I say again that this bill busting at its worst and I want my vote recorded in opposition.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 2, line 47, insert the following:

"WORKING CAPITAL FUND"

The paragraph under this heading in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1961 (71 Stat. 210) is inserted to read as follows: "Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department: (4) a central tabulating service; (5) telephone, mail and messenger services; (6) a central accounting and auditing service; and (7) a central laborers' service: Provided, That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order shall be available to the Departments of Labor, and which such centralized services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment,"

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, and on that motion I ask recognition to explain the conference report.

The Clerk called the roll.

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were to have an explanation of this bill before the conference report was voted on.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

 Alexander  Ellinoff  Morrison
 Barbour  Iott  Murray
 Baumer  Isett  Nicoll
 Bitchess  Keneas  Norrell
 Boiling  Kilburn  Passman
 Bowles  Kinnard, W.  Patman
 Celler  King, Utah  Powell
 Davis, Tenn.  Lawbrough  Preston
 Dixon  Landrum  Quie
 Durham  Lipscomb  Rains
 Glenn  Long  Rogers, Mass.
 Goodell  McDowell  Shelley
 Grant  McGowan  Smith, S.C.
 Gray  Mangun  Taylor, N.Y.
 Hasely  Maben  Thompson, La.
 Hirtz  Melcher  Vines
 Hoffmann, Ill.  Morris, Okla.
 Hollingsworth  Morris, W.  Withrow

The SPEAKER then temporarily (Mr. Arnaus). On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet at the time the conference report was adopted, in order to give a brief explanation, but apparently did not make it clear that I desired recognition. I would, therefore, like to explain it at this time.

There is a unanimous conference report.

Every member of the conference signed it. As is always the case, there were some members of the conference that felt that the appropriations were too high in some areas, and others felt they were too low, but we were all agreed that a good compromise resulted from the four sessions that we held.

The total of the bill as it passed the House was $4,184,932,731. As it passed the Senate the total was $4,485,788,931, or an increase over the House bill of $300,856,200. The conference agreement total was $4,354,557,931, or $131,631,000 less than appropriated by the Senate bill.

There were 83 Senate amendments to the bill. Most of them involved rather small amounts. This represents a larger increase in the Public Health Service. In the field of medical research alone the House bill provided $455 million for the National Institutes of Health. The Senate bill increased this figure to $650 million, or an increase over the House bill of $200 million. So in this one field the increase accounts for over two-thirds of the total for the whole House bill. The conference agreement was $550 million, or a decrease of $104 million below the Senate bill, and $105 million over the bill as it passed the House. This represents approximately two-thirds of the total amount by which the entire bill is now over the amount passed by the House last March.

Another significant item in conference was for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton program. The House originally provided $150 million for this program, and this was increased by the Senate to $311,200,000. The conference adopted the figure of $186,200,000, which keeps the amount at the same level as for last year. This is an increase of $26,200,000 over the House bill and $25 million under the Senate bill. These two items, the National Institutes of Health and the hospital construction program, account for over 80 percent of the increase provided by the conference report over the bill as it originally passed the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much was it over the budget?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is $334,135,960 over the budget.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

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

Mr. GROSS. I thought this bill was exceedingly rich when it left the House at $4,184 million. Now it is $164 million above the House figure, and $34 million above the budget recommendation.
As I tried to explain at that time, it was a compromise that we reached in the House last March. Some of us wanted to include more in the House bill than we did and others wanted to spend less, but we came out with a unanimous report on the agreement that was reached. Then the other body increased it by $300 million. After four long sessions, we have finally made this compromise.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the following tabulation shows up-to-date comparison with the President's budget requests for the session on the appropriation bills. At the insistence of the other body, the 16 bills thus far cleared, including the excessive Labor-HEW total reported in this morning's Rollcall, exceeded the corresponding budget requests to $301,877,547. Excessive nondefense appropriations pushed the total over the budget.

The two bills—public works and mutual security—on which conferences are being held today offer the last practical opportunities to bring the total under the budget requests.

