

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 10809, with Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey 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 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to be able to bring this appropriation bill to you for your consideration today. This is the 14th year out of 18, that I have served on this committee, that I have had the privilege of offering this appropriation bill to the House.

First I wish to thank all the members of the subcommittee for their attendance at all the hearings and their hard work on this bill.

This year, because of the insistence—and I believe rightly so—by our chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that we get our bills reported

earlier, it was necessary to work long hours, to keep on schedule, and on many nights we worked until 6 o'clock.

I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] on the Democratic side, and to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] on the Republican side, for their attention and cooperation.

As I have said before, no committee can work its will or do a decent job unless it has a good clerk. I believe we have one of the best clerks on appropriations in Mr. Moyer who serves our committee.

There is nothing startling in the bill today. Some increases are provided over the amounts for last year, and there are some decreases. The only significant changes in the bill result because of legislation passed by the last session of the Congress. Those were in areas dealing with health and education.

Mr. Chairman, I will insert in the RECORD a table showing in summary, the committee's recommendations included in the bill compared with the budget requests and the appropriations for fiscal year 1964.

Summary of estimates and appropriations

Department or agency	Appropriation, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (including 1964 supplementals)
Department of Labor.....	\$392,508,000	\$725,510,000	\$585,954,000	+\$193,446,000	-\$139,556,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	5,372,823,500	6,789,299,000	6,276,200,000	+903,376,500	-513,099,000
National Labor Relations Board.....	22,460,000	25,250,000	24,000,000	+1,540,000	-1,250,000
National Mediation Board.....	1,950,000	1,970,000	1,970,000	+20,000	-----
Railroad Retirement Board: Limitation on salaries and expenses.....	(11,065,000)	(10,500,000)	(10,500,000)	(-565,000)	(-----)
Payment for military service credits.....	-----	13,834,000	13,834,000	+13,834,000	-----
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	5,690,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	+410,000	-----
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	-----	-----
U.S. Soldiers' Home.....	(6,622,000)	(6,888,000)	(6,888,000)	(+266,000)	(-----)
Total.....	5,795,436,500	7,561,968,000	6,908,063,000	+1,112,626,500	-653,905,000
Consisting of— Related to 1964 supplemental appropriations.....	-----	457,186,000	-----	-----	-457,186,000
Related to 1965 appropriations.....	5,795,436,500	7,104,782,000	6,908,063,000	+1,112,626,500	-196,719,000

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 10809, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and one-half of the time to be controlled by me.

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

As will be noted from the above table the committee considered requests totaling, in round figures, \$7.56 billion and recommends appropriation totaling \$6.91 billion, or a reduction of \$0.65 billion.

The committee considered both 1965 estimates for these two departments and related agencies and the pending requests for supplemental appropriations for 1964 for the same departments and agencies. The committee carefully considered each individual supplemental request for 1964 but in view of the prospective timing for the final enactment of this appropriation bill, the committee has denied all of them. In all instances where a new program is involved the committee has included language in the bill to make the 1965 appropriation for these programs available immediately upon enactment of the bill. Thus, if

the bill should become law before the end of the fiscal year, these important programs could be started.

The disallowance of requests for supplemental appropriations accounts for 70 percent of the total reduction recommended by the committee. In most part, the reductions recommended in the 1965 budget are only token reductions. There is a reduction of \$100 million in the appropriation "Grants to States for public assistance" which is an administratively uncontrollable item and if the committees' estimate proves to be too low, it will have to be made up in a supplemental appropriation.

The other large reduction is \$83,094,000 in the request for "Manpower development and training activities." This is a very important program and as the committee's report points out, this re-

duction in no way reflects a lack of appreciation of the importance of this program to the national economy, nor is it made with a view to reducing the number of training programs or the number of people who may receive training. In other words, if the committee's estimate of the speed with which this program can expand is too low, the Department almost has an invitation to come back with a request for a supplemental appropriation.

Thus, if one takes out of consideration the requests for supplemental appropriations, and the two items mentioned above, action on the remainder of the budget requests represents a net decrease of less than \$14 million which, percentagewise, is almost infinitesimal.

On the surface, this may appear to reflect an unusually liberal attitude on the part of the committee. When one analyzes the character of the 1965 budget for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, one gains a somewhat different perspective. The action of the committee does not so much reflect a liberal attitude as it does a recognition that the 1965 budget was one of the most conservative that has been submitted to Congress in recent years. The only significant increases were in connection with new legislation that made increases close to mandatory. Increases in this category include in round figures, \$300 million for the manpower development and training program, \$150 million for vocational education, \$464 million for higher education facilities construction, \$37 million for defense educational activities, \$85 million for health professions educational assistance, and \$35 million for construction of community mental health centers. With the exception of these programs, there were no significant increases in the budget for either Department. It was a hold-the-line budget, even in highly important fields like the Public Health Service, and, in many cases, even cut back from the level of operation provided for by the 1964 appropriations.

While the original 1965 budget was certainly conservative, it was made even more so by a budget amendment submitted to Congress on March 9, 1964. This budget amendment reduced the requests for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare by some \$4 million and 640 positions.

It was in view of the type of budget before it, that the committee made very few substantial reductions in the 1965 budget, and even increased a few appropriations above the amount requested.

For the Department of Labor the bill includes \$585,954,000, which is \$193,446,000 more than was appropriated for 1964 and is a reduction of \$139,556,000 from the amount requested. There is very little change in the Department of Labor's appropriations except for the manpower development and training activities for which \$327,906,000 is included in the bill. This represents an increase of \$217,906,000 over the amount appropriated for 1964. Thus this one item accounts for more than the total increase in the De-

partment of Labor. The reduction which the committee recommends in the budget request for this program, including the supplemental request, totals \$138,094,000, or approximately the total amount of the reduction in the whole Department. As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, this reduction in no way reflects a lack of appreciation of the importance of this program, nor is it intended that the committee's action result in any reduction in the number of people who could otherwise be trained. It simply represents the committee's best estimate of what the Department will be able to accomplish under this program during the next 15 months.

The first item under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the very important "Food and Drug Administration." The committee has approved the full budget request which represents an increase of \$3,395,000 over the amount appropriated for 1964, however, two-thirds of this increase is necessary to cover mandatory costs most of which is the amount necessary to annualize new positions allowed for part of the fiscal year 1964. The rest of the increase is mostly for the partial implementation of the recommendations of the President's Advisory Science Committee on the Use of Pesticides, and to carry out the Kefauver-Harris drug amendments of 1962.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The committee considered two very important new programs in the Office of Education, "Expansion and improvement of vocational education" and "Higher education facilities construction." In both instances there was a request for a supplemental appropriation which the committee has not allowed. This disallowance in no way reflects a desire on the part of the committee to hamper the progress of these programs in any way. Both of these programs represent most significant advances in the field of education, and it is certainly my desire and I believe the desire of the committee that progress be made as rapidly as possible. The practicalities of the situation, which are discussed in more detail in the committee report, are that it would be practically impossible for any significant program progress to be made before the end of this fiscal year under the most optimistic outlook with regard to the final passage of this bill.

The committee has allowed the full 1965 budget request for the vocational education program, which was \$183,296,000, and allowed \$463,150,000 for the higher education facilities construction program. The reduction of \$850,000 made in the request for the latter program is from the \$1,750,000 which was budgeted for technical services to be rendered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This estimate was based on the program starting in fiscal year 1964 and being in full operation during fiscal year 1965. It is now obvious that there will be very little need for these technical services until well into fiscal year 1965. The committee's action allows the full amount requested for construction grants and loans.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

Mr. Chairman, on December 16, 1963, President Johnson signed the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. The statesmanlike action of the Congress in approving the bill, H.R. 6143, was lauded by the President in remarks he made upon signing the new law. On that historic occasion, Mr. Johnson paid great tribute to the Congress when he said:

This new law is the most significant education bill passed by the Congress in the history of the Republic. In fact, this session of the Congress will go down in history as the education Congress of 1963.

Significant as was the enactment of this extremely important measure, approval of the bill represents the accomplishment of only one of the major steps required to implement fully this urgently needed program.

The measure upon which we deliberate today provides the funds necessary for meeting the objectives of the law.

Mr. Chairman, the objectives of this law were thoroughly and admirably presented and explained to the House by distinguished members of both parties. Surely, the vote by which we approved this act is testimony to the overwhelming agreement on the urgent need for the assistance it provides. I remind my distinguished colleagues that the vote was 258 to 92 in favor of the measure. Further evidence of the wide support for the act is the action of the other body approving the bill by a two to one majority.

It appears abundantly clear that the House must translate its awareness of one of the most serious problems facing higher education into appropriate action, if this act is to provide the properly trained present and future generations upon whom the very security and welfare of the United States depend.

Perhaps the strongest argument for the speedy adoption of this appropriation is the tremendous work already accomplished by State and institution officials and by the U.S. Office of Education. The response of the States to the new program serves to underscore their readiness to assume their responsibilities under the act. To date, 34 States have designated commissions to participate in the administration of the grant program. Final action by five other States is imminent.

Mail arriving in the Office of Education from college and university officials indicates their advanced state of preparedness to use the Federal funds as soon as they are available. In view of the matching requirement included in the grant program, we may conclude, with justification, that the program has provided, in a few months, the kind of impetus to individual institution effort which was predicted during House debate. This is rather remarkable when one realizes that the matching requirements in the case of 4-year colleges is two-thirds of the construction project cost. This remarkable degree of preparedness on the part of States and institutions, even before appropriation approval augers well for the success of this milestone legislation.

During the period December 18, 1963, to April 9, 1964, the Commissioner's office has received 750 letters from State officials and school administrators relative to some part of the act. Many of the letters informed the Commissioner of institution readiness to participate in the program. Others asked how soon Federal funds would be available. Virtually all of the letters emphasized the importance of implementing the law at the earliest possible date.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues that the excellent work of the colleges and universities cannot proceed until this appropriation is approved. State commissions cannot function until the appropriation sets in motion the machinery for processing applications. And, in fact, many planned construction projects for which grant money may be available are being held up until the school officials know that applications may be submitted.

U.S. Office of Education officials have met and will continue to meet with representatives of colleges and universities to discuss procedures involved in administering grants for construction projects. Daylong meetings have been scheduled for Atlanta, April 15; New York, April 16; Chicago, April 22; and Denver, April 23. Attending these meetings will be members of State commissions and other State officials involved in the administration of the act.

Preparation of the regulations governing the act has been one of the major efforts of the task force. The regulations, applications, and supporting documents are in final draft form and await only the appropriation approval before they are printed and distributed to the colleges and universities of the Nation.

I am sure my colleagues would agree that all parties involved in the administration of the act have been proceeding admirably under rather serious limitations. Further progress awaits our action here today. Only by approving this appropriation measure will we make it possible for the program to be administered effectively.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to be guided by the unquestioned need for appropriate action on the measure before us and respectively request that we join in the same bipartisan effort which marked our approval of the bill. Let us move quickly to approve this appropriation.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Reports from all of the States indicate that plans have been underway for sometime to enable them to implement the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 promptly upon the availability of funds. It is known, for example, that all States have undertaken preparatory steps in the preparation of new State plans which would incorporate amendments to the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts as well as in providing for operations under the new act. The States have made an analysis of their present State plans in relation to the act, as they would interpret it and thus have been preparing themselves with understandings which would make

possible more rapid preparation for implementation of the program.

The provision of authority for expenditures for the construction of area vocational education school facilities has been of considerable interest to the States. In the fiscal year 1963 it was reported that 71 new area vocational technical schools were opened and put into operation; 37 new area vocational technical schools were under construction; 69 were in the planning stages; and 53 schools were planning to expand their offerings in technologies this year. It is known that the States have plans for continued expansion of this activity and would be aided materially in the accomplishment of this objective by funds if appropriated by the Congress for this purpose.

In addition to the regular biennial sessions of most State legislatures, 1964 sessions are meeting in 22 States and many of these are being asked to consider legislation in behalf of vocational education.

Activity has been reported by the States both in the matter substantive legislation regarding the establishment and operation of area vocational school facilities and in sizeable appropriations to implement plans for these new facilities. For example, in Kansas, the legislature appropriated \$700,000 to aid in the implementation of such plans and local communities have been given taxing power and authority to issue bonds which they are doing for new construction purposes, as in Emporia, in the amount of \$600,000, just recently. In Rhode Island, the legislature appropriated \$2 million for the development of regional vocational technical schools of a secondary school nature. The State Board has already asked the Office of Education for professional help in developing programs for these schools. In New Hampshire appropriations have totaled \$7 million for the construction of a central technical institute of post-secondary level plus two other area vocational technical centers and including the planning for three more of these. In West Virginia a fund of \$500,000 was made available to continue area vocational education programs. In Arkansas, a special session of the legislature will consider supplementary budget requests for participation in the program authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Visits with State boards for vocational education and legislative committees reveal interest in gearing up State staff activities in anticipation of greatly improved authority for programs of vocational education.

