went to Congress I was going to stay here as long as Blaine did, and I was 67 when I reached here.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Certainly I will yield to my good friend.

Mr. FINDLEY. As a colleague of the gentleman from the great State of Illinois, I want to wish you many years of health, happiness, and service.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my good and able friend from Illinois, and I appreciate his words from the bottom of my heart.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the great and beloved Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Illinois is the youngest Member of the House that I know of. The gentleman is looking ahead 10, 15, 20 years in terms of public service, in terms of his outlook on life, and in terms of his relationship to his fellow man. The gentleman is young because he is young in mind. That is the important thing in terms of public service.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the Speaker. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take advantage of the Speaker, although I should not do this, but he has laid himself wide open. If I am to have any contest next year, I am going to ask Speaker McCORMACK to come out and save the day for me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do want to get this in the RECORD. The issue of age was raised in my last campaign. These downtown newspapers, and mind you they had been my friends and I deeply respected them, all said that O'HARA was too old. Ordinarily newspaper endorsements carry weight. This was especially true in the last election when there was so much scratching because of the Presidential situation. Frankly, I was worried. No one wants to be carried by his ticket. Yet this was the end sought by this strategy. If I ran way below my running mates someone figured my nomination in 1966 would be more difficult. I did not know what was going to happen to me, but I wished the people to decide. In reality they were voting on BARRATT O'HARA and the age issue forced upon them. I think you will be interested in the official figures in my congressional district. President Johnson got a majority of 66,000. Now, mind you, the President got 10,000 votes that no other candidate got. In other words, 10,000 people voted just for the President. I am humbly grateful that the voters gave me the largest majority of any one of the candidates next to our great President of the United States. And in this I found a rebuke by the voters of the injection of the vicious poison of discrimination on the issue of age.

Here, Mr. Chairman, is a tabulation of the official vote in November of 1964 in the Second Congressional District of Illinois:

Official returns, 1964 election, 2d Congressional District

For President:	
Johnson.....	117, 012
Goldwater.....	50, 493
Johnson majority.....	66, 519
For Congress:	
O'HARA.....	107, 795
Scannell.....	52, 416
O'Hara majority.....	55, 379
For state's attorney:	
Ward.....	107, 618
Bickley.....	53, 484
Ward majority.....	54, 134
For Lieutenant Governor:	
Shapiro.....	106, 581
Altorf.....	54, 223
Shapiro majority.....	52, 355

Official returns, 1964 election, 2d Congressional District—Continued

For secretary of state:	
Powell.....	102, 992
Hoffman.....	55, 359
Powell majority.....	
47, 633	
For State auditor:	
Howlett.....	102, 189
Kirby.....	57, 891
Howlett majority.....	
44, 298	
For attorney general:	
Clark.....	102, 532
Sandquist.....	58, 577
Clark majority.....	
43, 945	
For recorder of deeds:	
Olsen.....	100, 923
Schall.....	57, 882
Olsen majority.....	
43, 041	
For clerk of the circuit court:	
McDonough.....	100, 318
Kucharski.....	58, 886
McDonough majority.....	
41, 431	
For coroner:	
Toman.....	99, 467
Osmanski.....	59, 651
Toman majority.....	
39, 816	
For Governor:	
Kerner.....	100, 726
Percy.....	64, 759
Kerner majority.....	
35, 967	

Many Republicans who supported President Johnson supported Percy for Governor, hence the reason for the difference in the gubernatorial majority.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Surely. I yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I go by the saying you are only as old as you feel, and so far as the gentleman in the well is concerned, he is still a very young man.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. In such presence and living in the perfume of such rich friendship, I feel like sweet 16.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DADDARIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as "Administration on Aging" pursuant to House Resolution 284, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chairman will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. MORTON. 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 Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 391, nays 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—391

