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. Lange] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michael] on the Republican side, for their attention and cooperation.

As I have said before, no committee can do work 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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or agency</th>
<th>Appropriation, 1965</th>
<th>Budget estimate, 1965 (as amended)</th>
<th>Recommended in the bill</th>
<th>Bill compared with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As will be noted from the above table, the committee considered requests totaling in round figures, $7.56 billion and recommends appropriation totaling $6.81 billion, or a reduction of $0.75 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 disagreement 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 committee's estimate proves to be too low, it will have to be made up in a supplemental appropriation.

The other large reduction is $85,840,000 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-

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 me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?
duction in no way reflects a lack of appreciation of the importance of this pro-
gram to the national economy, nor is it made with a view to reducing the num-
ber of training programs or the number of people who may receive training.
In other words, if the committee, in making the decision by which this pro-
gram can expand is too low the Depart-
ment almost has an invitation to come back with a request for a supplemental appro-

Thus, if one takes out of consideration the requests for supplemental appro-

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 ac-
tion of the Department on the programs in question are made increases in connection with the new law that are substantial and increase to mandatory-

Increases in this category include in round figures $450 million for the labor de-

While the original 1965 budget was certainly conservative, it was made even more so by a budget amendment sub-

It was in view of the type of budget before it, that the committee made very few substantial reductions in the 1965 budget, and in a few instances, even cut back from the level of operation provided for by the 1964 appro-

For the Department of Labor the bill includes $855,954,000, which is $183,446,0-

There is very little change in the Department of Labor's appropriations except for the manpower development and training activities for which $327,908,000 is included in the bill.

This represents an increase of $117,908,000 over the amount appropriated for 1964. Thus this item accounts for more than the total increase in the De-

but it is this reduction in no way reflects a lack of appreciation of the im-

Thus the committee's best estimate of what the Department will be able to accomplish under this program during the next 10 months.

The first item under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the very important "Food and Drug Admin-

It simply represents the committee's best estimate of what the Department will be able to accomplish under this program during the next 10 months.

The first item under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the very important "Food and Drug Admin-

The reduction in no way reflects a lack of appreciation of the im-

Significant as was the enactment of this important 1965 budget, it is the favorable manner in which the bill was approved by both House and Senate that 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 schools would be involved in the provisions of the act. 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 educational agencies many of the colleges and universities cannot proceed until this appropriation is approved. State commissions cannot function until the appropriation sets in motion the preparatory steps in the preparation of projects for which grant money may be submitted.

U.S. Office of Education officials have met and will continue to meet with representatives of colleges and universities to discuss the programs 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 29. At these meetings, members of State commissions and other officials involved in the administration of the act.

Preparation of the regulations governing this 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 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 some time 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 indicate new steps under the old titles of the Smith-Hughes and Georze-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 expenditure 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 82 schools have had their first offerings in technology 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 as to substantial legislation regarding the establishment and operation of area vocational school facilities and in sizeable appropriations to implement the 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 using 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 totalled $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 $600,000 was made available for 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 activities in preparation of greatly improved authority for programs of vocational education.

An example of the States need for assistance was the request of an area school district in one State. Twelve thousand students responded that they would attend a vocational technical school if such an opportunity were available to them. It is estimated that upon employment a total earning capacity of more than $5 million in the first year would have been gained by these students. The corresponding 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. Meetings at least once in almost every State have been held by professional groups having concern for business and office education.

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 of the 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 3 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 encourage the habit of reading and the quality of libraries, I think, is 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 1955 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 186 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 book titles 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 $52 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 overshadowed and used in 1965 for public library construction. Many communities have been planning new buildings and are now waiting for Federal matching funds to make them head. Public Law 88-269 passed the House on January 31, 1964, by a vote of 254 to 107. This fact indicates our commitment to the importance of good public library services 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 treatment to the importance of good public services in urban and rural areas. They confront our cities and towns: inadequate libraries, many communities have been planning new building. Many communities have been planning new buildings and are now waiting for Federal matching funds to make them head. Public Law 88-269 passed the House on January 31, 1964, by a vote of 254 to 107. This fact indicates our commitment to the importance of good public library services 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...
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, for which we have no responsible, and unimaginative 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—now more than ever before—I have seen the Congress stepping in—because in good conscience it could not do otherwise—to assure the funds to seize present opportunities presented by our 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 of it—complete, and 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 survivors.

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 request included an additional $12 million to taxpayers of about $12 million.

Increasing evidence of viral causation of cancer—with at least the possibility, that what has been wrought in this post-war effort in medical research will emerge as the most significant Federal action of our era.