At a time when our gold reserves are continuing to dwindle, when the cost-of-living hits a new high nearly every 30 days, when the buying power of the dollar is less than half what it was only a few years back, when business profits on which the Treasury heavily depends to help pay the bills are slacking off—and the cost-of-living hits a new high nearly every 30 days, when the buying power of the dollar is less than half what it was only a few years back, when business profits on which the Treasury heavily depends to help pay the bills are slacking off when the cost-of-living hits a new high nearly every 30 days, when the buying power of the dollar is less than half what it was only a few years back, when business profits on which the Treasury heavily depends to help pay the bills are slacking off—and the cost-of-living hits a new high nearly every 30 days, when the buying power of the dollar is less than half what it was only a few years back, when business profits on which the Treasury heavily depends to help pay the bills are slacking off—

The tabulation follows:

Status of the appropriation bills for the 86th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 25, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bills compared with House</th>
<th>Bills compared with budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net total for the 16 session bills enacted</td>
<td>$301,877,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less authorizations</td>
<td>($211,400,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed Senate</td>
<td>$230,465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Public works, as passed by Senate</td>
<td>$240,765,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mutual security, as passed by the Senate</td>
<td>$292,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All bills, new stand (appropriation)</td>
<td>$206,780,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Supplemental bill is yet to come.

The House will I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this bill or have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately prior to the vote on the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without obligation, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the following tabulation shows up-to-date comparison with the President’s budget requests for the session on the appropriation bills. At the insistence of the other body, the 16 bills thus far cleared, including the excessive Labor-HEW total reported in this morning’s Rollcall, exceeded the corresponding budget requests to $301,877,547. Excessive nondefense appropriations pushed the total over the budget.

The two bills—public works and mutual security—on which conferences are being held today offer the last practical opportunities to bring the total under the budget requests.

At a time when our gold reserves are continuing to dwindle, when the cost-of-living hits a new high nearly every 30 days, when the buying power of the dollar is less than half what it was only a few years back, when business profits on which the Treasury heavily depends to help pay the bills are slacking off—

The tabulation follows:

Status of the appropriation bills for the 86th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 25, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bills compared with House</th>
<th>Bills compared with budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net total for the 16 session bills enacted</td>
<td>$301,877,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less authorizations</td>
<td>($211,400,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed Senate</td>
<td>$230,465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Public works, as passed by Senate</td>
<td>$240,765,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mutual security, as passed by the Senate</td>
<td>$292,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All bills, new stand (appropriation)</td>
<td>$206,780,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Supplemental bill is yet to come.

The House will I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this bill or have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee with reference to the student loan fund. What disposition was made of that item?

Mr. FOGARTY. Last March, when the bill passed the House originally, we gave the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare everything that they asked for. They told us at that time that they would probably have to come back for a supplemental appropriation. That will be taken up on tomorrow in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill. It is not in this bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Then, do I understand correctly that there will be funds in the supplemental appropriation bill for the student loan fund?

Mr. FOGARTY. The bill is to be reported tomorrow and so I cannot answer the gentleman at this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield at that point, as I understand the situation, if amendment No. 16 is adopted, they can spend anything they like. I did not understand that that was how that situation was going to be agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, that that is in another area and will be charged against next year's appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but it is not limited. Mr. FOGARTY. It is the same as we are doing with reference to social security grants for public assistance and other similar programs. Then the advances are charged against the appropriation when it is made. This is what it says or the purpose of the bill to be charged against the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year. That is the language of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but there is no limitation on what they can spend and while it might be charged to an appropriation, obviously, they can go ahead and spend anything they like.

Mr. FOGARTY. The limitation is there since they cannot spend more than what the Congress appropriates. If they spend more in that first quarter, then they should, then they are going to have to make up for it by cutting back the rest of the year.