Abbutt	Clawson, Del.	Fulton, Pa.
Abernethy	Cleveland	Fuqua
Adair	Clevenger	Gallagher
Adams	Cohelan	Garmatz
Addabbo	Collier	Gathings
Albert	Colmer	Gettys
Anderson, III.	Conable	Gibbons
Anderson,	Conte	Gilbert
Tenn.	Conyers	Gilligan
Andrews,	Corbett	Gonzalez
George W.	Corman	Goodell
Andrews,	Craley	Grabowski
Glenn	Cramer	Green, Oreg.
Andrews,	Culver	Green, Pa.
N. Dak.	Cunningham	Greig
Annunzio	Curtin	Grider
Arends	Curtis	Griffin
Ashbrook	Daddario	Griffiths
Ashley	Daniels	Gross
Ashmore	Davis, Ga.	Grover
Aspinall	Davis, Wis.	Gubser
Bandstra	Dawson	Gurney
Baring	de la Garza	Hagan, Ga.
Barrett	Delaney	Hagen, Calif.
Bates	Dent	Haley
Battin	Denton	Hall
Beckworth	Derwinski	Halleck
Belcher	Devine	Halpern
Bell	Dickinson	Hamilton
Bennett	Dingell	Hanley
Berry	Dole	Hansen, Idaho
Betts	Donohue	Hansen, Iowa
Bingham	Dorn	Hansen, Wash.
Blatnik	Dow	Hardy
Boggs	Dowdy	Harris
Boland	Downing	Harsha
Bolling	Dulski	Harvey, Ind.
Bolton	Duncan, Oreg.	Harvey, Mich.
Bow	Duncan, Tenn.	Hathaway
Brademas	Dwyer	Hays
Bray	Edmondson	Hechler
Brock	Edwards, Ala.	Helstoski
Brooks	Edwards, Calif.	Henderson
Broomfield	Ellsworth	Herlong
Brown, Calif.	Erlenborn	Hicks
Brown, Ohio	Evans, Colo.	Hollifield
Broyhill, N.C.	Fallon	Holland
Broyhill, Va.	Farbstein	Horton
Buchanan	Farnley	Hosmer
Burke	Farnum	Hull
Burleson	Fascell	Hungate
Burton, Calif.	Feighan	Huot
Burton, Utah	Findley	Hutchinson
Byrne, Pa.	Fino	Ichord
Cabell	Fisher	Irwin
Cahill	Flynt	Jacobs
Callan	Fogarty	Jarman
Callaway	Foley	Jennings
Cameron	Ford, Gerald R.	Joelson
Carey	Ford,	Johnson, Calif.
Carter	William D.	Johnson, Okla.
Cederberg	Fountain	Johnson, Pa.
Celler	Fraser	Jonas
Chamberlain	Frelinghuysen	Jones, Mo.
Chelf	Friedel	Karsten
Clancy		Karth
Clark		Ke

Keith	Nedzi	Scott
Kelly	Nelsen	Secret
Keogh	Nix	Selden
King, Calif.	O'Brien	Senner
King, N.Y.	O'Hara, III.	Shibley
King, Utah	O'Hara, Mich.	Shriver
Kirwan	O'Konski	Sickles
Kluczynski	Olsen, Mont.	Sikes
Kornegay	Olsen, Minn.	Sisk
Krebs	O'Neal, Ga.	Skubitz
Kunkel	O'Neill, Mass.	Slack
Laird	Ottinger	Smith, N.Y.
Landrum	Passman	Smith, Va.
Langen	Patman	Springer
Latta	Patten	Stafford
Leggett	Pelly	Staggers
Lennon	Perkins	Stalbaum
Lindsay	Philbin	Stanton
Lipscomb	Pike	Steed
Long, La.	Pirnie	Stephens
Long, Md.	Poage	Stratton
Long, Md.	Poff	Stubblefield
McCarthy	Pool	Sullivan
McClary	Powell	Sweeney
McCulloch	Price	Talcott
McDade	Pucinski	Taylor
McEwen	Quile	Teague, Calif.
McFall	Quillen	Teague, Tex.
McGrath	Race	Tenzer
McVicker	Randall	Thomas
Macdonald	Redlin	Thompson, N.J.
Machen	Reid, III.	Thompson, Tex.
Mackay	Reifel	Thomson, Wis.
Mackie	Reinecke	Trimble
Madden	Resnick	Tuck
Mahon	Reuss	Tunney
Mailliard	Rhodes, Ariz.	Tupper
Marsh	Rhodes, Pa.	Tuten
Martin, Ala.	Rivers, Alaska	Udall
Martin, Miss.	Rivers, S.C.	Ullman
Mathias	Roberts	Utt
Matsunaga	Robison	Van Deerlin
Matthews	Rodino	Vanik
May	Rogers, Colo.	Vigorito
Meeds	Rogers, Fla.	Vivian
Miller	Rogers, Tex.	Waggoner
Mills	Ronan	Walker, N. Mex.
Minish	Roncalio	Weltner
Mink	Rooney, N.Y.	Whalley
Minshall	Rooney, Pa.	White, Idaho
Mize	Rosenthal	White, Tex.
Moeller	Rostenkowski	Whitener
Monagan	Roudebush	Whitten
Moore	Roush	Widnall
Moorhead	Roybal	Williams
Morgan	Rumsfeld	Williams
Morris	Ryan	Wilson, Bob
Morrison	Satterfield	Wolf
Morse	St Germain	Wright
Morton	St. Onge	Wyatt
Mosher	Saylor	Wyder
Moss	Scheuer	Yates
Multer	Schisler	Young
Murphy, III.	Schmidhauser	Younger
Murphy, N.Y.	Schneebell	Zablocki
Murray	Schweiker	
Natcher		

