LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

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. 7765) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Linsenmeyer) and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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. 7765, with Mr. Thomson 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.

The Chairman. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY) will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Linsenmeyer) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY), one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Mary), who has been a Member of the House for a long time and has served with distinction. Then we have on the committee the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Duncan), who has been invaluable as a member of this committee. We also have the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Parnell), who has been a really hard-working new member.

On the Republican side we have the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Shriver), who is the new committee member on the minority side who serves with the old members; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McNichols) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Linsenmeyer). They have all been very helpful in the work of the committee, and we have the best clerk, Robert Moyer, on the committee.

Mr. Chairman, extensive hearings have been held. We held hearings since the first week in February and we bring to you today a unanimous report. I will place in the record a summary of the action on the bill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or agency</th>
<th>Appropriation, 1966</th>
<th>Budget estimate, 1966</th>
<th>Recommended in the bill</th>
<th>Bill compared with—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>$696,316,500</td>
<td>$588,144,000</td>
<td>$537,940,000</td>
<td>$318,664,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health, Education, and Welfare</td>
<td>$6,963,750,000</td>
<td>$7,932,674,000</td>
<td>$7,373,325,000</td>
<td>$793,453,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related agencies</td>
<td>$2,335,000</td>
<td>$3,536,000</td>
<td>$2,705,000</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,923,035,500</td>
<td>$8,293,814,000</td>
<td>$7,943,394,000</td>
<td>$329,453,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Chairman, just about 90 percent of the bill we bring you today is for grants—grants to State and local governments, school and health facilities construction grants, research grants, and training grants. We have the growing public acceptance of grants in aid as a means of achieving national goals, there has been more and more of this type of legislation passed in recent years with the result that the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill has increased each year. This year is no exception. The bill we bring you today totals $7,943,394,000 which is roughly $1 billion more than the bill we brought to this House 1 year ago. The bill is $329,453,000 over the total appropriations for fiscal year 1965, which includes rather substantial sums appropriated in supplemental appropriation acts. However, the bill is $329,780,000 less than requested in the President's Budget.

As is always the case, this bill is the result of compromise. My position is well known to the Chairman and the older Members of this House. There are several places in this bill where I think that much more could be efficiently utilized and that the benefits to the Nation would be more than the cost. However, taken as a whole, I think this is a good bill and I am prepared to support it fully as it stands. While it will do little more than hold the line with some programs, the committee has substantially improved the budget in other areas to provide for some real progress.
$273,500,000. This was based on the law of 1965 and the budget was submitted to Congress. Since that time a liberalized program has been enacted and it is my understanding that a rather sizable supplemental request is being drawn up in the executive branch. A request of $93,260,000 for "Advances for employment services" was included in the budget. The purpose of this program, from general funds of the Treasury, was to supplement the appropriation: "Limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration," for which funds are transferred from the unemployment trust fund. The latter appropriation has a legislative limitation that is included in the Social Security Act, as amended. The $80 million proposed appropriation would be in addition to the funds that could be used from the trust fund, which were budgeted at the maximum authorization. It appeared to the committee that this was perhaps technically legal, but for practical purposes was simply a way of getting around the legal limitation for these funds. The request has therefore been denied. The bill does include the full legal limitation for transfer from the unemployment trust fund. This amounts to $62,100,000.

For unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-service men the bill includes $131 million which is a reduction of $10 million from the request, but simply reflects a downward trend in payments from this fund that has occurred since the budget was prepared.

The bill includes $26,605,000 for the Wage and Hour Division, an increase of $500,000 over the request to restore most of the reduction proposed in the budget for enforcement activities. All of labor, organized and unorganized, and all honest businessmen want to see the wage and hour laws properly enforced. I cannot understand the action in reducing enforcement of these laws is indicative of considerable violation of these laws.

The bill includes $19,501,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This is approximately $1 million more than the 1965 appropriation and $1 million less than the 1966 request. The committee feels certain that this important agency can continue to do a good job—in fact, an even better job—with the funds allowed.