Mr. TABER. It is a contract on the part of the Congress to provide the money and we cannot get out of it. Mr. FOGARTY. We do this for the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of Employment Security in connection with their grant programs and we have had no problems with reference to it.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Is the intention made clear here that it is not a contract authority and that a contract could not be read into this?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Under this provision in amendment No. 16 they are authorized to draw down the Treasury, and there is no way to get it back after they receive it.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Do I understand that the 15 percent overhead has been maintained in this conference report?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have had some serious reservations as to the advisability of expanding some of these programs as rapidly as we have. In talking with some of the administrators of schools in the administration of these research grants it seems to me we could well give consideration next year to increasing the indirect costs but not accelerating the overhead grants as we have been in the past.

Mr. FOGARTY. I appreciate the gentleman’s remarks, and I think maybe something should be done, but perhaps in the other direction. A study has just been completed under a grant made by the National Institutes of Health that dealt with the question of overhead costs. They would like to read it, because there is a serious question raised by this grantee as to whether any overhead costs ought to be paid.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman knows probably better than I do that the determination of costs is not uniform, not the same for different departments of Government, not the same for the National Institutes of Health, for instance, as for the military. Different formulas are used. It seems to me desirable to have uniform treatment in this regard. Some administrators of schools have serious reservations as to the adequacy of 15 percent.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss in a little more detail the action taken with respect to the appropriations agreed to for the National Institutes of Health.

The Basis for Agreement

First, I should like to emphasize that I believe the reas because of the agreement between the House and the Senate concerning the basic philosophy under which the Federal Government should act in respect to medical research. This was reflected in the attitude of the conferences from both Houses in their discussions of the items that were in disagreement in this bill.

Their attitudes reflected complete agreement upon the significance of medical research, upon the objectives which the Federal Government should attain such objectives, and upon the objectives which should be sought, and in general upon the approaches which should be followed in attaining such objectives.
principles and that was also realistic in terms of operational requirements.

I should like, as I did last year, to report to the House the gratification I experienced in participating with the immediate availability of the decision by my distinguished colleagues in the House in the conference discussions concerning these medical research appropriations. There was, as always, a forthright exchange of views which, as I have said, did not differ in respect to basic principles but only in honest attempts to determine the optimum level of support of these programs in order to achieve the most effective results.

The conference have agreed to accept a figure of $560 million as the total for the several appropriations of the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1961. This amount is $104 million under the amount in the Senate version of this bill and $165 million above the allowance originating in the House in its passage of this bill. It is, however, $160 million greater than the amount which the President had requested for these appropriations in his budget last January.

MEDICAL RESEARCH AND THE NATIONAL BUDGET

To those who are concerned about this increase I should like to say this: The President's budget proposals for fiscal year 1961 in the field of medical research in essence set forth the point of view that the development of medical research in the United States should not be accelerated. This view, I am afraid, was based wholly upon fiscal considerations.

The Congress this year, as it has in past years, has again emphasized that maintaining the existing level of national medical research effort is a completely unwise, if not disastrous, course of action to follow.

We cannot stand still in our search for knowledge. We cannot mark time or restrain research because of contrived fiscal reasons or for misleading arguments that research is inflationary or that there are economic obstacles which stand in the way. This attitude, I believe, reflects an utter and complete misunderstanding of the meaning that medical research has for the Nation.

It is my view, and I believe the view of this Congress, that a strong and sustained and increasing medical research effort is sound national economics. The effect of medical research is not inflationary, nor does it threaten progress in other areas of our national economy.

The ultimate product of medical research is an enlargement of the wealth of this Nation. This wealth comes from the increased national productivity which derives from a well population, from reducing the loss in energy and creativity resulting from disease, and the longer effective lifespan of our people.

This Nation now spends over $21 billion for doctors' bills, for the operation of hospitals, for the purchase of drugs and medicines, and other forms of medical care and health services. This vast national expenditure is a burden which can be substantially modified if we can move forward with our medical research programs.

BETTER HEALTH AND GREATER PRODUCTIVITY

Medical research can change in a radical and revolutionary manner the whole pattern of medical care, hospital services, and health practices. The achievement and the progress that is possible as a result of research findings can drastically reorder the nature of health manpower requirements and the whole pattern of medical, hospital, and health services and expenditures of the Nation.