NAYS—1

Martin, Nebr.

NOT VOTING—41

Ayres	Gray	Purcell
Baldwin	Hanna	Reid, N.Y.
Bonner	Hawkins	Roosevelt
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Howard	Smith, Iowa
Clausen,	Jones, Ala.	Thompson, La.
Don H.	Kastenmeier	Todd
Cooley	Love	Toll
Dague	McDowell	Walker, Miss.
Everett	McMillan	Watkins
Ewins, Tenn.	MacGregor	Watts
Flood	Michel	Wilson,
Fulton, Tenn.	Pepper	Charles H.
Glaimo	Pickle	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Dague.
 Mr. Ewins with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Todd with Mr. Reid of New York.
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Love with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Kastemeier.
 Mr. Everett with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Howard.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
 Mr. Flood with Mr. McMillan.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Glaimo.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Hanna.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Hawkins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The doors were opened.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend and revise their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.
 The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
 There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Thursday, April 1, 1965, to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1966.

Mr. CONTE reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, April 2, 1965, to file a privileged report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1965.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority mem-

ber of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 provides for consideration of H.R. 1111, a bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 1111 is to encourage and make possible the prudent development of the Nation's water and related land resources through sound, comprehensive, and coordinated planning. To accomplish this purpose, the bill establishes a Cabinet-level Water Resources Council in the executive branch; authorizes the President to establish river basin planning commissions when and where they are needed; and provides for financial assistance to the States for water resources planning.

The Council will be composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, the Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. It will have the responsibility for guiding the Nation's planning effort in the water resources field and keeping the President and the Congress informed on the water needs of the Nation.

The river basin commissions will be established upon the basis of need and at the request of the States involved or of the Council. They will prepare and keep up to date comprehensive, integrated joint plans for Federal, State, interstate, local, and nongovernmental development of water and related land resources.

The financial assistance to the State for which H.R. 1111 provides would be on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis, and would enable them to play a more effective role in planning the development and conservation of their water and related land resources.

Existing laws will not be modified or superseded by this legislation, and commissions will not be established where adequate planning is already being accomplished by some other means.

The cost of carrying out the provisions of title I of the bill is estimated at from \$120,000 to \$150,000 per year. The cost of the assistance program to the States would be \$5 million per year for 10 years, assuming that the full amount author-

ized is appropriated. The cost of administering title III is estimated at \$300,000 to \$400,000 per year for the 10-year period. The cost of carrying out the provisions of title II should not exceed \$5 or \$6 million per year at the peak, with the maximum number of commissions, and not more than \$2 million after the basin plans have been completed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 309.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order under 1 hour of general debate and an open rule, the Water Resources Planning Act, which calls for an appropriation on a 5-year basis of around \$7 million a year to establish a Water Resources Council and also certain commissions within different river basin areas. Our water resources have become extremely important to the people of this Nation. There has been complete support of this bill, as I understand it, within the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which reported it out unanimously and in the Committee on Rules. I believe this is a worthy piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House have permission to revise and extend their remarks on this piece of legislation.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1111, with Mr. DADDARIO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, this legislation comes before you today after 6 years of study and consideration in the Interior

and Insular Affairs Committee. Long before that, basinwide comprehensive planning of the Nation's water resources was a matter of study in the executive branch and by various commissions and committees. The approach set out in H.R. 1111 was recommended in the 1951 report of the Water Resources Policy Commission appointed by President Truman and in the 1955 report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy appointed by President Eisenhower.