An example of the States need for assistance is revealed by a survey of an 84-percent sample of high school students in one State. Twelve thousand students responded that they would attend a vocational technical school if such an opportunity were available. It was estimated that upon employment a total earning capacity of more than \$5 million in the first year would have been gained by these youth. In that same State the unemployment of vocational school graduates was only 5 percent while 15 percent of the other high school graduates were unemployed.

More than 50 expressions of interest have been received regarding the establishment of residential vocational education schools. These have come from wide geographical areas around the country.

Considerable interest has been expressed regarding the establishment of vocational education programs in business and office occupations; 18 States have indicated a desire to add a supervisor in this field to the staff of the State education department; numerous meetings at least one in almost every State have been held by professional groups having concern for business and office education.

In the matter of replacement of vocational school equipment, about which there has been national notice regarding the need, many of the States have reported their intention to modernize their provisions for improved learning opportunities for students preparing for gainful employment.

Representatives of State boards for vocational education in all States have reported greatly increased interest in the program of vocational education as this would contribute to the solution of some grave social and economic problems affecting the lives of youth and adults in all parts of the country.

LIBRARY SERVICES

This bill does not include a budget item for Public Law 88-269, the Library Services and Construction Act. I would like to comment on this omission on behalf of the committee. Despite repeated inquiries by the committee, no budget request for this program was transmitted to Congress until 5 days after the hearings had been closed, obviously too late to be considered.

The Library Services and Construction Act was approved by the President on February 11, 1964. When he signed the bill the President noted that:

Books and ideas are the most effective weapons against intolerance and ignorance. Anything that we can do to enlarge the number and the quality of libraries is, I think, an act of national achievement.

The States and communities are ready and eager to participate in the expanded library services program. Since 1961, every eligible State and territory has been participating in the Library Services Act of 1956 which was limited to rural areas and did not allow the use of funds for the construction of public libraries. Even under that limited program, State and local appropriations for rural library services increased 180 percent. Now that benefits under the law have been extended to urban areas, greater and more rapid achievements can be predicted.

Library facilities are generally inadequate and obsolete throughout the country. Only 4 percent of the libraries now in use were built within the past 40 years. Urban areas are greatly in need of the increased library services they can receive under the new act if funds are appropriated; 60 percent of our population live in areas covered by the expanded law.

The States report that \$25 million can be fully matched and effectively used in

1965 for the development of public library services in urban and rural areas. They also report that \$30 million can be far overmatched and fully used in 1965 for public library construction. Many communities have been planning new buildings and are now waiting for Federal matching funds to move ahead.

Public Law 88-269 passed the House on January 21, 1964, by a vote of 254 to 107. This fact indicates our commitment to the importance of good public library service for every American citizen.

My own State is intensely interested in the potential progress which this program will make possible. Rhode Island has drafted a statewide plan for better libraries which can be put into immediate operation when funds become available. Never have I seen interest in libraries and determination to improve libraries so great as it is in my State today.

Across the Nation there are some 16 million persons without any public library. Another 110 million people have inadequate libraries, many of which are poorly housed and understaffed, with book collections which are limited and obsolete. As our population changes and grows, many social and economic problems confront our cities and towns: illiteracy, unemployment, delinquency and deprivation. These are all problems that a good library can help to solve. Free to all, the public library meets the user on his own terms, provides materials at his level of development, and allows him to proceed at his own pace. Those adults who have just begun to read English, those unemployed whose jobs have been automated, those youths whose training has not fitted them for productive work—all these and more may turn to the public library for free, unbiased, and reliable information.

I know that good libraries cost money. We have all seen the excellent return on our modest investment in the rural library program. I believe that the Federal Government has a definite responsibility toward the support of good libraries. Public Law 88-269, if properly funded, has great promise in making good library service a reality for all our citizens.

The vocational rehabilitation program continues to be one of the best, if not the best, moneymaking programs of the Federal Government. A conservative estimate is that for every dollar spent \$7 comes back in Federal taxes alone. When other benefits are included the results are at least 10 to 1. Of course the human benefits are immeasurable in dollars and cents. The committee has included the full amount of the budget requests for all appropriations under the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration with the exception of \$55,000 which was budgeted for increasing the overhead allowance on research grant projects. The budget was prepared on the basis of increasing the amount to be allowed for this purpose from 20 to 25 percent of the direct cost. The committee has retained the 20 percent limitation and so has reduced all amounts budgeted for more than that.

The first item under the Public Health Service, is "Buildings and Facilities." The committee allowed the full amount of the request for \$21,512,000 but made internal adjustments to disallow funds requested for the Environmental Health Center, for which \$1,500,000 was requested; add \$2,500,000 for the Midwest Water Pollution Control Laboratory at Ann Arbor, Michigan; and reduce remaining projects by \$1 million.

The committee was unable to find any good reason for the reduction recommended in the budget for accident prevention activities. The appropriation for fiscal year 1964 was \$4,163,000 and the budget request for 1965 was for \$3,823,000. Certainly a reduction in these activities is no economy measure for the Nation's economy is saved many times the cost of this program by the results it obtains. The committee hearings on this subject revealed very conclusive evidence of this. The committee has therefore restored the reduction and has included \$4,163,000 in the bill.

Much the same situation prevails with regard to control of tuberculosis. The 1964 appropriation was \$6,828,000 and the budget reduced this to \$6,364,000. If there was any doubt whatsoever that a reduction in this appropriation is being penny wise and pound foolish, it was dispelled by the report by the task force established by the Surgeon General at the request of the Committee on Appropriation. This report recommends a 10-year program to reduce the very significant health problem of tuberculosis to the point approaching insignificance. It pointed out that if such a program were followed, it would, during this 10-year period, save \$1,250 million in hospital costs alone. The committee felt that not to invest the funds necessary to carry out this program would be the essence of false economy. The committee has therefore recommended in the bill an appropriation of \$10,364,000 or an increase of \$4 million over the amount recommended in the budget. Of this \$4 million, \$1 million would be for formula grants to the States, and \$3 million would be for project grants.

Another recommendation in the budget which surprised and disappointed the committee was in connection with control of venereal diseases. In its report 3 years ago the committee directed the Public Health Service to make a thorough restudy of this program and be prepared with recommendations for a program that would result in the eradication of syphilis. A task force was selected to make this study under the chairmanship of Dr. Leona Baumgartner, commissioner of health, city of New York. There was practically universal agreement among experts in this field that the task force submitted an excellent report and recommendations. The committee added \$1 million over the budget request for fiscal year 1963 in order to get started on this program. The budget for 1964 continued the program, and the committee is at a complete loss to understand why the budget for 1965 cuts back from the task force recommendations, just at the time when the program is beginning to be effective in

reversing trends of recent years toward every increasing incidence of this disease. The recommendation of the committee to increase the budget request by \$314,000 is simply to restore this reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that the budget provides so inadequately for research training in the field of community health. We were led to believe, a year ago, that a real program was to be started but the budget provides for almost nothing compared to the need. I certainly hope that more attention is given the important activity in the future.

The health professions educational assistance program is another new program for which both a request for a supplemental appropriation for 1964 and a considerably increased appropriation for 1965 were requested. As in other similar programs, the committee has recommended no funds for 1964 solely on the basis that time will not permit any substantial activity under the program this fiscal year under the most optimistic predictions for final passage of the bill. However, in recognition of the fact that this is one of the most important new programs in the field of public health, the committee has allowed the full amount of \$85,782,000 requested in the budget for 1965. As in other similar programs, the committee has also included language in the bill which will make these funds available immediately upon enactment in case the bill should be enacted before July 1, 1964.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. Chairman, we take up next the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health.

Through these programs we invest approximately a billion dollars a year in health research and training—representing our main national effort in the national attack upon the health problems of the people: What do we look to these programs for? For today and tomorrow, we invest for healthier and fuller lives for ourselves and for our children; for the future—and I say this without sense of overstatement—we look to individuals bred to a new splendor and fulfillment. Let me preface my summary of this part of the bill with a comment that I feel can not be restated too often—though doubtless you will find it self-evident. That comment is this: There is no human need more basic to any of us than good health.

Mr. Chairman, esteemed Members of this House, I am sure that each of us can testify—on the basis of his own experience—the fear, unhappiness, and distress that results when we, or our family, or our closest friends pass from health to serious illness.

I think none of us has been so fortunate that he cannot testify to this.

I ask also: As we know the world, from having lived in it awhile—is there another good that stands equally with health in making a difference to everything we do—especially in making it possible to enjoy every other good or blessing that comes our way? I think not.

I ask these questions. But do not really doubt your answers: For a number of years now, congressional consen-

sus on the primacy to be given to meeting health needs—and to support for the health research programs that are the key to accomplishing that purpose—has been clear, enthusiastic, and nonpartisan.

With this as background, you will be able to appreciate my disappointment at the inadequate budget request we received this year for these programs of the National Institutes of Health. I am particularly concerned at the lack of leadership shown by the executive department in presenting so conservative and unimaginative an assessment of national health needs. Last year's relatively progressive budget, you will recall, gave up hope that a new era of budgetary realism had begun.

I have been intimately involved in the development of these health research programs over the years. And time and again—and more often than it should have been necessary—I have seen the Congress stepping in—because in good conscience it could not do otherwise—to assure the funds to seize present opportunities—as identified by our science leaders—to meet the most urgent of these health needs. Largely because the Congress has had the foresight and good sense to take bold action—these health related programs have flourished. Their effectiveness and high reputation throughout the world are unequalled in the science area. All of us—each day—count increasing benefits from these programs. I reiterate my conviction that what has been wrought in this post-war effort in medical research will emerge as the most significant Federal action of our era.

To judge the adequacy of program totals in the 1965 request for NIH, the committee listened with interest to official and outside witnesses, describing the present state of knowledge, recent gains and further needs and opportunities in each research area. I think you will find the record of these hearings—some 650 pages in all—completely reassuring on the benefits derived from our expenditures. Let me cite just a very few of the significant research gains which these programs contributed to in the past year:

Remission rate for children with childhood leukemia increased to about 90 percent, with increases also in the periods of remission and number of 5-year survivals.

A 2.1 percent decline in the average population of State and county mental hospitals during 1963—the eighth year in a row that there has been a decline. The 1963 drop represents an annual savings to taxpayers of about \$12 million.

Increasing evidence of viral causation of cancer—with at least the possibility, therefore, of eventual control through vaccines.

Promise of new understanding of aging phenomena and associated disease processes—including possibly cancer—through studies of growth promoter—"promine"—and growth retarder—"retine"—found in the thymus gland by Nobel Prize winner Albert Szent Györgyi.

Undefined but obviously tremendous research potential through synthesis of

the benzene molecule—nature's most common organic building block—long considered an impossible chemical achievement. Synthesis of a biologically active, artificial insulin molecule, that should prove an invaluable tool for studying insulin action in diabetes.

Rapidly intensifying research in molecular biology—quite possibly the most active and exciting research area in all science today—with many contributions to knowledge of fundamental life processes, including the way characteristics are passed from generation to generation.

These hearings are also most instructive on the inadequacies of the present budget submission.

Let me cite a few of the inadequacies: As you know, two new National Institutes—child health and human development and general medical sciences—were established at NIH about 1 year ago. Would not any reasonable person expect a strong buildup of essential program staff, and presentation of a series of definite and clearly formulated program proposals in these new areas? The committee anticipated this, but unfortunately these matters were not at all clear.

Two of the Institutes received a net reduction in comparison with 1964 program levels. Oddly enough, these were the National Heart Institute and National Cancer Institute—which are responsible for research on respectively the Nation's largest and next largest killer diseases.

In the training area, the request simply is not consistent with the well publicized and generally accepted goal of doubling biomedical research manpower during the decade of the 1960's. For example, take fellowships: Appropriation requests for five out of nine institutes show an actual reduction in number of fellowships, relative to 1964 support levels. For three of the remaining four institutes, the 1964 level is maintained in 1965; and the final institute shows a small increase in number of fellowships, but the same funding level.

Also, there are no significant increases for the research resource programs of the Division of Research Facilities and Resources. Since there is abundant testimony that these resources are the key to further progress in a number of research areas, the committee found it hard to understand the neglect of this program in the 1965 request. Balance-of-payment fiscal policies have been applied uncritically to the small but vital international research programs of NIH. The evident consequence—unless the executive department specifically exempts these programs—is that these programs will be sacrificed; without any real gain to our balances problems.