The evident consequence—unless the executive department specifically exempt 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—progress in productivity—they appear to have received no special recognition whatever in the budget formulation for 1965.

The bill now before the House contains one very important increase over the 1965 budget request: The bill provides an additional $7.3 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.
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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 prospects 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 or two reasons: Either because the body's immunologic defense—a little-understood mechanism that repels all foreign proteins in the body—will not suppress it, 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 will immunological defense mechanisms work, whether—and how—it can be modified to tolerate vital organ transplants, or can be suppressed without fatal risks. It is felt that the research grant funds for this effort in one Institute—NIAD—there is best assurance of prompt and purposeful development of research efforts in this vital area. The committee took no research in the budget where the need for increased effort—and the promise of research gains—was highly visible, though ignored by the executive. This is in research on therapy—including use of hormonal substances—for the control of coronary heart disease. The committee, therefore proposes earmarking of $500,000 in 1965 research grant funds to get this program started. The need identified to the committee was for a tightly con-

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 rehabilitation program "Educational television facilities." This is $6,- 500,000 more than the appropriation for 1964, the first full year of operation, and a reduction of $2,500,000 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, and 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. However, there has been a considerable amount of time and work by many more unless Members have questions.

Early in January, before this budget was submitted, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Larson) 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 own buildings could be located anywhere 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 millions of dollars could be saved by construction of their own build-

The committee reduced the amount of the reduction in "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Family Services" by $264,000 which will allow them approximately one-half of the additional positions re-

Mr. FOGLARTY. That is right. Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. FOGLARTY. I yield to the gentle-

Mr. FOGLARTY. All I know is that if the act is just extended it would be about $250 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 commit-

Mr. FOGLARTY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana. Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the chairman of the sub-

As a member of the committee I know how much time, work and study has gone into this bill. The chairman of the committee has pointed out that because of the necessity of getting the approipa-
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 field 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 one 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 in the circumstances 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 gentlewoman from Oregon.

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

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

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

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

Mr. FERRINGS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island for such an excellent bill. I yield myself to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FERRINGS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island for such an excellent bill. I yield myself to the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

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 retarded.

Mr. FOGARTY. I observe that in connection with the hospital construction activities there is included $23,346,000, much of which is for the mental retarded.

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

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the bill contains $11,122 million more than the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor on appropriations for fiscal year 1965. 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

Mr. HARRIS. That is what I wanted to make clear in the record. The committee is 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 take us a week before we can con-}

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentle-

Mr. WISCONSIN.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentle-

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentle-

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

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentle-

Mr. FERRINGS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island for such an excellent bill. I yield myself to the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentle-

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

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the bill contains $11,122 million more than the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor on appropriations for fiscal year 1965. 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
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 $1,854 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 appropriations 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 $484 million. The committee 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 social programs presently pending before legislative committees will be considered at some future time in connection with requests which 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 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 several Federal studies of research activities and bureaus 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 United States.

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 way that President Johnson, in addition to 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 Government spends the research project 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 going to face up to it and are willing to look at this problem of the disbursement of our research dollars 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, Federal tax 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 1512 of our hearings. I have been alarmed as I have watched the growth of the Federal 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 83 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.

I was shocked to find in answer to my question in a very minor survey of 4 or 5 weeks that some 50 individual employees of the Food and Drug Administration had moved in this direction. There are some 50 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 consideration 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 kinds 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 be very interested in, that for the sake of those who 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 wish to 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1964 Original 1965 Revised</th>
<th>Bill compared with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$8,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Education, and Welfare</td>
<td>$76,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$4,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$90,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 education assistance for vocational education, for higher education facilities, and for the manpower training program. We have made a reduction of $500 million but the reduction is not 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. 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. Fogarty, 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 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 appropriation requests for both the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and their related agencies comes to $5,908,083,000 for the fiscal year 1965, as against a total of $5,436,000 for the current fiscal year, or an increase of more than $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 "legis- lating 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. The bill includes $327,968,000 for manpower development and training activities, which is a booming increase of nearly $318 million over 1964.

The bill also includes 776,000 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 "parity 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 Wisconsin 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 for the coming fiscal year of $10,000, and a 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 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 an increase of $3,355,000 over 1964. Except for the mandatory pay costs, the increase is for partial implementation of the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on the use of pesticides and to carry out the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1963.

