is apparently becoming par for the course in the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

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. 7035, with Mr. Parke in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. I do this for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for the balance of the week is the pending bill, and after the disposition of this bill there is H.R. 5079, increasing travel allowances for Federal employees.

Mr. HALLECK. And that will conclude the work for this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all I have now.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of nothing else at the present time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to bring to you today another unanimous report, from our Committee on Appropriations, for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Larson] and myself.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the unanimous consent request, is the gentleman saying that there is so little interest in the House of Representatives in the spending of nearly $4.5 billion of the taxpayers' money that general debate can be dispensed of in 2 hours?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, we did it last year without any trouble, and we thought all questions were answered last year and 2 years ago. I am sure the gentleman knows that about half of the total of the bill is grants to States for public assistance, and there is nothing that you or I can do about it in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to observe that this abbreviated procedure
tion of hospital costs. We were told that hospital costs have gone up 300 percent in the last 20 years; and all through the hearings, if you have time to read them, you will learn that we have been insisting that more attention be spent on training physical therapists and others that can help in expanding the home-care programs and permit people to get out and continue their work where they otherwise would be able. We have added a special appropriation for a new program of research in hospital facilities. There is $10 million in the bill for this new program.

We had evidence given to us by doctors from the Mayo Clinic and the Methodist Hospital in Rochester who have been working on a project now for 6 years, studying the value of a new design for hospitals. In the last 40 or 50 years there has been little change in the design of hospitals. As a result of their study, they have come to us and told us, after this 6-year study of the problem, that they were able to bring down the cost of nursing care in the intensive ward area from $34 a day to $14 a day. They made a report which was presented to the committee this year. That is why we included the $10 million as a new item.

I shall try to go down the table in the report; and if Members have the committee report in front of them, they will be able to follow the explanation of the changes that have been made in the committee from the suggestions of the Budget.

In the Department of Labor we cut the appropriation for the Secretary by $184,000; $184,000. Of the cut was to cover the cost of the Labor-Management Committee set up by the President. We thought this should be financed all in one place, rather than split between the Departments of Commerce and Labor. We cut out $27,000 for two positions in Civil Defense and another $7,000 item for a new position in the personnel office.

In the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports we made a cut of $500,000 from the request because the workload did not come up to what they expected.

In the Bureau of International Labor Affairs they asked for an increase of some $150,000, and we gave them half the increase asked for.

In the Office of the Solicitor we approved the budget estimate.

For the Bureau of Labor Standards we approved the budget estimate.

In the Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment Rights we gave them the amount they asked for.

For the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, because of automation and other factors we have included $647,000 more than they have this year. The recommended increase includes approval of the request of $147,000 aimed primarily at strengthening the Bureau's support of the Department's manpower program by providing staff and programs to retrain and improve training in industry. The Committee has added another $500,000 to initiate a really effective program of training. The Committee will expect that special emphasis be given to those areas of high unemployment due to increased automation, migration of industry, and other factors; and to those areas where shortages of properly trained personnel exist.

In the Bureau of Employment Security we made a small cut of $185,000 from the amount requested for salaries and expenses. We cut the Employees' Compensation Fund $1,500,000, because they gave us a new estimate that indicated this amount will not be needed.

We gave the Bureau of Labor Statistics just what was asked for. We also gave the Women's Bureau the budget estimate, $686,000, and we gave the Wage and Hour Divisions of the Department what they asked for.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Now as to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we gave the Food and Drug Administration what they asked for. I think we should have given them more. They are an important and vital part of the Federal Government and it is imperative that we support them adequately.

Mr. Chairman, few agencies of the Federal Government fulfill a more responsible mission than the Food and Drug Administration. A few years ago, almost unknown to the American public, the Food and Drug Administration each day for a supply of safe and pure foods, drugs, and cosmetics. And in times such as these when technological changes in new foods are made, it is important to remember that the Food and Drug Administration has responsibility.

In a very literal sense, this agency has the direct and personal welfare of every man, woman, and child in the United States. And because every American relies upon the Food and Drug Administration each day for a supply of safe and pure foods, drugs, and cosmetics, the appropriate appropriation which would provide the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 1962 would permit that agency, in 1962, to increase the program of inspection and sampling a half of one percent of the annual interstate shipments of such food crops. This is progress in the right direction.

DRUGS

Another responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration which has been given an entirely new look as a result of technological changes, as well as a result of new techniques of distribution and marketing, is the responsibility to protect all Americans from unsafe, impotent, and mislabeled drugs. It is imperative that the Food and Drug Administration receive 480 new drug applications. In effect, therefore, we can say that a new drug is developed in this Nation on the average of more than one every day. In addition to this, the Food and Drug Administration in fiscal year 1960 received 2,059 so-called supplements of new drugs. These supplements are changes in new drugs which had been previously approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

Not only are new drugs being developed and changed in greater numbers, but they are for the most part more complex than before. Some have timing agents which permit them to dissolve and to react over a period of time. Some are designed for the crop cycle. It is imperative that the Food and Drug Administration receive 480 new drug applications. In effect, therefore, we can say that a new drug is developed in this Nation on the average of more than one every day. In addition to this, the Food and Drug Administration in fiscal year 1960 received 2,059 so-called supplements of new drugs. These supplements are changes in new drugs which had been previously approved by the Food and Drug Administration.
being marketed under the approved labeling, that they contain the approved ingredients, and that they are sold under the approved means of distribution. This FDA is responsible for this task.

It is also the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration to make certain that promotional literature for new drugs and its label information which is submitted to physicians by the drug industry contain accurate and honest descriptions of the drugs, how they are to be used, and what they can affect. When one considers that the general practitioner in this Nation receives an average of 4,700 such pieces of literature annually and that the Food and Drug Administration seriously reviews only 2 percent—100 of these, we can begin to visualize clearly the scope of the FDA responsibility.

Likewise, when we realize that there are over 56,000 retail drugstores which must be inspected to guard against a legal sale of prescription drugs and of counterfeit drugs—a problem of growing dimensions—we can again better understand the problem the Food and Drug Administration faces. When we realize that there are over 12,000 manufacturers of drugs which have to be surveyed to determine whether or not approved drugs are being manufactured in accordance with proper safety controls, we get an even better picture of the responsibilities which are the Food and Drug Administration's in this area.

Recent findings of the Kefauver committee, as well as a recent study of FDA drug operations made by a special committee headed by Dr. Detlev Bronk, President of the National Academy of Sciences, have indicated, in the former case, the phenomenal changes which have occurred in the development, manufacture and distribution of drugs, and, in the latter case, the inadequate resources available to the Food and Drug Administration to cope adequately with these changes and to provide the type of protection which this Nation deserves. The appropriation for fiscal year 1962 would contribute substantially to the strengthening of FDA drug activities across the board.

OTHER PROBLEMS

These two problems are but two of a host of problems confronting the Food and Drug Administration as a result of relatively recent changes in the technology of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. As significant as these two problems are, others are no less significant. If time permitted, I would like to discuss a few of these.

First, Food additives: There are over 3,000 chemicals used today in the manufacture, processing and packaging of foods. It is essential that the manufacturer evaluate and prescribe tolerances for the safe use of each of these in every food product. It must then enforce such tolerances.

Second, Color additives: There are an estimated 16,000 manufacturers, packers and mixers of color additives and an estimated 18,000 firms using such additives. Each color additive must be tested for safety and used under specific tolerances established by the Food and Drug Administration. FDA must also certify many of them on a batch-by-batch basis.

Third, Hazardous substances: Under an act passed by the Congress last year, FDA is required to prescribe labeling for any products which contain hazardous substances and must prescribe proper cautionary labeling for each such product. There are an estimated 20,000 such products used in and around the household containing dangerous substances.

Fourth, Frozen foods: This means of processing and distributing foods has grown from zero to World War II frozen foods output in this country was about 263 million pounds a year. Today the output is well over five billion pounds annually. Since these products do not receive a final heating during manufacture, and since they are consumed in the home often without sufficient heat to destroy micro-organisms, it becomes necessary to be produced in the plant under the most sanitary conditions and that they are not subject to any mishandling in commerce. FDA inspections must assure that this is the case.

Fourth, Cosmetics: This is an industry which has made great strides in the past decade or so. Retail sales of cosmetics approach an annual figure of $1 billion. There are over 1,000 manufacturers and distributors in the United States. The big problem here, is that cosmetics now on the market and being developed by drug manufacturers, have not received that type of testing and which are causing harm to users. The job of sampling the thousands of cosmetic products on the market and those which are constantly being added is a task of huge dimensions for the Food and Drug Administration.

Thus, citing only a handful of problems, we get some concept of the importance of the Food and Drug Administration's activities to the health and well being of the American people alone. Under this program, special training is provided for high school students and adults who need retraining or additional training for new jobs.

One of the most successful of these programs is in vocational education. It helps to fill our needs for skilled manpower. It provides a weapon against unemployment. It cuts down school dropout. It increases the efficiency of the Nation and provides workers with common sense choices for the individual. Under this program, special training is provided for high school students and adults who need retraining or additional training for new jobs.

The sum of $83,672,000 included in the bill for 1962 provides for continuation of the program at the 1961 level of operations and includes $4 million to expand, indeed, to our very survival. The Congress has repeatedly affirmed its deep concern for education beginning with the first Morrill Act of 1862 which provided for the great land-grant college institutions and more recently by the provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The 68 land-grant colleges and universities participate in a permanent appropriation of $2,550,000 a year and also share in an annual appropriation through the Bankhead-Jones Act—1955 and 1952. Last year the Congress increased the annual authorization from $2,501,500 to $3,195,000.

The bill provides $8,194,000, which is an increase of $6,698,500 over the 1961 appropriation and represents the first of two steps to reach the new maximum authorized by the Congress last year. Uniform grants to each State will increase from $10,000 to $60,000, and Puerto Rico will be included. Variable grants to each State based on population will increase from $1,501,500 to $3,600,000.

For many years the land-grant colleges have underwritten the Nation's progress in agriculture and the mechanic arts. About one-fifth of the total enrollment in higher education in the United States is accommodated by the land-grant colleges and universities.

GRANTS TO LIBRARY SERVICES

Last year the Library Services Act was extended through 1966—Public Law 85-
The appropriations for these two programs because some members may have wondered at the amount for the 1962 fiscal year compared to the much larger amounts appropriated for these programs for the current fiscal year, totaling $280 million for both programs.

In 1958 this Congress amended these two Federal Impact laws by making permanent the provisions that apply to children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property. Congress extended the provisions authorizing payments to all other categories of Federal Impact until June 30, 1961. Thus the appropriation of $35 million for Public Law 874 and $24 million for Public Law 815 includes only funds for payments to children living on Federal bases. There is nothing in this appropriation for those districts educating children who live in a taxable home with a parent employed on Federal property. The administration has recommended permanent legislation to the current session of Congress for payments to school districts for children who live in a taxable home with a parent employed on Federal property. At the same time, the proposed legislation provides that the rate of payment be in half the present 50 percent of the local contribution rate to 25 percent of that rate. I call this matter to your attention to explain why the appropriations we are voting on today are only 50 percent of the total local contribution rate. The act opens the world to every isolated community. Over 250 new bookmobiles are on the roads-as a result of these provisions insofar as they applied to the $280 million appropriation for school facilities as authorized by Public Law 874. I want to mention that the Committee on Education and Labor and the $24 million appropriation for the extension recommended by the administration, the requirements would be $156 million. If Public Law 815 were extended in its present form, the requirements would be about $62 million. Under the amendments proposed by the administration, the estimated cost would be about $45 million.

I am pleased to note that the Committee on Education and Labor has shown its good judgment in recommending against the proposed severe cuts and for continuation of the programs. I personally do not believe that this program should be curtailed in view of the continuing burdens placed upon communities by the tax-exempt status of Federal property. In my home State of Rhode Island, 21 federally impacted school districts received approximately $1,117,000 for 7,851 children whose parents were living in taxable homes in the 1961 fiscal year. Had the proposed amendments been in effect 1962, these 21 federally impacted school districts would have received only $58,000 for these same children. This is a very substantial cut for those districts to absorb at a time when the number of children brought into these communities by the continuing burdens placed upon communities by the tax-exempt status of Federal property.

The National Defense Education Act provides greatly needed assistance in States and their subdivisions, to communities, to school districts, and to individuals. Every State and practically every community, large or small, benefits from this act. The bill includes $210,857,000 which represents an increase of $23,377,000 over the amount provided for fiscal year 1961.

STUDENT LOANS (TITLE II) ($58,430,000 AMENDED TO $79,143,000)

The student loan program allows needy students to borrow money for a college education. This year 145,000 students in 1,407 colleges will be aided in continuing their education. The program has met with universal acceptance and is one of the finest actions taken by this Government to encourage our people to invest in themselves through education.

SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (TITLE III) ($97,750,000)

Title III of the NDEA is aimed at improving instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. It aids the schools in the acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling of laboratories and supports additional courses in foreign language instruction. Loans to nonprofit private schools are also available under terms of the act.

The schools have been deplorably weak in these important fields of instruction which are so definitely allied with the national defense. Under the impetus of the NDEA funds, there have been approved projects to strengthen instruction. Student enrollment has increased significantly. Teacher compensation and instructional materials and supervisory services are increasingly effective. I will insert in the Record at this point a statement of comments submitted by various local superintendents showing the dramatic result realized by the value of equipment acquired with the aid of NDEA funds.

Title III of the NDEA has brought about a dynamic change in thousands of schools. Instruction in science and mathematics has been upgraded and updated. Rural schools have been put on a par with their urban counterparts. New curriculum materials have been developed, new equipment has been purchased, laboratories have been modernized, new resource centers have been established, and higher standards have been set. In thousands of schools yesterday's obsolete scientific equipment has been replaced by the modern equipment used in industry and commerce; in hundreds of school laboratories, the age of electronics can now be taught and understood.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS (TITLE IV) ($271,790,000)

The budget estimate for fiscal year 1962 represents an increase of $3,012,000 over the amount provided in 1961. The graduate fellowship program has expanded and strengthened graduate facilities in our colleges and universities. Over 680 graduate programs have been established or expanded in 149 graduate schools. Three-year fellowships have been awarded to 4,000 students for graduate study through 1961. The committee has reduced the budget request for this item by $1 million which will curtail the program expansion in 1962 but will not reduce any existing programs.

GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING (TITLE V): (A) GRANTS TO STATES ($12 million); (B) INSTITUTIONS FOR COUNSELING PERSONNEL ($650,000)

In the kind of world we are facing, our youth must meet challenges which impose new requirements of personal initiative, effort, and ability. In order to accomplish this, we must maintain imaginative programs of guidance and counseling in our schools. This is the objective of Title V of the NDEA. A dramatic example of how this program is aiding our schools reduce "drop-outs" and thereby to cut down on delinquency and unemployment is provided by the higher horizons project in New York City. This project has enabled the successful education transition of children coming from families of minority groups in New York City, such as Puerto Ricans and Negroes, by providing special guidance and education programs which are supported by Title V funds. Otherwise, a substantial number of these children would find it hard to get along and the result that many would drop out and add to the delinquency problem. This
is the sort of activity that needs to be spread across this country if we are to combat the evils of delinquency and the problems of unemployment due to lack of employment.

ADVANCED TRAINING FOREIGN AREAS AND LANGUAGES (TITLE VII) ($18,250,000)

The teaching of foreign languages so that the learner can converse fluently and his work comprehend quickly is an imperative skill in a world which, almost overnight, has shrunk to a neighborhood. Within the past few years the aims of such teaching have altered. The methods have changed. The materials of instruction have expanded. To meet this change, the NDEA is supporting more institutes for retraining teachers and more research to discover the most effective teaching methods and develop specialized materials.

Under the NDEA, 48 language centers are now in operation and more than 4,000 teachers will attend summer institutes in 1962.

Great progress is being made in the development of teaching materials such as programs, readers, and materials; and projects have been undertaken for research in the improvement of the technique of teaching languages.

NEW EDUCATIONAL MEDIA; RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF INFORMATION (TITLE VII) ($4,700,000)

Educators and laymen alike are convinced that the solution of many of our educational problems may be found in the effective utilization of motion pictures, TV, radio, and the other media of communication. Current developments in teaching machines, educational TV, language laboratories, and similar devices are opening up possibilities that hold much promise for improvement of educational communication. This program will undoubtedly introduce new changes in practice, but more importantly, it is creating a solid basis for changes built on sound research.

AREA VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS (TITLE VII) ($12,800,000)

This allocation provides for the training of technicians in occupations requiring scientific knowledge—how in fields necessary for the national defense such as automation, chemical and metallurgical engineering, civil construction, and electronics.

Prior to the advent of the NDEA a relatively small number of schools and institutions in a comparatively small number of States offered technical programs for training technicians. Now new buildings and facilities are being provided by the States and communities. High standards have been developed and students of top-level ability are being attracted.

The committee believes the acceleration of this program can be accomplished by adding $1 million to the budget request as provided by the Committee bill.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR IMPROVEMENT OF STATE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES (TITLE VII) ($1,500,000)

These grants provide a sorely needed stimulus toward implementation of adequate data systems and standard definitions essential in order to have meaningful and comparable data in the schools. The work essential to achieving an adequate modern record and data system for the States and their 40,000 constituent local school units is underway.

Before this work was started were using machine data processing to some extent, now 38 States either have installed or have definite plans to install machine systems.

This completes the presentation of the NDEA items.

MENTALLY RETARDED

The appropriation bill contains $1 million for grants to aid in the training of mentally retarded children.

The American promise of equality and human worth must extend to every child within the borders of our country, no matter what are his capacities or his lack.

There is no community in the United States that does not contain youngsters handicapped by mental retardation. We know mental retardation can be caused by a variety of conditions and diseases, and yet we are just beginning to realize that much can be done to prevent these causes and to cure the disease. The future holds a great deal of hope and promise for the mentally retarded. Thousands of them can be returned to health and well-being. Presently there are approximately a million and a quarter mentally retarded children in the Nation and only about one-fourth are receiving suitable education. Throughout the years, the greatest single barrier to the development of these services for these children has been the lack of qualified teaching and supervisory personnel. The program developed under Public Law 85-926 will help greatly in alleviating this serious problem.

Public Law 85-926 is designed to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through cooperative research and training programs. The committee recommends in the bill its establishment in recognition of the importance of this activity the committee recommends in the bill its establishment in the bill its establishment as a separate appropriation account rather than its continued inclusion in the salaries and expenses budget of the Office of Education which asked for increased research funds for the areas of English instruction and the identification of talent.

It is a national disgrace that the total investment in education research in this country is such a small fraction of the tens of billions of dollars spent by our nation in education. The testimony received by the committee from this eminent group of educators served the committee sufficient evidence to support an increase for this activity. Accordingly, the bill contains $5.5 million for this purpose, an increase of $300,000 over the revised amount recommended by the President. Further, in view of the increasing importance of this activity the committee recommends in the bill its establishment as a separate appropriation account rather than its continued inclusion in the salaries and expenses budget of the Office of Education. In this way the Congress can have a much clearer concept of the amount of money available for this important purpose.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The bill recommends approval of all funds requested for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, plus certain increases. This Federal-State program, which is devoted to rehabilitating disabled people and placing them in useful jobs, is doing one of the better jobs among public agencies today. It has had the interest and support of both political parties, both in the Congress and in the executive branch, and our confidence in it has not been misplaced.

The number of disabled people being rehabilitated is increasing each year, although I must say that I would be much happier if the rate of increase could be stepped up.