In summary: Though these programs are the key to health gains—and thus to health savings and increased citizen productivity—they appear to have received no special recognition whatever in the budget formulation for 1965.

These are the actions taken by the committee with respect to the 1965 request for NIH:

For the 10 operating appropriations of NIH, plus health research facilities con-

struction, the bill recommends a 1965 total of \$1,045,242,000. This represents an increase of \$70.788 million over the 1964 appropriation level—or an increase of about 7.3 percent. It represents a reduction of \$4.25 million from the 1965 request.

For regular research grants program, appropriations will go up approximately \$36.5 million. However, money for completely new grants remains at the 1964 level—with one exception noted below. This increase is needed to pay the higher cost and greater number of research projects active now, for which support will be continued in fiscal year 1965.

Among special research grants programs, the bill provides an additional \$5 million for general research support grants, bringing that program total to \$40 million. Testimony strongly backs up the value of this institutional support program. It permits certain grantee institutions active in health research a greater measure of flexible control over their own research activities. Another increase: Mental Health Institute program of hospital improvement grants is doubled by the addition of \$6 million. Minor increases include \$1.3 million for stepped-up operating levels on primate centers; and the general and categorical clinical research centers—taken together—will receive about \$300,000 more, largely to consolidate the present level of the program.

The bill provides an additional \$8 million in training funds to the Mental Health Institute. This will help meet acute shortages of mental health personnel—mainly service personnel for the new community mental health centers program approved by Public Law 88-164. General medical sciences also receives an increase for training grants—\$1.2 million. However, this will go for higher costs and increased number of grants active now that will be continued in 1965. Fellowship programs are held at the 1964 level, except for increased stipend costs estimated at \$735,000, and going mainly to NIMH and NIGMS.

The health research facilities appropriation is increased by \$2 million, as authorized in Public Law 88-164, for construction of mental retardation centers.

The bill allows an additional \$7.2 million for direct operations. This will make possible about a 3.7-percent rise in intramural research and roughly a 4.7-percent increase for collaborative studies.

One significant decrease was proposed in the budget request for 1965 and is reflected in the bill: \$4.2 million for State control programs of the Mental Health Institute, representing the completion of NIMH State planning grants for community mental health centers.

The bill now before the House contains one very important increase over the 1965 budget request: The committee received such conclusive testimony as to the urgent need for stepped up fundamental research in problems of immunology, that \$2 million was added for this purpose to the research grants total for the Allergy and Infectious Diseases Institute. Over the past year or so, I am sure you have all read many reports of extraordi-

nary organ transplant operations, in which diseased kidneys, lungs, livers—and even hearts—of fatally ill patients that have been replaced by well organs, with potentially lifesaving effects. These operations represent triumphs in terms of surgical techniques. Understandably, there has been growing public excitement at the possibilities in this area. Unfortunately, however, the lifesaving potential of these operations is almost never achieved on a permanent basis: the patient dies—in a few weeks or a few months—for one of two reasons: Either because the body's immunologic defense—a little-understood mechanism that repels all foreign proteins in the body—eventually rejects the foreign organ; or because attempts to suppress this basic defense reaction of the body permits some other disease to attack with fatal effect. What is lacking in this area is fundamental knowledge of how the immunological defense mechanism works, whether—and how—it can be modified to tolerate vital organ transplants, or can be suppressed without fatal risks. It is felt that by concentrating funds for this effort in one Institute—NIAID—there is best assurance of prompt and purposeful development of research efforts in this vital area. The committee took note of a second research area where the need for increased effort—and the promise of research gains—was highly visible, though ignored by the executive branch. This is in drug therapy—including use of hormonal substances—for the control of coronary heart disease. The committee, therefore proposes earmarking of \$850,000 in 1965 research grant funds to get this program started. The need identified to the committee was for a tightly controlled cooperative study, utilizing engineered approaches, including carefully drawn research protocols. It is recognized that a substantially increased effort—rising to \$2 or \$3 million annually—will be required in subsequent years; and that an addition to funding—rather than earmarking or regular grants funds—should be requested, with backup based on specific program plans.

In connection with the Social Security Administration, the committee is very pleased to see that they are finally planning a program to construct many of their own office buildings rather than rent. This is not only going to result in much more satisfactory space arrangements in many cases, but will result in saving millions of dollars just on the small start that is now planned and should result in savings of many tens of millions if it is expanded in the future as seems logical and feasible.

Early in January, before this budget was submitted, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and I made a trip to the Southwest for the primary purpose of a firsthand review of the Mexican farm labor program. While we were there we also visited other activities of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare in this area. Among these was the Social Security Administration's payment center in San

Francisco. We were surprised to find this operation located in the high rent district of San Francisco whereas their operations require only a simple building which could be located anyplace where good transportation is available for employees. We mentioned to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in our report that it appeared that many millions of dollars could be saved by construction of their own buildings rather than by renting. So the committee is pleased to see that they budgeted \$5,750,000 to begin a construction program. The committee has approved the full amount.

Under the Welfare Administration, the committee has recommended a reduction of \$100 million from the amount of \$2,980 million requested for grants to States for public assistance. The committee cannot see why the cost of this program needs to continue going up, especially in view of the 1962 amendments which were supposed to reduce these costs, and in view of the increase in economic activity estimated to result from the tax cut, and the inroads to be made by the war on poverty program.

The committee reduced the amount of the request for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Family Services" by \$264,000 which will allow them approximately one-half of the additional positions requested.

The bill also includes a reduction of \$2 million from the request of \$131,830,000 for "Grants for maternal and child welfare." This results from the committee's action to provide an increase of \$2 million rather than \$4 million for day care centers. For fiscal year 1964 this activity has \$4 million.

There are no particularly significant changes in the special institutions or in the Office of the Secretary. Perhaps the most significant in the latter category is that the committee allowed \$13 million for the relatively new program "Educational television facilities," which is \$6,500,000 more than the appropriation for 1964, the first full year of operation, and a reduction of \$2,300,000 from the request.

The only change which the committee made in the budget requests for the related agencies was in connection with the National Labor Relations Board. The bill includes \$24 million, which is a reduction of \$1,250,000 from the request, but an increase of \$1,540,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. There appears to be no doubt that workload will increase somewhat in 1965. The amount in the bill will cover all mandatory increases in costs and over \$600,000 for additional personnel to handle the increased workload.

This is an overall summary of the bill and certainly does not cover all important activities that it provides for. However, I have taken a considerable amount of time and will not take more unless Members have questions.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have two questions to ask. One is on a point that

the gentleman discussed, the Higher Education Facilities Act. I notice that the supplemental for \$266 million for this year was not allowed. There is a provision for a carryover in the bill. Is there any chance that later in this year there will be a supplemental appropriation which would allow this \$266 million, or that it would be approved next year in addition to the full amount that has been authorized for the following year?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether I can give a direct answer to that question. I do not know whether there will be a supplemental appropriation bill this session. But under the law, the additional money could be added to the appropriation bill next year and it will not be lost.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. If the authorization for Hill-Burton is passed this will call for some few hundred million more dollars than is contained in this bill; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. If Hill-Burton is passed retroactively as is, it would add about \$220 million more than is in this bill. They could use \$400 or \$500 million instead of \$200 million from the requests that they have had.

Mr. GROSS. That would still be \$220 million which would be added to the \$1.1 billion above last year's spending; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out to the gentleman from Iowa that the Hill-Burton authorization currently before the legislative committee, calls for an increase in the program. It is not just a continuation of the present program.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Then is it \$220 million or \$400 million, or what that is being asked?

Mr. FOGARTY. All I know is that if the act is just extended it would be about \$220 million. But if they modify it as the gentleman from Wisconsin just stated I do not know what that request would amount to. We have no control over that at all. The House would have to work its will if and when the committee reports that legislation to the House.

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

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

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for the work that he has done on this subcommittee.

As a member of the committee I know how much time, work and study has gone into this bill. The chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out that because of the necessity of getting the appropri-

tion bills passed before the first of the fiscal year, we worked long hours on this bill. We started early and worked late. The chairman of this committee for the past 14 years has worked hard and has been able to do a great deal for labor and for projects in the fields of health, welfare, and education.

Mr. Chairman, I could mention many things in addition which the gentleman from Rhode Island has accomplished. But I refer to those in particular. I would like to mention also his very effective and prominent work in the field of retarded children, and the tremendous amount of work he has done in the field of medical research.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the tightest budget we have had during the 14 years I have served on this subcommittee. It does not provide as much for some of the programs as I would like. However, I feel, as the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, it is a compromise bill and it is the best bill we could get under the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, again, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the effective work which he has done on this committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his kind remarks.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. As I mentioned earlier, I had two questions. At this point I will direct my second question.

I know of no committee in the House that does a more conscientious job than the committee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island. I must say I am sure not only the members of the Education Committee, because many of them have strongly supported this proposition, but countless other people will be disappointed also, that there is nothing in this appropriation bill for carrying out the Library Services Act, for basic to any educational program certainly there is the necessity for having libraries and books.

Does the gentleman think there would be any possibility of having legislation yet this year which would enable funds to go to the libraries across the country?

Mr. FOGARTY. Of course, this bill goes to the Senate. The Senate will work its will. We will then go to conference. I have stated my position. I am for the full amount, and will do everything I can to see that the full amount is appropriated for the fiscal year 1965.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman is saying it might be added by the Senate or through a supplemental?

Mr. FOGARTY. The authorizing legislation passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote. It passed the House by more than two to one, and I would assume that the committees considering this appropriation will take into consideration this action of both Houses, and do something about it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am not critical of the committees, but I would join with the gentleman in his general ideas along this line.

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as I am concerned, if the budget had been before us we would have had \$55 million in the bill for library services.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. I should like to point out that on the day the President signed this bill the Bureau of the Budget had a letter of transmittal to the Congress requesting these funds typed and ready for his signature. That was not signed by the President until more than 2 months later.

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

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

Mr. JOELSON. I share the gentleman's disappointment that there are no funds for the extended library services, but I am encouraged by the gentleman's statement and position and support of this general appropriation and hope something will be done about it. I also want to add my voice to those that have been raised in admiration of the chairman. He has done a splendid job, and I want to express my personal gratitude.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for such an excellent job. I too share the disappointment of the chairman of the subcommittee concerning the lack of library funds in the bill for this fiscal year.

The gentleman is certainly to be commended in seeing that these other programs such as the National Defense Education Act and vocational education, are being adequately financed.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. I observe that in connection with the hospital construction activities there is included \$23,346,000, much of which is for the mental retardation program, and \$45 million to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act we passed last year. The gentleman may have mentioned it in his discussion heretofore, but I do not observe that there are any funds for what is considered to be the regular Hill-Burton construction program.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, there are no funds for what we know as the Hill-Burton construction program, because the act expired and I believe the gentleman's committee is holding hearings now on a new bill.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what I wanted to make clear in the Record. The committee has concluded hearings. We are now meeting in executive session. We are endeavoring to get the schedule of

the committee rearranged. We had hoped to get the bill out already. It will probably be next week before we can conclude the consideration of it, though we are going to try to tomorrow. Does the gentleman have any information as to whether or not a supplemental appropriation would very likely be forthcoming should we get the authorization extension?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know of any plans for any supplemental bills this year.

Mr. HARRIS. There is in the budget a certain amount of funds for hospital construction, is there not?

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. On this point I think it might be pointed out that it is our hope that legislative action will be completed on the authorization in time for the Hill-Burton authorization to be included in the regular bill in the Senate. The question of a supplemental would then be a moot question.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the gentleman for his suggestion. I was endeavoring to make the record here for the benefit of the members of our own committee and the States who are interested in the continuation of the program and those who are interested in the projects with reference to the appropriations for the next fiscal year, 1965. It would also be my hope that we could expedite the consideration of the authorization for this in time for it to be included in this bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. I know of no plan for a supplemental. As the gentleman from Wisconsin said, if the legislation is passed before the Senate considers this appropriation bill, of course it could be taken care of.

Mr. HARRIS. It will be my purpose, in order to do our job, to get it through so that can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island has consumed 28 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subcommittee that works hard and long and accumulates more testimony than any other subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. In reading over this report I have but one disagreement with my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island and our committee report. What I quarrel somewhat with is the use of the term "conservative" in this report. The gentleman from Rhode Island insists on the use of the word "conservative" as the hallmark of the report which we have before us today. I do not know what a liberal report would be in view of the fact that this bill contains \$1,112 million more than the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor appropriations for fiscal year 1964. Under the definition of the word "conservative," I would say that this report falls short of that particular label. But labels sometimes do not mean very much and, insofar as this report is concerned, I think it is better if we do not try to use a label but just say that there is an increase of

\$1,112 million in the 1965 budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor and a decrease of some \$650 million from the President's budget.