There are several salary and expense items in the Department of Labor that I have not mentioned specifically, but they are all at approximately the current level of operation. In fact, in total there are slightly lower positions provided for in the bill than are provided for by the current appropriations.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the first item is the Federal Administration branch. The budget request was for $80,552,000 and this amount is carried in the bill. While this is almost $10 million above the current appropriation, it provides very little for anything but mandatory cost increases and the extremely large load of drug applications that must be evaluated and acted upon. This is workload that is not controllable by the agency, but has been brought about by recent enacted legislation. No increase in full amounts was included for police enforcement activities even though the workload in that area is also increasing somewhat. The request was $8 million for active agents and 125,000 accounted for by deferral of action on planning funds for additional laboratory facilities in the Washington, D.C., area. I am making a more detailed study of the possibility of decentralizing such activities.

In the Office of Education the committee approved the budget request for the expenditure of educational programs with the exception of the residential schools. The budget request included $5 million for one residential school to be located in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area pending a more detailed study of the possibility of decentralizing such activities.

The bill includes $641,750,000 for higher education facilities construction, which is $10 million less than the request included in the budget. This will provide for the full amount of construction grants authorized by the basic legislation.

The committee approved the budget request of $55 million for public libraries. Personally, I cannot understand the action of the Bureau of the Budget in disallowing $20 million of the $55 million requested by the Department for this program. The great need for both additional facilities and for additional funds for operation and maintenance of public libraries is obvious to all who will look. State and local matching funds are available to much more than match the $55 million appropriated for the current fiscal year and most certainly would be available to match an additional $20 million in 1966.

For both payments to school districts and assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, the bill includes the amount recommended by the Office of Education to be necessary to meet 100 percent of entitlements under existing law.

The bill includes $412,500,000 for defense educational activities. This is the amount requested and in most instances is the full amount authorized for the various programs that fall under this appropriation. The largest part of the increase over the current fiscal year is for the student loan program and for graduate fellowships which were increased $31,300,000 and $2 million, respectively, over the amount available for fiscal year 1965. This increase brings both of these programs to the maximum authorized by law.

For educational improvement for the handicapped, the bill also includes the amount of the budget request, $21,500,000. This is a small amount compared to the need when one considers that it is estimated full time 30,000 teachers are needed for teaching the handicapped whereas there are currently only 60,000 in classrooms.

Another extremely popular program is cooperative research in education. The full amount of the budget, $35 million, is carried in the bill. While there were many who felt this should be at least $55 million, the majority of the committee felt that the increase of $16,000,000, provided in the bill, above the amount approved for the current fiscal year should be adequate. For educational research using foreign currency surplus to the normal needs of the United States, the committee has approved the budget request of $1 million. In connection with all the special foreign currency programs of the Department, it appears that considerable progress has been made in improving procedures so that the programs can move forward and accomplish worthwhile results.

The request for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education included funds for 151 positions. It is quite obvious that legislation passed by the last Congress requires considerable additional work in 1966 as these programs go into full effect. However, the majority of the committee felt that an adequate Job could be done with 100 additional employees. This accounts for the reduction of $510,000 from the amount of the request.

The vocational rehabilitation program continues to be one of the most popular, one of the most worthwhile, and one of the most profitable of the programs carried out by the Federal Government. In addition to the great and obvious human benefits, it can be mathematically proven that this program returns to the taxpayers several times the tax dollars spent on it. The bill includes the full amount of the request for grants to States, research and training—special foreign currency programs. This is salaries and expenses. The committee has included, in connection with the regular research and training program, $300,000, not included in the budget, for two special centers, one for the mentally retarded and one for the deaf. The committee also included $100,000 for a thorough study of the national needs for vocational rehabilitation and recommendations as to how these needs can best be met. The bill includes $200,000 for the Laboratory for Perinatal Physiology of the National Institutes of Health in Puerto Rico. Under the bill this total facility would have been built in two stages. Under the pro-
visions of the bill, it can be built in one stage which will be cheaper and will provide the facility at an earlier date.

For injury control, the bill includes $4,560,000 over the budget to restore a small portion of the $1,900,000 by which the Bureau of the Budget reduced the Department's request.