The request for $100,000 in grants to States for support of the basic program of rehabilitation services was for $200 million. The request made no provision for an allotment of federal funds for State matching, without appropriating large sums which we know will revert to the Treasury. The committee has,
therefore, reinstated in this bill the provision for an allotment base, in the amount of $80 million, thereby making it unnecessary to appropriate above $80 million which would not have been used.

The committee has recommended increases for the research and training programs of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. In my opinion, the funds for this important work are still far short of what we should be investing, and I am disappointed that the administration's request was so far short of the need.

The request for training funds is a good example of what I mean. We cannot expect to see major increases in rehabilitation services for disabled people unless we do something about the serious shortages of professional personnel who work with the disabled. Despite repeated testimony before the committee, from experts within the Government and outside, describing the serious and widespread effects of these shortages, we still are getting requests for inadequate funds to reduce these shortages. The committee has noted a number of important fields which are underway, but I hope that the request for training will be increased to permit public and voluntary agencies in rehabilitation to recruit trained personnel when they need them. The committee, accordingly, has increased the amount for training by $1 million.

In the rehabilitation research program, I have been equally disappointed that the request for 1962 made so little provision for the expansion needed. We must be willing to invest much more in the pursuit if new knowledge of our rehabilitation programs of the future are to measure up to their responsibilities. The committee has noted a number of research projects now underway which give promise of helping to do a better job among the severely disabled, particularly among disabled persons who are social security beneficiaries, as well as others in their later years. In mental retardation, I have noted with satisfaction that a number of research projects are underway, as well as demonstration projects to apply earlier research findings.

These and other evidences of progress are encouraging, but this research program is still operating on an extremely limited scale and I hope that the request for next year will indicate a more realistic approach to research needs in this important field.

As one step in this direction, the committee has included in this bill an additional $1 million for the establishment of two or three pilot regional rehabilitation institutes, in which a comprehensive effort can be made in programs of teaching and research in rehabilitation. The committee has included testimony which convinces us that such institutes can play an extremely important role in advancing this whole field, and particularly in underfunded and neglected teaching in physical medicine and rehabilitation, along with the other specialized fields in rehabilitation. Each of these centers would also have formal working arrangements with a large voluntary rehabilitation center which provides services to disabled people, so that the teaching and research phases could be related to the practical needs of service programs.

The committee is in complete agreement on the amounts in this bill for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and I urge your support of this appropriation.

For the Public Health Service, with respect to buildings and equipment, I gave them what they asked for.

Under community health activities, many appropriation items were lumped together. We broke them down into individual items, like chronic diseases and health of the aged, communicable disease activities, control of venereal diseases, control of tuberculosis, community health in rural areas, and other programs. That means more people, crowding more and more into our biggest metropolitan areas. It means more industries—supply our wants and to keep our living standards climbing, but also to dump more and more waste products into the urban atmosphere. It means more and more cars and trucks belching their exhaust gases on our streets and highways.

But there are also other new facts which give urgency to our need for more vigorous Federal leadership in this field. For example, the early evidence—primarily statistical evidence—which indicated an association between air pollution and lung cancer is being increasingly confirmed by followup studies, in the laboratory as well as in the field. One of the latest and most meaningful of these is the product of the first time, of a human type of lung cancer in mice by inhalation of air pollutants.

In addition to new knowledge about cancer, with which we are all so deeply concerned, the Public Health Service program is also providing convincing evidence of the relationship between air pollution and other types of lung ailments.

Research in these important areas must be accelerated. Furthermore, we must make more effort to apply—much more generally than is now being done—what we already know about controlling air pollution.

While air pollution's economic damage is less alarming than its potential health hazards, it certainly seems worth mentioning when you consider that the latest estimates put the national annual economic toll as high as $7.5 billion. This includes injury, vegetation, livestock, corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, interference with visibility, and depression of property values.

The efforts of the Public Health Service, of course, are calculated to help reduce both kinds of damage. The increase in the budget for Federal activity in this field is in line with the objective suggested in President Kennedy's message on natural resources, to provide 'new leadership, research, and financial and technical assistance for the control of air pollution.'

In this connection, I also want to make a few comments on two of America's biggest industries, the automobile industry and the oil industry, and their contributions—to air pollution and to air pollution control.

Motor vehicles constitute one of the major sources of air pollution and, unlike many other important pollution resources, this one is universal throughout the United States. Our cars and trucks go everywhere.

I cannot escape the conclusion that the automobile industry has been dragging its feet in the matter of factory installation of blow-by devices. These, as you probably know, are relatively inexpensive devices for controlling emissions from automotive crankcases. While they will not solve the larger problem of exhaust emissions from the tailpipe, they do eliminate from one-fourth to one-third of the motorcar's total contribution to our air pollution problem.

Such devices were factory-installed on new cars sold this year in the one State of California and are available—at a higher price, of course, of course, of course—and dealer-installed equipment on new American cars in other localities. In view of the mounting evidence that air pollution not only is costly but may also be highly hazardous to human health—and since these new devices eliminate a part of it at a low cost—it would have seemed both good business and good public relations for the auto industry to install such a device at the factory on all new cars sold in this country. This, in fact, is what Secretary Ribicoff recently recommended.

Unlike automobiles, oil refineries are not an important part of the air pollution problem in every city, but they certainly are in many cities. In the Los Angeles area refineries have placed into effect control measures which drastically reduce their potential contribution to Los Angeles smog. What this means, then, is that Los Angeles suffers a minimum of refinery emissions. In addition, receives new cars with blow-by control devices factory installed.

In other parts of the country, however, neither the automobile industry nor the
oil industry is cooperating half so well. New Jersey, for example, is one of the many States that receive almost none of the advantages insisted upon in Los Angeles. New Jersey comes to mind because it has just recently come to my attention that New Jersey's Rutgers University is attempting to develop smog-resistant plants in order to help truck farmers to survive. A single ride at almost any hour of the day on the upper stretch of the New Jersey Turnpike makes it patently clear why Rutgers is interested in plants that can survive smog, and you don't have to be an expert loaded down with instruments to see that both farmers and automobiles play an important role in New Jersey's smog problem.

I should think that these two rich industries—simply in enlightened self-interest, if for no other reason—would do everything they reasonably could to abate their own contribution to this growing environmental hazard, if only to save the drastic losses which might seem to them much less reasonable in its demands. Many of the controls imposed on the refineries in Los Angeles also make economic good sense, too, in that they cut down losses from evaporation of a marketable product. And factory-installed blow-by devices for automobiles cost less than $5 and also improve the car's function.

What could be more reasonable than for both the oil and automobile industries to follow throughout the country the splendid example set in Los Angeles?

NURSING SERVICES

In nursing services and resources, we gave them $300,000 more than they asked for to try to develop a home care program that will reduce hospital costs.

The supply and quality of available nursing services continues to be a matter of foremost importance since these are fundamental to the success of all medical and health programs related to patient care. Already faced with shortages of medical doctors, health professionals face new pressures in connection with the rising demand for nursing care for people sick in their homes. It is for this reason that the committee recommended an additional $300,000 for the Division of Nursing, with the suggestion that it be used for traineeship grants. It is understood, however, that such grants are a long-term approach to the problem since they are primarily intended for the support of teaching, supervisory, and administrative personnel.

It is recognized that there is also an urgent need for special training for those who give direct care to the patient. This includes learning to care for patients with complicated appliances, or needing special treatment methods. The committee recommended $300,000 for special training for those who give direct care to the patient. This includes learning to care for patients with complicated appliances, or needing special treatment methods.

Sewage, chemicals, and radioactive pollutants are a fast-growing threat to the safety of our water supplies. They endanger all industries—and the shellfish industry is only one of many—that depend on clean, safe water in order to operate.

We need to strengthen our water pollution control program all along the line—better enforcement, more research, more personnel, more money for sewage treatment works.

We also need to step up shellfish sanitation research. It is a national disgrace that there are no facilities for shellfish sanitation research right here in our country—out in Purdy, Wash.—making any study of how all this new and growing pollution, chemical and radiological as well as biological, may be affecting a basic food supply. We need shellfish research laboratories on the northeast and gulf coasts as well as in the Northwest. If we already had them, the tragic death of oysters in Pascagoula and the clam eaters in New Jersey might have been prevented.

It is no longer enough to curb the gross pollution that we know makes people sick. What we should be concerned about now is the water people use with confidence because they think it is safe. Probably most of it is safe, now, but you cannot walk off pollution with chemical treatment indefinitely. More and more people are going to find, as the shellfish harvesters in Raritan Bay found, that the water they thought was safe was not safe and that happen to the water supply of a big city—as it could happen—and imagine the consequences.

We have a clear duty to do everything within our power to see that the known methods of controlling pollution are fully applied and that research on ways to screen out viruses, chemical poisons, radioactivity, and other pollutants is speeded up. This bill represents our minimum responsibility to protect the water and water products used by American industry and by the American people.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The NIH stands today at the center of our national medical research effort. Over the years the Congress has responded vigorously to the public demand for an all-out attack on the dread diseases and the fearful disabilities which constantly threaten each of us. It has consistently acted on its firm conviction that medical research is a sound investment in our future welfare and that the defense of the health of our people is no less vital or less urgent a national need than the defense of our shores and the air above us.

There is abundant evidence that this investment is paying off—first, and most importantly, in better health and better medical care for the American people but also in dollars and cents by steadily reducing the economic losses due to illness and premature deaths. The potential for even greater dividends is there if we will build on this foundation which has been so painstakingly built up.

This House can be justly proud of the aggressive part it has played in turning what was once a mere handful of labora-
tories into a leading force in the battle against disease. But Health Service scientists anxious to do research, into the leading medical research institutions not only in this country but in the world, are held after field, a high proportion of the leading investigators are found among the clinicians and scientists whom NIH has developed either in its laboratories and Clinical Center at Be-
the Institute by contributing to a broader base of knowledge. I am especially proud to have had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which must review the NIH budget. After 11 years of faithful and faithful service, most of the growth of the Institutes has taken place. I do not say this boastfully nor do I seek credit for any part I may have had in the growth. Let me say it because I want you to know—and I want my constituents at home in Rhode Island to know—that no task in my 30 years of public service in the Congress has given me greater satisfaction than this opportunity to press forward a program whose success will so directly effect the well-being of every man, woman, and child. Each Member of this House has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The preamble of the Constitution says that one of its purposes is to "promote the general welfare." What we are doing will promote the general welfare more meaningfully than a program designed to promote sound health and a long and active life for each individual American.

It is therefore all the more astonishing to me that the executive branch, which, under our system of government, has the primary responsibility for developing national policy, has so consistently left it to the Congress to take the lead in stimulating the vital programs of the National Institutes of Health. Only once during the past 9 years—and that was 5 years ago—has the administration come forward with a budget which requested any substantial increase for the NIH programs, and even then the proposed amount was inadequate for the needs. In the past 3 years, the appropriation requests submitted to the Congress have simply tried to hold the budget line and have represented a retraction and a flat refusal to grasp the opportunities for progress which were so clearly available.

The budget sent to the Congress in January by the previous administration was in this same short-sighted pattern. Members of the House will recall that the budget message spoke of "a substantial program increase for medical research and training." But what did the budget actually provide? It provided for an appropriation which was $6 million less than the Congress appropriated for 1961. The budget cutters created the illusion of an increase by putting their sharp pencils to work on the 1961 figures. To get a favorable comparison they cut out of the 1961 figure a lot of so-called nonrecurring items and so came up with an apparent increase.

Frankly, I am disappointed. I had hoped—not for partisan reasons but because I feel so strongly that we have no obligation more demanding of us than promoting the health and welfare of our people—that the new administration would develop a vigorous, forward-looking program to meet the needs of medical research.

I had hoped that we would see the new administration take real budgetary action in regard to the NIH programs. As it has not yet seen fit to do so, it remains the responsibility of the Congress to press on in this vital work. The parallel program, launched to meet part of the need for long-range measures to remedy significant manpower shortages and to make medical research truly competitive with other very promising proposals are under review. The program has been enthusiastically received by the research community. We may confidently expect that it will result in significant advances toward the solution of a wide variety of disease problems.

The budget sent to the Congress in January by the previous administration was in this same short-sighted pattern. Members of the House will recall that the budget message spoke of "a substantial program increase for medical research and training." But what did the budget actually provide? It provided for an appropriation which was $6 million less than the Congress appropriated for 1961. The budget cutters created the illusion of an increase by putting their sharp pencils to work on the 1961 figures. To get a favorable comparison they cut out of the 1961 figure a lot of so-called nonrecurring items and so came up with an apparent increase.

Frankly, I am disappointed. I had hoped—not for partisan reasons but because I feel so strongly that we have no obligation more demanding of us than promoting the health and welfare of our people—that the new administration would develop a vigorous, forward-looking program to meet the needs of medical research.

I had hoped that we would see the new administration take real budgetary action in regard to the NIH programs. As it has not yet seen fit to do so, it remains the responsibility of the Congress to press on in this vital work. The parallel program, launched to meet part of the need for long-range measures to remedy significant manpower shortages and to make medical research truly competitive with other very promising proposals are under review. The program has been enthusiastically received by the research community. We may confidently expect that it will result in significant advances toward the solution of a wide variety of disease problems.
under its $5 million appropriation. The Institute of Mental Health had 11 totaling over $4 million and only had half a a million dollars. The Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, which also had only half a million dollars, had 14 applications totaling nearly $2 million. These are programs that must obviously be continued.

The committee received evidence that there is a need to develop the center concept for anesthesiology. The field that is deeply concerned with the public health even though its importance has not been sufficiently understood. Competent surgery is impossible without competent anesthesia. It is, therefore, disturbing to me that the Institute now faces a critical personnel problem.

The NIH, through its grant programs, has progressively strengthened the universities and medical schools and enabled them to embark on stimulating research programs. This was the aim of the opportunity for part-time practice, which the government does not permit. Three of these men accepted. It is a fair guess that four annual income will be $30,000 or better.

I might add that it speaks well for the spirit which prevails at NIH that the four man passed up the opportunity to increase his income by more than 50 percent and chose to stay in Bethesda. It is clear to me that NIH must be given some flexibility in its salary structure so that it will retain its ability to attract and to hold men of superior talent.

The committee has therefore urged the Surgeon General and the Secretary to give prompt consideration to this problem and to make suitable recommendations to the appropriate congressional committees.

The impressive catalog of the achievements of NIH scientists, and of the several thousand outside investigators whose work NIH supports, has focused the committee's attention on a highly important aspect of research to which too little attention is given. This is the
communication of research results to medical practitioners.

The ultimate purpose of medical research is to make it possible for the medical and health professions to give the American people more effective medical care. It is for this reason that the public supports research programs so enthusiastically and it is for this purpose—i.e., the application of such desirable principles available for them.

Let no one forget that a research project does not end until the applicable results have been made readily available to medical practitioners throughout the country.

I do not pretend that this is a simple task. The mechanisms available at present—medical journals and other publications, symposia, medical conventions, and the other traditional means of professional communication—are slow and cumbersome. They do not always reach many practitioners who are either too busy to avail themselves of these means or are in remote areas not easily served by some of them.

But NIH has taken too little initiative in tackling the communication problem and in applying the great progress which has been made in communication techniques to the areas of its special interests and responsibilities. The committee feels that the opportunities for radically new approaches to the communication problem need to be thoroughly and systematically explored.

No funds have been specifically earmarked for this purpose in the 1962 appropriation but the committee has made it clear to NIH that it expects it to present, at next year's hearings, a well-considered plan which will set out the responsibilities of the various components of the Public Health Service and outline a vigorous developmental program in medical communication.

Another area which might profitably receive more attention—as NIH itself has recognized—is the application of physical science and engineering techniques to medical research problems. The possibilities range from the development of simple prosthetic devices to new surgical tools and elaborate automated laboratory instruments. We had some interesting testimony on this during the hearings from a couple of witnesses who showed the committee an ingenious mechanism for stapling together thin blood vessels which cannot be sewn by hand and told us about a small electronic device which a heart patient might wear to warn him of over-exertion.

During the course of the testimony by outstanding leaders in the fields of research, health services, and medicine, several witnesses emphasized the problem presented by the rapidly rising cost of present-day hospital care. Research has made medical and surgical care cheaper and faster, but the resulting changes in the nature and character of hospital and medical practice have been major barriers to the widespread application of new techniques and research findings because of the cost. It has therefore become urgently necessary to determine the most effective and economical means of providing these new approaches to the diagnosis and treatment of disease in the hospital setting.

Witnesses emphasized that these approaches could be developed by carrying out research on hospital design and construction of hospitals and treatment facilities to determine how patients, especially those requiring intensive care, could be best handled in the most use of research findings, and at the same time, reduce to a minimum the costs involved. The committee was much impressed by this testimony.

The committee has therefore included in the bill a new appropriation of $10 million for grants for hospital research facilities. These funds would be used for making grants, as authorized by section 333(a) of the Public Health Service Act. These grants would be made on a matching basis which would permit the use of Federal funds for not more than two-thirds of the cost of these facilities.

I have not attempted to discuss each of the programs which funds are appropriated in this bill.

I have, for example, said nothing about the new institutional grants which were authorized by the Congress at the end of the last session. Five percent of the research project funds in this year's appropriation will be used to make these grants for medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health schools, and certain other institutions, for the general support of their research and research-training activities.

I have said nothing about the new program, which the Congress also approved last year, for making research career awards to selected investigators who want to devote their professional life to medical research.

Both of these programs are important steps in the development of even closer cooperative relations between the NIH and the institutions in which the bulk of non-Federal medical research is conducted. Both are described in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill.

The major items which the Bureau of the Budget so recklessly cut from the budget request and which the committee has restored are $17,500,000 for the support of new research projects; $9,500,000 for the institutional research grant program; $14 million for the increased support of general therapeutic and metabolic research centers; $7,500,000 for the enlargement of the categorical clinical research grant program; and $5 million for a new program for special research resources centers.

I am sure that the House will agree that these are important and necessary elements in the further growth of medical research which should not be impeded by the lack of essential funds.

These appropriations for the National Institutes of Health total $488 million, including $30 million for the sixth and final year of the program under the present Health Research Facilities Construction Act. This is a small sum in relation to the important work which it serves. It is, my colleagues, the minimum investment we dare make to promote so fundamental an aspect of the general welfare as the people's health.

For grants for waste treatment works construction, we allowed the full $50 million which is authorized by law.

For foreign quarantine activities, because of the increased foreign travel into this country, especially at airports, we allowed an increase of $300,000.

In our hospital and medical care program, in order to make them first-class hospitals, we have raised that figure by $500,000.

Four years ago the Surgeon General had special surveys made of the Public Health Service hospitals to determine their staffing needs. Even in view of the considerable needs that were demonstrated by these surveys, only modest increases were provided in fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 as the first three steps in a 4-year program to get the hospitals to an adequate staffing level. The 1962 budget provided for an increase of only 27 additional man-years of employment. In recognition of the inadequacy of the budget request the justification stated the estimate provides for additional staff in the hospitals to the staffing level approaching that which was identified as needed. Everyone who has made any serious study of the Public Health Service hospitals has concluded that there are two definite needs that are not yet filled. One is for additional operating staff and the other is for a good research program which will help in attracting and retaining good personnel as well as contributing to our conquest of disease. The committee will expect that the increase of $1 million be allocated to these two purposes, giving first priority to operating personnel, thus assuring better care for patients.

In the National Institutes of Health, and this is where the largest increases are, we have raised the President's budget by $58 million. This is a compromise figure.

There were several figures the committee had to consider. The original estimates of the Institute directors, the original budget submitted in January, the revised President's figure, the public witnesses requests, and so forth. The amount of $641 million included in the bill is the U.S. Public Health Service's final official request which was cut $58 million by the Bureau of the Budget.