It is only fair, I think, to point out that about \$1 billion of the increase in this 1965 bill is a result of the enactment by the Congress last year of four programs. Those four programs are the Health Professions Assistance Act, the Vocational Education Expansion Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act and amendments to the Manpower Training Act. President Johnson asked for a total of \$1,554 million to finance these four new programs for fiscal years 1964 and 1965. The committee has reduced the Johnson request for 1964 and 1965 for these four programs by a total of \$500 million. We have included a total of \$1,058 million to finance these four programs as compared with President Johnson's request of \$1,554 million for these programs.

Here is how the reductions were made. In the Health Professions Assistance Act, the budget asked for \$115 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 to finance this program. The committee has combined 1964 and 1965 and made available upon the passage of this bill, whether it be next week, next month, or June, a total of \$85 million or a reduction of \$30 million from the budget request.

In vocational education, the committee was asked to provide \$243 million in the budget submission. The committee has made available \$183 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 or a reduction of \$60 million in the budget.

In the area of higher education facilities, the budget documents requested \$730 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 and the committee has made available \$463 million for 1964 and 1965.

For manpower training the committee was asked to provide, for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, a total of \$466 million. The committee has recommended for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, \$327.9 million, or a reduction of some \$138 million on this particular program.

The bill is a difficult bill on which to make reductions, particularly when dealing with the new programs. I add that there are before the Congress at the present time requests for new authorizations for new programs to be administered by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor which total \$1.5 billion, in addition to the programs funded in this particular bill.

It is impossible to predict with certainty what action the Congress will take on the new program requests for these two departments, but I predict that we shall have not heard the end of appropriations for these two departments when we act upon the bill today, because all of the increased poverty program spending, hospital construction spending, and spending for many other new programs presently pending before legislative committees will be considered at some future time in connection with requests which undoubtedly will be transmitted by the administration when these new programs are enacted.

I should like to call attention to two deletions which were made in the budget by the committee in the area of construction.

The committee deleted funds for the planning of new Food and Drug buildings in the Washington, D.C., area. It also deleted the funds for the establishment of the environmental health center in the Washington, D.C., area.

My vote was cast to delete those funds because of the heavy concentration of research activities and bureaucracy in general in this particular section of the United States.

Other committees of the Congress at this time are receiving recommendations from the Department of Defense and from the civil defense planning group of the Department of Defense for greater dispersal of these activities, so that they will not be concentrated in one area of the United States.

We had before us the broad budget covering all departments, and learned that President Johnson, in submitting his recommendations to the Congress this year, provided that 74 percent of all the construction money for new research facilities be concentrated in the coastal States. We have seen this trend developing for the past 10—yes, 15 years. There has been a concentration in space, military, health, atomic energy, and all the large research installations, in the coastal areas of the United States. This has had a tremendous effect upon the Midwestern region of the United States. I refer particularly to the Big Ten schools, and include with the Big Ten schools the University of Notre Dame and also the University of Chicago. This complex of graduate schools in the Midwestern section of the United States is supplying the greatest number of advanced degrees, on a percentage basis to enrollment, of any educational institutions in the United States.

My own University of Wisconsin has a higher number of Ph. D.'s working for the Federal Government here in Washington, D.C., than any other institution of higher learning in the country.

What is the reason for the exodus of advanced degree personnel from the Midwestern area of the United States to the coastal areas of the United States? The reason is simple to explain. Eighty-four percent of all of the basic research work being done in the United States today is being done with Federal tax dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The concentration of research facilities is in the coastal States. The only place that these people can receive the employment and the compensation they should, and pursue the work which they have trained for with their advanced degrees is in these coastal States where the Federal financing of these research projects has been concentrated for the past few years. This is going to be more and more of a problem, and unless we in the Congress are willing to face up to it and are willing to look at this problem of the disbursement of our research dol-

lar on a fair and equitable basis, we will be creating in the great midwestern section of the United States an economic wasteland. I say this because whether it be in the area of health research, atomic energy research, space research, or defense research, we find that the procurement dollars follow the location of the research dollars to a very marked degree. It should be pointed out that research contracts are not awarded on a competitive bid basis but are awarded on an assignment basis. This is something that I think we should call to the attention of legislative committees as well as all Members of the House of Representatives so that we can have a better development of the Nation as a whole, which development is being retarded in certain sections through the manner in which these research dollars are disbursed. In these hearings we developed some very interesting points and I would like to call the attention of the committee to the discussion, concerning the Food and Drug Administration, which we had with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This begins on page 1312 of our hearings. I have been alarmed as I have watched the growth of the Food and Drug Administration, during the period of 12 years that I have served on this subcommittee on appropriations, at the large number of Food and Drug Administration people who are hired from this agency who go to work for concerns that are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration. I am not so concerned with the fact that these employees from the Food and Drug Administration come back and testify publicly before hearings that the Food and Drug Administration conducts on the use of this or that drug, or on the use of this or that additive in food, and so forth, because these are public hearings and the record is open for anyone to see. I am, however, concerned about another phase of this.

We found on the first survey, that during the last 5-year period 83 former Food and Drug Administration employees had gone to work for regulated concerns and we found some 96 former employees that are still to be reported on.

I believe you will find a major portion of these 96 former Food and Drug Administration employees are working for regulated concerns.

Here is what happens. A concern makes a breakthrough with some drug or with some other product that is regulated by the agency. It has spent, in many cases, hundreds of thousands of dollars in the development of this product through research. They have proprietary rights to these products. The employee of the Food and Drug Administration is given all of the information as to the ingredients, the formula, the manner in which this or that product was manufactured. This has to be. This information should be made available to the Food and Drug Administration. But immediately that particular employee of the Food and Drug Administration becomes a very

valuable asset to a competing concern. His knowledge could be valued in some cases in the millions of dollars.

These particular concerns that are in competition go out and try to outbid one another for the services of the evaluator that had access to all of this confidential information on the development of this or that product and that particular person can command a tremendous salary in private industry because of the knowledge that he was able to gain through the study and through the analysis of that product.

I was shocked to find in answer to my question in a very minor survey of 4 or 5 weeks that some 83 individual employees of the Food and Drug Administration had moved in this direction. There are some 96 on whom we are still checking. It seems to me that the legislative committees of the Congress as well as the Appropriations Committee, should give serious thought and con-

sideration to this, a new conflict-of-interest problem which is going to be with us to a much larger extent as we face the next 10 or 15 years when more and more regulations in the field of food, drugs, cosmetics and many of the other new types of products will be issued by the Food and Drug Administration.

This is one of the areas that both we in the Congress and the executive branch of our Government must take more interest in. If the executive branch will not police itself in this area, then it is our responsibility to investigate thoroughly. We started this year, through the development of this record, to go into an area which needs to be examined to a much larger extent in our hearings next year.

Mr. Chairman, before I complete my remarks, I will place in the RECORD material showing some pertinent comparisons with regard to Federal employment provided by funds in the bill.

Comparison of estimated number of permanent positions provided in the bill with the number authorized for 1964 and number requested for 1965

	1964	Original 1965 budget	Revised 1965 budget	Bill	Bill compared with—		
					1964	Original 1965 budget	Revised 1965 budget
Labor.....	8,452	8,542	8,542	8,346	-106	-196	-196
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	77,058	79,421	78,811	78,323	+1,270	-1,093	-483
Other.....	4,788	4,994	4,984	4,840	+52	-154	-144
Total.....	90,298	92,957	92,337	91,514	+1,216	-1,443	-823

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill. I believe the committee was wise in combining the supplemental appropriation requests with the 1965 budget request for health professions educational assistance, for vocational education, for higher education facilities, and for the manpower training program. We have made a reduction of \$500 million in these four programs from the requests of the President but I am sure that the funding levels which we have provided will be adequate to carry on these programs to a high degree of efficiency. The funds for these programs will be made immediately available upon the passage of the act.

I am supporting this bill and I hope that we will have a strong vote in support by Members on both sides of the aisle for this compromise which has been worked out by your subcommittee.

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I fully embrace the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and would underscore what he has said relative to the "conservative" nature of this 1965 budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The position of Mr. FOCARTY, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, has been known throughout the years. We do not see eye to eye on a

number of items in this bill, but I will say this for him, he is always considerate of the minority's view and gives us ample opportunity to develop our own line of questioning and present our case. What he believes to be conservative today is something altogether different from what I believe to be conservative. The facts are, the total amount of direct appropriations for both the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and their related agencies comes to \$6,908,063,000 for the fiscal year 1965, as against a total of \$5,795,436,000 for the current fiscal year, or an increase of better than \$1.1 billion.

It is true that the big increases in this bill are a result of new legislation that in effect made some of these increases mandatory—which all goes back to the old story that we cannot cut back on the level of Federal expenditures if the Congress itself, at the prodding of the President and his administration, continue to enact new authorizing legislation. We on the Appropriations Committee are foreclosed from "legislating on an appropriations bill" and our only recourse is the imposition of limitations and guidelines by report language.

I believe the subcommittee took the proper course in eliminating supplemental requests for the balance of this fiscal year, tying them together with the requests for the coming year, 1965, with the authority to begin spending as soon as this bill is enacted. This action might very well spur the other body to move

more expeditiously on this, and other appropriation bills.

This bill includes \$327,906,000 for manpower development and training activities, which is a booming increase of nearly \$218 million over 1964.

The bill also includes \$455,076,000 in grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment security administration. This is an increase in this area of over \$30 million. The committee report states that "priority in use of these funds for employment services must be for the placement of the unemployed," and I would add to that, from a personal point of view, that emphasis should be given to those unemployed who do not have the education and ability to express themselves, rather than putting so much emphasis on the college graduate. It would seem to me that those with the highly technical skills also have the capacity for securing jobs on their own. I am reminded of a publication of the Illinois State employment service for February 1964, which lists a public relations man at a salary of \$10,000, an advertising manager at \$10,000, an advertising production manager, \$10,000, a copywriter at a salary of \$21,000, an industrial relations manager, \$10,000, a copy supervisor with a range of \$20,000 to \$25,000, a copy group head at \$20,000, a general accountant at \$10,000, merchandising manager at \$10,000, account executive, \$12,000, and a host of others.

This, to my mind, is just nonsense and is taking the U.S. Employment Service far afield from its original intent and purpose. There are private employment agencies throughout the United States adequately equipped and fitted to perform this function and the practice of concentrating on the placement of executives, highly skilled and well educated is not, in my opinion, a primary function of the U.S. Employment Service. It was designed primarily to help those who really need some form of assistance in finding a job.

The Food and Drug Administration appropriation is now up to \$39,200,000, an increase of \$3,395,000 over 1964. Except for the mandatory pay costs, the increase is for partial implementation of the recommendations of the President's Advisory Science Committee on the use of pesticides and to carry out the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1962.

I am glad the committee has seen fit to disallow any funds for planning for the development of a building site in the Beltsville area. I have been one of those who have severely criticized this concentration of further Federal facilities in the Washington area.

In the area of education, it is very significant that the bill includes \$183,296,000 for the coming fiscal year in expansion and improvement of vocational education. This is over \$148 million more than was appropriated for the current fiscal year.

At the beginning of my remarks, I made mention of the additional legislative enactments of the Congress which were responsible in large measure for upping the figures in this bill. Not the least of these is the higher education facilities construction portion of the bill

which comes to \$463,150,000, and we have included nearly \$12 million, the same as appropriated for the year 1964, for further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

There is also included in this bill \$287,-853,000 for Defense educational activities which includes, of course, the contributions to student loan funds. The committee has also been very generous in allocation of funds for the education of the handicapped and cooperative research. I should point out that the U.S. Office of Education is growing by leaps and bounds. As I recall, back in 1958 there were some 500 employees in the U.S. Office of Education and the request for the coming fiscal year was for 3 times that number, to something in the neighborhood of 1,500, but I would go back once again to what I said in my initial remarks—that we cannot keep this level of Federal employment in check if we continue to authorize new spending programs.

On page 2 of the report, the chairman refers to a "hold the line budget, even in highly important fields like the Public Health Service," but I would point out that we are spending considerable sums in this area.