Legislation similar to H.R. 1111 was developed in my committee and introduced in 1959. We studied the legislation in cooperation with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and other affected Federal agencies. Out of these cooperative studies came the legislative proposal of President Kennedy which was introduced and considered in the 87th Congress, but on which there was no final action in either body. H.R. 3620 and S. 1111 of the 88th Congress were revised versions of President Kennedy's proposal, reflecting particularly suggestions made by representatives of the States that river basin commissions be truly Federal-State in character and that river basin planning be a partnership venture with not only the Federal Government and the States participating but including also local agencies and private enterprise. S. 1111 passed the Senate in the 88th Congress and was reported by my committee. In the rush for adjournment last year, the legislation was not called up in the House. With minor changes, the legislation we bring before you today is the same as that approved by the Senate and by my committee last year. A similar bill, S. 21, has already passed the other body.

During the period that the committee studied this legislation, we worked very closely with the States in order to be sure that the rights of the States and local interests are protected and that the planning, development, and use of our available water resources is a joint venture. Initially, many of the States were concerned that this legislation would give the Federal Government additional authority and jurisdiction over water distribution and use. This, of course, was never intended and legislation that we have developed makes this abundantly clear. Not only would the legislation not give the Federal Government expanded authority for water resources development but, through the 10-year financial assistance program provided until title III, it will permit the States to play a more important and effective role in planning the development and conservation of their water and related land resources. From a position of disinterest or downright opposition, the States have become the most ardent supporters of this legislation. Last year the committee received the personal endorsement of 23 Governors and the endorsement of many additional State water agencies and groups. The legislation has the full backing of the Council of State Governments, which represents all the States.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1111 will make possible the prudent development of the

Nation's water and related land resources through sound, comprehensive, and coordinated planning. It involves planning only, and the construction and operation of works of improvement will continue to be the responsibility of appropriate Federal agencies, States, municipalities, local groups, or nongovernmental entities. The present responsibilities of the Federal Government or of the States relative to the development, control, or use of water will be neither expanded nor diminished by the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, no major responsibility of the Federal Government is so divided as that relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the Nation's water and land resources. With water use in this Nation expected to double in the next 20 years and as our limited water supplies dwindle in relation to our national needs, choices among alternative uses will have to be made. It is, therefore, becoming increasingly important that some effective means be established for water resources management which will achieve maximum beneficial use of our limited supplies. We believe that comprehensive planning as contemplated by H.R. 1111 is a key element in resolution of the problems of water supply and water-use requirements which face this Nation in the years ahead, and that the enactment of this bill will materially assist the Nation in developing, managing, and utilizing its basic water supply to best meet demands as they arise both in terms of quantity and in terms of quality.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the subcommittee responsible for the hearings and study given to this legislation, will discuss provisions of H.R. 1111 and the committee amendments thereto.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt in the minds of any of us that the handling of water resources development by the United States, by the States and by private enterprise is very confusing. We see this right here on Capitol Hill. Legislative authority in this field is split between the Interior Committee, the Public Works Committee, the Agriculture Committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Commerce Committee, and even sometimes the Foreign Relations Committee. Executive authority is split in just as confusing fashion between the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department acting through the American section of the International Boundary and Waters Commission, the Geological Survey, the Weather Bureau, the Public Health Service, and heaven knows what other agencies.

I have hopes that enactment of H.R. 1111 will help to overcome some of the executive confusion, even if it does not help much here on the Hill. I have hopes, too, that it will serve to bring into

focus, river basin by river basin, who is doing what and who ought to be doing what. For we have not only the problem of interagency and intercommittee confusion here in Washington, we also have confusion between what is properly State and what is properly Federal, between what is properly local and what is properly State, between what is properly nongovernmental and what is properly governmental. To sort out all these factors and to produce workable and feasible plans for our river basins is going to be a monumental task. H.R. 1111 can help get that job done, and, therefore, I am all for it.