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 $1.48 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 up- ping 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 $237,853,000 for Defense educational activities which includes, of course, the contributions to student loans. The committee has also been very generous in allocation of funds for the education of the handicapped and cooperative research. I should note 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 current 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 "holding need but unallocated funds" in highly important fields like the Public Health Service," but I would point out that we are spending considerable sums in this area.

The 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 diseases activities: 29,828,000
- Communicable diseases research: 22,575,000
- Control of tuberculosis: 10,364,000
- Control of venereal diseases: 10,000,000
- 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): 98,642,000
- Hospital construction: 9,380,000
- Environmental health sciences: 18,070,000
- Environmental health sciences (1964 supplemental estimate): 20,930,000
- Air pollution: 20,930,000
- Air pollution (1964 supplemental estimate): 34,239,000
- Environmental engineering and sanitation: 9,177,000
- Occupational health: 5,168,000
- Radiological health: 19,598,000
- Water supply and water pollution control: 34,239,000
- Water supply and water pollution control: 86,000,000
- Hospitals and medical care: 93,710,000
- Grants for venereal disease prevention: 6,851,000

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

- General research and services: $163,909,000
- Biologics standards: 4,909,000
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development: 42,696,000
- National Cancer Institute: 149,011,000
- National Institute of Mental Health: 187,932,000
- Construction of community mental health centers: 35,000,000
- National Heart Institute: 124,176,000

This brings the total figure for Public Health Service to $1,382,154,000.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to say that last year 2 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 see 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 should not have such a concentration of Federal facilities here in the Washington area and some of us out in the Midwest, particularly are eager to have a seat on the other side of the aisle in opposition to this concentration if there 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 if the State has to do that. The only justification in my opinion for the granting of this assistance is that it 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 F. Bolton].

(Mrs. Frances P. Bolton) (Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, as ordered asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

MRS. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, very much appreciate the opportunity of appearing 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 has been submitted (Mr. Harasi 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 a few months. It is quite true, I know, 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 make you 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 standing by her legitimate fight but the great lack at the bedside is not being filled.

Mr. Chairman, back in 1958, 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 for many, many. I have considered 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 we want more nurses and 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. Harasi) has submitted. I did not know it existed until today, and I have not had time to go over it to know what it 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. 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 who need care. They need 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 of 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, 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 leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.

The need is for much more than greater leadership. Yes—so do I—but, Mr. Chairman, are we going to take care of patients in the bed if they need it.
play aquatic biologists for this program rather than to develop for specialists the Department's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. As recognized in your February 8 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 the Bureau for participation in field studies. This is a serious omission of use of established scientific competency and recognition of energy potential.

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, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, provides for the development of undergraduate education facilities. The amount of $2 million, provided for 1965, is out of proportion 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 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 education facilities 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 needed facilities which are anticipated to be very necessary if they are to keep pace with that enrollment. Keep pace with that enrollment, we must—almost any cost.

Until additional 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 falling 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 way the foreseeable needs in education. The obsolete structures must be modernized to conform to progress; new facilities must be constructed where needed; engineering, medical, agricultural, 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 post mortems for lost opportunities, but we can take advantage of 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 or cooperation 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 students, and the laboratories and libraries to accommodate the ever-growing volume of research knowledge. The $468,150,000 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.

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 can 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 was designed to give children the right start in life so that we legislators can 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.

Every cent that has been asked for in the day care 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 new body will make the restoration, strengthen this part of the bill, and give us a chance to strengthen day care 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 day care program. If we wish to avoid higher appropriations in the future for day care programs for the relief and rehabilitation of the adult world, it is through this program. If we wish to avoid higher appropriations in the future for day care programs for the relief and rehabilitation of the adult world, it is through this program. If we wish to avoid higher appropriations in the future for day care programs for the relief and rehabilitation of the adult world, it is through this program.

Finally, I should like to add that eventually separate and special legislation is required in this area. The day care center program has been given such wide
Mr. CHAPA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am happily enthusiastic in my support of H.R. 10508 as I have been of all the measures from the subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota. 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 Education Facilities Planning 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) the renovation of Cobb Hall, approximately 66,300 square feet, at a cost of $2.5 million. This building will provide usable classroom space after renovation. (2) A new chemistry building, approximately 87,000 square feet, at a cost of $4.5 million. This building will provide usable classroom and research facilities for the 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 as requested by President Beadle, which of course is subject to a state 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 service programs. The bill was approved by President on February 11, 1964, and immediately thereafter by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made request of the Bureau of the Budget for approval of funds for public libraries 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 conference will not even take up the bill until when the subcommittee 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 assure 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 aspirations and 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 23 additional security guards at the St. Elizabeths Hospital although somewhat distressed that the Bureau of the Budget severely cut the original request of $61,500,000 for 1965, this represents an undue delay on the installation of these facilities to house the expanding staffs of 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 subcampus be developed specifically for "prisoner patients." It is my understanding that funds for this purpose will be requested in the fiscal year 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 formerly incarcerated "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 beyond belief 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 House Appropriations Committee will be fully furnished all the information it needs to act on this important project at some point in the legislative process and that the executive branch 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 construction 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 rationalization be made in each case regarding whether the proposed function can be best 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 which addresses itself to the question of whether Federal facilities should be located within or outside of the Washington area. Each year the Bureau of the Budget presents to the Senate and the House of Representatives a memorandum which is an analysis of the geographical distribution of Federal activities and consequently I am sure we will give these points full consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to add a brief statement concerning the request for planning funds for the Environmental Health Center.