This bill calls for expenditures as follows for the Public Health Service:

Building and facilities.....	\$21,512,000
Accident prevention.....	4,163,000
Chronic diseases and health of the aged.....	53,722,000
Communicable disease activities.....	29,828,000
Community health practice and research.....	22,575,000
Control of tuberculosis.....	10,364,000
Control of venereal diseases.....	10,030,000
Dental services and resources.....	6,651,000
Nursing services and resources.....	4,031,000
Hospital construction activities.....	23,346,000
Health professions educational assistance.....	85,782,000
Health professions educational assistance (1964 supplemental estimate).....	
George Washington University Hospital construction.....	9,350,000
Environmental health sciences.....	
Environmental health sciences (1964 supplemental estimate).....	20,930,000
Air pollution.....	
Air pollution (1964 supplemental estimate).....	
Environmental engineering and sanitation.....	9,117,000
Occupational health.....	5,163,000
Radiological health.....	19,598,000
Water supply and water pollution control.....	34,239,000
Grants for waste treatment works construction.....	90,000,000
Hospitals and medical care.....	52,710,000
Foreign quarantine activities.....	6,851,000

Now, in addition, Mr. Chairman, for the National Institutes of Health, there is over \$1 billion in this bill, as follows:

General research and services.....	\$162,959,000
Biological standards.....	4,969,000
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.....	42,696,000
National Cancer Institute.....	140,011,000
National Institute of Mental Health.....	187,932,000
Construction of community mental health centers.....	35,000,000
National Heart Institute.....	124,174,000

National Institute of Dental Research.....	\$19,983,000
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.....	112,050,000
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.....	69,847,000
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.....	87,621,000
Grants for construction of health research facilities.....	58,000,000

This brings the total figure for Public Health Service to \$1,582,154,000.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to say that last year I was opposed to our embarking upon a big construction program for an Environmental Health Center for this project would ultimately cost some \$50 million or more and that, in my opinion, adequate work was currently being done at the Taft Center in Cincinnati. Now I am not so sure that in the future we will not have to proceed with something better, but I for one shall never give in to the establishment of this Center here in the Washington area. There is absolutely no reason in the world why we have got to have such a concentration of Federal facilities here in the Washington area and some of us out in the Midwest particularly are going to have to join forces on both sides of the aisle in opposition to this concentration if that is what is necessary to convince any administration in power that there ought to be a more equitable distribution of these Federal facilities. I can guarantee that if there were an establishment of this kind in my home State of Illinois, we would not be petitioning the Federal Government for special grants for school construction under the federally impacted school bill, as is the case here in the neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia. Federal employees with long tenure at a given installation ought to be treated like ordinary citizens and they should pay local taxes to support the education of their children, just like everyone else has to do. The only justification in my opinion for the granting of this assistance is in truly defense establishment areas where there are great influxes of transient Defense Department personnel.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity of speaking on this bill. I had very much hoped that before this time I would have been able to submit a bill somewhat similar to the one which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has submitted to the committee of which he is chairman. Mine would have been on the matter of training bedside nurses.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has to do only with the appropriation of money for the purpose of teaching chiefs, but not Indians. They are all to be degree nurses of some kind. Of course, there are not enough of these, that I grant. There is a tragic lack of nursing care for the sick in this country. There is a terrific gap between these top degree

nurses and the practical nurses who do what they are trained to do exceedingly well, but at most their training is for but 1 year. It is quite true, Mr. Chairman, that the care of the sick has become much more complex, just as medicine has become more complex. No one knows better than the practical nurse herself that 1 year does not give one what one needs to take full care of a sick person. I am very enthusiastic over the practical nurse and am doing all I can to bring high standards into her legitimate field but the great lack at the bedside is not being filled.

Mr. Chairman, back in 1956, I submitted a bill to the committee which had for its purpose the setting up of what I hoped would be the last research group. Since then we have had one research group after another doing one research project after another gathering dust on the shelves. But there has been no action.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked with the nursing profession longer than many. I have considered it one of the great privileges that has been mine to be close to the heart of the care of the sick.

I know very poignantly that our great need is nurses who will nurse at the bedside. We need at least 50,000 of them. We are closing wards and at the same time building new hospitals. But who is going to staff those hospitals? How are we going to take care of the sick in those new hospitals when we shut wards in the old hospitals?

Yes; we need to renew and repair the old ones. We need to do better work in them. We need reorganization of the methods employed in them, of the division of labor so to speak. But how are we going to get that unless there is a real recognition on the part of the nursing profession itself that there is this huge gap between our degree nurses and the practical nurse? I agree that the practical nurse is a marvelous addition to the forces that take care of the sick in this country. But she is not sufficiently trained to assume the heavy responsibilities of a professional nurse.

If we are really going to do a job, Mr. Chairman, we need very definitely such a bill, with certain additions, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has submitted. I did not know it existed until today, and I have not had time to go over it to know what is in it; but I am sure he and I could sit down together and get somewhere in this whole matter.

What we need is nurses at the bedside. Yes, we need administrators. Yes, we need teachers. We cannot add to the number of the rank and file unless we have more teachers. But that is all this House has been doing—giving millions of dollars to increase the number of teachers. That is fine, but let us not forget that there are sick people in bed and they need care. They need far more care than hospitals today—with a very few exceptions—are able to give them. I cannot urge you too strongly to consider this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we have had the Surgeon General's consulting group on nurses. They issued a report. It is bright green, and it is very good as far as it goes. It calls for quality in nursing, the need, and so forth.

We also had a second group on evaluation of the professional nurses' traineeship program. It talks about nurses for leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, we must have the nurses who are going to take care of patients in the bed, both in the hospitals and at home, if they need it.

I think we have been really unfortunate in our lack of understanding of this whole problem, which is really serious. Mrs. Scott in her statement before the committee speaks of the shortage of nurses, of course, she is aware of the lack even as I am aware of the changes that must be met in nursing procedures. The need is for much more than greater and broader education. The need, to my mind, is for vastly more fundamental training in the actual care of the sick.

There are two very critical problems. One is the continuation of the effort to supply top nurses. This committee is doing a great deal for this and women everywhere, people everywhere, are especially grateful to this Congress for its efforts. The increased complexity in the whole nursing field makes a very different problem from what it was.

In 1941 the Congress was good enough to listen to my request for additional money to be given for nurse training to the Public Health Department. They did such a beautiful job in increasing the students in the big schools that when I again came before the Congress for more money in order to meet the even greater need through the war we established the U.S. Cadet Corps. That corps graduated 125,000 nurses. But we have not begun to touch the need of today.

We have to have teachers, yes, but we do have to attract the girls who are long-ing to care for the sick.

I am told that one reason why there are not more girls going into nursing is that they want college, they want to say, "I have been to college." All right. Two-year colleges are being established all over the country with 2-year nursing courses. There are more than 40 in California alone. I am told that in every one of those schools, when those girls go to take their State license examinations, they all pass. I would like to know what the license examination contains to find out what they are examined in, because I have been told that there is very little clinical experience in those 2 years. I want thousands and thousands and thousands who have had clinical experience, who know what it is to take care of a person in bed. Many of us know what it means to lie in bed for months on end. Have you? I have, and I happen to have a son who has been there, too. I happen to know a good deal about what it means to be in a hospital or sick at home, and so forth. I think it should be a requirement for most people.

I hope very much that this fine committee will have opportunity to give study to our need for adequate care for the sick of this country and in the world.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLODY].

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order that I might make a few comments and perhaps address a few inquiries to the committee. I certainly want to join the others who have paid high compliments to the chairman and members of the subcommittee who have worked with the extremely difficult problem of this budget.

I have had the opportunity to serve during the past year as a member of what we call the Jones committee, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations headed by the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ROBERT E. JONES, investigating primarily the subject of water pollution. In the course of our investigations we have had occasion to consider the subject of the expenditures of the Public Health Service and other agencies which are concerned with water pollution and water pollution control and, may I say, research in these areas.

It has come to my attention that there is a great deal of overlapping on research and investigation in the areas primarily of water pollution and water pollution control. I notice that on page 424 of the budget, for the first time, the Bureau of the Budget has undertaken to identify water pollution research as a specific item, to correct the former practice of spreading it throughout the entire budget.

I do notice, too, that the budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is up almost \$1 billion, almost 20 percent, and that in the areas of water pollution control I think the increase was between \$5 and \$6 million, which is again about a 20-percent increase over what it was in the prior year.

In connection with one of the hearings of the Jones committee, I inquired as to research activities planned to be carried on at a research laboratory down in Georgia, and was informed that a principal subject was to be a study of the adverse effect of pesticides on water conditions. Yet, I find that subject is also being investigated by the Department of the Interior and by the Department of Agriculture and under a special grant from the Public Health Service to Rutgers University.

Now, these multiple research programs have been explained to me as being complementary programs, but I am still impressed by the fact there is a great deal of overlapping and a great deal of duplication.

With regard to the Public Health Service research programs in the area of water, I have had presented to me a document which indicates there are as many as eight other departments and agencies that are working in the same areas and on the same subjects. I want to call this to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations.

I also want to make a comment about the subject of the proposed acid mine drainage investigation for which an ap-

propriation is included in this bill of more than \$1,500,000. Here is an area where several departments have assured our committee and the Committee on Appropriations that there would be cooperation and coordination. Yet, I am informed that the Public Health Service has unilaterally undertaken to decide where this research project is going to be and has placed it in West Virginia where they have two old deep mines that are no longer used. However, in order to do a competent job on the subject of acid mine drainage, it is going to be necessary to perform a pilot project not only with regard to deep mines but also with regard to strip mines. The pilot project should be carried on with regard to usable mines where people are working and where there are employees. That is something in which this Congress has an interest and ought to have an interest. I feel that the Public Health Service has departed from the admonition of the Jones committee and from what your committee expects will be undertaken.

I have correspondence between the Department of the Interior and the Public Health Service which I will be happy to show to the Members if they care to see it.

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

Mr. McCLODY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to point out to the gentleman on page 19 of the report we go into this very point that the gentleman is making. We made a reduction in the funds available for the administration of acid mine drainage control and abatement. It is true that we are still providing a substantial amount for this work, but we have made a substantial reduction in the budget request for this type of pollution research work.

Mr. McCLODY. I commend the committee for that. But I do want to call to the attention of the committee a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of March 5 which calls attention to the fact that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has acted unilaterally without the kind of coordination that he assured the Congress there would be.

The letter referred to is as follows:

Although we are pleased with some aspects of the progress made at these meetings, we have some concern over developments which seem to indicate that the Bureau of the Budget requirement for joint HEW-Interior agreement has not been fully achieved. We refer specifically to insistence of the Public Health Service that a demonstration site be selected by February 28, despite the indicated and admitted need for at least another 6 weeks to 2 months of field examination to compile requisite data, such as aerial photographs and water quality measurements. In our opinion the necessity for a sound engineering and scientific approach to site selection demands these additional data. Despite our repeated urging to this effect at the Morgantown meeting, we have now been notified informally that a site has been selected by PHS without our concurrence.

Another matter of concern relates to the decision of the Public Health Service to em-

play aquatic biologists for this program rather than to call upon specialists of this Department's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. As recognized in your February 5 letter the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has a significant role in research on acid mine water pollution. As we understand the proposed program to be funded through appropriations to HEW, fish and wildlife interests have not been clearly identified and there is no intent to transfer funds to that Bureau for participation in field studies. This is a serious omission of use of established scientific competency and recognition of agency mission.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the appropriations recommended in this bill (H.R. 10809). I feel the amounts appropriated for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the areas to which I have referred, and elsewhere, are excessive. These amounts should be reviewed further by the Committee.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, title II of H.R. 10809, allowing for implementing provisions of Public Law 88-204, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, is of extreme significance because it responds to the urgent need to help higher educational institutions plan for the increased enrollments ahead which are estimated to double in the next 10 years.

The institutions themselves do not have the ready resources to make available the academic facilities which are anticipated to be very necessary if they are to keep pace with that enrollment. And keep pace with that enrollment, we must—at almost any cost.

Until adequate college facilities are available and within reach of all our able young people, time is wasting away and we are depriving our Nation of its greatest natural resource in failing to develop the unlimited potentials at our disposal and command.

The loan and grant provisions of Public Law 88-204, according to college and university officials all over the country, are the only hope to meet the foreseeable needs in education. The obsolete structures must be modernized to conform to progress; new facilities must be constructed where needed; engineering, medical, scientific and other technical fields must be expanded and new graduate facilities developed if we are to produce a sufficient supply of qualified personnel needed by industry and Government and for research and teaching. It is the responsibility and duty of this body to see that opportunities for higher education are not denied to any of our young people "because there is no room." The burden rests on us today to provide for the expansion of high quality education and research in the technical fields which are so essential to national defense and security and continued economic growth.