We have $5 million for grant for construction of cancer research facilities on a nonmatching basis because we find that over and above one of the greatest needs in cancer research is lack of facilities.

Then we have $10 million for research in the construction of hospital facilities. We are convinced that it will cut the cost of care in hospitals, which is going up and up and up. About 65 percent of our bills in a hospital represent personnel costs, and the average hospital cost has gone up 300 percent in the last 20 years.

A 6-year study was carried on in Rochester, Minn. It was a controlled study of the usual hospital unit. It was done by people that with a new design, they could reduce the cost from $54 per day to $14. They claim 60-
percent of all hospital patients in any given area in the country require general hospital care. About 20 percent do not require such care, and among them is 20 percent of the population in the hospital that demands that kind of intensive care which is the most expensive, that is, when there is a nurse around the clock—3 nurses which cost $50 per day. In some of our Eastern States it will go as high as $60 and $70 a day. They found by building this circular hospital and having the nurses in the center, where the nurse can see every patient and the patient can see the nurse, that they can bring about this economy and also that in one 8-hour shift a nurse will walk more than a mile less than she would in the old rectangular designed hospitals that have been built heretofore. They gave us other facts and figures which are in the hearings, but the main thing is that through a controlled study like this, they have been able to reduce the cost of nursing for the people who need the most intensive care from $54 to $14 per day, or $40 a day.

Grants for construction of health research facilities was allowed $30 million. Authorization for this runs out this year, but legislation has been introduced to increase this to $50 million. We gave them just what they asked for.

Scientific activities overseas: We reduced the request by $2,084,000, but allowed $4,293,000 more than they have this year.

National health statistics: We gave what they asked for.

The National Library of Medicine is the best library of its kind in the world. We gave just what they asked for.

For St. Elizabeths Hospital, we have increased this appropriation by $166,000 to fully man the new buildings that have been built out there and provided 150 more positions for St. Elizabeths than called for in the budget. Now we come to the Social Security Administration. We increased the limitation on "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age Insurance" from $320,000 to buy some land adjacent to their site in Baltimore. It undoubtedly will be needed in the near future to enable them to build larger quarters. We were told that if we did not buy the land now it would surely cost much more later on.

For grants to States for public assistance, we gave them the request of $5,285 million. This is the largest single item in the bill, and there is absolutely nothing we can do about it, for the law provides that if the States put up their money, under the law, the Federal Government is bound to match it. In the present bill it is $2,285 million. There is nothing we can do about it unless we change the law.

For a request for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance $79,000.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

For salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, the request was $25 million. It has been suggested to every Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and every administrator of the Federal Security Agency that it is wrong to relegate the Children's Bureau to the Secretary of the Treasury. The committee strongly feels that the responsibilities and the activities of the Children's Bureau are of sufficient importance to warrant a place on a level directly below the Secretary rather than being just another office in the Social Security Administration. The Secretary has always had the authority to make such an organizational change and give the Children's Bureau the recognition that it deserves. The committee also feels that the Children's Bureau should be given more responsibilities for research than it has in the past. The research programs of the National Institutes of Health have been primarily in the disease areas and the Committee is of the opinion that this is as it should be. There has been some tendency however during the past few years to do more work in the behavioral research area in connection with children. This, it seems to the committee, should more properly be the role of the Children's Bureau. When this was discussed during the hearings, considerable emphasis was placed upon the authority of the Children's Bureau to make research grants in this area. While much important research could be done directly the research program should include extramural activities. The committee is specifically anxious that the Children's Bureau be given a more important role in connection with these human problems. It may well be that the Committee itself is as much at fault as anyone for the current situation, for the committee encouraged the Mental Health Institute in this field rather than attempting to lay a foundation, and encouraging the Department to take the steps necessary, for such a program in the Medical field. Children's Bureau, however, it will be expected that the Department give serious consideration to this matter during the next year and if necessary seek legislation to provide a well-rounded program possible; and be prepared to present such a well-rounded program to the committee next year.

We increased grants to Stakes for maternal and child welfare by $2,350,000. The net increase over the amount requested represents an increase of $1 million each for the three original categories and a reduction of $650,000 in the amount requested for the new activity "Research or demonstrating projects in child welfare." There was $1 million requested for the later program of which $350,000 was estimated to be necessary for grants to a third level position for 1962, and $650,000 was for obligations to be incurred in 1963 and succeeding years. The committee does not feel that it is wise to deviate from the standard procedure of appropriating funds for such programs on an annual basis.

Then there are several items for which we allowed the budget request without change: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner; American Printing House for the Blind; Gallaudet College, the only college in the world for deaf people; and Howard University.

PROGRAM IN AGING

We have included the full amount of the budget request for the Office of the Secretary.

During the hearings I expressed deep concern, disappointment, and dissatisfaction with the Department's activities in aging. There is no clearly defined program and little to be seen of leadership directed toward positive action following the White House Conference on Aging.

The report of the Conference, "The Nation and Its Older People," transmitted to the President, April 10, 1961, is not the blueprint for action the country was promised during the years preceding the Conference and in the hundreds of meetings that were held throughout the Nation in preparation for it.

The report at best is little more than a directory of participants, a collection of general policy statements, and a wide assortment of recommendations that have little significance without some in-
dication of the plans that will convert them into action.

Unless a more useful document is prepared for the American public with a determination on the part of HEW to follow through, the White House Conference on Aging will have been not only one of the most expensive, but the least productive of the national conferences, and could become one of the cruellest hoaxes ever perpetrated against the Nation's senior citizens. Immediate action must be taken to develop a program that will achieve the aims and purposes set forth in the bill which established the conference.

The Office of Field Administration asked for $18,000 new positions, for an analyst and a secretary in each regional office. We denied that request. The total reduction was $138,000.

In related agencies, the National Labor Relations Board has reported on funds for Public Law 874. The funds appropriated are simply for the permanent section of the law which applies 100 percent to the children who live on Federal property and their parents live on Federal property. The Committee on Education is working on a bill which will extend the section B authorization for research that was cut out on private property although their parents work on Federal installations. If that bill is passed, does the gentleman expect to have the gentleman from California that when this legislation is extended we will try to do everything we can to get the appropriation to meet the law as extended. Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. On page 9 of the report, at the bottom of the page, you indicate a decrease of a million dollars from the amount requested for national defense fellowships.

Did the gentleman explain why there was such a reduction in the amount requested?

Mr. FOGRARTY. This has been one of the more controversial sections of the Office of Education. It has received some bad publicity with reference to certain of the fellowships that were granted in connection with the teaching of folklore and other things like that. As a result, this million dollars was cut. I may say to the gentleman there were some who wanted to cut a lot more.

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

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

Mr. BALDWIN. On the same page 9 of the report, the Committee has reported on funds for Public Law 874. The funds appropriated are simply for the permanent section of the law which applies 100 percent to the children who live on Federal property and their parents live on Federal property. The Committee on Education is working on a bill which will extend the section B authorization for research that was cut out on private property although their parents work on Federal installations. If that bill is passed, does the gentleman expect to have the initiative to bring a supplemental appropriation bill in during this session to provide the funds required?

Mr. FOGRARTY. We would expect the administration to send up a request for a supplemental bill, and I hope we will give them every due they are entitled to under the law. That has been my position since 1959.

Mr. BALDWIN. I appreciate that. The gentleman from Rhode Island has been a leader in this field for Public Law 874. The reason I raised the point is due to the fact that some school districts are having great difficulty and will have more difficulty unless those funds are appropriated in the current session.

Mr. FOGRARTY. I can assure the gentleman from California that when this legislation is extended we will try to do everything we can to get the appropriation to meet the law as extended. Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say he gave the Office of the Secretary of Labor a special assistant as requested by the Department and as described in the hearings?

Mr. FOGRARTY. A special assistant, yes.

Mr. GROSS. A special assistant to the assistant Secretary?

Mr. FOGRARTY. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. You gave them an assistant?

Mr. FOGRARTY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That was for the purpose of maintaining proper relations with other Departments?

Mr. FOGRARTY. No.

Mr. GROSS. You did not give them this assistant?

Mr. FOGRARTY. No, not for liaison work with other Departments.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. I do not know of any other department that has to have a special assistant to maintain proper relations with other departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGRARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that you increased the number of labor attaches in foreign countries?

Mr. FOGRARTY. No. All this does is to provide more funds for the people here in Washington. These people in the Department of Labor I might say have been doing an excellent job. They asked for a $132,000 increase. We allowed them an increase of $66,000, half of what they requested. The Labor attaches are appointed through the Secretary of State. These people in the Department of Labor also back up the delegates to the International Labor Organization. That meeting is going to be held next month in Geneva.

Mr. GROSS. So they did get some more money for the reason stated in the hearings, because the Labor Department has acquired heavy new responsibilities in respect to the development of U.S. foreign policy.

Since when did the Department of Labor start becoming a vital factor in foreign policy?

Mr. FOGRARTY. I do not know how vital it is.

Mr. GROSS. Well, having heavy new responsibilities.

Mr. FOGRARTY. I thought the witness gave a very good account of the International Labor Organization. I thought what he said made sense; that in some foreign countries many of the leaders in government came up from the ranks of labor, and it is good to have people who know the problems of labor in these countries, like Mr. La Follette for example.

Mr. GROSS. Did we have labor attaches in Cuba, and if we did, what happened to that situation?

Mr. FOGRARTY. We do not have a labor attaché in every country in the world.

Mr. GROSS. Now, I understand from the hearings that these labor attaches have trained some place they are given training some place. Can the gentleman tell me where that school may be and who operates the training school?

Mr. FOGRARTY. The Department of State, I assume.

Mr. GROSS. The Department of State?

Mr. FOGRARTY. Yes. The labor attaches are appointed by the Department of State. They are not appointed by the Department of Labor, and there is nothing in here for labor attaches; not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. No money in this bill for labor attaches?

Mr. FOGRARTY. No.

Mr. GROSS. Even through the Department of Labor?

Mr. FOGRARTY. No. This section in the Department of Labor has been headed by Mr. Lodge for the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. GROSS. Is Lodge the man who has had such wonderful training through his father in operating the giveaway program?

Mr. FOGRARTY. Yes. He is still is, Mr. GROSS. He is still head of this program for the Department of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I have no doubt of that. If you can dig up any more internationalists to run this show, they will be dug up.

Mr. FOGRARTY. I think he has done a very good job. He is a very energetic young man, and I think he is putting some sense into this program. He is doing a good job.

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

Mr. FOGRARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I think it ought to be said that in many countries which have strong labor movements and sometimes labor governments, most of the important and effective work that has been done has been done by labor governments, most of the important and effective work that has been done by men coming out of our own labor movement. They understand the kind of fight that has to be made because they went through the battle of resisting Communist infiltration of some unions in this country. They have exerted a constructive and helpful influence in keeping several other countries the free world instead of having their will as free nations gradually eroded with inevitable movement toward or into the other camp. These labor leaders ought to be commended for the beneficial work they have done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder
if the Committee on Foreign Affairs called Mr. Goldberg up to tell them how to handle these foreign aid bills and so on and so forth.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether they did or not, but it might have been a good idea, because he is a very able man.

Mr. GROSS. From what he said it would be a good idea.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Goldberg is going to be one of our great Secretaries of Labor.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Speaking about Mr. Goldberg, he just testified last week that all the jobs even in the defense plants should belong to union men. And, when the gentleman from Minnesota talks about the State Department and the Foreign Service knowing what we do, I wonder if the gentleman has forgotten about Walter Reuther’s training in Russia, together with his brother, when they were working in that capacity.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know where he got his training but wherever he got it, it has stood him in good stead. I do not think there is one any more willing or who has done more to fight communism in this country than Walter Reuther.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to call the gentleman’s attention to the second paragraph on page 41 of the report:

The bill includes $85,000, the amount of the request, as the final amount necessary to liquidate contract authority previously granted for the construction of the auditorium-fine arts building.

I wonder if the gentleman could tell me the progress of the program for the auditorium-fine arts building, for Howard University, and just what the liquidation of the contract authority portends for the future. The gentleman knows of my long interest in Howard University.

Mr. FOGARTY. We chided them a little bit on their presentation because in all of their building programs they have been a year or two behind. But we have given them enough to complete the building.

Mrs. CHURCH. Then there is nothing portentous about the term liquidation? Nothing to indicate that completion of the building will be interfered with?

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, no. We are just finishing the financing.

Mrs. CHURCH. Then there is no intent to phase out any part of the programs?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. We gave them everything they asked for.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think they deserve it. I think they are doing a good job at Howard University. That is becoming a really great school, and this Congress and past Congresses have helped tremendously in this regard.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. On page 22 I notice the committee recommended that 5 percent of the total appropriation for research grants be allowed in the form of institutional grants to public and other non-profit institutions. Is it the intention of the committee to increase this gradually up to 15 percent that was originally authorized?

Mr. FOGARTY. That would be based on the testimony next year. When the act passed Congress a year ago the plan of administration called for 5 percent for the first year, 10 percent the second year, and then it will go up to 15 percent.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It will be the intention of the Chairman of the committee to recommend that the authorization be raised to the 15 percent figure?

Mr. FOGARTY. Unless something happens to indicate this program is not an efficient way to carry out the research program.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman and I commend him for his outstanding work in this field of medical research.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate and commend him for his outstanding work in the field of medical research.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, first may I compliment the gentleman on what I think is a very fine report and a very fine bill.

Regarding the Department of Labor appropriations as set out in Report No. 392, page 5, of the Appropriations Committee, I note that the committee has provided for a substantial increase in the appropriated appropriation for the Bureau or Labor Standards. As the Members know, the Special Subcommittee on Labor will begin hearings Wednesday, May 24, on amendments to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act which is administered by the Bureau of Labor Standards.

I think the Members, therefore, would be interested in comments contained on page 5 of the report with respect to the need for amendments to the act. The report states:

Activities required of this Bureau by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act cost approximately $550,000 per year. Secretary Mitchell stated that this act provides only a shameful illusion to those who do not have any done to manipulate or embezzle funds. When asked his opinion of this statement, Secretary Goldberg said “I join in that statement 100 percent.”

I would like to emphasize the last statement wherein the committee hopes that legislative action will be taken to correct this matter.

I would like to emphasize the last statement wherein the committee hopes that legislative action will be taken to correct the deficiencies in the present law. This becomes very meaningful in view of our hearings to begin next week on proposed amendments, and I hope all interested Members will contact the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was testified by Secretary Mitchell a year or two ago that this law did not really accomplish anything. We asked the present Secretary this year to give us his opinion. Mr. Mitchell and he said he did. That is why we put it in the report that way.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, one thing that has bothered me over a considerable period of time has been the method of processing the total and permanent disability claims under the social security law. It has caused a great many complaints to be made to the office and Congressmen tell me that they have had similar difficulty. A great deal of time is spent by the congressional staffs in working on social security cases. I think this has been brought about partly because of the system by which the claims are processed.

The claimant makes his claim with the district office of the Social Security Administration. Under the law, of course, he is expected to make out his case, but unless a man was given assistance it would be impossible for many of them to make out their claims. The district office pays 100 percent of the claimant. However, he does not have the same assistance that a veteran receives where there is generally a county service officer, a veteran's council office in the Social Security Administration, and a service officer in the various veterans' organizations, locally, to assist the claimant.

After the claim has been processed in the district office, it goes to the State vocational rehabilitation office, which decides whether the claim should be paid. From there, it goes to the social security office at Baltimore, which again reviews the case and claim. While they have no authority to set aside the claim, they can ask for a reconsideration in some 55 percent of the claims, and the Baltimore office sends back all claims which they think are wrong to the State office. They have only authority to set aside the allowance of a claim they think is erroneous. The evidence shows that the State office had to reinvestigate or call for a reinvestigation in some 55 percent of the claims, and the Baltimore office sent back all claims which they think are wrong to the State office.

Thus the system is cumbersome, inefficient, and wasteful administratively. We have the unique situation where State vocational rehabilitation agencies, with no monetary interest, determine the eligibility of claimants applying for benefits under a Federal program. Since the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the expenses of the State agencies, and since the State agencies have no monetary stake in the program, there is obviously no incentive on the part of the State agencies to economize, or even operate efficiently, except the personal pride of the individuals.

Some have sought to defend this administrative monstrosity with the argument that it is a way of having the claimants come in contact with the facilities for rehabilitation and so be rehabilitated. The facts are that through this program and the 15 percent of their claims.

Mr. Mitchell replied:

My personal opinion is that if this were asked at the beginning of the program, I would have recommended against it, and I think it is now time to take another look at it. One of the lessons which we have learned is that some of the fundamental principles of Federal-State relations in that, for one thing, it gave the States an opportunity to write blank checks against Federal funds.

When asked, in connection with the hearings this year, Mr. Mitchell indicated that his opinion in the matter had not changed.

On October 23, 1959, the Comptroller General of the United States transmitted to the Speaker of the House a copy of the report on the General Accounting Office's study of this program. The Comptroller General pointed out that, while there are some excellent requirements which lead to waste of funds which were spent on Federal programs for medical examinations.

This report brought out the fact that budget controls were weak and applied differently in different States, that in many States records were insufficient to allow for a definite separation of funds which were spent for State programs and funds which were spent on Federal programs of determining disability, and that there absolutely no uniformity in fee schedules for medical examinations.

Just to take the medical fee schedules as one example, it was pointed out that of 34 contracting State agencies, 30 are free to revise the schedules used in their program without even relating them to other programs in the States. Among the various State agencies, some use the Federal program fee schedule, others use Veterans' Administration fee schedules, and one uses Blue Shield, but most set their own, which are revised from time to time, with no uniformity in the base schedule or the revisions as compared to what other States are doing. One thing is common—the fees and other costs are continuing to go up. While the cost per case for fiscal year 1960 was budgeted at $32.50, it actually amounted to $40.40. While the estimates for fiscal year 1961 were based on a presumption that the cost would average $38 per case during that fiscal year, however, at the time of the staff inquiry the unit cost had already risen to $41 per case. In 1957, the per capita average was $17.64. In just 4 years the cost has gone up over 100 percent.

While just the unnecessary expense of this program is certainly sufficient cause for change, the same basic administrative requirements which lead to waste of funds also lead to undue delays in claims processing, inconsistent determinations as to eligibility, and in general lead to unsatisfactory and inequitable treatment of claimants.

Coupled with these difficulties is an appeals system which leaves much to be desired. The Appeals Council is technically a part of the Office of the Secretary; however, nearly all employees are paid from Social Security Administration funds and are actually under the supervisory control of the Social Security Administration rather than under the Secretary. This cannot help but influence appeals decisions.

If any further proof of the weakness of this whole system were needed, one has only to look at the sorry court record to find it. According to recent statistics, of the cases that were taken to court, 173 had been affirmed and 103 were reversed. This is not to say that the court found that in 173 cases the appeals were correctly decided, but only that the court found there was sufficient evidence in the case to sustain a finding. Thus in over a third of the cases the court found that there was not even sufficient evidence to sustain a finding. This is practically the same as the court's setting aside the verdict of a jury. It certainly suggests that something is wrong with this program.

On the whole, I think the social security district office and the review office in Baltimore are doing a good job under the circumstances. I think that the problem is the system under which they work. The following facts will show that something must be wrong with the system besides the expense and unnecessary delay.