The bill includes $66,453,000 for chronic diseases and health of the aged. This is an increase of $5,250,000 over the budget, of which $50,000 is for work in the field of mental retardation. In 1964 the Public Health Service established an advisory group of experts in this field from outside the Federal Government. This group recommended a total of $5,250,000 more than is contained in the budget. The committee was surprised that the budget allowed so little in view of the recommendations of this distinguished group of experts. The remaining $2 million of the increase over the budget is earmarked for work on kidney, heart, and liver diseases.

It has been brought to the committee's attention that the report appears to limit the use of these funds to hemodialysis. It was the intention of the committee that dialysis activities be increased in connection with this increase, but it is leaving it to the Public Health Service to determine the precise activities to be carried out with these funds which will do the most in meeting the very serious problems of kidney diseases.

The $8 million reduction recommended here for communicable disease activities represents funds requested for an expanded vaccination program which has not yet been authorized.

Likewise, the reduction of $3 million in the budget for community health practice and research is for the program of grants for migrant worker health activities for which the legislation has not been extended past 1965.

The bill includes $3,913,000 for hospital construction activities, which is a reduction of $136,000 from the request. This reduction is brought about primarily as a result of the committee's disallowance of legislative language which would permit the allocation of a much larger amount for modernization than is permitted under the existing law. The budget included $80 million for modernization, whereas, if the formula in existing law was applied to the total request, only $14,285,000 could be expended for this purpose. The committee made the adjustment in funds that corresponded to the disallowance of a change in the legislation.

The increase of $1,624,000 over the budget for air pollution includes $659,000 to provide sufficient funds to finance as many new research projects in 1966 as are being financed in 1965; and $975,000 for demonstration projects in control of mine waste fires. The later amount was denied in connection with the Appalachian regional development program since the act authorizing that program did not specifically authorize this activity, whereas it is clearly authorized under the Clean Air Act.

The relatively small increases for environmental engineering and sanitation, occupational health, and radiological health are all to provide sufficient funds to finance as many new research projects in 1966 as are being financed in 1965. The committee requested that the budget sought to cut these relatively new and very important research programs back in the 1966 budget.

The increased recommended by the committee for water supply and water pollution control is $3,913,000 over the budget. The largest item of increase is $1,900,000 for work in connection with the Appalachian development program but denied since the legislation authorizing that program did not specifically authorize demonstration in acid mine drainage for which these funds were requested. In addition to this, the committee has added $1 million to the bill for demonstration grants; $500,000 to permit 56 percent staffing, instead of 55 percent staffing provided in the budget, for the new regional water pollution control laboratories at Corvallis, Ore.; Owensboro, Ky.; and $813,000 to enable the division to finance as many new research projects in 1966 as are being financed in 1965.

The bill includes $97,710,000, an increase of $864,000, the amount necessary to keep the Chicago and Memphis hospitals open. The committee would be opposed to closing these hospitals on principle, even if the costs were slightly more than the costs of caring for merchant seamen and other legal beneficiaries on a contract basis. Any possible doubts were resolved when I learned that it actually would cost the Federal Government $312,000 less in 1966 to keep these hospitals in operation than it would to close them.

Except for a small reduction of $80,000 in the request for national health statistics all of the other items in the Public Health Service, except the National Institutes of Health, are included in the bill in the same amounts as requested in the budget. So unless there are questions regarding them, I will not take the time to discuss them.

I was not very happy about the budget for the National Institutes of Health, in fact, I recommended an increase of $100 million in committee. I have a lot to say about this so I think I will comment on the other items in the bill and then discuss the NIH budget in some detail.

But before I leave the subject of public health, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House something not directly related to this bill. My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio recently sent me a new book by Peter Wyden, "The Overweight Society." I was a little amused by it at first, and most people, I think would react the same way. But the time I had finished it, however, I was convinced that this is one of the real public health problems of this Nation today. This is a really good book, in opinion, and I highly recommend that this bill will sugarcoat the public health—or, for that matter, interested in their own health.

To get back to the bill—there is a relatively small increase in the Elizabethtown Hospital which will simply allow them to keep their positions filled at the normal rate. No additional positions are provided.

There is a decrease of $3 million or approximately 1 percent in the request for the Social Security Administration. We believe that they can do an adequate job with the funds allowed.