There was lethargy and complacency in America before October 4, 1957, when a spacecraft called sputnik challenged our claim of world leadership. We were rudely awakened to the importance of the prerequisite of education and training our young people. We were awakened, sure enough, but not enough has been done to make up for the time we lost prior to 1957.

We cannot recall the lost time, and we cannot dwell on past mortems for lost opportunities, but we can establish an accelerated program of education in 1964. We have no choice—we not only can, we must.

Public Law 88-204 provides for a program of matching grants for assistance to junior colleges and technical institutes and for the establishment of graduate schools or graduate centers created by the merger and cooperative efforts of two or more institutions in providing research projects. Both of the programs are designed to strengthen our educational system. The junior colleges will help alleviate the overcrowded conditions at the 4-year colleges and the universities, and the establishment of the graduate centers will promote a wider distribution of graduate facilities. The cooperative endeavors of educational institutions will, without doubt, provide for the advancement of knowledge and the strengthening and effectiveness of research.

The libraries, laboratories, and the classrooms provided by Public Law 88-204 are urgently needed—the classrooms to house the expanded enrollment, and the laboratories and libraries to accommodate the ever-growing volume of research knowledge.

The \$463,150,000 proposed for 1965, although not sufficient in comparison to the need and urgency, is a trend in the right direction. I urge the passage of H.R. 10809.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I am dismayed by the fact that we are not able to pass appropriations for the Library Services Act this afternoon.

Certainly, as the subcommittee made clear to the full Appropriations Committee last Friday, there is no good reason why the administration failed to deliver the necessary reports so that the appropriations could be enacted at this time.

In fact, I attended the White House signing on February 11, and cannot imagine why this feature of the HEW appropriations was not dispatched in the normal course of events.

Surely, as the President indicated at the White House signing, this is a significant piece of legislation in that it expands the historic Library Services Act of 1956 to include communities with over 10,000 population.

During the floor debate on this legislation, Mr. Chairman, I made the point that the importance of this program and the necessity for its expansion was manifest because of the great nationwide interest in reading, and the importance of outstanding libraries in every community of the Nation.

The outstanding western Massachusetts libraries in my district are in immediate need of the matching grant money allotted under the terms of the Library Services Act, which is now public law of the land.

I understand that it was 5 days after hearings closed on the HEW appropriations that the administration followed through with the necessary reports.

All told, it has been pending since January when the legislation cleared the House of Representatives.

It seems to me imperative that immediate action be taken on the library services legislation. I plan to watch this very closely in the Senate, and I hope their deliberation will expedite the act.

I sincerely hope and trust that they will, because the strength of our country may very well turn upon the continuity and strength of our libraries and the ability of our citizens to have access to the information available at libraries throughout the land.

And finally, what is discouraging about this whole situation is the fact that this is National Library Week, and it would have been an ideal time to start circulating the funds that have been granted to the libraries. Instead we have to wait and give token praise to these institutions during their week in 1964.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this bill that troubles me greatly. The full Committee on Appropriations has cut the appropriations for day care centers by \$2 million. Why?

This Nation is engaged, theoretically, in an effort to overcome abject poverty. Of all the problems that arise out of broken homes or "part time" homes in the cities of this country, the worst is the infection of the little ones. If the young children are brought up in an uncared for, hostile, tension-ridden environment they cannot be expected to become responsible adults. The consequences are school dropouts, narcotics addiction, crime, and all of the other sad and sick results that in turn contribute to the further illness of the neighborhood.

The day care center program was designed to rescue the little ones before this could happen. The day care center program is designed to give children the right start in life so that we legislators will not be required to enact crash programs for the adults when it is too late. Day care centers have proven themselves in New York City. In thousands of cases where the mother works to round out the family income, or, as is often the case, the family is without a father, day care centers have saved the children.

Every cent that has been asked for in the daycare centers is money well spent and an investment with high return to the citizens and the taxpayers.

I know from past history that an effort to restore \$2 million by amendment on the floor of the House would not be immediately successful, because of the unanimous committee position on the subject. However, I do hope that the other body will make the restoration, strengthen this part of the bill, and give us a chance to strengthen our daycare centers in our cities. If there ever was a program that had a minimum of red tape, a maximum of highly dedicated people connected with it, and a maximum of return to the taxpayers, it is the daycare program. If we wish to avoid higher appropriations in the future for crash programs for the relief and rehabilitation of the adult world, a more significant investment in the children's world in this area, is one way to do it.

Finally, I should like to add that eventually separate and special legislation is required in this area. The daycare center program has been given such wide

recognition for excellence that it needs separate handling and substantial authorizations and appropriations. The amount provided in this bill is a beginning, but it is far less than what is needed.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am happily enthusiastic in my support of H.R. 10809 as I have been of all the measures from the subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], whom I regard as one of the great Americans of this generation, certainly in the field of education and health. Mr. FOGARTY, as is well and accurately known, refused a seat in the U.S. Senate offered him on a silver platter, in order that he might continue to serve the cause of health, labor, and education from the vantage position of chairman of this most important subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Under date of April 10, 1964, President George W. Beadle, of the University of Chicago, wrote me:

The University of Chicago has been anxiously awaiting the time when Congress will provide the necessary appropriations to implement the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. We have three projects on the drawing boards at the present time for which we would like to apply for the maximum loan and grant amounts and proceed with the construction involved. You may be interested in the nature of these facilities: (1) Renovation of Cobb Hall, approximately 66,800 square feet, at a cost of \$2 million. This building will provide usable classroom space after renovation. (2) A new chemistry building, approximately 87,000 square feet, at a cost of \$4,500,000 to provide additional laboratory and research facilities for our rapidly increasing enrollments in this discipline. (3) A new \$12 million library.

The first project is ready for the taking of bids, and the second will be in the same situation in 3 months. Prompt action by the Congress would make it possible for us to expand our facilities within a short period of time. I hope you will support the appropriation measure.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BEADLE.

I am informed that the bill now before us provides ample funds for the first two projects listed by President Beadle, which of course are subject to selection on a State level. Only a modest sum, however, is available for library purposes; but this, I am informed, is a temporary condition due to the failure of the Bureau of the Budget to act prior to the closing of the hearings of the Fogarty subcommittee on March 18, 1964.

Public Law 269 cleared Congress in late January of this year by an overwhelming majority. It provided for a greatly expanded library construction as well as library services program. The bill was approved by the President on February 11, 1964, and immediately thereafter the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made request of the Bureau of the Budget for approval of funds with which to carry out the program. This approval, however, did not come until after the House subcommittee had completed its hearings, and it is my understanding that the House conferees will not offer objection if, when this bill reaches the other body, it is amended to provide funds for the implementing of

Public Law 269 and I hope the construction of the new \$12 million library at the University of Chicago.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the members of his great subcommittee on both sides of the political fence for a good job magnificently executed.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make three comments on the appropriations bill we are considering today.

First, I am extremely pleased to see that the subcommittee has acted to fund the important education programs passed by the 1963 "education" Congress. In particular I am pleased that money has been made available to implement the higher education facilities construction legislation which it was my pleasure to work on in the Education and Labor Committee last year. The substantive work of our legislative committee in developing programs such as this means nothing unless it is subsequently backed up by the necessary appropriations.

Second, I am pleased to note that the committee has fully funded the administration's request for 33 additional security guards at the St. Elizabeths Hospital although somewhat distressed that the Bureau of the Budget severely cut the original request of 98 additional security personnel made by the hospital staff. In the hearings before the House Education and Labor Committee's ad hoc subcommittee on St. Elizabeths Hospital chaired by the Honorable Mr. Daniels the need for additional security personnel was fully apparent. You may recall that the subcommittee was established because of the serious problem that had developed regarding the serious crimes committed by escaped "prisoner patients."

Unfortunately, the hospital staff did not act to secure funds to implement the subcommittee's suggestion that a sub-campus be developed specifically for "prisoner patients." It is my understanding that funds for this purpose will be requested in the 1966 budget. In my view this represents an undue delay on the part of the hospital staff in resolving one aspect of the serious problem that the hospital has had in dealing with its contingent of "prisoner patients."

Third, it is disturbing to me that funds have not been allocated in this budget for the planning of the proposed Environmental Health Center. The committee report notes that the committee was presented with "a considerable amount of confused and indecisive information" on this project.

Mr. Chairman, this project has been delayed for at least 3 years and during this period the eventual consolidation of various related environmental research activities has also been delayed. This is not a healthy situation. It is my hope that the Appropriations Committee will be furnished all the information it needs to act on this important project at some point in the legislative process and that the executive branch of government will "speak with one voice" to the Congress on this matter.

For the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, I would

like to submit the text of testimony submitted by Secretary Celebrezze favoring the location of the bulk of this important project in Beltsville, Md.

Contrary to what some of my colleagues may assume, I do not believe that every Government installation should be located in the Washington metropolitan area or in the State of Maryland. I do believe, however, that the principles of economy, efficiency and good management require that a rational determination be made in each case regarding whether the proposed function can best be accomplished here at the seat of our national Government. I do not believe that the location or expansion of facilities in this area is bad per se anymore than I believe that the operations of our Federal Government should be decentralized to provide every community in the United States with some type of installation.

In this regard, I would like to submit for the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Bureau of the Budget that addresses itself to the question of whether Federal facilities should be located within or outside of the Washington area. Each of us is concerned with the cost of Government and orderly development of Federal activities and consequently I am sure we will give these points full consideration.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH CENTER

Secretary CELEBREZZE. I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to add a brief statement concerning the request for planning funds for environmental health facilities.

Mr. FOGARTY. All right.

Secretary CELEBREZZE. The budget contains \$1,500,000 for 1965, to be added to \$785,000 previously appropriated, for the preparation of plans and specifications for urgently needed facilities to house the expanding staffs of the environmental health programs of the Public Health Service. The budget did not state where the facilities were to be located.

LOCATION OF FACILITY

Since the Congress disallowed a similar request last year involving a plan to build an environmental health center at Beltsville, Md., we have given careful thought to the objections which were voiced at that time to the further concentration of research and research-related activities in the Washington metropolitan area. It is not our purpose to locate activities here which could be performed as effectively or almost as effectively, elsewhere. Only when the advantages of locating research facilities are very strong would we recommend further concentration of activities in this area.

The result of our further review is to conclude that, although there are certain applied research and training activities which could be performed elsewhere without serious detriment to the program, the basic activities envisioned for our environmental health center are so interrelated with other activities located in the Washington area that we cannot see how these activities could be effectively and efficiently conducted elsewhere.

ADVANTAGES OF BELTSVILLE LOCATION

The environmental health sciences are concerned with the chemistry and physics of our environment, the effects of environment on man, and methods of control which might reduce pollution or its harmful effect upon man. Such work involves many scientific disciplines including chemistry, physics, physiology, biology, toxicology, and pharmacology, as well as a variety of engineering specialties. The Public Health Service needs to have a group of competent scientists in

these disciplines, working with scientists in other departments and agencies of the Government on many types of problems, but particularly on the much-neglected area of the effects on man of long-term low dosages of various toxic chemicals in our environment. Recent emphasis on the adverse effects of pesticides and the extremely large and growing number of pesticides used both on food crops and for many urban and household purposes, has brought out how little we know about the long-term effects of very small dosages of numerous powerful chemical agents and poisons.

The Food and Drug Administration is likewise concerned with these problems and is planning to construct a new laboratory at Beltsville, Md., to work on these and other problems. The Department of Agriculture already has its pesticides research work centered at Beltsville. Each of these agencies has an important role related to its principal mission. Fundamental research, which will underlie the applied research of the other agencies will be conducted by the Public Health Service. In working on problems of this kind, the advantages of close proximity to the related research activities of the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the National Institutes of Health, and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior are obviously great.

I have used the illustration of research in the toxicology of pesticides as an example of the need for coordination with other agencies and great advantages of locating at Beltsville the basic research in the environmental health sciences which underlies specific research on pesticides. In using this illustration, I do not wish to convey the impression that it is our intention to conduct all research on subjects of this type in Federal laboratories with Federal employees. On the contrary, we intend to make appropriate use of grants to obtain the support of universities and other nonprofit research institutions to perform as much of this type of research as possible. It may also prove desirable and even necessary to use the contract device to enlist the special competence of industry to conduct some aspects of our research programs in areas such as these.

Heretofore, there has not been nearly as intense interest on the part of the scientific community in this kind of research as in the search for causes and cures of dread diseases. For this reason, it is especially important in this area of scientific work to develop the capability in our own laboratories to perform those aspects of research which do not lend themselves to being worked on elsewhere.