For there is no question about the necessity of utilizing our water resources to their utmost. I am not going to burden the RECORD at this point with detailed figures on how our population is increasing, on how much water it takes per man per day in our economy, on the number of hundreds of gallons it takes to make a ton of steel, on how our rivers are getting polluted and how we need to freshen them up and keep them clean, on the growing demand for water for recreation, on how much food our people will need a quarter of a century from now, and how there will not only—I say this hopefully—be no farm surplus but a great need to increase the acres we use for agriculture and, therefore, a need for draining our wet places and irrigating our dry places.

We all know, even without statistics, that these things are so and we all know that to meet the challenge of the future is going to take the best efforts of all of us, including, particularly, the millions of citizens who are in what we grandiloquently refer to as the private sector of our economy. For make no mistake about it—great as Hoover Dam is as an engineering achievement, millions of acres more have been irrigated through private efforts than through Federal expenditure, and great as is Grand Coulee Dam, the private power companies out-produce the Federal power installations many, many times.

I am laying stress on this for one reason—to call attention to the importance of a number of committee amendments to H.R. 1111 that I am proud to have been associated with. I refer, for instance, to the rewritten statement of policy on page 2 of the bill with the emphasis it lays on private enterprise and on the contribution which "individuals, corporations, business enterprises, and others concerned" can make to comprehensive and coordinated planning of our water resources. I refer again to page 9 of the bill where the reference to Federal, State, and interstate plans for the development of water resources has been enlarged to include "local and nongovernmental plans" for the same. And I refer to page 22 of the bill where the Water Resources Council is enjoined to approve State programs for comprehensive water resources planning only if they make "adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State, and local agencies, and nongovernmental entities having responsibilities in affected fields."

With the full cooperation of private enterprise and without full attention be-

ing paid to what it can and should do, the best river basin plans that could be provided would be sadly lacking. I am glad that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has recognized this by the adoption of the amendments I just referred to.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is enough to indicate my feelings on H.R. 1111. I urge its passage by the House.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania tell the committee how this bill ties in with the water resources research bill which we did pass last year? Was that a companion piece of legislation to this?

Mr. SAYLOR. That was a companion piece of legislation to H.R. 1111. This will try to direct its attention principally to the executive branch of the Federal Government to see to it that the Federal agencies will eliminate duplication.

Mr. JONAS. I was just getting to that.

Will the gentleman in the well assure the Committee that there is no overlapping in the two programs?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. To the gentleman from North Carolina I would say that last year's water resource bill had to do with the study of water as a natural resource. This has to do with the planning for the collection and the capture and the use of the water and the spreading of it around to the various uses. There is no correlation insofar as the research and development effort and planning efforts are concerned, except they are both water programs.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, they will complement each other instead of being in opposition?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Just how does this fit in now with the bill that apparently we are coming to fairly soon, S. 4, the so-called water pollution bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin if the House will pass S. 4 as reported by the House Public Works Committee, and when the House and Senate conferees go to conference, if the House will be able to maintain its position there will be absolutely no duplication in these two bills, and they will complement each other and help solve this water problem.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. It is necessary that we remember if we are not careful in this matter of water pollution under the jurisdiction of HEW, and the committee that handles it in this body as well as the other body, we will get ourselves into a duplicatory situation

that it would be difficult for us to disentangle ourselves from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I want to thank the gentleman, chairman of the committee, for his answer. I gather an inference from a statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there may be a difference in the Senate and House versions with respect to S. 4. The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned if we can sustain the House position. Are we to infer that the Senate version contains provisions that are duplicatory of the provisions of H.R. 1111?

Mr. SAYLOR. No. The Senate version will cause duplication as far as eliminating the States' right to participate. May I say from reading the report on S. 4 as reported by the House Public Works Committee, both majority and minority sides are to be complimented on the manner in which they took this very important problem and worked out a very excellent bill. The mere fact this committee worked its will and has reported such a good bill when they bring that bill to the floor of the House it should require the complete cooperation of Members on both sides so that when the House conferees go to conference they will be in a position to tell the Senate that they have unanimous support in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I take it that S. 4 in the form in which it has been approved by the Public Works Committee and the House does have the approval of the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. SAYLOR. It has my full support.