There are approximately 30,000 applicants each month under the disability provisions of the act. Of this number, approximately 19,000 will be allowed and 11,000 will be disallowed. Out of the group whose claims are disallowed, about 3,000 will want their cases reconsidered. Of that number, about 40 percent, or 1,200, will have their claims allowed on reconsideration. Out of the 69 percent, or 1,700 disallowed, about 700 will go on to a requested hearing before the Appeals Council. Of that number, about 200, or 30 percent of those whose claims were disallowed, will have them allowed before the referee of the Appeals Council.

Then, a small percentage go to court, and of that number over one-third have
their claims allowed. This leaves one to wonder about the 8,000-plus whose claims are denied and never ask for reconsideration or appeal. Undoubtedly, many claims for disability are filed which are unfounded and should not be allowed, but when 40 or so percent of those who ask for a rehearing after their claims have been denied are then allowed the claims on reconsideration, and the claims of 30 percent of those who have had them denied on reconsideration are allowed by the referee or the Appeals Council—and then over one-third of those disallowed by the Appeals Council are allowed by the court—one wonders, if these 8,000 who did not ask for reconsideration had the ability or the assistance to exercise their rights, just how large a percentage of these disallowed claims would eventually have been allowed.

I want my Government to be a fair government in this case. I am certain in my own mind that justice is being denied a great many people. Certainly if there is any group of people in our Nation that deserves just treatment, it is the group of disabled who in so many cases are unable to help themselves. In the interests of efficient government, in the interests of saving the taxpayers millions of dollars now being wasted, and for just plain humanitarian reasons, I hope that we will not put off much longer straightening out the administration mess that we have helped create in connection with this program.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to say to the gentleman that no Member of the Congress performs a more useful and valuable work than the gentleman now in the House. It is a stimulus to national morale, and an example of dedication to the public service over and beyond personal ambition and aims when the gentleman offered almost on a shoestring a great service to the country and body, elected to remain here in this body to continue the great and dedicated work he is doing, for which the American people always will be indebted to him.

I have received a number of telegrams from my constituents interested in the continuance on an enlarged scale of apprenticeship training. I commend the gentleman, but in this case I am certain that the subcommittee is acting favorably in that area.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. We increased that amount by $600,000 over the budget. Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I have received a telegram from the chancellor of the University of Chicago, reading:

Strongly urge restoration of funds for support of fellowships which are of great importance to programs being financed jointly by the Government and the universities.

Is that covered in the present bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, not to his liking.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does my colleague disagree with the eminent chancellor of the University of Chicago?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is an unanimous report. There was some give and take on this, and what we came out with is the best compromise we could agree on.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I appreciate that in the grinding of the legislative mills compromises sometimes become necessary, but I do hope that in the other body the funds will be restored as recommended by the chancellor of the University of Chicago who is an outstanding scientist and educator, and the House conference will agree to accept such restoration, if in the judgment of the other body, it is made.

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

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

Mr. BECKWITH. I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island. He knows that I am interested in what procedure the Government follows in connection with hiring older people. I note on page 41 of the report this short paragraph that I would like to read:

During the hearings the chairman of the subcommittee expressed disappointment and dissatisfaction with the Department's activities in aging. There is no clearly defined program and little evidence of leadership directed toward positive action following the White House Conference on Aging.

There has been a lot of talk about helping the aged to obtain work. I personally have undertaken from time to time to ascertain from the various departments of the Government the number of people actually hired 65 years of age or older in their employ. I note on page 46 of the report this short paragraph that I would like to read:

"There has been a policy of not discriminating against older people, but when you ask for figures they do not seem to have them and are not interested in obtaining them. The gentleman has undertaken to help me get those figures, and I want to thank him again for that, but I hope too, that a new effort will be made to find out whether or not the various departments are in truth and in fact following their own policies about hiring older people."

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GIAIMO. On the east coast near Milford, Conn., the Fish and Wildlife Service specializes in shellfish and oyster culture where we have a great industry in shellfish and oysters. At the present time there is pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a bill which will enlarge the functions of this fish and wildlife agency in Milford, which will initiate a research project into the whole area of the oyster industry and the commercial production of shellfish and oysters.

Mr. FOGARTY. This bill would have no effect on that at all.

Mr. GIAIMO. Would this have any effect on that?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman raised the question with me a couple of days ago, and I went to the trouble to get the details on this subject. We have complete cooperation between the Public Health Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service. There is no duplication of effort there at all. But they work together and the people of the Public Health Service are backing this bill that you speak of.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I commend the gentleman and the committee for giving cognizance to the extremely serious problems of automation and recommending additional funds for the Department of Labor in the retraining of industrial workers. I note on page 57 of the hearings the gentlemen states:

We have talked a lot about retraining workers during the last 4 or 5 years, but I do not think anything very worthwhile has materialized.

I wonder if the gentleman does not feel this is in an area where we could make a larger investment?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am sure we could. We have been asking the Secretary of Labor every year to spend more time and effort in this area. Everyone agrees more should be done, but nothing much has been accomplished.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The records of the Congress will show that the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island has been closely associated with me in our effort to do something about the education program of the United States. I am just a little bit surprised to see reductions made in the appropriation.
Mr. FOGARTY. As I said a while ago, this is a unanimous report and, therefore, a compromise report.

Mr. BATES. It would just like to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island that my Committee on General Education will begin hearings on amendments to the Defense Education Act on Tuesday of next week, and we will probably be talking to you a little bit later.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island for the work he has done in this matter. I also have given my final remarks and for the statue he gives to the Congress and for the help he has given me and for the stature he gives to the State of Rhode Island by virtue of his position here in the Congress.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank my colleague.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island and the subcommittee and the staff for the excellent report on this bill.

(Mrs. SULLIVAN addressed the Committee. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

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

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

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman will recall Dr. Ralph A. Sawyer, vice president of the Department of Research at the University of Michigan who appeared following me and Senator Hart before the gentlemen, to urge the removal of the 15-percent limitation on overhead expenses.

His testimony appears at page 692 of the hearings with regard to section 204, page 48 of the bill. I gather that no action was taken by the subcommittee with respect to either the removal of that limitation of 15 percent or an increase in the percentage. Was this considered by the committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, it was considered. I think the gentleman from Michigan made a very excellent statement, and Doctor Sawyer who brought with him from the University of Michigan made a fine statement. We did not, however, have the votes in the committee to raise the ceiling. Some members wanted to cut it below 15 percent. The result is that we have a compromise agreement to hold what we have.

Mr. MEADER. I take it the gentleman himself is receptive to the suggestion and that he himself favors some relaxation of this limitation.

Mr. FOGARTY. There are many who feel that direct aid to medical schools is the answer. I think the quicker we get that the better off we are going to be. I think we should have some legislation along this line. We should find a way to increase the ceiling.

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

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

Mr. DURNO. I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Rhode Island. As he may know, I have been a practicing physician for 35 years. I realize what the gentleman has in getting this appropriation. I am interested in knowing how you go about justifying the $58 million in excess of the request. What is the authority for the increase?

Mr. FOGARTY. First, we asked the various institute directors what they thought they needed. We got their estimates. Then we asked the Surgeon General what his recommendation was for those institutes. He generally cuts the requests by a few million dollars. Then it goes to the Department and to the Bureau in Washington where they cut it further. Sometimes in the Bureau of the Budget it is just an arbitrary cut to come within a ceiling.

After listening to all the Government people, we have some of the outstanding people in these various categories come in, at their own expense, and they tell us what they think ought to be done in these various areas.

This amount of $641 million is the exact amount the Surgeon General said was required. This was the compromise we reached.

I wanted to include $200 million over the budget. I think we could spend $200 million more very effectively.

Mr. DURNO. This is an emotional matter. I agree that very much more could be spent, but I would like to ask one final question: Did organized medicine ask for this?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. They had an opportunity. We never refuse anyone from appearing before our committee and testifying. We have talked to them from time to time, and in the research field, we find ourselves in agreement with the organized professional associations.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. First, I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, and the subcommittee for its work. I have read a great deal of the hearings and I find them most enlightening. But there are three major cuts which are distressing to me. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, it is my intention to follow the lead of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

I am concerned, however, about the reduction of a million dollars in fellowships under the National Defense Education Act. This act is barely underway. If, indeed, its original purpose was meritorious at all, they should be given more now.

The second cut is a reduction of $350,000 in the request for institutes for the guidance of personnel, something badly needed throughout the whole system and in the National Defense Education Act. Many of us felt that the original amount provided and requested was too little.

The third one is the $500,000 cut in the salaries and expenses section. This would retard the work of the educational statistics group, as well as the college information center, which is vitally needed.

I think that these three cuts do great violence to the program of education under the National Defense Education Act.

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

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

Mr. BATES. I observe in the report that the committee has included a provision of $1,800,000 for the establishment and operation of shellfish laboratories.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BATES. I wish to commend the committee for that. We have a very serious problem up there. I am well acquainted with the situation on the east coast. I thank the gentleman for including this in the report.

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

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express approval of the report of the House Committee on Appropriations, presented by my colleague from Rhode Island, John Fogarty, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Many of the provisions of this bill, in addition to benefiting all the people of this Nation, are of special interest to the people of Rhode Island.

An example of this is the inclusion of funds in the Office of the Secretary of Labor to institute an effective program for the training of men and women for skilled industrial positions. As the committee's report points out, this is of particular importance in areas where migration of industry and other economic factors have raised unemployment to high levels. The value of such a program cannot be too highly estimated, because the benefits which will accrue to those areas where chronic unemployment exists are innumerable.

With respect to the all-important field of education, grants for library services assistance for school construction, expansion of teaching and education for the mentally retarded, and those with special handicaps, and provision for a program in cooperative research are of the greatest necessity.

Also, funds for accident prevention, chronic diseases and health of the aged, community health research, control of tuberculosis, nursing services and resources, hospital construction activities, and other health services are important to the well-being of Rhode Island as
well as that of the entire country. The expansion of programs for cancer research, mental health activities, research in heart disease, arthritis, and other illnesses are essential phases of integrated, realistic health planning.

I am very happy to note that funds have been recommended for the establishment of a Public Health Service shellfish laboratory in the East. This will greatly benefit Rhode Island due to the importance of the shellfish industry to my State and the danger to health which results from the contamination of water in which many shellfish are to be found. Progress toward providing solutions for this problem is very desirable and of great concern to Rhode Island.

The expansion of services under the Social Security Administration through increased grants to States for public assistance, maternal and child welfare, provision for cooperative research in social security, continues and increases the benefits our citizens enjoy under our social security system.

The committee is to be commended for its realistic appraisal of human needs and the reality of the financial situation of these needs. Such farsighted judgments deserve careful consideration and approval by the Congress.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee submitting the report on the bill covering appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I should like to express my strong support of the committee's actions and recommendations and urge that the House approve them. I have served on this committee in the 83rd, 85th, 86th as well as now in the 87th Congresses, and I am acutely aware of how the programs of these agencies directly affect the lives and welfare of every man, woman, and child in this country. The Members of this Congress are also well aware of what these programs mean to each of our citizens, ranging as they do from unemployment compensation to such things that shall have a profound effect on our future as educational research.

NATION'S HEALTH IMPORTANT

There are many areas represented in these appropriations that I could comment on, but I would like now to discuss some of the National Institutes of Health activities not covered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY) in his remarks. We give special emphasis to the appropriations of NIH for a number of reasons. First, because these appropriations support a series of programs which are of fundamental importance to the health and well-being of this Nation. This is an area of the national interest with which the citizens of the country are concerned since my election to the Congress. The research programs carried out by the National Institutes of Health have made possible a substantial expansion of knowledge concerning disease and health problems. The continued support of these programs will substantially increase the probability of major discoveries which will have as powerful effect upon the health status of the Nation in the future as the discovery of the antibiotics and the nature of our insulin was in the past. Second, I am convinced that the people of this country are fully in support of the continued effort to enlarge the National medical research program. Those of us on the committee who work closely with the research and related programs served by these appropriations can attest—simply from the amount and nature of our mail from the general public—to the desire for a greater effort in medical research. One thing that is generally acknowledged in this outpouring of sentiment is that productive medical research is that the United States is second to none in this field. Of this we can be proud because a healthy people, is a strong people, and a healthy nation is a strong nation. If we are to remain free from today's health hazards and from those that may involve from today's environment and in some situations involve those who seek to dominate us, then the answer is quite clear:

We must continue to make this investment commensurate with our intellectual and financial capacity to seek, find, and apply new knowledge for the benefit of man.

A third reason for my interest in the programs of the National Institutes of Health is that the Members of this Congress should be aware of this: For a number of years, our committee and those who administer the programs of the National Institutes of Health have been agreed that there is one key factor in developing a logical, orderly, fruitful national medical research program, namely, balance. Support of current research must be balanced by efforts to enlarge the medical research manpower of the future through training. These programs in turn must be completed by efforts to provide research facilities through construction—particularly for the highly specialized and complex facilities which research in major disease programs now require.

BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

During the past 2 years it has become more and more evident that development of up-to-date research facilities—some of which could be identified as large, regional, or national resources—was lagging behind. To get some measure of just where we stand, we need to look at the picture for the years 1956-58. As of March 1958, $22 million were authorized for the Public Health Service omnibus bill was enacted. That legislation through a key action (433a) provided the statutory authority for the Public Health Service to make grants for the construction of medical research facilities essential for the carrying out of research in the several categorical disease areas. Under this authority, 196 applications were made for the construction of cancer and heart research facilities, but the Korean war, among other factors, brought to a halt the processing of these applications. From that time until 1956, a hiatus—in retrospect, a very serious hiatus—occurred. In 1956, the Congress added title VII to the Public Health Service Act, authorizing up to $30 million each year for 3 years to assist in the construction and equipping of research facilities to enlarge the research capacity of medical schools, universities, and other institutions for research in the sciences related to health. These general needs have been the subject of hearings since 1956. This extension of the authority for an additional 3 years—through fiscal year 1962—was authorized. These requests have been routinely documented in more than 1,100 applications from institutions doing health-related research—by public and private nonprofit schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health; and by hospitals, universities, and other research institutions. From the $180 million appropriated for the first 3 program years, funds have been awarded to 305 institutions in 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. According to the latest report we have received, 206 of these projects have been completed. Over 180 projects are under contract—many of which are nearing completion.

With the kind of progress we have experienced in the construction of research facilities in the past 3 years, one might ask: "Is this enough? Does this not satisfy the need?" The answer, our committee has found, is positively "No." The counts. First, of the amounts authorized for this program are inadequate to meet any but a small portion of the need that exists. Secondly, the limitations of our matching program simply are too restrictive to allow many institutions to help fill national research needs perceived by our committee because of the inability of those institutions to finance construction of facilities for which they are otherwise well qualified. Thirdly, since the program was directed to the general research needs of institutions it has had to provide support for construction of facilities directly aimed at the highly complex and specialized needs of research in two specific major disease problems.

Now on the first point—that is, the inadequacy of the appropriation authorization, we noted in the statement in support of this year's appropriation request that there are projects awaiting action, despite the fact that the full appropriation has been used every year for the past 5 years. Let me give you the picture: As of March 10, 1961, there was a backlog of $22 million worth of projects that had been approved by the National Health Research Facilities Advisory Council but were awaiting payment. An additional 95 applications totaling over $3 million were pending, which represented new or deferred applications that were awaiting action of the Council. And an additional 95 notices of intent to apply that applications valued in excess of $35 million were on file. After persistent inquiry, our committee persuaded the expert witness on this subject to give us his best realistic estimate of the amount that
could be used each year. That estimate was $65 million a year—over twice our present limitation and $15 million a year more than authorization provided in the fiscal year of 1962. An authorization of $641 million for fiscal year 1962 was disregarded as the most pressing need in the area of cancer research which exists in this Nation today. This need was emphasized and heard during the many days of hearings held before our subcommittee.

Mr. Laird. In the area of cancer research facilities, limited to this categorical area, you have before you at the present time, I understand, a group of applications for medical research construction facilities. Present proposals of these applications were the certification that all avenues had been investigated and that the facilities which were proposed could not possibly be constructed if they were required to meet the standards of the Medical Research Facility Act. What do these applications total in dollars and cents?

Dr. Endcott. We have before us for consideration at the next meeting of the council some 30 applications for $28,500,000.

Mr. Laird. And there is a certification with these applications that the research facilities could not be constructed under any other program?

Dr. Endcott. We have asked them to demonstrate that they have exhausted every reasonable possibility of raising matching funds. Now, of course, all of these applicants will be visited before their grants are considered, so we have not extended this offer of sound matching funds.

Mr. Laird. You have $8 worth of applications for every $1 that you have available to you for this purpose?

Dr. Endcott. Yes, sir.

Mr. Laird. Do you know of any other program in which there is such a great demand for funds, in any ratio like that?

Dr. Endcott. Not this year, sir.

Against this historical backdrop, let us examine the most recent developments. First, and most importantly, what has happened as a result of the conservative start afforded by the $5 million cancer construction program authorized for the current year? Although this amount has been vastly exceeded by the relatively little positive publicity on the program, universities, medical schools, hospitals, and other research institutions have responded with well thought out programs in the cancer research field. In fact, I understand that the National Advisory Cancer Council, which met just last month, considered over 30 applications from nearly as many institutions for grants totaling over $25 million. This set of facts alone indicate that our earlier judgments not only were correct but that the allocation of priorities was probably conducted on the proper basis. I am thinking of a committee members or of the committee itself has been governed by considerations related to the party in power. There have been years, however, when the executive branch has been unduly restrictive in setting the level of its appropriation requests for medical research activities; and this, I am sorry to say, is one of those years.

We have heard much about the New Frontier but apparently it does not yet include the frontier of the medical sciences. This administration is organizing a bold new program to help the fellow man in underdeveloped countries but it is apparently not yet ready to expand a health research program which will benefit men everywhere. It apparently finds nothing odd in planning to spend three times as much to put man into space as it proposes to spend helping men everywhere. The needs of mankind. The steps we must take, as the facts have just related indicate, are:

First, we must not only continue the health research facilities construction program but must also increase its annual limitation in the years ahead, and

Second, we must not only continue the present nonmatching program for construction of research facilities to meet national and regional needs in the categorical area of cancer, but we must also expand this program to other categorical areas as opportunities and meaningful programs are developed and presented.

Mr. LAIRD. And there is a certification with the directors of the National Cancer Institute for the support of construction of research facilities to meet the urgent need to provide match making program fills specific needs. Now, I would like to turn to the other points having to do with the availability of support for the construction of categorical research facilities on a nonmatching basis. In the course of the committee's hearings last year, we requested and were provided with data obtained from NIH, its advisers, and others that clearly demonstrated the need for cancer research facilities. We were told that those needs were not otherwise typical of organizations doing research, since their programs focused on the cancer problem exclusively in contrast to most university research programs, which usually encompass a variety of research fields. The data, accumulated from 10 university research institutes, indicated an immediate need for over $28 million in research laboratory space. In addition, I made a special effort to bring out some estimate for the study of the status authority of such grants. It was generally acknowledged that purely categorical cancer research facilities represented a true national need. As a result, our subcommittee and the Congress provided a special earmark appropriation of $5 million to the National Cancer Institute for the support of construction of such facilities. This was not offered as a 1-year effort; it was a start upon which could be mounted a national program for cancer construction needs and one which might be extended to other categorical areas as needs were demonstrated and as programs were described and presented.

Considerable misinformation about this program has persisted, and, in fact, the administration itself early in this session offered—as part of its recommended legislation—a proposal to repeal the authority itself. I am thinking of a committee members or of the committee itself has been governed by considerations related to the party in power. There have been years, however, when the executive branch has been unduly restrictive in setting the level of its appropriation requests for medical research activities; and this, I am sorry to say, is one of those years.