It is our plan to house at Beltsville, in addition to personnel who will be directly engaged in basic and certain long-term applied research in the environmental health sciences, the scientific review staff and the administrative staff needed to conduct the extramural grant and contract programs in the same and related areas. It seems self-evidently desirable to coordinate research performed through grants and contracts with related research done directly in Government laboratories by seeing that those responsible for both are housed together and work together. These personnel will also be within easy traveling distance of the NIH and other units of the Public Health Service with whom they will need to work in administering the research grant and training programs.

Another important function which can be performed far more effectively and efficiently in the Washington area than elsewhere is the conduct of our research responsibilities in respect to the long-range biological effects of radiation on man. Such research and the operation of our national surveillance center to keep constant check on radiation conditions of the atmosphere and the effects of

"fallout," can be far better performed in the Washington area than elsewhere because of the need to maintain close working relationships with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Standards, the NIH, and the Food and Drug Administration, all of whom have related responsibilities in this subject-matter area.

These functions, together with certain related training and technical assistance activities, would be grouped together to form the core of an environmental health center devoted to developing one of the most neglected fields related to the health of man. The most appropriate, effective, and efficient location of a center to carry forward these purposes is, in our judgment, the site recommended last year at Beltsville, Md., on land earmarked for transfer to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from the Department of Agriculture, which now owns it. It is part of the Beltsville Agricultural Experiment Station.

Location of the center in the Washington area was originally recommended by a panel of distinguished scientific consultants headed by Dr. Paul Gross, of Duke University, immediate past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. It was subsequently reaffirmed by a special panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

The size of the facility recommended last year was such as to house approximately 1,600 persons, with an estimated cost of about \$34 million. It was to be located on a large enough piece of land and so designed that it could be enlarged if it was found later to be necessary or desirable.

LOCATION OF ONE-FOURTH PERSONNEL OUTSIDE WASHINGTON AREA

We are currently reviewing functions which might be performed elsewhere. Our preliminary conclusion is that approximately a fourth of the persons who were scheduled to work in this facility could be located outside the Washington metropolitan area. Certain types of applied research and training are more separable than other elements. Thus, the conclusion is that we should proceed with a basic center at Beltsville of approximately 300,000 square feet, to provide facilities for approximately 1,200 people. We will also pursue rapidly to a conclusion the most appropriate location for the other applied research and training functions. We urge that you provide the full amount of the planning funds requested with the understanding that approximately three-fourths of the total facilities requested will be located at Beltsville and that the remaining portion is to be located if feasible at an appropriate site outside the immediate Washington area.

We shall undertake to inform your committee at the earliest possible time of the decision on the location of the functions for which we are now seeking an appropriate location outside the Washington area.

This concludes my formal statement, Mr. Chairman.

Again I want to say I regret the length of time that I have taken but sometimes when I present my programs I wonder if there are any other departments in the Government.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1963.

To: The heads of executive departments and establishments.

Subject: Criteria for decentralizing Federal activities from the National Capital region.

1. Purpose: Section 3(d) of Executive Order No. 11035 of July 9, 1962, directs agencies to "review continuously their needs for space in and near the District of Columbia, taking into account the feasibility of de-

centralizing services or activities which can be carried on elsewhere without excessive costs or significant loss of efficiency." This circular establishes general criteria to assist Federal departments and agencies in determining the desirability of decentralizing agencies or agency activities from the National Capital region.

2. Background: In a memorandum of November 27, 1962, to the heads of executive departments and establishments and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the President set forth development policies to serve as guidelines for the agencies of the executive branch in fulfilling the objectives of the year 2000 plan developed by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council. The plan projected a total regional population of 5 million by the year 2000. Among the assumptions on which that projection was based were that Federal employment in the region would not exceed 450,000 and, secondly, that Federal activities not essential to the seat of Government would be located outside of the National Capital region.

The President's ad hoc Committee on Federal Office Space initially proposed criteria for decentralization of activities from the National Capital region. These criteria are refined and clarified in this circular.

The criteria are designed to provide practical tests for determining whether agencies, new or expanding activities, or existing activities should be located in the National Capital region or located outside of the region through decentralization or delegation of responsibility to existing field facilities. The National Capital region includes the District of Columbia, Montgomery, and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland, and Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties in Virginia; the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in Virginia; and all cities now or hereafter existing in Maryland or Virginia within the geographic area bounded by outer boundaries of the combined area of aforesaid counties.

Development of a well-informed judgment on the most desirable location of an agency or activity under review will require balanced consideration of all applicable criteria; no one criterion can be considered conclusive. In such an evaluation, consideration must be given to the needs of the Government as a whole, the relation of the work of the agency to other agency headquarters, and the needs of persons served or affected by the agency or activity.

3. Criteria for location of agencies or activities: In formulating and applying criteria regarding the proper location of an agency or an activity, consideration must be given to its major purpose, its principal working relationships with other governmental and nongovernmental activities, and to costs and special requirements.

(a) An agency or an agency activity is generally susceptible to location outside of the National Capital region when—

(1) It performs functions or provides services to clientele in a particular region of the country other than Washington.

(2) It is engaged in operations to carry out well-defined policies and programs which require only limited day-to-day headquarters supervision.

(3) It is a regional, district or other field office (unless it can be demonstrated that the workload of the office is predominantly concerned with the National Capital region).

(4) It provides large-scale supporting services of a relatively repetitive or routine nature, such as records maintenance; procurement and inventory control; training, including the operation of schools; administration of real property and related engineering services; manufacturing; financial accounting and disbursing activities; or

statistics and data collection, and related fact-gathering and processing operations.

(5) It is a review function or administrative service activity which could be performed equally well by field offices exercising general supervision over operating offices.

(6) It operates in a relatively self-sufficient manner, which does not require it to have close intra-agency or interagency working relationships.

(7) It requires close coordination with other governmental (Federal, State and local) and nongovernmental activities or individuals within a given geographical area other than the National Capital region.

(8) It requires close coordination or working relationships with other Federal activities which are also susceptible to decentralization or delegation to a common new location or to existing field offices in a common location outside the National Capital region.

(9) Small liaison offices in Washington could effectively meet headquarters needs.

(10) Increased administrative economies, such as in travel, communications, rental, and recruiting, and improved efficiency, as in speed of decisionmaking or better service to the public, can be achieved through relocation and its initial costs can be justified accordingly.

(b) An agency or agency activity is generally not susceptible to location outside the National Capital region when—

(1) It is directed to meeting the needs of the President, the Congress, or agency heads for continuing consultation, direction, and fixing of responsibility for governmental action.

(2) It is concerned with establishing national policies or developing broad principles and programs for nationwide application.

(3) It involves exercising general supervision over agency operations throughout the country to assure that those operations are in accord with general national policies.

(4) It is an activity conducted by persons who require close working relationships with those who make or direct major agency policy and who themselves must be located in the National Capital region.

(5) It requires close coordination or working relationships or continual communication with other headquarters agencies, the Congress, or nongovernmental organizations or individuals located in the National Capital region.

(6) The costs of decentralization (including replacement of specialized physical facilities, loss of personnel with specialized skills, special training, relocation, travel, communications, and disruption of current operations) would outweigh benefits to be gained.

(7) Workload would not justify development of additional specialized staffs solely in order to achieve decentralization or delegation.

4. Responsibility for implementation: Responsibility for implementing the provisions of this circular is assigned as follows:

(a) Department and agency heads: Department and agency heads will utilize the criteria contained in paragraph 3 in continuously reviewing their needs for space in and near the District of Columbia, as required by section 3(d) of Executive Order No. 11035, and in determining and justifying requests for additional space.

Whenever it is determined that decentralization of an agency or segments of an agency is desirable, but not permissible under existing laws, the department or agency head will request such amendments to these laws as may be required to carry out this objective. Department and agency heads (in coordination with the General Services Administration when appropriate) will also take such steps as may be required by applicable

statutes and regulations to secure authorizations and appropriations for land acquisition, construction, alteration, or leasing of facilities.

(b) The General Services Administration: The General Services Administration will utilize the criteria contained in paragraph 3 in its continuing investigation and survey of public building needs in the National Capital region under the Public Buildings Act of 1959 and Executive Order No. 11035 and in reviewing the requests of each agency for new space or facilities in the region.

Whenever decentralization of an agency or activity has been determined to be desirable, the General Services Administration, in coordination with the agency concerned, will take such steps as may be required by applicable statutes and regulations to secure authorizations and appropriations for land acquisition, construction, alteration, or leasing of facilities.

(c) The Bureau of the Budget: The Bureau of the Budget will provide assistance to agencies, upon request, in utilizing the criteria established by this circular and will further refine and clarify these criteria as necessary. It will take into account these criteria in reviewing agency reorganization proposals and in reviewing agency requests for funds for new space or facilities in the National Capital region.

(d) Consultation with other agencies: Agencies considering decentralization of one or more of their activities will consult with the Area Redevelopment Administration (Department of Commerce), the Civil Service Commission and the Office of Emergency Planning, on matters affecting the responsibilities of these agencies. Agencies considering relocation of existing activities involving the construction of public works or the location of new activities in the National Capital region will consult with the National Capital Planning Commission on matters affecting its responsibilities. The Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration will similarly consult with these agencies in reviewing agency proposals for decentralization.

5. Report to the Bureau of the Budget: Each department and agency head will advise the Bureau of the Budget not later than September 9, 1963, of the procedural arrangements (including assignments of responsibility) that he has made for the systematic utilization of these criteria in reviewing and determining his organization's space requirements in the National Capital region.

KERMIT GORDON,
Director.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to yield any more time?

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of the Office of Education, as authorized by law, \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations to such agency, for payments in the foregoing currencies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for the spending of nearly \$7 billion. It is \$1.1 billion above spending for the same general purposes as last year.

I note in the report that this is called one of the most conservative bills that has been submitted to the Congress in recent years. I wonder if I am mistaken about the meaning of the word "conservative."

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is my opinion. I am merely expressing my opinion that it is one of the most conservative budgets submitted to the Congress. In many areas we should be spending much more money than the bill calls for. That is why I call it conservative.

Mr. GROSS. If an authorization bill is passed, we may reasonably expect from \$200 to \$400 million more will be needed to finance the Hill-Burton Act. If the Department of Poverty is established, do I correctly understand that that will come under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not sure where that is going. That would involve approximately another billion dollars, I have heard.

There is \$55 million for the Library Services Act which I had hoped would be in this bill, but it is not.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman hopes there will be another \$55 million put in the bill today?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is why I believe it is a conservative bill.

Mr. GROSS. If the \$55 million is put in, the gentleman would still say it is conservative?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not talking about action by the House today on the \$55 million. I hoped the budget request would have been submitted in time for the committee to put it in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

I note that the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is on the House floor. I seem to recall that when the \$11.5 billion tax reduction bill was before the House he told us that we could take one of two roads—that it would be the road toward economy, if we were to have tax reduction, or we would run the risk of doing grave damage to the finances and economy of the country if we took the spending road. In view of the fact that this bill, as it now stands, calls for \$1.1 billion above the spending for last year, I wonder which road we will be taking today if we vote for it?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman would have to answer that question for himself. The gentleman from Iowa knows my position on these matters. I get very impatient with the slowness with which we approach some of these problems.

Mr. GROSS. I know.

Mr. FOGARTY. I believe we ought to move faster; to build more buildings and train more personnel and do more research.

Mr. GROSS. I know.

Mr. FOGARTY. I believe we ought to move faster; to build more buildings and train more personnel and do more research.

Mr. GROSS. I notice that in the hearings the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island said:

But to put it bluntly, this is the most conservative budget since Mrs. Hobby was Secretary. I do not say it is worse, but I say it is almost as bad.

Mr. FOGARTY. I said it. That is in the RECORD. I cannot take it back.

Mr. GROSS. The bill is \$600 million some below the budget estimates.

Mr. FOGARTY. Four hundred and fifty-seven million dollars of that was in the supplementals for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. GROSS. It is some \$600 million below the budget estimates, but still \$1.1 billion above the spending for last year and still it is called conservative.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the State of Louisiana owes the Federal Government a million dollars in connection with some welfare program to which it failed to contribute? Is there any hope of collecting that million dollars from the State of Louisiana, does the gentleman believe?

Mr. FOGARTY. We did not get a very satisfactory answer on that. That was alleged by the General Accounting Office; that \$1 million was owed. Louisiana is still in this program, but there is another program the State is not taking part in.