This is not only possible, but it has happened, and happened numerous times. Outstanding instances of the revolutionary consequences of the findings of medical research are the following:

First. The whole character of the treatment of infectious disease has changed, the great threats that the pneumonia and dangerous infec-
tions posed in the past have been almost completely dispelled by the emergence of the antibiotics. This is the result of research efforts. On the other hand, the common cold still costs the Nation as much as $2 billion a year in industrial absenteeism.

Second. We have witnessed in the past few years the serious decline of tuberculosis as a major cause of death and illness in this country as a result of the development of new drugs effective in the care of this dreaded disease. The whole structure of hospitalization in the Nation has changed as a result. Large numbers of tuberculosis hospitals throughout the country have closed or been converted to other uses and all the health, medical, technicians, and physicians, once demanded for the treatment of tuberculosis, have now dis-lected their skills and energies to other urgent health and medical care problems. On the other hand, recent increases in the attack rate of cancer of the lung places this condition foremost in the causes of death from lung involvement.

Third. We are witnessing today a basic change in the approach to the treatment of mental illness as a result of the remarkable discovery made concerning the relationship of drugs and psychological and psychiatric conditions. For the first time we have seen the total population of our mental institutions decrease and looking forward, as a result of the intensified efforts in this area engendered by the actions of the Congress of the United States, to new and heartening prospects in the solution of the problems of mental illness. This, again, is an achievement of medical research that is reshaping the entire character of our community health efforts and recovering for the Nation the vast creative potential of these once ill minds.

Nonetheless, the mentally ill still occupy one out of two hospital beds throughout the country, and in the aggregate this group of illnesses cause the taxpayer an annual medical bill of over $2 billion.

On the basis of these few isolated but dramatic instances of the influence and effect of medical research on the one hand and of the problems yet to be solved on the other, it is possible to see that the continued movement forward in medical research holds the promise of completely transforming the balance of national expenditures and productivity in the future. The concept that we must maintain the line on expenditures for medical research, is the same as saying that we must stop now, not pursue the promising leads that have opened in respect to the viral origin of cancer, nor seek virus vaccines to control the common cold, we must not expand our knowledge concerning the biochemical basis of schizophrenia, we must stop now our promising inquiry into the nature of heart disease. That we must mark time, hold opportunities that now beckon in abeyance and direct our attention to a budget balance sheet. To do all this is to deny the strength and promise of our scientific capability.

It is not the role of medical research to wait. The promise of the future is too bright and too great.

Medical research is a revolutionary force. It can change in a radical manner the level of national productivity, the life expectancy of our people, and our prospect of well-being.

This progressive decrease in the ravages of disease, the tragedy of premature death, and the progressive increase in the productivity of our people and our Nation is to me an objective without parallel when we consider what our national purpose should be.

It is toward this end which we are moving in the level of appropriations which I present here to you today as a result of the House and Senate conference on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

A budget of over a half a billion dollars for the National Institutes of Health is a complicated matter. It cannot be intelligently considered except through a detailed consideration of its various parts. The following table will in summary indicate the nature of the conference agreement.

I should like to emphasize that the specific amounts set forth in this table for the individual program elements comprising the several appropriations are not intended to be fixed or absolute levels of expenditure for the individual programs. When changing operating circumstances require, I believe it important to leave it up to the good judgment of the program operators to make such adjustments in these amounts as is necessary in the interest of effective progress and prudent utilization of resources.
Grants for research and training:

1. Research projects at 15 percent indirect costs
2. Research fellowships
3. Training grants

(b) $260 million is provided for the appropriation bill

Sine qua non grants presented by the House earlier in the year.

I should like to explain for the information of the House, the basis of the conference action in each of the major NIH functional areas and relate the amounts proposed in these areas to the levels contained in the appropriation bill passed by the House earlier in the year.