Now I would like to turn to the general considerations surrounding my support for the appropriations for the Public Health Service's medical research activities. I am sure that there is general agreement on the consistent bipartisan nature of the support in Congress for these programs which seek to acquire new knowledge in order that people may have better health. I cannot recall that there has ever been a time when the action of a committee member or of the committee itself has been governed by considerations related to the party in power. There have been years, however, when the executive branch has been unduly restrictive in setting the level of its appropriation requests for medical research activities; and this, I am sorry to say, is one of those years.

These are the facts, then, that make our course clear; if medical research is to continue to flower, we must take the steps to see that the construction of facilities not only for research purpose facilities—but the specialized facilities for research in categorical diseases, keeps pace with the other component factors of sound medical research—the growth for the Nation. I am thinking specifically of the urgent need to provide research space for the numbers of bright young people emerging from our training programs—young people with creative minds and full measures of research ideas of high potential. I am thinking of the rapidly evolving research techniques and instrumentation for cancer research and cardiovascular research that are crying for up-to-date facilities in which to be put to work for the benefit of mankind. The steps we must take, as the facts have just related indicate, are:

First, we must not only continue the health research facilities construction program but must also increase its annual limitation in the years ahead, and

Second, we must not only continue the present nonmatching program for construction of research facilities to meet national and regional needs in the categorical area of cancer, but we must also expand this program to other categorical areas as opportunities and meaningful programs are developed and presented.

Mr. LAIRD. And there is a certification with the directors of the National Cancer Institute for the support of construction of research facilities to meet the urgent need to provide...
several institutes. This is the same budget that was supported by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Last year, the last administration, the Surgeon General in testifying before our subcommittee supported the $641 million appropriation with a most positive statement. His testimony makes it very clear that his request of $101 million above the original $540 million budget for the National Institutes of Health would be the absolute limit which he could support. No guidelines or limitations were imposed upon him in arriving at this figure. His testimony on page 56 of volume II of our hearings is as follows:

NIH BUDGET FOR 1962

Mr. LAIRD. You are a new Surgeon General and you made a very careful study of the budget of the National Institutes of Health. You had long experience in the National Institutes of Health, and served as the Acting Director of the Heart Institute. You prepared the budget you submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. That provided for an increase in the NIH budget of $101 million.

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. That was your best judgment?

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. As to what the National Institutes of Health could use to carry an effective program for 1962?

Dr. TERRY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you think that we would be getting to the point where you would have better control over this program if you followed exactly what you in 1962?

Dr. TERRY. I do not know, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Did you not have any guidelines given you by President Kennedy, or the Bureau of the Budget, or anyone else, in determining that particular figure?

Dr. TERRY. We had guidelines, but no limitations, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. But there was no limitation imposed upon you that you could not go above $101 million?

Dr. TERRY. There was no suggestion that I could, should, or could not.

Mr. LAIRD. And you had complete freedom in the area of funding when you came up with that recommendation?

Dr. TERRY. I had complete freedom in terms of dollars. In fact, the best recommendation that could be made for the National Institutes of Health.

It is interesting to note that the Bureau of the Budget arbitrarily cut back the $641 million figure to $533 million for the National Institutes of Health. This cutback in the requests of the Surgeon General and the Public Health Service represents the New Frontier's position on these vital health research programs.

In past years, the Congress—responding to the wishes of the people it represents—has appropriated those additional funds which medical research could not otherwise wisely and profitably use. The record gives substantial evidence that these additional funds were, in fact, wisely and profitably used, and that the benefits derived from these programs will not be sustained unless additional funds are provided now. I am therefore wholeheartedly in support of the committee's bill, which is now before you for action, calling for a level of $641 million for the eight appropriations of the National Institutes of Health. It is impossible to measure these $641 million against vital statistics that report on the deaths from cancer, heart disease, infectious and parasitic diseases, and a host of other health hazards. We cannot talk of them in terms of death rates or millions of deaths per year. What we are concerned with is the people and with support for long-range research and tireless effort to produce health facts—facts that mean children may be strong instead of crippled; families held together in strength instead of separated; lives that were short instead of long, severely crippled, a productive life instead of long-term disability.

The appropriation figure of $641 million for NIH for 1962 is a sound one, and I would like this to be clear. In hearing the members of our committee in supporting this funding level for the coming year.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us contains an amount of $64,450,000 for grants to States for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Grants to States will be made on the basis of a $50 million allotment to each State. That, one of the best investments we make, for this is the program which helps restore disabled people to activity and usefulness and helps each individual to get an appropriation of $19,250,000 for research and training. This is an increase of $2 million above the Kennedy budget.

I have great enthusiasm for the work being done both in the States and in the nation. In Wisconsin we have a rehabilitation program which is doing an excellent job of developing soundly and with supporting a long-range vocational rehabilitation program. Under his chairmanship, the program receives the same careful scrutiny as all requests coming before the committee, yet he has shown his belief in the basic soundness of the rehabilitation program by his support of the funds required to expand it.

WASHINGTON REHABILITATION PROGRAM

In Wisconsin we have a rehabilitation program which is doing an excellent job of developing soundly and which was for many years a leader among the States in this work. I am hopeful that Wisconsin will soon be able to develop its program to the place where we are able to get the rehabilitation services he needs to become self-sustaining again—and I would offer that same hope for the disabled residents of every State, for this is one of the things we mean when we say that the United States is the land of opportunity.

IN 1962 OVER 100,000 TO BE REHABILITATED

Last year the Federal-State rehabilitation program restored 89,900 disabled people to employment. This year they expect to rehabilitate 96,000. The bill before us now will provide enough funds to enable the State agencies to rehabilitate about 107,000 disabled individuals. To me, this is a wonderful thing to do—to provide the means whereby these thousands of handicapped Americans will become able to look after themselves, stand on their own feet, and have the satisfaction of being self-supporting citizens.

I find a special pleasure in the fact that this appropriation will make it possible for the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation to reach another milestone in its history—for if the committee's bill is approved, 1962 will be the first year in which this program has rehabilitated more than 100,000 disabled people in a single year.

Aside from the numbers being rehabilitated, the State rehabilitation agencies today are helping us in many ways in the war against poverty and the war against ignorance which confront both the States and the Federal
Government. While the appropriations for this work represent an outlay of Federal funds and of State funds, the rehabilitation programs have shown time and again that the cost of this work, returned to the Federal and State Treasuries many times in the form of taxes which the disabled people pay when they return to work.

While our Government is considering many proposals having to do with our older citizens, the rehabilitation program is already doing something constructive about all know that the proportion of disability increases with age. However, with proper rehabilitation services, many of our older citizens cannot only become active again, but many of them can work at their old jobs or at new ones. The rehabilitation programs in the States have been proving this for several years. Back in 1945 less than 7,000 disabled persons over 45 years old were in rehabilitation and receiving employment. That represented about 17 percent of the total for that year. This number has been growing steadily since then, and an estimated 33,000 disabled people in this age group, or 31 percent of the total, will be rehabilitated.

The success and the growth of this program—and many other rehabilitation programs outside the Government—are due in part to the excellent programs in training and research conducted by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

TRAINING REHAB WORKERS

We cannot expect to see larger numbers of disabled people rehabilitated unless something is done to cope with the shortage of professional personnel who work with the disabled. This need is so serious that it affects both the public program and the many fine voluntary agencies now engaged in this bill for expanding the training grant program aimed at meeting at least a part of this need, so that there will be more physicians trained in the special procedures of rehabilitation—more physical therapists and occupational therapists—more rehabilitation counselors to work with the voluntary agencies and others—and an increase in several other types of professional workers who are essential in providing rehabilitation services.

At the same time, the training program will support short, intensive courses of instruction for personnel already working in rehabilitation, to give them specialized training for working with people who have severe and especially difficult handicaps. One of these is mental illness, in which the possibilities for expanding our rehabilitation work are so tremendous. Mental institutionalization, in which the rehabilitation programs are trying to make a major effort. These disabilities require special knowledge which is now being provided to the staffs of the States agencies and other organizations through the training program of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

REHABILITATION RESEARCH PROGRAM

The research program holds the real key to the future of rehabilitation work. We must have new knowledge, new procedures, new information if our investments in coming years are to pay the greatest dividends. Already the benefits of such research are beginning to flow into the hands of rehabilitation agencies.

Advanced types of artificial limbs are being developed, some of them offering simplified mechanical apparatus which reduces pressures on the user's hand and aids his walking. Experimental work now is being done to see if the power impulses generated by certain muscles in the body can be used as control signals to move limbs. Further research is developing various kinds of external power, such as the hydraulic principle, to see if this type of power can be brought under control to provide the delicate degree required to safely actuate an artificial arm and hand.

A great variety of other research is being done in several hundred hospitals, universities, rehabilitation centers, and other research agencies in the country. In certain places, projects are under way to develop and increase the research capacities of schools and institutions which have demonstrated a nucleus of talent and facilities they need. One of these is in my own State of Wisconsin where the Curative Workshop of Milwaukee and the Marquette University School of Medicine are cooperating to develop a well-rounded plan and program of research in rehabilitation.

REHABILITATION CENTERS

The committee has also heard testimony on a further proposal in research which I believe has great merit. We still have not provided, in the field of rehabilitation, comprehensive research and training institutions where the several kinds of scientists and professional people can jointly work on the complicated problems of severe disability. This concept of the major and complete research and teaching center has been adopted in many European countries and in space-problems, and other areas—and it can be a powerful step forward in solving many of the problems of disability which remain unanswered today.

I believe that support the establishment of several such centers and this bill provides the funds to do so, with two in 1962. These centers would make available, as part of a total rehabilitation research effort, the skills of physicians, therapists, prosthetics experts, rehabilitation counselors, engineers, physicists, and other scientists and personnel who play key roles in developing new knowledge in the total problem of disability and rehabilitation. They also would provide a complete training program for professional students. This form of center probably will require that the work be carried on in a university, where the personnel and facilities can be provided in one organized effort. We have a number of outstanding universities in this country which also are engaged in teaching, research, and service in rehabilitation, and which would be prepared to undertake this sort of responsibility within a very short time.

In summary, then, I believe this bill provides essential funds for the further development of one of our most important public programs—vocational rehabilitation. I believe these funds for the rehabilitation of our disabled citizens represent one of the finest investments the country can make. I urge your support of this appropriation.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that hospital rates have risen over 300 percent over the last two decades. This increase will continue unless, through research, hospital design and operations can be improved.

This bill which we are bringing before the House of Representatives today provides for a new program to study hospital costs through the construction of two hospital research facilities. This program is undertaken under the authority of section 433A of the Public Health Service Act. Our committee feels that there will be sufficient benefit to any community in which a hospital facility is located that there should be a minimum of one-third non-Federal matching funds contributed by the community involved.

Our committee is very proud of starting this new program and wishes to give proper credit to outstanding doctors from the Mayo Clinic and Rochester Methodist Hospital who appeared before our committee suggesting that we embark on a hospital research facility program. I particularly wish to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, from Minnesota's First Congressional District, Mr. Quz, who has worked very closely with our committee in the development of this new program.

The bill before us today includes $10 million to carry on this research program in hospital facilities and costs.

Since 1955, personnel of the Rochester Methodist Hospital, members of its board of directors, and members of the staff of Mayo Clinic have studied intensively several aspects of hospital function and design, in preparation for new hospital facilities. These studies have had as their objective new approaches in hospital construction and operation, to more efficient utilization of personnel, to improved care of the patient and to reduction of hospitalization costs. The studies to date include construction of, and controlled experiments with, a 12-bed nursing unit for the care of the critically ill.

Further studies are needed to reach the goals of improved care and reduced costs. The Rochester Methodist Hospital is seeking financial assistance for construction of an experimental and demonstrative hospital in patient care, hospital function, and design. Simultaneously little controlled research is recorded in medical literature on the effect of physical facilities on care of the patient or on how design can reduce hospitalization costs. The lack of research in this field contrasts sharply with the tremendous amount of time and energy expended for research in medicine and industry. And this dearth of critical studies is particularly surprising when one realizes that the operation of hospitals is third largest industry in the United States.
States. Billions of dollars have been spent for hospital construction in this country alone in recent years. A further indication of the need for careful reappraisal of hospital design and operation is the continuous increase in the cost of hospital care since 1940. Statistics from the U.S. Department of Labor demonstrate increases of almost 300 percent in the rates charged by hospitals in this period. This is much greater than the increase in prices and the increase in physicians' fees over the same period.

A survey was made in Rochester in 1955 to determine variations in care required by patients in St. Marys Hospital and Rochester Methodist Hospital. This survey included classification by Mayo Clinic physicians of 1,100 patients for 7,513 patient-days according to the type of care required by each patient. Each day for a week each patient was placed in one of three categories based on the amount of nursing care required: Stage 1, minimal care because of satisfactory progress or a nonsurgical type of illness; Stage 2, average care; Stage 3, minimal care because of serious illness.

Analysis of this data revealed that on any given day approximately 20 percent of patients required stage-1 care, 60 percent stage-2 care, and 20 percent stage-3 care. While these percentages will vary somewhat from one hospital to another, the study did quantitate what has been recognized as a fact: Not every patient in a given hospital requires the same amount of care. Patients in stage 1 need more hours of nursing care daily and the care of more skilled personnel than patients in stage 2 or stage 3. Conversely, patients in stage 3 need fewer hours of nursing care daily and care of less skilled personnel than patients in stage 1 or stage 2. In addition, patients in the convalescent or stage-3 category appeared not to require the extensive equipment and facilities that are necessary for seriously ill patients.

The initial studies were directed toward the seriously ill patient who requires constant observation because of critical illness and who was accompanied by a measure of stage 1 or stage 2. It was found that those responsible for studies to date for the future when the experimental hospital is available. To determine variations in care required by the patient who is acutely ill and evaluate the effect of architectural design. It has, however, only scratched the surface. What will be the effect of design and different methods of caring for the seriously ill throughout the country for many decades to come?

Among the many factors studied, several stand out. It was shown that the patient was better satisfied with his care in the circular unit and in the rectangular unit. Detailed data was accumulated and has been published.1 Among the many factors studied, several stand out. It was shown that the patient was better satisfied with his care in the circular unit, and were the patient's relatives because of the resistance provided by constant visual contact between the patients and the nurses. Corridor travel by nurses was significantly less. Most surprising was the cost. A patient in a conventional unit requiring three special duty nurses around the clock pays $54 a day plus a room charge on an average of $20 or a total of $74. In the circular unit, equal or superior care was given for a total of $36 per day—a savings of $38 per day.

The experimental team has completed controlled studies of the care required by the patient who is acutely ill and evaluated the effect of architectural design. It has, however, only scratched the surface. What will be the effect of design and different methods of caring for the seriously ill patient throughout the hospital? Some hospitals have considered various phases of progressive patient care, but to date there has been no critical evaluation of the quality of care or its cost. This should be done before the method is more widely copied. Under ideal and controlled conditions is progressive patient care of a higher quality and lower cost?

PROPOSED FUTURE HOSPITAL RESEARCH

Those responsible for studies to date have begun development of a program of study for the future when the experimental hospital is available. To determine variations in care required by the patient who is acutely ill and evaluate the effect of architectural design. It has, however, only scratched the surface. What will be the effect of design and different methods of caring for the seriously ill patient throughout the hospital? Some hospitals have considered various phases of progressive patient care, but to date there has been no critical evaluation of the quality of care or its cost. This should be done before the method is more widely copied. Under ideal and controlled conditions is progressive patient care of a higher quality and lower cost?

First, Comparison of the circular nursing units with rectangular units in care of stage 2 and 3 patients to determine whether the circular design is superior for these groups. Both the quality of such care and the cost per patient-day would be evaluated.

Second. Positive determination of the feasibility of progressive patient care of patients in a general hospital. Again both the quality of the care received by the patients and the cost of that care would be assessed.

Third. Study of other proposed schemes for segregation of patients by clinical service or probable length of stay. Possibly patients admitted for 1 to 3 days for a diagnostic or therapeutic procedure could be accommodated at lower cost in a special hospital unit.

Fourth. Consideration of all possible mechanical, electric, and pneumatic devices to reduce labor and installation of such devices for actual trial if determined to be of practical value.
Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service, but were not given much consideration by the New Frontier. It seems to me that it is most important that the executive branch, under the leadership of the Surgeon General take control and give leadership to the whole area of medical research. For that reason our subcommittee has included in the fiscal year 1961 the recommendation of the Surgeon General as far as the National Institutes of Health are concerned. In the past the figures which have been recommended by the Surgeon General have been increased from $100 million to as high as $200 million by the other body. This year we are basing our committee recommendations on sound testimony, study, and research which has been done by the new Surgeon General as well as our committee. It may be necessary for us to bring this bill back to the House of Representatives at some future time in order to substantiate the $84 million figure, anticipating that the Senate might take action to increase this bill. The House of Representatives will stand firm on the recommendations of this subcommittee, and I believe that such a vote at a future time is probably inevitable.

In this particular bill we are placing special emphasis upon several programs. First, we are placing greater emphasis in the area of training the unskilled worker and the semiskilled worker and in also training people who are taken off the labor market by various handicaps. It seems to me that when we considered the depressed areas legislation passed early in this session of the Congress, a bill with over 55 percent of authorized funds in direct subsidies to industry, with less than 5 percent of the authorization going to this area of training individuals. It is sad but true that we enacted a piece of legislation which did not clearly meet the problems as we face the challenges of the 1960's.

During our committee hearings the new Secretary of Labor, and last year Secretary of Labor Mitchell, pointed out to us that the need in the labor market, as we face the next 5- and 10-year period, is in the area of the semiskilled and the skilled worker. It seems that the emphasis which we give in this bill to training individual Americans is a much greater step forward than the legislation which passed the House giving 85 percent of the aid in the form of direct subsidies to industry. I believe that the increased emphasis the Surgeon General has placed on the importance of training the nation’s most important people—those who face the problems of employment in the 1960's—will go a long way in facing these problems.

It seems to me that the executive branch has done an excellent job and that is why you called attention to one or two of them last year. Did they go into it this year?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, we did. I think the gentleman referred last year, when this bill was on the floor, to some of these grants. We made a rather thorough study of them this year.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, the gentleman referred last year, when this bill was on the floor, to some of these grants. We made a rather thorough study of them this year.

Mr. JUDD. I will be very glad to furnish the gentleman a list of those grants.

Mr. LAIRD. It is a unit within the Office of the Director of the National Institutes of Health. It will have the function and responsibility for administering these overseas research activities.

Mr. JUDD. Did the committee go into some of these research grants? I called attention to one or two of them last year.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, we did. I think the gentleman referred last year, when this bill was on the floor, to some of these grants. We made a rather thorough study of them this year.

Mr. LAIRD. I will be very glad to furnish the gentleman a list of those grants.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will you yield?

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

Mr. JUDD. I commend the gentleman and the chairman of the subcommittee and all its other members for this bill as a whole and especially for two particular items which I think are of
great significance. One is the provision of funds to establish two regional institutes for vocational rehabilitation. At one time I had prepared a bill to establish in the National Institutes of Health an additional institute on vocational rehabilitation. This is a field that has been too long neglected, and it is a field that pays special dividends in that it returns disabled people to useful work. Thousands of persons who are in some way or other disabled are converted from tax consumers to self-supporting, self-respecting taxpayers.