The largest reduction in the bill is for grants to States for public assistance. The budget request was $3,242,100,000 and the bill includes an even $3 billion. This is less than 6 percent below the appropriation for 1965 and as stated in the report, it would be a very modest reduction to expect in view of the expansion of programs under the Social Security Amendments of 1965, that were aimed at reducing dependency, and in view of all of the other programs that are also aimed at doing this, such as the vocational rehabilitation program, the antipoverty program, the Appalachian program, and so forth.

The committee also made a reduction in salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Family Services but has allowed 20 of the 48 new positions.

The reduction for juvenile delinquency and youth offenses represents the disallowance of all of the activities for which there is no authorization in 1966, and limiting funds for the activities that are authorized to just the amount required in 1966.

Of the remaining programs under the Welfare Administration the committee is recommending a reduction of $203,000 for the Office of Aging: $1,882,000, a reduction of $118,000 from the request for cooperative research or demonstration programs and has disallowed $116,000 requested by the Office of the Commissioner for the establishment of regional coordinator for welfare programs and a secretary in each of seven regional offices. There is no change from the budget for the other items.

The bill includes $1 million for the American Printing House for the Blind which is sufficient to allow $50 per blind pupil. This is $91,000 more than the request but is based on testimony by the vice president and general manager of the American Printing House for the Blind that $50 is the minimum amount necessary to provide the available educational materials that these pupils should have. The budget request was approved in each instance for the other items appearing under "special institutions."

For all items appearing under the heading, "Office of the Secretary," the bill includes $19,921,000 which is a reduction of $3,222,000 below the request. Most of this reduction is accounted for by a reduction of $3 million for educational television facilities. The hearings and materials submitted to the committee indicate that the $8,826,000 included in the bill will be all that will be required during the year.

The only change from the budget request for the related agencies was a small reduction of $4,000 for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. This leaves that agency $6,610,000 or
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$275,000 more than the 1965 appropriation.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

As I mentioned earlier, I was most unhappy with the NIH budget. The estimates submitted on behalf of the National Institutes of Health were again totally inadequate this year. There was no allowance whatever for any new advances on major disease problems. There was no allowance for the intensification of any of the existing research programs—even in areas where both urgent need and challenging opportunity are clearly evident. There was not even adequate provision for maintaining the momentum of present efforts to solve the fully identified problems whose solution could save thousands of lives and prevent uncountable days of pain and misery.

The administration's request for the National Institutes of Health was not even a good hold-the-line budget—and a hold-the-line budget is simply not good enough for an agency whose activities so vitally affect the future health and welfare of all the American people. I can wholeheartedly support the President's goals for a Great Society but I cannot support a program achieving a Great Society which does not have as one of its primary aims the elimination of the scourge of disease, the tragedy of mental retardation and all other forms of congenital disabilities, and the ever-present threat of untimely death. What can possibly be of more importance to a Great Society than the health of its citizens? What is going on when the President speaks of a healthy citizenry as one of this country's foremost goals and the Bureau of the Budget restricts and reduces the budget estimates of the agency which is at the forefront of the toughest battle we face—the battle to conquer man's most ancient, most relentless and most personal enemy—disease?

The attitude of the Bureau of the Budget seems doubly capricious because it flies in the face of its own assessment of the level of Federal support needed merely to keep pace with the rising cost of doing research. It has recently been well publicized that the Bureau of the Budget regards an annual increase of 15 percent as the minimum necessary to keep existing programs going. This figure is also contained in the report of the Panel on Basic Research and National Goals set up by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of the Congress.

About 5 percent of this increase is due to the normal rise in the cost of doing business experienced by almost every flourishing enterprise. It represents increases in salaries, wages, and the price of supplies. Most of the increased cost of ongoing research, however, is due to the greater complexity of the work being done—to the higher cost of more effective and more accurate instruments and of meeting the more exacting demands of modern research methods.

As the committee's report on the bill points out, electron microscopes are now 100 times as expensive as an ordinary microscope; electronic devices become more costly as greater accuracy is demanded from them; the application of computers to research routine increases the cost, and significant cost factor; germ-free animals are a necessary, expensive replacement for ordinary mice, rats, and guinea pigs. Their 15 percent figure was arrived at after a year's study by the committee; the committee does not feel that the budget is inadequate to take care of all the real needs of medical research—it is a minimum figure which does not pretend to measure the true level of potential research from slowing down for lack of funds.