Mr. GROSS. But funds were not cut off on the basis of no reimbursement to the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think the program to which the gentleman alludes, referring to Louisiana, is the fact that Louisiana does not participate in the Manpower Development Training Act program.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is the one that I was thinking of. But the gentleman from Iowa is right and this is in our hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot vote for this appropriation bill for it has a number of provisions which I approve. But here is a bill calling for the spending of \$7 billion in the next fiscal year—an increase of more than \$1.1 billion in expenditure for the same general purposes as in the present fiscal year.

Additionally, we have been told this afternoon that pending legislation may well add another \$1 billion during this session of Congress. Instead of reducing expenditures or even holding the line we have here still another bill that means the borrowing of more money, increasing the deficit and promoting inflation. This is a strange procedure in view of the \$11.5 billion tax reduction—a huge cut in revenue—and the dire need for a balance of spending and income.

No matter how worthy some of the programs contained in this bill, I am compelled to vote against it in the interest of fiscal sanity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

For grants pursuant to the Community Mental Health Centers Act, \$35,000,000: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from "Hospital construction activities" an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustments made by the Secretary pursuant to section 192(c) of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out to Members who have contacted us regarding the General Accounting Office decision on the payment of grants to universities and college, the action the committee has taken on this. Since the inception of the National Institutes of Health, grants have been made to colleges and universities, particularly medical schools, for research activities. These grants are paid in a lump sum at the start of the project for a given year. Under the present procedures, for the first time, letters of credit will be issued to these universities and colleges. The universities will be able to draw down from their local bank on these letters of credit. Prior to this time the universities would deposit these funds, and many universities invested them and drew interest. This was wise management on the part of these universities and colleges. They are now being required, under this GAO ruling, to reimburse the Federal Treasury for all of the interest that they drew on the advance payments of these grants.

Our committee does not feel that this is fair. The schools that did invest these funds were engaged in proper management and should not be penalized. Language is written into this bill to protect those universities and colleges which carried out good management of these funds and they will not be required to reimburse the Federal Treasury for these interest payments. This amendment and this language was agreed upon unanimously by our committee and I think it is a step in the right direction.

I think it is only fair to point out that by using the letter-of-credit technique for the first time in this budget, we are using what some people refer to as gimmickry in the expenditure level for 1965. By issuing letters of credit instead of issuing checks we will show a reduction in the expenditure budget for 1965 of about \$1 billion. We are, however, not reducing eventual expenditures in this amount. The expenditure budget can show this reduction, but our commitment is still just as large as it was under the old system. The expenditure budget figure is changed for 1965 but this spending will be reflected in the budget in the fiscal year 1966.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want anyone to be misled by this change in the expenditure level which has been pointed to by some as a saving. This, of course, is not the case. This is a bookkeeping device which, if taken for the Government as a whole has the effect of an apparent reduction of \$1 billion which is not a reduction of our commitment in any way.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman to say that by a provision in this bill the Congress is foregoing interest on loans to certain educational institutions for certain purposes?

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to explain this to the gentleman; and perhaps it would be best to use an example. College A and college B have been handling research grants over a long period. College A when it receives its research grant money would take it to a bank and invest it in short-term securities and receive interest on this grant until the grant was actually drawn down by the researcher. This practice was in fact good management on the part of college A. College B would take the money and just deposit it in a checking account at the bank and would not receive any interest. I do not believe college B used good management practices.

Under the new Federal procedure, the suggestions made by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] at the time of the hearings on the debt limitation before the Committee on Ways and Means are being implemented in this year's budget. This shows a reduction in expenditures for only 1 year. The expenditure level will be much higher next year as a result.

But as far as the interest is concerned we are not requiring those colleges that, during the last 6 years have received interest, to reimburse the Federal Government because they had used good, sound, financial arrangements as far as their school was concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has expired.

(Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. GROSS) was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. I assume the gentleman from Wisconsin is aware that only about 2 weeks ago the Federal Government borrowed some \$2 billion, paying an interest rate of 3½ percent and selling the notes at less than par, which means that the real interest rate on the \$2 billion borrowing will amount to something like a 4.15 percent?

Mr. LAIRD. I well understand the point which the gentleman makes. However, I would like to state that in this budget we are not advancing research funds to the universities and colleges. This is not only in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare programs but also in the Department of Defense, the AEC, and other programs. Letters of credit will be issued and this will not represent a charge against the Government until the college, the university, or the research establishment actually goes to the bank to draw down on the letter of credit which is issued by the Government agency.

This reflects a reduction in the expenditure level for fiscal year 1965. This, in effect, when compared with the 1964 budget is a misleading expenditure

reduction because the commitment is still the same commitment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

My point is that there is no such thing as interest free money that the Government borrows insofar as the taxpayers of this country are concerned. There is no such money available when the Federal Government is now paying more than 4 percent interest on its borrowings.

Mr. LAIRD. These are grants about which I am talking.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. LAIRD. They have nothing to do with loans. These are outright grants made by the AEC, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and many other agencies. These are grant funds and not loan funds that I am discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES
AND BLINDNESS

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to neurology and blindness, \$87,621,000.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the minority members of the subcommittee, as well as the entire Committee on Appropriations for inserting certain money in this bill, the necessary funds, to carry out the programs to control tuberculosis and venereal disease.

It is my understanding that the administration requested more money from the Congress for the purpose of controlling bangs disease in cattle than it did for both of these items. The committee in its wisdom, however, restored \$4 million for the control of tuberculosis and \$314,000 for the control of venereal disease, which disease is running rampant especially here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, this represented a case where the administration tried to send up to the Congress a balanced budget by cutting out programs that are very, very popular with the Congress and with the people of the United States. This is particularly true in the case of the control of tuberculosis. This control involves a 5-year program, and at a time when we are almost on the verge of a breakthrough in this program, we find the administration cutting needed funds.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that I am disappointed that no money is contained in this bill for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Library Services Act. However, I certainly have high hopes that this money will be inserted in the new budget for the purpose of carrying out our commitment under the authorization bill for this most worthwhile project and that the Senate will restore these funds. I also hope that we

can have these funds agreed to by the committee when it goes to conference.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for the outstanding job it has done, especially the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who has been a dedicated public servant in the field of public health.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES
NATIONALS

For necessary expenses of carrying out the provisions of the Act of July 5, 1960 (74 Stat. 308), and for care and treatment in accordance with the Acts of March 2, 1929, and October 29, 1941, as amended (24 U.S.C. 191a, 196a), \$310,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question: What are repatriated nationals—U.S. citizens who are brought back to this country?

Mr. FOGARTY. Any American citizen who has been overseas and who comes back here with a disabling illness and is destitute, will be taken care of.

Mr. GROSS. That is the meaning of this particular provision of the bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House of the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 10809, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 21, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—344

Abbitt	Fisher	Mailliard
Abernethy	Flood	Marsh
Adair	Fogarty	Martin, Calif.
Albert	Ford	Martin, Nebr.
Andrews, Ala.	Forrester	Mathias
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fountain	Mathews
Arends	Fraser	May
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Meador
Ashmore	Friedel	Miller, Calif.
Aspinall	Fulton, Tenn.	Milliken
Auchincloss	Fuqua	Mills
Ayres	Gallagher	Minish
Baker	Garmatz	Minshall
Baldwin	Gary	Monagan
Baring	Gathings	Montoya
Barrett	Gibbons	Moore
Barry	Gilbert	Moorhead
Bates	Gill	Morgan
Becker	Glenn	Morris
Beckworth	Goodling	Morse
Belcher	Grabowski	Morton
Bell	Grant	Mosher
Bennett, Mich.	Cray	Moss
Berry	Griffin	Multer
Betts	Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.
Boggs	Grover	Murray
Bolton,	Gubser	Natcher
Frances P.	Gurney	Nedzi
Bo'ton,	Hagan, Ga.	Nelsen
Oliver P.	Hagen, Calif.	Nix
Bonner	Haley	Norblad
Bow	Halleck	O'Brien, N.Y.
Brademas	Harding	O'Hara, Ill.
Bray	Hardy	O'Konski
Bromwell	Harris	Olsen, Mont.
Brooks	Harrison	Olson, Minn.
Broomfield	Harsha	O'Neill
Brotzman	Harvey, Ind.	Ostertag
Brown, Calif.	Harvey, Mich.	Passman
Brown, Ohio	Hawkins	Patman
Broyhill, N.C.	Hays	Patten
Bruce	Healey	Pelly
Burke	Hsbert	Perkins
Burkhalter	Hechler	Philbin
Burton, Calif.	Hemphill	Pickle
Burton, Utah	Henderson	Pike
Byrne, Pa.	Herlong	Pillion
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Pirnie
Cahill	Hollifield	Poage
Cameron	Holland	Poff
Cannon	Horan	Pool
Carey	Horton	Powell
Casey	Hull	Price
Cederberg	Ichord	Purcell
Celler	Jarman	Quie
Chamberlain	Jennings	Rains
Chenoweth	Jensen	Randall
Clancy	Joelson	Reid, Ill.
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Clausen,	Johnson, Wis.	Reifel
Don H.	Jonas	Reuss
Clawson, Del.	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Cleveland	Karsten	Rich
Cohelan	Karth	Riehlman
Colmer	Kastenmeier	Rivers, Alaska
Conte	Keith	Rivers, S.C.
Corbett	Kelly	Roberts, Ala.
Corman	Keogh	Roberts, Tex.
Cramer	King, Calif.	Robison
Cunningham	Kirwan	Rodino
Curtin	Knox	Rogers, Colo.
Dague	Kornegay	Rogers, Fla.
Daniels	Kunkel	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Kyl	Rooney, N.Y.
Davis, Tenn.	Laird	Rooney, Pa.
Delaney	Landrum	Roosevelt
Dent	Langen	Rosenthal
Denton	Lankford	Roudebush
Derounian	Latta	Roush
Devine	Leggett	Roybal
Diggs	Lennon	Ryan, Mich.
Dingell	Lesinski	Ryan, N.Y.
Dole	Libonati	St. George
Donohue	Lindsay	St. Germain
Dorn	Lipscomb	St. Onge
Downing	Lloyd	Saylor
Dulski	Long, La.	Schadeberg
Dwyer	Long, Md.	Schenck
Edmondson	McCulloch	Schneebeil
Edwards	McDade	Schweiker
Ellsworth	McDowell	Schwengel
Everett	McFall	Secrest
Evins	McIntire	Selden
Fascell	McMillan	Senner
Feighan	Macdonald	Sheppard
Findley	MacGregor	Shriver
Fino	Madden	Sibal
	Mahon	Sickles

Sikes	Thompson, Tex.	Whalley
Skubitz	Thomson, Wis.	Wharton
Slack	Toll	White
Smith, Va.	Tollefson	Whitener
Springer	Trimble	Whitten
Staebler	Tuck	Widnall
Stafford	Tupper	Williams
Staggers	Tuten	Wilson, Bob
Stephens	Udall	Wilson,
Stinson	Ullman	Charles H.
Stratton	Van Deerlin	Wilson, Ind.
Stubblefield	Vanik	Winstead
Sullivan	Van Pelt	Wydler
Taft	Vinson	Wyman
Taylor	Wallhauser	Young
Teague, Calif.	Watson	Younger
Teague, Tex.	Watts	Zablocki
Thomas	Weaver	
Thompson, N.J.	Weltner	

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

NAYS—21

Abele	Foreman	King, N.Y.
Alger	Goodell	McClory
Ashbrook	Gross	Quillen
Beermann	Hall	Short
Bennett, Fla.	Hutchinson	Smith, Calif.
Brock	Johansen	Snyder
Curtis	Kilburn	Waggonner

NOT VOTING—69

Addabbo	Flynt	O'Brien, Ill.
Anderson	Fulton, Pa.	O'Hara, Mich.
Avery	Gialmo	Osmers
Bass	Gonzalez	Pepper
Battin	Green, Oreg.	Pilcher
Blatnik	Halpern	Pucinski
Boland	Hanna	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolling	Hansen	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, Va.	Hoffman	Rumsfeld
Buckley	Hosmer	Scott
Burleson	Huddleston	Shipley
Chelf	Johnson, Pa.	Siler
Collier	Jones, Ala.	Sisk
Cooley	Kee	Smith, Iowa
Daddario	Kilgore	Steed
Dawson	Kluczynski	Talcott
Derwinski	McLoskey	Thompson, La.
Dowdy	Martin, Mass.	Utt
Duncan	Matsunaga	Westland
Elliott	Michel	Wickersham
Fallon	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Farbstein	Morrison	Wright
Finnegan	Murphy, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Duncan with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Gialmo with Mr. McLoskey.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Hanna with Mrs. Hansen.

Mr. Huddleston with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Finnegan.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Bass.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Boland.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Kilgore.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Pilcher.

Messrs. SNYDER and BROCK changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."