Mr. FOGARTY. All right.

Secretary Celebrezze. The budget contains $1,800,000 for 1965, $1,050,000 for 1966, for Environmental Health Center. The funds have been 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.

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 consideration to the objections which were voiced at that time to the further concentration of research and training activities which are related to other activities in the 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 environment for our environmental research center are so interrelated with other activities located in the Washington area that we cannot see how these activities could be effective and efficiently operated elsewhere.

Mr. CHAPA. I would like to submit for the Record a memorandum prepared by the Bureau of the Budget which addresses itself to the question of whether Federal facilities should be located within or outside of the Washington area. Each year the Bureau of the Budget presents to the Senate and the House of Representatives a memorandum which is an analysis of the geographical distribution of Federal activities and consequently I am sure we will give these points full consideration.

ADVANTAGES OF BELTSVILLE LOCATION

The environmental health sciences are concerned with the chemistry and physics of man and his environment. Such work involves a wide variety of 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 (who have related responsibilities in this subject-matter area).

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 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 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.

Herefore, it is obvious that as intense interest on the part of the scientific community in this kind of research as in the study of core research problems, there has been a need for coordination with other elements of the Federal Government. For this reason, it is especially important in this area of scientific work to develop the capability of the Beltsville laboratories to work as part of a functioning scientific team those aspects of research which do not lend themselves to working 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 especially desirable to coordinate research performed through grants and contracts with related research in Government laboratories by seeing that those responsible for both are housed together and work together. This will also be an easy and efficient distance of the NIH and other units of the Public Health Service with whom they will need to work in administering the research grants and contracts.

Another important function which can be performed more effectively and efficiently in the Washington area is the conduct of our research responsibilities in respect to the long-range biological effects of radiations. The Air Force Laboratory and operation of our national surveillance center to keep constant watch on radiation conditions of the atmosphere and the effects of "fallout," can be far better performed in the Washington area than in any other because of the need for close cooperation between scientists working with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Standards, the NIH, and the Food and Drug Administration, each 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 research activities here located. The department devoted to developing one of the most neglected fields related to the health of man, the environmental health sciences, would also be located in this executive research and development center. The efficient location of a center to carry forward these purposes is, in our judgment, the site recommended last year at Beltsville, Md., on land transferred 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, as opposed to other areas, is important in the toxicology of pesticides as an example. Several factors made the location of a center to carry forward these purposes in our judgment, the site recommended last year at Beltsville, Md., on land transferred 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 agricultural scientists headed by Dr. Paul Gross, of Duke University, 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 1,500 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 expanded if need be. It was found inter to be necessary or desirable.

LOCATION OF ONE-FOURTH PERSONNEL OUTSIDE WASHINGTON AREA

We are currently considering functions which might be performed elsewhere. Our preliminary conclusion is that approximately a fourth of the persons who would be scheduled to work in this facility could be located outside the Washington metropolitan area. Certain types of applied research and training activities 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 consideration of decentralizing certain types of research and training functions. We urge you that provide the full amount of the planning funds requested with the understanding that the final disposition of the total facilities would be at Beltsville and that the remaining portion is to be located if found more suitable 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.


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 10218 directs agencies to "review continuously their needs for space and in near the District of Columbia, taking into account the feasibility of decentralizing services or activities which can be carried on elsewhere with no sacrifice of the quality of performance or of efficiency." This circular establishes general criteria to assist Federal departments and agencies in determining the desirability of establishing new offices or expanding existing ones or of transferring agency or activity functions from the National Capital region.