Research Projects

A total of $260 million is provided in order to continue the making of grants in support of medical research projects carried out in the universities, medical schools and research institutions in the country. This amount will provide the funds necessary to continue the research programs which are now underway supported by NIH grants in these institutions and in addition permit the awarding of most new applications received during fiscal year 1961 which will stand the rigorous scientific review carried out by the NIH review bodies and which are recommended for payment. It is also important to the solution of major disease problems by these several National Advisory Committees of the NIH.

This total increase in funds for research grants should be viewed in terms of the important areas of research inquiry which will be benefited. A very few of these areas selected as examples of both past progress and present opportunity would include viruses and the cause of cancer, radiation and the treatment of cancer, drugs and the mental illness, surgery and heart disease, dental caries and infectious agents, creation of arthritis and drugs for treatment, arteriosclerosis and strokes and a whole host of such practical problems as mental retardation, alcoholism, to say nothing of the pressing medical problems of our elder citizens.

Fellowships

A total of $22 million is provided for the support of research fellowships in fiscal year 1961. This program of research fellowships is an essential activity directed toward the development of the supply of senior teachers and research investigators which will be needed to staff the medical schools and research laboratories of the future. This increase will permit the payment of substantially all the backlog of unpaid-approved fellowships applications now in hand and extending the senior fellowship awards to include the clinical area.

It will also permit providing broader support for medical students and enlarging the foreign fellowship program. This amount also includes $2 million for the awarding of approximately 100 research fellowships as a means of establishing research professorships to enlarge opportunities for stable careers in academic medicine and research.

Training Grants

An amount of $110 million is provided for the support of training grants to support training in the sciences and disciplines basic to medicine and medical research where shortages continue to exist in terms of current needs and to provide for enlargement of the trained research manpower of the future. Included in this amount is sufficient funds, estimated at $16.4 million, to permit reordering the backlog of unpaid training grants which will allow such grants to be made on a forward payment basis—an arrangement necessary to permit proper planning and effective conduct of these programs.

Important areas of manpower development which will be benefited by this increase in training grant funds include:

Investigators in the sciences fundamental to clinical medicine.

Experimental approaches to providing greater research and scientific content to the training of physicians.

Research pharmacologists in the field of mental disorders.

A wide range of specialized manpower contributory to cardiovascular research.

Virologists, immunologists, and immunochemoists whose work is basic in the fields of infectious diseases and allergies, and now of crucial importance to virus-cancer investigations.

Investigators able to pursue genetic phenomena at the molecular level.

Biophysicists and biochemists who can pursue the basic phenomena of chemical and energy transformations at the cellular level.

Research neurophysiologists and neuroanatomists essential to the research attack upon the disorders of vision and cerebrovascular diseases.

Clinical Research Centers

A major feature of the conference agreement is the provision of funds for several special programs which had been included in the Senate passed version of the appropriation bill and had their origins in the extensive recommendations made by the Jones committee. Most important amongst these special programs is the designation of $20 million for the further development and support of a program for the establishment of large-scale clinical research centers throughout the country. This program has its origins in the efforts made by the National Institutes of Health to provide support for a series of clinical and metabolic research facilities undertaken in fiscal year 1960.

During this past year some eight grants, totaling approximately $3 million, were made to eight medical institutions in the country. These grants provided funds for the establishment of specially designed clinical and metabolic research facilities, staffed and equipped to meet the growing needs of programs involving research investigations in the clinical area. This program has met with enthusiastic support and approval in the research community of the Nation.

The Jones committee reported favor for an enlargement of this program to permit the establishment of broadly based clinical research centers. It is intended that these centers will provide a stable framework in which a variety of medical and scientific disciplines can be organized.
ized for a concentrated attack upon major disease or health problems. All laboratory and clinical facilities and supporting services necessary for the research programs to be carried on by the Institute would be constructed within such centers.

The Senate-passed version of the bill provided $55 million for these research centers. The conferences have agreed that a level of $20 million is perhaps a more realistic and feasible level to initiate what undoubtedly will be a substantial program of great importance to the further development of medical research in the Nation.