Yet what does the Bureau of the Budget do when it comes to the estimates for the National Institutes of Health? Does it allow the increase of 15 percent that it has set as the necessary minimum? It does not. For medical research—of which is vital concern to every man, woman, and child which has the full support of the American people—the budget allows only half of this minimum increase.

There is no justification for the arbitrary limitation imposed on the NIH budget estimates. The effectiveness of the NIH programs is universally recognized. The defense of medicine have been outstanding—not merely through the work supported by the grant-in-aid programs, but through the work done in its own schools. The dedicated men who work in Bethesda and in the field stations of NIH in various parts of the world have run up an impressive score of research accomplishments from such specific achievements as finding a cure for Rocky Mountain spotted fever, which used to be a fast-skiing and fatal disease, to such dramatic breakthroughs as the cracking of the genetic code which opens the way to the unraveling of the causes of a whole host of genetic diseases.

The record of the scientists whose work NIH has supported is no less impressive. There is hardly a major advance in medical research—or in the scientific disciplines with which medicine is concerned—without the under-standing of medical problems—that is not directly or indirectly indebted to the grant programs of the NIH.

A thorough review of the NIH programs at the request of the President, by a distinguished committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Dean Woldridge. This committee and its advisory panels—comprising 77 prominent scientists and administrators—appraised the extramural projects supported by NIH in 37 universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions. The group made detailed investigations and evaluations of some 400 separate activities supported by NIH covering each of its major program research problems. In the exhaustive review, the Woldridge committee stated in its report to the President that:

The first and probably most important conclusion of the study is that the activities of the National Institutes of Health are essentially sound and that its budget of approximately $1 billion a year, on the whole, being spent wisely and well in the public interest.

Not only did the Woldridge committee find that the vast majority of research supported by NIH is of high quality but it emphasizes that "vital expenditures "have greatly improved the quality and quantity of both research and teaching in our biomedical institutions." I have been much concerned over this past quarter century by the relative quality of our programs but have not found one shred of evidence to suggest that there has been any decline at all in the quality of the research supported by NIH as its appropriations grew larger. I am therefore not at all surprised but I am very much heartened by the statement of the Woldridge committee that "it is difficult to find any evidence of a lowering of quality but that it found "good evidence that the average quality is steadily improving." In fact, the committee's report puts it more strongly than that; it says that usually "NIH-supported work was found to set the national or international standard of excellence in its field."

In other words, instead of asking how the NIH programs stack against other research programs we might better ask how other programs stack up against the high standards set by NIH.

The Woldridge committee clearly states its conclusion that the NIH appropriations "constitute a sound investment for the American people." I think my constituents—and taxpayers everywhere—will be glad to hear the final sentence of the report's section on the quality of the NIH activities. The Woldridge committee says:

"We suspect that there are few, if any, $1 billion segments of the Federal budget that are buying more valuable services for the American people than the NIH is administered by the National Institutes of Health."

It would be helpful if the Bureau of the Budget would take note of the observation by this group of distinguished citizens that "greater expenditures for health research are yielding greater progress in the alleviation of disease" and its recommendation that new opportunities for health research "should be welcomed with enthusiasm and without reservation." I think the members and the American people would be glad to hear the final sentence of the report's section on the quality of the NIH activities. The Woldridge committee says:

"We suspect that there are few, if any, $1 billion segments of the Federal budget that are buying more valuable services for the American people than the NIH is administered by the National Institutes of Health."

For nearly 10 years the executive branch has been shirking its responsibility for developing a vigorous and forward-moving national health-research effort. Instead of encouraging and supporting those directly responsible for the NIH programs, it has tried to put these officials under wraps and to prevent them from giving the appropriations Committee straight, unblasted answers to questions involving their professional judgment on the proper course of the development of these programs. As a result, the Congress has had to take the initiative in expanding these programs. This is recognized by the Woldridge committee which says in its report:

"The Congress in particular deserves considerable credit for its past and continuing support of this kind of far-sighted program.
The Congress can—and should—continue to push and to prod, but it cannot undertake to make professional scientific assessments of new research opportunities; it cannot determine the most desirable lines of effort among the many fields that need further development; it cannot do the detailed planning of program needs that should be reflected in the budget estimates.