Mr. JONAS. I appreciate the gentleman's answer to the question I raised, the answer on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as the gentleman from Colorado. It is important to have the record clear because nothing is more important than water, and it would be a mistake to have a half-dozen separate pieces of legislation on the subject. I wanted to be sure that there is no duplication, and that this bill now before the Committee would actually complement the bill we passed last year.

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

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

Mr. REINECKE. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Title I, section 104, indicates that the report of the Council shall be transmitted to the President for his review, and transmittal to Congress. Section 204, title II, indicates that the report of the river basin commission, not the Council, but the commission, shall be submitted to the Governors or representatives of each State. Is it the intent of the committee that the report of the Council, the first part, shall also be submitted to the Governors or appointed representatives of the individual States as well as the President, or do the representatives of the States have to wait until the President has reviewed the report and referred

the report to the appropriate agency before they will hear about those particular plans or proposals for the river basin?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Let me answer the gentleman from California this way: It is anticipated in the river basin commissions that the States participate with membership in these commissions. There will be the Federal members and also State members. Those river basin commissions in any report they make, they will make that to the Governors of the several States involved who are participating in the river basin commission aspect. Then, of course, this will also be made to the Council. The Council in turn will make the report on its recommendations to the President and the President in turn to Congress. The only way a river basin commission can be formed is by request of the Governors of the States or by the Council itself. There must be accord between half of the States affected before they can have a commission.

It is anticipated, let me say, and I think the committee understands this and I want the entire membership of the House to understand it, that this is all public information and that it will be available to the Governors of the States or to the water commissioners of the States or to anyone else interested in the States that are affected. Although there is no specification that this be submitted to the Governors, that is because this Council itself is a national organization rather than a State organization, and the matter is submitted to the President, but it will be available to the Governors of the States and to the appropriate officials of the States at all times.

Mr. REINECKE. I thank the gentleman. I wanted the clarification as to the members of the river basin commission. I appreciate the information the gentleman has given.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, the citizens of my district in Massachusetts and throughout New England this year find themselves once more at the mercy of the uncontrollable forces of nature. We are on the verge of the third drought year in a row—a circumstance that threatens to produce the worst drought problem in New England in over 70 years.

We have had neither enough snow this past winter nor enough rain so far this spring to produce more than a trickle in our reservoirs. Many of the reservoirs in Massachusetts right now are two-thirds empty, instead of being two-thirds full which would be the normal for this time of year. The ground water level is estimated at 2 feet below normal—this means 2 feet beyond the reach of root systems for trees and plants.

Our State officials over in Boston estimate that 5 inches of rainfall are needed before April 15 in order to bring the ground water level up to normal for the start of the growing season. They also estimate that 20 inches of rainfall will be needed to bring our reservoir in Pittsfield up to normal.

Our people are already hearing the warnings—a scant 6 months since they heard it last—to conserve water; to stop washing cars; stop watering the lawn; stop wasting water wherever possible. I do not have to tell you what this means on the very eve of the spring growing season. The restaurants in Massachusetts have already been advised to stop serving water unless their patrons request it. That may be good news for the dairy farmers, but not for their cows who must also have water.

These pleas have an all too familiar ring for me. They are being made on a statewide basis now by Governor Volpe and the officials of the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission. Community officials in my hometown of Pittsfield were making the same pleas and the same warnings last fall in the wake of one of the driest summers on record.

The Weather Bureau advises that there is small hope of the kind of drenching downpour we need in Massachusetts in the next few weeks. This means the prolonged dry spell which has already stretched over two parched years is entering a third year. Last year the mean annual rainfall throughout the State of Massachusetts was 10 inches below its normal 43 inches. Any farmer will tell you that a dry summer followed by a dry spring is bad news for crops.

It all adds up to the fact that Massachusetts faces a worse drought in the summer of 1965 than we had back in 1941. And the statisticians told us in 1941 it was the worst drought they had had in 50 years.

The odd fact of our drought problem is that the metropolitan areas will be the hardest hit from the point of view of human consumption. It is the areas that must depend on runoff—on surface water—that will suffer most. These are the people in the cities whose water must come from reservoirs. The people who rely on so-called ground water—from wells and springs—will not be hit as hard.