But as I considered it further, it seemed wiser to follow the course this bill adopts of aiding and developing existing institutes, because research in rehabilitation is not so much a matter of laboratory research or test tube studies as it is a matter of working directly with patients. This research and training can best be done where the patients are in various places throughout the country rather than in Bethesda. So your committee very properly recommended on a sort of trial basis, appropriation of $500,000 to each of two established institutions, each already cooperating with a high-grade university that is doing work in the same field. I am sure this is a pattern of Federal assistance which, at least in this special field, can be very productive, and I commend the subcommittee for its leadership and foresight.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I have talked with my colleague on several occasions about the need for this type of center approach. We feel that the two centers which are provided for in this bill will be a real help. They will not only help to take care of individuals who happen to have an opportunity to use these centers, but I think even more important functions will be served by them in that they will provide a complete picture of the current means for people in vocational rehabilitation and will demonstrate procedures that others may follow in improving vocational rehabilitation programs throughout the Nation.

I would like to say we are making good and great progress in the field of vocational rehabilitation and this bill not only provides for the starting of these two additional centers, but it will make it possible to rehabilitate 107,000 individuals next year. This is real progress.

I would like, too, to point to the fact that it was President Eisenhower who sent a special message to the Congress on vocational rehabilitation, and since that message came to the Congress, I think there has been an entirely different emphasis on this program. We have gone from rehabilitating about 60,000 people each year, to over 106,000 people.

This is a very fine program and it is done on a cooperative basis with the States. It is a matching program, with the States and the local communities really being responsible for its operation, under some guidance and matching funds from the Federal Government.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding further. The other pioneering step I would like to commend is the provision of $10 million for hospital construction following out the pattern that very careful research and study at the Mayo Clinic have demonstrated can be so effective in giving better medical care to actually ill patients who need 24-hour nursing care. Furthermore, it provides the better care at greatly reduced costs and with enormous benefit to the state of mind of the patients. A seriously ill and anxious patient who is down at the bottom of his despair is afraid that when he wants help, the nurse may not be able to come, often pushes the button unnecessarily just to see the nurse and be reassured. In contrast, in this circular arrangement which was worked out at Rochester, and which I have had an opportunity to examine, there is a large picture window from the room to the center where the nurses are. The patient can see the nurses at all times and the nurses can see the patient. A curtain can be drawn when relatives are visiting or when treatments are being given, so that privacy is given the necessary privacy when needed. It makes the patients feel better, more secure, if they can look out and see the nurse and know she is available. This new arrangement gives you both from the standpoint of the well-being of patients and from the standpoint of the costs of hospital care to all who have to pay. Again, I commend the gentleman and his committee for this important breakthrough.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman from Wisconsin answered some questions concerning a portion of the committee report on the extension of teaching and education of the mentally retarded. I understand the appropriation made in this bill is $1 million, the amount of the budget request, and is the same as it was for fiscal year 1961. The committee in its report recommended that $5 million be made available under section 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act which does not require matching. There is no matching requirement.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman explain to me, on page 5, in the "Grants for construction of cancer research facilities," that $3 million is not, am I correct in my understanding, subject to the 50-percent matching fund?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. That is made available under section 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act, which does not require matching. There is no matching requirement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I wonder what would be the amount of the expenditure of $28 million that is provided for in the Budget Bureau report?

Mr. LAIRD. In my statement I tried to explain the reason I supported the expenditure by the Department of Health, why I felt this was a reasonable budget. It is not as much as some members of our committee advocated, as the
gentleman from Rhode Island pointed out, but I believe that we in the Congress are operating on a sound basis by accepting these figures which were justified in the budget submission of the Surgeon General. Before this hearing, I want you to take the budgets of the individual Directors, you will find those budgets will total about $100 million more, and the public witnesses $200 or $300 million more. I believe we are on a sound footing by accepting the Surgeon General's figure.

I want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the hearing record in which Dr. Terry testified at some length as to the proper funding level. If you will turn to page 56, part II, you will see a discussion between Dr. Terry and me in which this figure is substantiated very well, I believe.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The Government Operations Committee had a study made, and they found in the budget level for the research projects in the administration of some of these research projects.

Mr. LAIRD. From the press release I read, I felt there would be a lot of criticism in the report of the Government Operations Committee. I went over the report and I did not find the report very critical. There were statements made in the report that referred to the review of grants, and that they felt there should be better review, and a few other rather mild criticisms.

This program has grown at a rapid rate. That is why I support this funding level. I am not going to support the funding level requested by the public witnesses or the estimates by the Institute Directors of what could be spent. I think this is a reasonable funding level, one under which this program can make proper funding and proper progress in 1962.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. These findings were taken into consideration in setting this figure; is that right?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am pleased to hear that the gentleman is going into the report. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any kind of a guess, or the number of new employees that will be put on the payroll as the result of this appropriation bill we have before us today. It seems to me, in going through the hearings, that a lot of new employees will be put on the payroll.

Mr. FOUGARTY. There will be about 400 in the Department of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. 400.

Mr. FOUGARTY. Yes. And approximately 3,000 in HEW.

Mr. GROSS. 3,000. That would be 3,400 additional employees to be put on the payroll.

Mr. FOUGARTY. That is in round figures.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Well, that is a lot of people.

Mr. FOUGARTY. Most of these are in the Public Health Service.

Mr. GROSS. That leads me to a little discussion of some of the things we had up last year. Is the Public Health Service still making grants for the training of dogs?

Mr. FOUGARTY. I do not know whether they are or not; but, if they are, there is some good reason behind it.

Mr. GROSS. And a study of bird sounds at Cornell University?

Mr. FOUGARTY. And the life of a gosling, which turned out to be pretty good research.

Mr. GROSS. Now, in what way could that be good research?

Mr. FOUGARTY. Well, I would have to refer to the hearings. That was a project that was ridiculed 10 or 11 years ago. But, when we got the facts about it, it turned out to be a good project and resulted in new information of value. I remember that even one of the writers who ridiculed it admitted afterward that it was a worthwhile project. Some of these things that were criticized severely years ago have turned out to be good projects, although, from their titles, they might sound very foolish today.

Mr. GROSS. For the edification of the new Members, I want to describe the research grant to the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research in Jerusalem, Israel. The grant is for $33,100. It is described as "A test of the husband-wife relationship." It is further described as follows:

The aim is to develop a diagnostic pictorial test of both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of the role relationship of husband and wife. The test should provide information concerning the perceptions of actual behavior and norms and the conformance perceived between these.

I want to ask, as I did last year, whether this grant has been expanded. Has there been any report made, if the gentleman knows; and if so, what was the result of this study of the Intrapersonal and Interpersonal relationship of the husband and wife?

Mr. FOUGARTY. I do not know whether the report has been completed or not.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. We will see that the gentleman gets a copy of this report as soon as it is filed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman; I should like to have it. For the edification of the new Members on both sides of the aisle, there has been some $89,000 spent by the Public Health Service, and part of it has gone for a study of behavior at cocktail parties. For their information, I shall read briefly from a preliminary report. It says—

That the room in which the bar is situated tends to become crowded; that there is a variety of guests who will cringe in corners, while others sing, dance, sip martinis into the piano, and pursue members of the opposite sex to the pantry or beyond.

Then it goes on to say:

As the party begins, filling rooms filled with friends; they conversed quietly in small groups of the same sex. Soon the unmarried guests began to scan the knots of people of the opposite sex and plan to maneuver. Cross-sex conversations developed.

Things seemed to be off to a fair enough start, and around the bar in the dining room
they stayed lively enough, but in the living room there was an ominous lag: 'There was they stayed lively enough, but in the living room dyads of a long period of desultory conversation.'

Gradually the guests went home; or went to sleep. One host, at 5 a.m. was unable to find a vacant bed.

I should like to know if we are continuing to spend money for this sort of thing.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman, if he can shed some light on this.

Mr. LAIRD. The Saturday Evening Post had an editorial on this, and I directed an inquiry to the Director of the National Institutes of Health about it.

Mr. GROSS. This is in the Public Health Service, not the National Institutes of Health. The gentleman telling me that the National Institutes of Health is engaged in something similar to this?

Mr. LAIRD. I believe this was funded by the National Institutes of Health. This particular project had to do with work of the National Mental Health Institute. Although this project was approved by the study group, and approved by the advisory council and went all the way through the usual procedures for proper approval; I, frankly, do not believe it is approved. On the other hand, I don't think we should be too critical if there are three or four bad decisions made out of the thousands of applications that are considered each year.

Mr. GROSS. I have made a request for the complete report by the Public Health Service on "Behavior at Cocktails Parties," I have not been very successful in getting it; in fact, I have not gotten anything except these excerpts from a preliminary report. As the gentleman himself, is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, would he be good enough to help me try to get a copy of the full report?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I will be very happy to see that the gentleman gets a copy of the report on this particular study. Support for the subject of the gentleman is discussing now has been discontinued. It is not being funded at the present time. But I will be glad to see that a report on the information gathered up until the time it was stopped is made available to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not like to deal in excerpts from material, I like to have the full report.

Mr. LAIRD. I am not sure how complete the report will be, because that project was discontinued, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say, in conclusion, that I think an awful lot of money could be saved if the expenditure of these funds was properly screened. I cannot vote for this appropriation bill, dealing as it does in more than $4.3 billion, until the waste and extravagance is eliminated. I am convinced that many millions of dollars could be saved without hampering in the least essential research and health services.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIN].

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

Mr. QUIN. In support of this recommendation, not merely because the experimental work on this proposal was conducted in my congressional district at the Rochester Minnesota Methodist Hospital, but, more importantly, because the results of their work which started 6 years ago could have a dramatic and profoundly important consequence for all Americans.

First, I will discuss the specific problems which the Rochester Methodist Hospital confronted. Then, I will explain the scope of the problem as it concerns our country.

Finally, I will discuss the results of the experimental work already completed, discuss what remains to be done and why this program should receive the support of this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is a member here in this House who has not personally been a patient in a hospital or has not had a member of his family as a patient in a hospital. This experience is also generally true of our citizens as a whole. Therefore, all of us have some general knowledge of the tremendous rise in the costs of hospitalization.

To be more specific, the costs of hospitalization have risen—according to the Department of Labor statistics—more than an average of 20 percent in 19 years.

In a study conducted by doctors at the Mayo Clinic, in Rochester, Minn., it was found that of the total hospital charges to a patient, about 65 percent of these charges were the result of personnel costs and of this 65 percent about one-half was the cost of nursing personnel. As a first consideration, the doctors at the Mayo Clinic and at the Rochester Methodist Hospital thought it best—back in 1955—to find out just what kind of patients the average hospital in this country is caring for. Through a scientific sampling method, they sampled two hospitals in Rochester, Minn. One was the Rochester Methodist Hospital, which has 500 beds, and the other was St. Mary's Hospital, which has 900 beds and is the largest private hospital in our country.

Mayo Clinic doctors and administrators found that on any given day, about 20 percent of hospital population was made up of those people who needed intensive nursing care; about 60 percent was made up of those people who needed an average level of nursing care and the other 20 percent needed less average nursing care.

Therefore, it became obvious to these doctors and administrators that the patients they should concentrate on were the patients costing the most, that is, the 20 percent needing the intensive nursing care.

Their problem then was to attempt to cut the costs of intensive nursing care, and they decided to do this by constructing a radically new type of hospital where they hoped they would enable a highly efficient level of nursing care to be maintained at a drastic reduction in costs.

You can easily visualize the type of design they decided on when I tell you it was a circular design something like if you put an orange in the center and the core would be the nursing station, and in the various compartments would be the rooms. This enabled the patients to have direct eye contact with the nurses at all times, and also cut down the walking distances of the nurses—giving them more time with the patients themselves.

After this 3-year study, they also found that the drastic reduction in the cost of nursing care which they were hoping to accomplish was actually realized. To bring these results into concrete figures, an intensive-care patient in Rochester—a city similar to most parts of our country—would pay $5 a day for 24 hours of nursing care. In this experimental unit, the same nursing care was obtained at all times, and also cut down the walking distances of the nurses—giving them more time with the patients themselves.

In addition, I need but mention the salvaging of many families' savings which all too often are completely wiped up by prolonged hospitalization at the present high costs.

Now, I have discussed the problems which the doctors and administrators of the Rochester Methodist Hospital tried to solve, and the results of their experiment with the 20 percent of intensive-care patients.

I believe the results speak for themselves, but there is much more work to be done. As the doctors and administrators themselves point out, they have satisfactorily proven out only the beneficial effects of this new design on intensive-care patients. Now, they want to expand their study, and precisely determine if new hospital designs would prove as beneficial and efficient as their first experimental unit for patients requiring only average or minimum nursing care.

To do this, they wish to build a 450-room hospital at a cost of about $11,500,000. Just as they did not expect the costs of their experimental hospital to be borne completely by outside sources, they equally do not expect the total cost of this new experimental hospital to be borne by the Federal Government.

The Rochester Methodist Hospital representatives have asked the Appropriations Committee that they could raise—on a local level—about one-third of the construction costs if the Federal Government would provide two-thirds of the costs.
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sue. I ask leave to insert correspondence with the office of the President which speaks for itself. I have received no responsive answer to my last letter, dated April 13, 1961. I wish also to insert a table from page 623 of the budget which shows the carryover balance in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is no carryover in the Department of Labor.

MARCH, 24, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: In reading your budget message today, I am disappointed to find that you have made no recommendation that the Congress implement Public Law 85-759.

That this may be an oversight I have no doubt, for I recall the splendid service you performed when you introduced this legislation in the Senate and worked so vigorously to secure its passage. Why, however, on August 2, too, the outstanding efforts put forth by Ambassador Kennedy, as a member of the Second Hoover Commission, in behalf of this budget reform measure.

In view of the fact that the budget you have sent us last week is reported to call for a deficit of as much as $1.5 billion—it seems to me vital that Public Law 85-759 be implemented at once. As you point out in your message, should present revenue estimates prove overly optimistic, this deficit undoubtedly will be greater still.

Implementation of Public Law 85-759 might well help overcome such a deficit. The Bureau of the Budget advises me that as of the end of fiscal year 1960, unobligated carry-over balances in several Federal departments had reached the staggering figure of $37,565 billion—nearly one-half the total of the proposed budget. At the end of the calendar year 1960, $20 billion in Defense funds and more than $7 billion in foreign aid funds existed in unobligated carry-over balance.

Implementation of Public Law 85-759 would return to the Treasury a substantial amount of this tremendous, unspent, unobligated sum of money. It would, I hope, reduce the size of the deficit.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE, Member of Congress,
April 8, 1961.

F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Member of Congress,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The President has asked me to acknowledge your recent letter on accrued expenditures.

When the President was a Member of Congress, he supported the Hoover Commission recommendation to change the method of budgeting and accounting. Legislation introduced for this purpose was modified before enactment to provide for accrued expenditure limitations within appropriations on an obligation basis. In accordance with this legislation, accrued expenditure limitations were proposed in the budgets for 1960 and 1961 for certain appropriations. These limitations were rejected by the Congress.

The principal operating advantages and economies to be obtained from the Hoover Commission proposals on budgeting and accounting are the essentially associated with the adoption of accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting. As you know, both of these have been widely adopted in the civilian agencies of the Government, so that by the end of the fiscal year over 75 percent of the budgetary and almost all for civilian agencies will be on these bases. The President has asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to press toward rapid completion of the conversion of the remaining civilian agencies and the Defense Department to accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting methods.

Sincerely yours,

MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President.

Mr. Myer Feldman,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: Thank you, sir, for your support of my letter of March 24. I have no doubt that this legislation was enacted, President Eisenhower proposed limitations on the Canal Zone appropriation as starting points for putting the law into effect. The House Appropriations Committee struck the limitations from all six appropriations. Among these appropriations was that of the Panama Canal Zone Government. Representative of District of Columbia, who has been enthusiastic about the legislation put before our Appropriations Committee.
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and, after its passage by the Senate, Senator Hollands, as one of the committee, indicated that he would fight for retention of the limitations. Nevertheless, the conference struck the last remaining limitation.

As I pointed out in my earlier letter, President Eisenhower proposed 13 appropriation limitations for the fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee again rejected them.

At a time when the Nation is plunging more and more into deficit spending, at a time when we will be asked to once more raise the temporary ceiling on the national debt, it seems to me absolutely vital that the responsible guardians of the public treasure, we must search for every means of conserving unnecessary expenditures. Public Law 85-759 offers that opportunity—offers it without stripping worthwhile spending projects of needed funds and without slowing down acceleration of programs which must be stepped up in the national interest.

I respectfully reiterate my suggestion that as leader of the party which controls the Congress, and as Chief Executive, with the economic stability of our Nation as one of his most important responsibilities, the President reenact his budget recommendation on Public Law 85-759 to be implemented could meet with a warmer reception than was accorded President Eisenhower.

Time is running short. Public Law 85-759 expires on April 1, 1962. Without some operating experience, we will never be able to ascertain whether it is possible for Congress to make a firmer grip on the Federal purse strings and thus give the taxpayers full value for the dollars they entrust to us.

Sincerely,

P. BRADFORD MORSE, Member of Congress.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Balance, start of 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]
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mental appropriations...
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Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

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

(At this point, Mr. GROSS was asked and given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman a question. I note in the hearings that $1,118 was expended in Iowa to take care of the fishing industry. I did not know we had a commercial fishing industry in Iowa that required Federal funds. In the hearings I also read that the money was spent for care and maintenance of the tanks and fish nets. How much money for this purpose is being spent around the country?

Mr. MARSHALL. I think what the gentleman is referring to is the money that is used in the vocational educational end of the program, and it is being used to display salesmanship and so on in relation to fish. The testimony before the committee was that this was a very worthwhile part of distributive education in that it was familiarizing people just how to handle a product which is extremely vital to the dietary requirements of the people.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michael).

[Mr. MICHEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JARMAN).

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island and to the members of his subcommittee for their outstanding work on this bill. Particularly, Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to see the emphasis being placed on expanding the medical research programs. Certainly, nothing is more important to this Nation than the health of our citizens.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STEAGGS).
Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for the work they have done, and I consider the gentleman from Oklahoma in his remarks in regard to research in the problem of medical care in our country.

There is no doubt in my mind, and I believe this to be true with the majority of American citizens, that we must be concerned about health.

During the past 15 years this country has made great progress in the attack on disease, in the construction of hospitals, and development of other medical facilities.

But a great deal more is to be done. Expansion of present fields of research, establishment of new fields, training of medical personnel, and the availability of medical services to the people, need our serious and prompt attention.

To save a life, to lessen pain, to cure the maimed—these are worthwhile goals for which our dollars are spent wisely. And more are needed.

I join with my colleagues in support of legislation that will provide the plans and means to support a program for medical research, medical training, and medical service, not only to benefit this generation, but those to come.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, it is a rewarding experience to serve on the appropriations subcommittees for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. In one way or another, the work of these agencies touches on the life of every American family.

Our chairman, John Fogarty, well deserves the nationwide reputation he has earned for his great service to humanity. Many witnesses before the committee know first hand of his dedicated work as a Member of Congress. Many of the comments have learned to appreciate and support his judgment. The consideration and fairness he shows as chairman makes it possible for me to work with him.

My good hearted friend from Indiana, Winfield Denton, brings to the subcommittee legal training and experience together with genuine sympathy and understanding of the human problems with which we deal. The people of his State can be rightly proud of his effective contribution to this important work.

During the past two years I have served with Congresswoman LANDRUM-GRIFFIN. I have learned to appreciate more and more his working knowledge of the intricacies of many of these programs. He is a tireless worker who makes a real effort to understand every phase of an agency's work.

We were joined this year by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHELL]. Since it was my privilege to serve with him on the agricultural appropriations subcommittee, his efforts are not new to me. A man of ability and common sense, he is making a genuine contribution to the committee.

Throughout our long and sometimes arduous hearings, all of us appreciated the services of Robert Moyer, our well-informed and able clerk whose work is uniformly excellent.