2. Background: A memorandum of November 27, 1962, to the heads of executive departments and establishments and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia by the President set forth development policies to serve as guidelines for the agencies of the Federal Government. The President's plan was designed to permit an increase of the year 2000 plan developed by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council. The plan projects 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 decentralization for decentralizing of activities from the National Capital region. These criteria are refined and clarified in this circular.

3. Criteria for location of agencies or activities: These criteria are designed to aid 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 these counties.

Development of a well-informed judgment on the most desirable location of an agency or activity is 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 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 clients in a particular region of the country other than Washington.

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

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

(4) It provides large-scale supporting service to other Federal agencies such as records management, procurement and inventory control; training, information, administration of real property and related engineering services; manufacturing; financial accounting and disbursing activities; or to costs and special requirements.

(b) An agency or an agency activity is not susceptible to location outside of the National Capital region when...

(1) The agency or activity is essential to the location of the function, activity, or agency at the National Capital region.

(2) The agency or activity is essential to the support of the Federal Government as a whole.

(3) The agency or activity is essential to the seat of Government.

(4) The agency or activity is essential to the needs of persons served or supervised.

(5) The agency or activity is essential to the workload of the office.

(c) The agency or activity can be handled more effectively, efficiently, or conveniently...

(1) The agency or activity can be handled more effectively, efficiently, or conveniently...

(2) The agency or activity can be handled more effectively, efficiently, or conveniently...

(3) The agency or activity can be handled more effectively, efficiently, or conveniently...
(5) It is a review function or administrative service activity which could be performed equally well by field offices exercising general supervisory over operating offices.

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

(7) It requires close coordination with other Federal agencies, the National Capital region, 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 agencies which are 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 speeding up or better service to the public, can be achieved through relocation and its initial costs can be justified accordingly.

(a) 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 for 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 policy and who themselves must be located in the National Capital region.

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

(b) The General Services Administration: The General Services Administration will utilize the criteria contained in paragraph (b) in its continuing inventory and survey of needs in the National Capital region under the Public Buildings Act of 1959 and Executive Order No. 11059 and in reviewing the requests of an 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 such steps as may be required 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 concerned with 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 relevant 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.

3. 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 general arrangements (including assignments of responsibility) that he has made for the systematic utilization of the criteria in reviewing and determining his organization's space requirements in the National Capital region.

Kermit G. Grosvenor, 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 (EXCEPT FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be in excess of 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 foreign currency program.

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

Mr. FOGLYARTY. I said it. That is in the Recom. I cannot take it back.

Mr. GROSS. The bill is $900 million below the budget estimates, but still $1.1 billion above the spending for last year and still it is called conservative.

Mr. FOGLYARTY. 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. FOGLYARTY. We did not set 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. FOGLYARTY. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. I wanted to point out 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 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 payments deficit on five notes.

No matter how worthy some of the programs contained in this bill, I am compelled to vote against it in the interest of fiscal soundness, if nothing else.

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, $350,000,000: Provided, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from "provision for grants for purposes of community mental health centers" an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotments adjusted by the Secretary pursuant to section 132(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 colleges, 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 would actually draw interest. This was wise management on the part of the universities and colleges. They are now being required, under this GAO ruling, to reimburse the Federal Government for all of the interest that they drew on the advances 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 creating new interest rates, and this was wise management on the part of the universities and colleges. This practice was in fact good management on the part of college A, college B, and college C.

Letters of credit will be issued and this will be best to use an example.

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. LAIRD], at the time of the hearings on the debt limitations 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. LANG] 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 a $2 billion, paying an interest rate of 3% percent and selling the notes at less than par, which means that the real interest rate on the $2 billion borrowed will amount to something like 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, 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.

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 are concerned. There is now 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:

ASSESSMENT FOR REHABILITATIVE UNITED STATES NATIONALS

For necessary expenses of carrying out the provisions of the Act of July 5, 1955 (74 Stat. 808), and for care and treatment in accordance with the Acts of March 2, 1929, and October 29, 1941, as amended (25 U.S.C. 191a, 190a), $310,000.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that portion of the bill which authorizes the commitment of interest free money on investment 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 obligation 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.

The motion was agreed to.

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

[ROLL NO. 111]

YEAS—444

Abditt    Flaherty
Abbe      Mead
Abdus     Rowland
Adams     Smith
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The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo, with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Brophy 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. Roser.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Matsuno 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. Omers.
Mr. Parke 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. Blatnik with Mr. McLoakey.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Kilczynski with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Gonzales.
Mr. Hanna with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Huddleston with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Bass.
Mr. Chief with Mr. Roland.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Flynn with Mr. Kilgore.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Pitcher.

Messrs. Snyder and Brock changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”