PRIMATE RESEARCH CENTERS

A total of $7 million is provided for the further development of centers for research utilizing subhuman primates. This program was begun in fiscal year 1961 with $2 million available. These funds were granted for the establishment of a large primate center near Portland, Oreg. This center will make available several species of primates in adequate numbers and with appropriate facilities to meet the needs of scientists engaged in research requiring the use of primates. Although the Senate proposed a level of $12 million in fiscal year 1961 for this purpose, the conferences agreed that $7 million, a reduction of $5 million from the Senate allowance, but an increase of $5 million over the House allowance, would be an adequate amount to satisfy the more urgent needs in this area during fiscal year 1961. On the basis of experience gained in this more modest initial effort, it will be possible to develop an appropriate goal in this important program area.

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

The conferences also agreed that special emphasis in fiscal year 1961 should be given to the further extension of NIH research programs through support of investigators in foreign countries working in the fields important to the program objectives of the several institutes. The Senate allowance for this purpose totaled $7 million. The conferences agreed that $5 million was a more appropriate amount. In the conferences' view this amount should be utilized in addition to current funds now being utilized for research support of foreign investigators.

CONSTRUCTION

A total of $12,889,000 is provided for two important building projects at the National Institutes of Health; $12,139,000 of this amount will be for the planning and construction of a joint mental health-neurology basic science laboratory building; $700,000 is intended to be utilized for the planning of a new building to house cancer research activities at NIH. These projects will provide the means of increasing the increasingly difficult problems of space shortage which are hampering the progress of research activities at the Bethesda installation of NIH.

A special item of $5 million has been provided in the cancer appropriation to be utilized for taking care of a special need in the development of cancer research facilities which require non-matching funds.

The conferences agreed to allow the full authorized maximum of $30 million to be used for cancer research facilities construction under the health research facilities construction program. This amount was previously allowed in both the Senate- and House-passed versions of the bill. The increase of $5 million over the President's budget request.

I have attempted in the foregoing to single out the increase in this important series of appropriations. Both the Senate and House reports contain observations concerning the views of Congress on the direction and emphasis which should be given in the development and conduct of these national research programs. The National Institutes of Health is expected to pay careful attention to the observations and development of its programs during the forthcoming year.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], and all the members of the subcommittee, for the very fine bill they have brought in. One item particularly is of vital importance to the people of Chicago, namely, the appropriation of $500,000 to undertake a study of water pollution in the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway. The total cost of this survey as estimated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is $13 million. The fund approved by this bill permits a significant start on that survey.

I stated that this appropriation is of vital importance to the people of the city of Chicago, but that was an inadequate understatement. Actually, this is a national bill. It is of vital importance to the people living on the Great Lakes because it is important that vital water resources for the enjoyment of those living today, and for future generations to come. It is of importance to all the people of our Nation, not only in the preservation of the waters of the Great Lakes but because of the essential information about the study will elicit. For decades literally, a harassing, vituperative verbal and legal battle has been fought between the States bordering on the Great Lakes and the people of Chicago. Chicago needs the waters of Lake Michigan to live. Chicago needs such waters to dispose of its sewage and waste so that its people may continue to grow and prosper.

Years ago, when the city's pollution was discharged into the lake, it contaminated the drinking water and epidemics of typhoid ravaged Chicago's population. It was only when the flow of the Chicago River was reversed and the portion of the river from 1,005 cubic feet of water from Lake Michigan as an experiment for 1 year to determine whether such withdrawal would have any harmful effect on the people of the Great Lakes. Objection to the proposal has been violent, not only in the debates in the Halls of Congress, but in the courts in a suit filed by a number of the States in the Supreme Court of the United States to require Chicago to return its sewage into the Great Lakes.

This appropriation approving the study by the olive branch of peace to the dispute. For the first time the parties will be able to obtain tangible facts where speculation and estimates existed before. For the first time actual measurements can be taken of the effect of the diversion on lake levels and upon harbor, shipping, and power facilities. For the first time, a scientific study will be made of lake currents and drafts to ascertain the situation in the lower end of Lake Michigan to determine whether sewage may be safely returned therein. Whether the method now used by the city in washing it along the Illinois Waterway is not only the preferable method but the only feasible method.