Of course the farmer takes small consolation from the fact that he can get a drink from the well out front while his crops are drying to dust in the fields out back.

The people of Massachusetts need help. And they need the help proposed in the legislation, H.R. 1111—the Water Resources Planning Act.

As I understand this act, it proposes some pretty thorough machinery for planning and executing State and area-wide water conservation and storage programs. This hits at the very heart of our problem in Massachusetts. While we are prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to conserve water for vital requirements such as firefighting, sanitation, hygiene, and other necessities, this will not solve our basic problem. The answer lies in development of vast new water supply systems, new reservoirs, new conduit and ducting systems, new collection and storage facilities.

While New England has its drought problem, the question of adequate water resources is certainly not limited to any region of the country. It may be raining like crazy somewhere else but unless

that rainfall is stored up and controlled, it will not quench the thirst of our growing population. We read and hear a lot about desalting processes to convert sea water to potable drinking water. Most of these involve expensive, complicated industrial methods; huge plants and and costly materials.

It seems to me a simpler approach is embodied in the spirit of H.R. 1111. A system of matching study and development grants, administered through appropriate State and local officials should provide the soundest solutions for each region of the country and by letting nature do most of the work—converting sea water to rainfall by her own peculiar evaporation, and running it into our reservoirs.

I urge my colleagues to give this legislation serious consideration, and to weigh its merits in terms of the future requirements for water in each of their districts as well as the consequences of the kind of severe drought we New Englanders are currently facing.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has indicated, the purpose of H.R. 1111 is to encourage and make possible maximum use of this Nation's available water resources through basinwide, comprehensive, and coordinated planning. To accomplish this purpose, H.R. 1111 provides for establishment of a cabinet-level Water Resources Council, authorizes river basin planning commissions and provides financial assistance to the States for water resources planning.

The Water Resources Council will be composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Council will have the responsibility for guiding the Nation's planning effort in the water field and keeping the President and the Congress informed on the water needs of the Nation.

The river basin commissions will be established upon the basis of need and at the request of the States involved or of the Council. They will prepare and keep up-to-date comprehensive, integrated joint plans for Federal, State, interstate, local, and nongovernmental development of water and related land resources.

The financial assistance to the States for which H.R. 1111 provides would be on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis, and would enable them to play a more effective role in planning the development and conservation of their water and related land resources.

Mr. Chairman, in order that Members may better understand what is involved in this legislation, I shall briefly explain it title by title.

The first three sections of the bill include a statement of policy and the effect on existing laws. Section 2 states as broad congressional policy the encour-

agement of the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as private enterprise and other nongovernmental entities.—Section 3 makes it clear that this legislation is not to be construed as expanding or diminishing either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibilities, or rights in the field of water resources development. Other disclaimers set out in section 3 relate to interstate compacts, the authority of the Congress to authorize and fund projects, the responsibilities of Federal officials, the jurisdiction of any international joint commission, and the jurisdiction of Federal and State courts over matters in controversy affecting water.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Title I provides for the establishment of the Water Resources Council and defines its duties and responsibilities. As I have already indicated, the Council would be composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Army, HEW, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Chairman of the Council will be designated by the President. The heads of other departments and agencies will participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are being considered?

Section 102 requires the Council to maintain a continuing study of the water situation throughout the United States and to make recommendations with respect to policies and programs relating to the Nation's water needs. Under section 103 the Council will be responsible for establishing principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participation in the preparation of river basin plans. Section 104 requires the Council to review the comprehensive plans prepared by the river basin commissions and transmit them together with its recommendations to the President for his review and submission to the Congress. Section 105 gives the Council the administrative authority it needs to carry out its responsibilities.

The committee believes that, in addition to these basic responsibilities, the Water Resources Council will be an effective mechanism for bringing the agency heads together, for coordinated planning and resolution of interagency conflicts.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Title II provides for the establishment by the President of river basin water resources commissions. Section 201 describes the membership and the manner of organization, sets forth the duties of the commissions as well as their powers and administrative authority. The President may establish a commission upon the request of the Governor of one or more of the affected States or of the Council. Not less than half the affected States must concur. In addition, a commission involving the Upper Colorado River Basin or the Columbia River Basin could not be established without the concurrence of three out of four States specifically named in the legislation. The