In addition to the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we consider appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, and the U.S. Soldiers' Home. For the most part, these agencies render necessary service. Their activities are covered in some detail in our report.

R AILROAD RETIREMENT CREDITS

I do, however, want to call special attention to an unidentified situation that continues in regard to the railroad retirement trust fund. We have consistently urged that payments be approved to cover the military service credits authorized by law. It seems to me that the provisions of the act should be carried out; every day of delay only postpones the reckoning that must come.

Continued delay is bad budgeting and is unfair to members of the system as well as the taxpayers of the country. It is my understanding that a proposal will be made to the Bureau of the Budget to bring contributions to the fund up to date in five of six installments. I urge the Bureau to recognize this obligation to implement the law passed by Congress and to restore confidence in proper budgeting procedure.

U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

In studying the testimony concerning the U.S. Soldiers' Home, I am impressed by the efficiency with which it is administered by Gen. Wade H. Haislip and his staff. As Governor of the State, he is to be congratulated on this fine record.

BEGGled IN PAPERSWORK

The work of the Department of Labor has always interested me, but I am constantly amazed at the great mass of paperwork the agency and I am disappointed that the legislative committee and the Congress have not given more attention to eliminating useless paperwork and the resulting unnecessary expense.

An obvious example is the collection of reports of little or no real value or legal purpose. Thousands and thousands of these reports are accumulating under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Both former Secretary Mitchell and the present Secretary Goldberg have called attention to the situation without avail.

No Enforcement Powers

Not only do we bear the needless cost of employees and facilities but we contribute to the public illusion that the Secretary of Labor has enforcement powers. Commenting on this shameful deception, Mitchell said last year that the act provides "no persuasive deterrent to those who wish to ignore its provisions, or to manipulate or embezzle funds."

It is almost unbelievable that assets and insurance reserves of over $40 billion, which are intended to provide over 400,000 different benefits to 80 million workers, are so little protected. Yet administration of a law which does not provide this protection will cost about $350,000,000.

L ANDRUM-GRIFFIN COSTS

We encountered a similar situation in examining operations under the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (Landrum-Griffin Act). The bill before you includes $5,775,000 for purposes of the act. In 3 years, Department of Labor expenses under the bill will cost the taxpayers about $16,457,000.

If a law is measured by the number of jobs it creates, it has been a success since the budget requested funds for 586 positions. The Bureau of Labor Management reports originally requested 986 positions and $7,560,000 for administration of the law.

STATE LAWS APPLY

Our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], inquired into criminal actions to date. We were informed that there were 16 cases for embezzlement of funds. Convictions have been obtained in six. The Department admitted that State laws would usually cover these cases. It was stated that 1,460 alleged under investigation but this figure is meaningless, in my opinion, since a great many will be dropped upon completion of the investigations.

When the Landrum-Griffin bill was before the Congress, people all over the country were barraged with propaganda originating mostly from antibluelaw sources. Some of this was misleading; and some, downright false. Because of their legitimate concern over conditions disclosed by committees of the Congress, many people accepted the propaganda without further investigation.

Effect of happy action

The very people often interested in a balanced budget and economy in Government, wrote, wired, telephoned, and visited Members of Congress to demand immediate adoption of the law. Congress responded to the pressure generated by these activities. What has happened is a good example of what can happen when we legislate in this kind of climate.

In the face of these preposterous expenditures, I suggest that the Congress re-appraise its actions. Even the Department of Labor budget does not tell the whole story since the Department of Justice and the National Labor Relations Board are also involved in this flurry of fruitless activity.

Reductions in Labor Budget

The overall appropriation for the Department of Labor included in this bill is $283,113,000, a reduction of $2,179,000 below the budget request, and $791,447, $800 less than appropriated for 1961. The reductions are justified by action which made appropriations of $500 million for the Federal extended compensation account and $240 million for the unemployment trust fund unnecessary. The proposeion of $30 million was made in unemployment compensation funds for Federal employees and ex-service men and $18,924,-
in the field of education, we must have factual information upon which to base the practical decisions we are asked to make.

**AGREEMENT ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS**

Let me make it clear from the outset that there is no quarrel with the intention of any of these programs. I know of no Member of Congress who is not interested in promoting the best educational opportunities our resources can provide. No conscientious citizen can be indifferent to the welfare of all of the children of this country, whether devoted to public or private elementary, secondary, or higher education.

All of us want to make all of our schools as truly effective agencies of education as the resources of this Nation permit. This concern and determination is too real and too immediate to need elaborate embellishment.

**FACED WITH PRACTICAL QUESTIONS**

The test, however, is in applying our intentions to concrete action. Although we are not in disagreement here that legislation is in the area of ways and means. We are faced with practical questions of how it should be done, when it should be done, and in what measure it should be done. There are differences in practical judgments which can be resolved only on the basis of objective facts that will enable us to fairly evaluate the alternatives.

Yet today we often find that there is no single fact or set of facts upon which proponents and opponents of any program can agree, whether it be the teacher shortage, the classroom lag, the scale of local effort, the extent of local initiative, or whatever. Instead of facts based on consistent and valid standards, we seem to be getting a wide variety of conflicting opinions.

**BUREAU OF BUDGET CRITICISM**

The Bureau of the Budget has criticized the Office of Education's figures on the basis of their being dated and has commented on their inaccuracy for purposes of policy discussion. In 1950, Congress ordered a survey of facilities at a cost of over $5 million and the Office of Education reported a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. In 1954, the Commissioner testified that the shortage had grown to 370,000 classrooms and other experts predicted it would rise to 600,000 in 3 years.

**ESTIMATES ARE REVISED**

Yet, when the White House Conference on Education polled the States, it reported a shortage of 180,635 classrooms. Two years before, its estimate, and by 1959 the estimated shortage was 132,000 classrooms.

On its final day in office, January 9, 1961, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare released a report showing a shortage of 142,000 classrooms. This is the same figure given to us at our hearing on April 12.

**NO OBJECTIVE STANDARDS**

In response to a question I asked, concerning objective standards in determining classroom shortages so that valid comparisons could be made between States, we were told:

There is a variation among States in regard to the standards. There is no uniform standard that is accepted or adopted by the States. In some States, the standards written out in much greater detail than in others. In some States they have standards just for the construction of new buildings that they are going to build. * * *

The answer specifically to your question: "There is a difference among the States in the standards."

**CLASSROOM CONSTRUCTION HOLDS**

Based on this wide variety of standards, the report of January 19, 1961, estimated a need for 607,600 classrooms in the next 10 years. This called for an annual construction of 60,760 classrooms a year.

The same report says that we have been building classrooms at the rate of about 70,000 a year for the past 5 years.

Even if local efforts should decrease by 13 percent, it appears that the need would be met without any Federal activity. Persistent predictions that construction activity would decline have not materialized—despite some lag which can certainly be attributed to perennial promises of Federal assistance.

In any event, the problem we have is that today's predictions are more accurate than those of 10 years ago, 5 years ago, or last year.

**OUTDATED FIGURES ANOTHER PROBLEM**

These are examples of the questions that must inevitably occur when Congress is given contradictory figures on which it is expected to base practical judgments. Still another problem occurs when the figures are too accurate. For example, the most recent issue of the bulletin on Federal funds for education listing expenditures by all departments is bulletin No. 2, published in 1957, and covering the years 1956-57 and 1957-58. Incidentally, this bulletin shows that Federal assistance for educational programs for the 1956-57 school year totaled $1,907,525,000 of which $656,623,000 was spent on elementary and secondary education and $1,382,374,000 on higher education. Surely, when expenditures of this magnitude are already being made for educational purposes, it would be useful to have more current information at a time when additional expenditures are being asked.

We need to know not only how much is being spent, but what effect these expenditures are having in meeting the problems they are intended to alleviate. We are asked to inaugurate programs based on projections into the future without knowing what the present situation is. The Commissioner and other witnesses indicated that efforts will be made to update the statistical gathering apparatus so that reports and bulletins will have more than historical interest. I hope these efforts will be carried on with the same urgency so often displayed when some new expansion of authority of operations is requested.

**NO DE FACTO FACTS UNAVAILABLE**

The problem of obtaining current factual information is also illustrated in our discussion of the discussion of the Administration of the National Defense Education Act. Some school administrators have privately expressed misgivings about acting as collection agencies for the student.
loan program. Since collections do not begin until 1 year after graduation, there is no way to anticipate the experiences that lie ahead.

After 2 full years of operation, we still have no factual reports on the number of student borrowers who have dropped out of school or the collection problems caused by student defaults. We do know that over 25 percent of the institutions of high learning are not taking part in this program. Again, however, we do not know why such a sizable proportion of high learning are not taking part in the Federal loan program. Nor do we know what proportion of the funds are being used by State universities as compared to private institutions. Nor do we know the average loan made in either case.

HOPE FOR EARLY REPORT

Although the program is scheduled to expire on July 1, 1962, efforts are already underway to extend it and we have been told that if the Congress does so, additional funds will have to be appropriated in a supplemental bill either in this session of Congress or in the next. We do have the report sufficiently early to enable Members to study the actual operations and effects of the program during the past 2 years before we are asked to decide on extending or expanding it.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

We do have a little more information on the fellowship program under title IV of the act. This is frequently referred to in testimony as the national defense fellowship program and it is part of the National Defense Education Act. Of the 1,000 students participating in the first year's program, about 90 dropped out, according to the testimony we received. No figures were available for the second year.

The professed purpose of the program is to upgrade the college teachers and therefore continues to be confusion about its relationship to national defense, the professed purpose of the act itself. Last year we had some discussion about the contribution of fellowships in American folklore to the Nation's defense. This year English folklore has been added to the list.

RELATION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Other questions have occurred concerning fellowships in contemporary literature—also modern literature—dramatic art, theater and speech, musicology, sociology of marriage and family living, and a series of similarly unrelated subjects. These may be necessary and desirable in and of themselves but they are not considered to be indispensable to a nation's defense. This year we had some discussion about the professed purpose of the fellowship program under title IV of the National Defense Education Act. The act provides grants to colleges and universities under this program enable them to conduct teacher training programs. State agencies are assisted in preparing persons to supervise the special educational programs required in State and local school systems.

Thus, this modest appropriation is already showing results that warrant further consideration to determine what action can be taken to strengthen this important endeavor.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION NEED

The bill before you continues the vocational education program at its present level. We discussed the problems arising from unemployment due to automation or migration of industries since special programs are being inaugurated in these areas. There is no evidence, however, that the traditional vocations that distributed occupations, agriculture, and practical nursing are less needed. With our continued population growth, training in these fields continues to enhance employment opportunities by upgrading individuals in their vocational specialties.

Because the program is national in scope and application, its purposes are not limited to specific area programs which can best be met by restricted programs. This does not discount the local impact of vocational education programs on improved employment opportunities and better trained workers. The local support given the program is the best guarantee we have to its usefulness and its effectiveness at the community level.

FEDERAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE

Another subject of particular interest to your committee in studying the budget requests for educational purposes is Federal assistance to so-called impacted areas. Many of us, regardless of our position on across-the-board subsidies for school construction and teachers' salaries, support this program.

Despite some recent press innuocations to the contrary, there is no incoherence in this position. When local school districts are clearly and presently faced with an added burden, a direct result of Federal activity which increases school population while reducing local tax income, the Federal Government has a clear and present responsibility to assist in meeting it.

The problem is created by the Federal Government and justice demands that the Federal Government accept responsibility for assisting parents and the local communities in providing for the education of their children. Congress recognized this obligation in making permanent the provisions of Public Law 784 which relates to children who reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property.

RESERVE SEPARATE CONSIDERATION

The House will be asked to consider extensions and revisions of these programs, presumably in connection with the general Federal aid bill. This creates problems for members who believe that these are two entirely different programs that deserve to stand on their own merits. Legislation to extend assistance to impacted areas includes questions enough for one good debate.

This can be illustrated by taking a look at the allotments made in the District of Columbia area under Public Laws 784 and 818:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School district</th>
<th>Fiscal year 1960 (actual)</th>
<th>Fiscal year 1961 (actual)</th>
<th>Fiscal year 1962 (estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, Md.</td>
<td>$2,372,000</td>
<td>$2,490,000</td>
<td>$2,512,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Georges County, Md.</td>
<td>$1,967,000</td>
<td>$2,020,000</td>
<td>$2,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County, Md.</td>
<td>$1,569,000</td>
<td>$1,569,000</td>
<td>$1,569,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria City, Va.</td>
<td>$909,000</td>
<td>$1,019,000</td>
<td>$1,019,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington County, Va.</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$1,341,000</td>
<td>$1,341,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Church City, Va.</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on Public Law 784 without extension or amendment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School district</th>
<th>Fiscal year 1960</th>
<th>Fiscal year 1961 (estimated)</th>
<th>Fiscal year 1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, Md.</td>
<td>$62,236,927</td>
<td>$198,031</td>
<td>$179,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Georges County, Md.</td>
<td>1,666,662</td>
<td>742,468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria City, Va.</td>
<td>54,568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington County, Va.</td>
<td>2,098,000</td>
<td>1,788,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Church City, Va.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Public Law 815 without extension or amendment.

The familiar pattern of empire-building at work. This is not a direct criticism of the Office of Education, but merely a reflection of administrative and legislative branches know too well how fast these little sovereignties grow into big kingdoms.

Let me emphasize that these comments bear no ill will. All of us are anxious to make the Office of Education as efficient and effective an agency of Government as we possibly can. We wish the new Commissioner and his staff every success in strengthening and improving the services provided by law.

This is a time of new beginnings, and we want to be helpful in preventing the kinds of abuses and inadequacies that can only lead to disillusionment and bitter criticism later.

I have always regarded it as an important responsibility of the legislator to help administrators anticipate troubles and correct mistakes when programs are in the formative stage. Some officials are needlessly sensitive to suggestions, however constructive and well intentioned, and refuse to engage in candid discussions of shortcomings while there is still time to correct them.

In working with the details of these programs more intimately than most committees, we come to recognize patterns that often indicate the success or failure of programs. My own policy has been to bring the questions that occur to the attention of the administrators concerned in our hearings, rather than in press releases casting discredit on an entire agency or program. Neither false generosity nor bitter rancor serve the common goals.

REAL PROGRESS IN REHABILITATION

In our hearings on Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, I never fail to be impressed by the accomplishments of vocational rehabilitation programs. While we can never be satisfied with the progress in this important work, we are heartened by evidence that real progress is being made.

Few programs receive such widespread and deserved support in our committee and in the Congress. Last year, 88,275 disabled men and women were returned to a useful working life through this program. In 1961, an estimated 96,000 will receive this program in addition to the services provided by law.

The number will grow to 107,050 in 1962. Those who know the areas which need study and research should be as comprehensive in support of rehabilitation as the National Institutes of Health are.

We have included $12,350,000 for research and training in this vital field, an increase of $2 million over the budget and $2,620,000 over last year’s appropriation. This $2 million increase includes an additional $1 million to accelerate the training program, and $1 million to establish two regional institutes of rehabilitation.

SEVERE SHORTAGE OF SPECIALISTS

One of the major obstacles in providing rehabilitation services is the severe shortage of specialists in physical medicine and rehabilitation psychiatrists.

Of the more than 350,000 physicians licensed to practice medicine in this country, only 369 are certified psychiatrists.

At this time, only 143 graduate medical students are trained in this field.

In 1958, only 57 percent of the residences in physical medicine and rehabilitation were filled.

Only half of the Nation’s medical schools have men on their staffs who are qualified to teach physical medicine and rehabilitation.

MANY SKILLS NEEDED

Due to the comprehensive and intensive nature of the kinds of abuses and inadequacies that can only lead to disillusionment and bitter criticism later.
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In working with the details of these programs more intimately than most committees, we come to recognize patterns that often indicate the success or failure of programs. My own policy has been to bring the questions that occur to the attention of the administrators concerned in our hearings, rather than in press releases casting discredit on an entire agency or program. Neither false generosity nor bitter rancor serve the common goals.

REAL PROGRESS IN REHABILITATION

In our hearings on Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, I never fail to be impressed by the accomplishments of vocational rehabilitation programs. While we can never be satisfied with the progress in this important work, we are heartened by evidence that real progress is being made.

Few programs receive such widespread and deserved support in our committee and in the Congress. Last year, 88,275 disabled men and women were returned to a useful working life through this program. In 1961, an estimated 96,000 will receive this program in addition to the services provided by law. Numbers alone, however, do not measure the full meaning of this program in human terms.

PROBLEMS CONSTANTLY GROWING

Cheered as we are by this progress, the problem is so immense that we need to go forward more rapidly to keep from falling farther behind. Those who are devoting their lives to this work tell us that between 2.5 and 3 million of our 20 million disabled citizens can be returned to satisfying and gainful employments. Each year, another 250,000 persons become disabled by injury or disease to the extent of requiring assistance and training in order to continue useful occupations.

We have included $12,350,000 for research and training in this vital field, an increase of $2 million over the budget and $2,620,000 over last year’s appropriation. This $2 million increase includes an additional $1 million to accelerate the training program, and $1 million to establish two regional institutes of rehabilitation.

SEVERE SHORTAGE OF SPECIALISTS

One of the major obstacles in providing rehabilitation services is the severe shortage of specialists in physical medicine and rehabilitation psychiatrists.

Of the more than 350,000 physicians licensed to practice medicine in this country, only 369 are certified psychiatrists.

At this time, only 143 graduate medical students are trained in this field.

In 1958, only 57 percent of the residences in physical medicine and rehabilitation were filled.

Only half of the Nation’s medical schools have men on their staffs who are qualified to teach physical medicine and rehabilitation.

MANY SKILLS NEEDED

Due to the comprehensive and intensive nature of the kind of work involved, the need for specialists is critical. Of the more than 350,000 physicians licensed to practice medicine in this country, only 369 are certified psychiatrists.

At this time, only 143 graduate medical students are trained in this field.

In 1958, only 57 percent of the residences in physical medicine and rehabilitation were filled.

Only half of the Nation’s medical schools have men on their staffs who are qualified to teach physical medicine and rehabilitation.
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Due to the comprehensive and intensive nature of the kind of work involved, the need for specialists is critical. Of the more than 350,000 physicians licensed to practice medicine in this country, only 369 are certified psychiatrists.

At this time, only 143 graduate medical students are trained in this field.

In 1958, only 57 percent of the residences in physical medicine and rehabilitation were filled.

Only half of the Nation’s medical schools have men on their staffs who are qualified to teach physical medicine and rehabilitation.
in their support of categorical medical research programs. The program should be comprehensive enough to afford the medical student the broadest possible view of the field. It should be conducted at high level to familiarize the student with the most advanced learning in the field and give him an understanding of the potential it offers in both treatment and research. It should provide an opportunity for students to come in contact with leaders in the field, since this is recognized as one of the most influential factors in the selection of a specialty.

**Utility existing know-how**

Certainly consideration should be given to medical schools and research institutions that are now acknowledged leaders in this effort. The institutes are now reorganized to conduct research at a level high enough to afford the medical student the summary of the efforts and accomplishments with older efforts to control tuberculosis on a regional basis. Problems unheard of as recently as 10 years ago may now be dealt with in an environment that would be much more desirable than that of the chronically ill and aged to relieve the expense and congestion of hospital care. I am especially interested in the work of the Public Health Service to improve nursing home care for the aged since there is evidence that many people could receive better care in such homes in an environment that would be much more suitable than that of our crowded medical institutions.