The time for accusations, for invective, for playing politics with the diversion issue is over. This is the time for cooperation and working together, for purposeful mature effort to obtain the basic information which will permit everyone to know what to do and to take the steps necessary to preserve this vital water resource and the health of our communities.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

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

The SPEAKER. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The motion was agreed to.
Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 104]

- Alexander
- Hasley
- Morrison
- Alger
- Herbert
- Murray
- Ayers
- Hesel
- Naas
- Barden
- Hoffman, Ill.
- Norrell
- Beckmann
- Holm
- Passman
- Bichler
- Humm.
- Pedersen
- Bitte
- Itard
- Fowell
- Boggs
- Jones, Ala.
- Fonseca
- Bond
- Kearns
- Gue
- Bowles
- Kilburn
- Tenny
- Boykin
- King, Mo.
- Rogers, Miss.
- Buckley
- King, Utah
- Shelley
- Cahill
- Landrum
- Sills
- Celler
- Lazer
- Smith, Kan.
- Cockey
- McDowell
- Taylor, N.Y.
- Covington
- Mass.
- Teague, Tex.
- Davis, Tenn.
- Thompson, La.
- Durham
- Mabon
- Vinsant
- Gious
- Metcalfe
- Whitmer
- Goodell
- Mitchell
- Widnall
- Moller
- Moeller
- Moller

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.
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The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 22, line 18, strike out "for research, training, and trainee projects, pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for", and insert "for grants and other expenses for research, training, traineeships, and other special projects, pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for expenses of"

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 32, line 2, insert "not to exceed $5,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General;".

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 32, line 23, insert ", of $150,000, to remain available until December 31, 1961, shall be available for plans and specifications for a research facility for the National Cancer Institute."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 34, line 13, insert: "CONSTRUCTION OF MENTAL HEALTH-NEUROLOGY RESEARCH FACILITY"

"For construction of a combined basic and collaborative research facility for the National Institutes of Mental Health and Neurological Diseases and Blindness, including a physical biology component, and including plans and specifications, fixed and semifixed equipment, access roads and parking facilities, existing power, refrigeration and other utility systems, $150,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Mental health activities' and 'Neurology and blindness activities', as determined by the Surgeon General."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 32, line 15, insert: "Sec. 905. Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available only upon that basis or available at a reduced price on prepublication orders."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 53, line 3, insert: "Sec. 905. Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include extraneous matter in my remarks on the concurring report sent to the SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?
There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have permission to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the members of the House conferees and the members of the House Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY), on agreeing to the Senate amendment in adding funds for schools in impacted areas. Unfortunately, there has been a perennial problem concerning Public Laws 815 and 874, in explaining to the membership that this is not Federal aid to education or a Federal handout as such, but is simply a program by which the Federal Government can meet a portion of its obligations to the various communities in which its agencies are located. Obviously, when the Federal Government becomes a principal industry in a community and does not pay taxes for the land it owns as other industries must do, there is a deficiency in the economy of that community to render the services that must be provided as a result of the existence of the industry in the area. One of the most vital services which must be provided is an adequate public school system.

Yet, as I stated above, in spite of the simplicity of this obligation, it seems necessary to explain the problem over and over again. Fortunately, the Congress has repeatedly recognized this responsibility and has continually granted the appropriations pursuant to the act as well as renewed and extended the act on previous occasions.

The problem that exists here today is the fact that even though we recognize the responsibility from time to time, we fail to appropriate the full amount which is authorized and the amount to which the communities would be entitled under the formula agreed upon. This makes it extremely difficult for the communities involved to formulate a sound budget or financial program. It is, therefore, imperative for the Congress to state what it intends to do and fulfill its promises in a way in which the communities can count on these funds. The action taken by the conferees to eliminate the current deficiency, I am certain, will help many communities involved in overcoming a serious problem of meeting a deficiency in the school budget for this current year.