**Revolutionary Hospital Design**

Particular attention is properly being paid to hospital design and the construction of facilities for the care of the chronically ill and aged to relieve the expense and congestion of hospital care. The committee is greatly interested in these developments and we were impressed by the work being done in hospital design at the Rochester Methodist Hospital in Rochester, Minn. Revolutionary new designs promise the kind of economical construction and efficient operation that are necessary if we are to provide hospital care at reasonable costs for our growing population.

**Generous Support of NIH**

Since our chairman has given you a summary of the facts and accomplishments of the National Institutes of Health, I merely want to make a few observations on some of the practical considerations that should interest all of us. The Congress has generously supported this effort to conquer disease and we can be proud of some of the results. Again, we are always impatient with the progress made in programs so directly concerned with human life and human suffering. Dollars and cents are not an accurate standard by which such work can be measured and every breakthrough has a special meaning of its own. Two diseases alone, heart ailments and cancer, touch the lives of almost every family in the United States. Every new advance in eliminating or treating them is of immeasurable worth.

**Can Improve Administration**

But, because this work is so important and of such personal consequence, we are rightfully concerned that the best possible use be made of the resources committed to it. Appropriations have increased from $53,386,000 in 1952 to $560 million this year. The committee is recommending $841 million for 1962, which is $88 million less than requested in the budget and $81 million more than appropriated for 1961.

The generosity of the American people in support of these programs imposes a grave obligation to use every dollar as wisely as possible. I confess to misgivings about some of the fiscal operations involved in the rapid expansion of so many research programs. Not because I want less done, but because I want more done with the resources we have assigned to this great humanitarian endeavor.

A report of the Committee on Government Operations offers 13 recommendations on improving administrative practices. Although our committee has made no recommendations in this regard, I think it would be wise for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Institutes of Health to give careful and careful consideration to these recommendations.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan said...

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, introduced resolutions recommending reorganizations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Trade Commission. The plans are numbered, respectively, 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Hearings on the plans are scheduled for Thursday, May 18, 1961, in room 501-B, New House Office Building.

All parties interested should immediately contact the chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable William L. Dawson, Democrat of Illinois, if they wish to express their views for or against the reorganization plans.

Unless the Senate or the House votes its disapproval within a 60-day period following submission of the plans by the President, they will become the law of the land.

Plan Nos. 1 and 2, on the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission, respectively, were submitted April 27. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on June 28.

Plan No. 3, affecting the Civil Aeronautics Board, was submitted on May 3. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on July 2.

Plan No. 4, affecting the Federal Trade Commission, was transmitted May 9. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on July 8.

I have always opposed a delegation of legislative power to the President as being unconstitutional. We have given the President our power to make the laws unless we interpose a veto.

On May 10, I introduced resolutions of disapproval for each of the four plans in order to provide an opportunity for opponents of the plans to express their views and for the House of Representatives to express its view.

These resolutions were referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The committee may be discharged from further consideration of the resolutions if it has not been reported prior to May 20.

A motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of any of these resolutions may be made if any member favoring the resolution of disapproval.

When the committee has reported or has been discharged, it shall at any time thereafter be in order to proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Members opposed to a reorganization plan should vote "yes" on the resolution disapproving the plan.

While having introduced these resolutions of disapproval (H. Res. 285, 286, 287, 288) without regard to the merits of the individual plans, permit me to point out that each of the plans involves the delegation of important functions of the Commissioners to employees far removed from the control of the electorate.

I might also be noted that, despite the fact that the Committee on Government Operations, in reporting out the last extension of the basic enabling legislation—the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended—declared "a tendency in recent years for the Executive to submit plans without the full justification in reducing expenditures and promoting efficiency," the President, in each of the four plans submitted thus far, has simply stated:

It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have urged for some time that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare establish a Public Health Service shellfish laboratory in the North Shore area of Massachusetts, and I strongly recommend approval of this project for the East Coast in order to deal more effectively with the shellfish industry and the serious depletion and
pollution which has taken place in past years.

The North Shore area of my district is famous for its fish. On every occasion and beyond, and officials of such municipalities as Newburyport, Ipswich and Essex strongly advised me that such a laboratory would serve a tremendous useful purpose, providing clam populations to their former abundance and ridding shellfish of undesirable bacteria resulting from polluted waters. The North Shore would be ideal from every standpoint as a site for experimental work on a laboratory scale.

The city of Gloucester, Mass., famous as a fish center, has also expressed a special interest in this project. The Fish and Wildlife Service already maintains a biological office there and important research work is being carried on.

The Public Health Service is well aware of the seriousness and the urgency associated with problems of the shellfish industry in Massachusetts and other States along the New England Coast and it is considering the New England area as a possible locale for such a laboratory. It believes that such a laboratory, if properly equipped and in keeping with the level of public-health protection afforded by the State shellfish sanitation programs, your approval of this project is strongly urged.

Mr. DOYLE, Mr. Chairman, I very cordially concur with the other Members of this distinguished body who have already complimented the distinguished subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fougary), and every member of his so very important subcommittee—both majority and minority members—who have submitted this down-to-earth authorization bill for our consideration today. I use the term “down-to-earth bill” because almost every one of the items for which this splendid subcommittee has made study and recommended approval concerns millions of human beings who but for the furtherance of the programs in this bill might well suffer and succumb to death-dealing diseases and incurable maladies.

Each one of the last 14 years when the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island on the one hand, and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Lamp), and their respective subcommittee members, have brought forth their recommendations I have noted with pleasure that wherever they recommended reductions, they clearly had good arguments to sustain same.

And Mr. Chairman, wherever the bill recommended increases or new departures and adventures in human welfare, the bill sponsors always had what appeared to me as crystal clear, valid reasons for same. Not least of all in today’s bill I note again the repeated emphasis on research in cancer and research in the illnesses of the aged citizens of our beloved Nation, especially together with the repeated emphasis upon child welfare and education of our youth.

I pass to the full subcommittee my sincere compliments on making such honorable compromises and adjustments between themselves sufficient in sum and purpose so that they have brought this bill to the floor to our attention with their commendable approval. Possibly my observation, which I now make on this point: to-wit, that the objectives of this bill are so high in purpose and necessary that this fact, together with other like basic factors, made it more than usually consistent and pleasant for all of the subcommittee members to join in unison in support of the bill. I hereby call it to us for approval. I thank them each and everyone for doing so.

Mr. MICHEL, Mr. Chairman, this is my first year serving on this particular subcommittee of the full House Appropriations Committee, and I must say that it has been a revelation to me. I want to heartily concur with the thoughts expressed by our chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fougary), and every member of his so very important subcommittee—both majority and minority members—who have submitted this down-to-earth authorization bill for our consideration today. I use the term “down-to-earth bill” because almost every one of the items for which this splendid subcommittee has made study and recommended approval concerns millions of human beings who but for the furtherance of the programs in this bill might well suffer and succumb to death-dealing diseases and incurable maladies.

Each one of the last 14 years when the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island on the one hand, and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Lamp), and their respective subcommittee members, have brought forth their recommendations I have noted with pleasure that wherever they recommended reductions, they clearly had good arguments to sustain same.

And Mr. Chairman, wherever the bill recommended increases or new departures and adventures in human welfare, the bill sponsors always had what appeared to me as crystal clear, valid reasons for same. Not least of all in today’s bill I note again the repeated emphasis on research in cancer and research in the illnesses of the aged citizens of our beloved Nation, especially together with the repeated emphasis upon child welfare and education of our youth.

I pass to the full subcommittee my sincere compliments on making such honorable compromises and adjustments between themselves sufficient in sum and purpose so that they have brought this bill to the floor to our attention with their commendable approval. Possibly my observation, which I now make on this point: to-wit, that the objectives of this bill are so high in purpose and necessary that this fact, together with other like basic factors, made it more than usually consistent and pleasant for all of the subcommittee members to join in unison in support of the bill. I hereby call it to us for approval. I thank them each and everyone for doing so.
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The free world rests on the military strength of the United States. The military strength rests on our economy and the soundness of the dollar. The dangers of inflation which weakens our military strength, accompanied by all the evils that the depression and enslavement that accompanies it, and the soundness of the dollar.

Our economy rests on the necessity of deficit financing, accompanied by all the evils of price deflation and maladjustment. The free society rests on the outcome of our challenge of communism with the destruction of the dollar.

The free world rests on the military strength of the United States. The military strength rests on our economy and the soundness of the dollar.

I am tired of the congressional business as usual which shows an increase in most items of expense over last year, although a reduction from what we might have spent. We get too interested in the double entry justification of expenditures and forget that what we really should be doing is cutting expenses below last year. Our national existence is in peril, yet we not only spend as usual but increase the welfare as though it were not so important.

We should get our priorities straight. First, and always, a balanced budget—even reduce debt and taxes—then military expenditures. After this there should be an apportionment of what remains to the necessary expenditures of Government.

To do less than to be fiscally responsible in this way is not my definition of a Congressman's role. This appropriation bill should and could be considerably less. Therefore, I oppose this bill.

MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, once again, as I have done so often in the past when this annual appropriation bill has come before us, I want to express my personal gratitude to the gentleman from Rhode Island for the magnificent work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation which is so vital to every American. As a result of the work of the Fogarty subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the American people have been living longer, living better, enjoying better health, better educational opportunities, improved health and welfare programs generally, and are enjoying greater protections against nearly all of the hazards of our fast-paced environment.

I am pleased to see that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff has recognized the importance of many of the changes proposed in my bill. In the hearings of the Fogarty subcommittee, furthermore, Commissioner Larrick of the FDA has gone through a list of shortcomings in the powers and authority of his agency, and these coincide to a great extent with the loopholes which H.R. 1235 would close. Briefly, some of them include:

First. The lack of authority to require pretesting for safety of all ingredients used in the making of food; or, as stated in the lines of the Food Additives Act of 1958 provisions for ingredients used in or on foodstuffs.


Third. The lack of clear-cut authority for requiring easily readable labeling of drugs, food, and cosmetics, particularly as to weights and sizes.

Fourth. The lack of airtight factory inspection authority such as would be necessary to ensure more physicians to prescribe medicines by generic terms rather than by trade names.

Fifth. The lack of effective regulatory powers over the sale and distribution of hazardous drugs, such as amphetamines, the so-called pep pills.

Sixth. The lack of required certification of all antibiotics rather than just the few covered in the basic act.

Seventh. The lack of authority to require proof of efficiency as well as of safety of new drugs.

Eighth. The lack of authority to require testing for U.S. and non-U.S. such as technology changes, gaps in the law enable new dangers to the consumer to develop without any attempt to divide the opposition into a single, organized opposition to the whole bill. Yet I feel that in 23 years we have done much too slowly in closing loopholes in the basic act as they have developed or have become glaring.

I am certain that it is not good legislative tactics to put so many controversial provisions into an omnibus bill which would touch so many unrelated industries, and thus might create an organized opposition into a single, organized opposition to the whole bill. Yet I feel that in 23 years we have done much too slowly in closing loopholes in the basic act as they have developed or have become glaring.

The process of taking one subject at a time every 2 years or so, and closing the loopholes in just one area at a time, may serve to divide the opposition into manageable proportions, but the progress is much too slow. And, in the meantime, as technology changes, gaps in the law enable new dangers to the consumer to develop without any attempt to divide the opposition into a single, organized opposition to the whole bill.

I believe it to be. OTHER IMPORTANT PROGRAMS IN APPROPRIATION BILL

In the meantime, I applaud the overall problem now with open minds and a determination to make the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act into the consumer protection statute it is supposed to be and which most Americans trustingly believe it to be.

This appropriation bill this year, howev- er, which deserves comment, I believe. For the first time since I came to Congress 8 years ago, I am delighted to find that the executive department, from the President on down, has recognized without apology of any kind the vital importance of the funds requested for all of the social welfare programs and consumer protection services covered in this bill, and this is truly a new atmosphere.

I remember in 1953, when the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration, for instance, was slashed somewhere in the neighborhood of $5 million; in this bill we are appropriating the record level of $23,580,000 for FDA.

Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938

A good part of the credit for the re-vitalization of the Food and Drug Administration in recent years must be ascribed to the effective report filed by the Citizens Advisory Committee in 1955 which spotlighted so dramatically the starvation appropriations this agency had been receiving. Before that, some of us had been vigorously, but unsuccessfully, trying to call these facts to the attention of the White House and the Budget Bureau during the first few years of the Eisenhower administration, but no one seemed to be listening.

I note that the committee report on this bill now suggests the establishment of an expert committee to take up where the 1955 report left off, and to evaluate the work of the agency and its minimum needs on the basis of so many developments since 1955 in food, drug, and cosmetic technology.

To my mind, however, far more urgent than such a study—which I am sure would be worthwhile—is the need for comprehensive revision of the basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. In 23 years since that important act became law, we have had a series of patchwork improvements added on to it, but fundamentally the act suffers from many forms of obsolescence. That is why I prepared and introduced on the first day of this session H.R. 1235 which is a modern bill attempting to close the many glaring loopholes in the basic act.

GAPS IN PRESENT LAW WHICH WOULD BE CLOSED

In the meantime, I applaud the overall problem now with open minds and a determination to make the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act into the consumer protection statute it is supposed to be and which most Americans trustingly believe it to be.

OTHER IMPORTANT PROGRAMS IN APPROPRIATION BILL

In the meantime, I applaud the Fogarty subcommittee for its action in this bill, not only on the Food and Drug Administration's record budget but on the tremendous amounts recommended for the National Institutes of Health and other vital programs of the Public Health Service, including research into the major diseases which plague mankind and into the environmental factors which present such dangers to the environment. These are the most useful dollars spent each year by the Federal Government. There are so many other items of importance to the general public in this appropriation bill,
including programs of the Department of Labor, that it is impractical for me to try to mention them all in these few minutes.

But I do want to make this point on the proposal in the committee report that the $1 million-a-year program now in operation for teachers to obtain training in the skills mentally retarded be expanded to increase the limitation and also to include mentally retarded be expanded to increase the limitation and also to include teachers of children with speech and hearing defects.

I was happy to join with the gentleman from Rhode Island, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Elliott) and other sponsors in the extension research program to try to mention them all in these few minutes.

Yes, but the $1 million-a-year program now in operation for teachers to obtain training in the skills mentally retarded be expanded to increase the limitation and also to include mentally retarded be expanded to increase the limitation and also to include teachers of children with speech and hearing defects.

When I introduced the original bill in the 86th Congress, it was my hope we could arrange for public hearings in that Congress on this whole subject of teachers of exceptional children, but no hearings were scheduled then or in the 86th Congress. I am pleased that the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Drake) is now planning to arrange such hearings for later in the current session, and I look forward to a comprehensive review of the needs in this field. An extension research program was authorized in this area in the last Congress and I hope that we now have sufficient background information to justify going ahead with an effective action program to meet the needs of exceptional children.

All areas of exceptionality should be included.

Much as I recognize the need for more trained teachers for the mentally retarded, and for children with speech and hearing defects, as suggested by the Appropriations Subcommittee in its report, I think we must also open our eyes to the similar needs of children with other types of handicap, including emotional disturbances, heart disease, the crippled, and so on. And with the increasing emphasis in our educational system in trying to locate and identify the extraordinarily gifted, we certainly need more teachers especially trained to give these outstanding youngsters the best possible guidance and help in achieving to their full learning potential. That holds true also for all of the exceptional children.

Mr. Chairman, again I congratulate the Fogarty subcommittee for an outstanding legislative accomplishment in this bill. We do not expect every Member will be in agreement with every decision made in the legislation—obviously some compromises are required in connection with an appropriation bill aggregating, as this one does, more than four and a quarter billions of dollars—the net result is a magnificent recognition of the social welfare needs of our country.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1962 appropriation bill for the Office of Education contemplates several serious reductions below the budget request—reductions which will hamper the new Commissioner of Education in his effort to assist American education achieve the level of excellence which the Nation deserves and needs.

The fiscal year 1962 appropriation bill authorizes the elimination of about 40 positions—a serious handicap to a new Commissioner of Education. The positions eliminated would retard the improvement of educational statistics; would eliminate the College Information Center, a service program for guidance and counseling personnel. This program for high school students and their parents to assist in the selection of a proper course of higher education, and would seriously hamper meeting the workload increases under the National Defense Education Act, particularly in the area of audit of loan, grant, and contract programs with universities and colleges.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For grants and scholarships under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1850-1853), $210,857,000, of which $75,145,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be for such loans for non-Federal capital contributions; $84,000,000 shall be for grants to States and loans to nonprofit private schools for science, mathematics, or modern foreign language equipment and minor remodeling of facilities; $8,750,000 shall be for grants to States for supervisory and other services; $12,800,000 shall be for grants to States for area vocational education programs; and $16,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling:

Provided, That in the event that appropriations contained in this paragraph shall be available for fellowships in the humanities and social sciences field.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order to try to get the National Defense Education Act back to where I think the Congress intended it should be: that is, to provide fellowships for the study of mathematics, physics, engineering, chemistry, and other sciences as an aid to the national defense effort of this country. This thing has gone far astray. We now provide fellowships for social studies, studies in humanities, and so forth. My amendment simply brings it back to where I think it should be. I know of no reason why under the National Defense Education Act there should be studies of the ecology and economics of flowing water, English folklore, and American folklore. What is the difference between English and American folklore? I will be pleased to answer any member of the committee in the difference and why we should be providing fellowships under the National Defense Act to study folklore, jazz, and so forth.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman on folklore and jazz, but we can do a great deal of good in the economies of flowing water, I think that is the term which the gentleman used correctly. The water supply of our country and of the allied countries of the world is a vital asset in the cold war and a good water supply is necessary.

Mr. GROSS. If this is so imperative why did you not write something into the water pollution bill to provide for education on this subject?

Mr. EDMONDSON. In this instance you have to begin in the schools. You have to prepare your men and women.

Mr. GROSS. Then go on. This does not deal with kindergarten or elementary schools.

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am certainly in sympathy with what the gentleman intends to do. But at our service academies, whether it be the Army, Navy, or Air Force, in the curriculum are also studies in the humanities and social sciences. Would the gentleman wipe out these courses of study at our defense academies?

Mr. GROSS. Those are special and particular schools. Cadets do not major, as the gentleman well knows, in such subjects as folklore, the theater, anthropology, and ballet dancing.

Mr. MICHEL. That is true. By the wording of the gentleman's amendment it covers a rather wide scope.

Mr. GROSS. It just brings it back to mathematics, physics, engineering, and chemistry where I think it ought to be.
they voted for the National Defense Education Act. If the Members of the House will turn to page 497 of the hearings, they will find page after page of grants to various universities and colleges for study of languages and science. It went far beyond that. I do not see why we should today take over the responsibilities of the proper legislative committee to amend the National Defense Education Act by approving the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gросс].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 11: Loans and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, loans and payments under title II of the National Defense Education Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year: Provided, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid for the same purposes during the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to comment on some information that has been provided to me by Members of the House with regard to the allocation of the funds for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education. The information which has been supplied to me on how the Office plans to allocate the cut in their request is not in accordance with the committee report. We would certainly request that the new Commissioner of Education follow this report, and give consideration to the desires of the committee as expressed in the hearings.

It is my understanding that the Office of Education plans to reduce, by a little over one-third, the number of new positions requested. The committee's report expressly states that the reduction is over 50 percent. During the hearings on this portion of the Office's budget, the weaknesses in the area of statistics was commented on at length and emphasized not only by committee members but by the witnesses. I have been told that the Office of Education plans to apply a major part of the cut to their budgeted program to improve statistics in the field of education. I hope that the information I have received is not correct but, if it is, I certainly think some reprogramming is in order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Furse, 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. 7036) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks and include extraneous matter, and that I may have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.