The committee has probed deeply into the opportunities for carrying forward the fight against the major crippling diseases and the leading causes of premature death in the United States. It has inquired into the unmet program needs of the National Institutes of Health not only as viewed by the capable officials responsible for these programs but as seen by many of this country's leading medical scientists. The conclusion is inescapable that with the budget estimates submitted by the executive branch the NIH could not march forward but would be forced to spend a year simply marching in place.

In the absence of the forward-looking budget justifications which it has a right to expect—and which it will certainly insist upon next year—the committee has included no general increases for any of the National Institutes of Health in the bill. It has, however, provided specific increases, totaling $11,700,000, for six special programs that are so important to the future health of the American people that it would be intolerable to wait another year in the hope that the Bureau of the Budget might see fit to include them.

These six programs are described in some detail in the committee's report on the bill but they may be briefly summarized:

The bill includes an increase of $2.5 million for work on the development of an artificial heart. Such a device will make possible treatments not possible with the present heart-lung machine which is only effective for the relatively short period of time required by a single operation. It is hoped that this program will ultimately lead to the development of a compact and reliable mechanism that can be used as a permanent replacement for an irreparably damaged heart.

The bill includes an increase of $2 million for perfecting the artificial kidney and bringing it within reach of a larger number of people who suffer from kidney failure. Much additional research is also needed on the nature of kidney failure if the machine is to be successfully applied to a broader range of pathologies. Nothing has been included in the budget for this important work.

The bill includes an increase of $1,650,000 for breast cancer research, a disease which is still the most common form of cancer in women and for which the mortality figures have not improved over the last several years. The committee is convinced that more attention can, and must be done about this unsatisfactory situation for which the budget made no adequate provision.

The bill includes an increase of $2,390,000 for the second year of the study on the effect of drugs on coronary thrombosis. Although the Congress appropriated funds last year especially for this program, the Bureau of the Budget took it upon itself to withhold these funds from the Heart Institute until about 6 months after the request for them; the funds for the second year of this program from the budget for fiscal 1966. This is a flagrant example not only of the irresponsible attitude of the Bureau of the Budget but of its complete failure to respond to the determination of the Congress and of the American people to press the war on disease with all the vigor possible.

The bill includes an amendment for the cancer training program which was gratuitously deleted by the Bureau of the Budget as an economy measure. Some major modifications in this program have been proposed by the Cancer Institute to improve its effectiveness in providing special training in the diagnosis and the treatment of cancer. These will be financed by the amendment of the Bill as justification for an economy cut in the estimates. The committee has heard no evidence—and can hardly imagine any—that this is the sort of program whose elimination the American people want to economize.

The bill provides an increase of $1,250,000 for the Division of Computer Research and Technology which is being set up at NIH. The application of advanced computer techniques to clinical medicine and to laboratory research opens up important new avenues for progress not only in the understanding of biological processes but in the treatment of patients. The computer is destined to become as important an adjunct to the operating room as the X-ray machine.

The facilities at NIH and the broad competence of its staff furnishes an excellent setting for developmental work in this very promising new field. I think it is important to note that certain of these new programs, for which the bill makes special provision, reflect two important trends in the further scientific and technical aspects of NIH programs:

First, it is now possible to undertake, with a high degree of confidence, the pursuit of very specific objectives relating to diagnostic and therapeutic approaches to disease problems and to organize for the development of such devices as artificial kidneys and external support mechanisms for the heart. This capability results from the ever-increasing body of knowledge concerning life and disease processes which is flowing from the broad base of research activities. NIH is uniquely suited to the biomedical sciences. Thus we can now undertake with the hope of very practical results the application of this broad base of knowledge to the solution of particular disease problems and the development of specific devices and systems to support or replace physiological processes and organs.

Second, we are now witnessing the growing transfer of the advances in the physical sciences, and relating engineering and technical capability, to the field of medical and health services. The current scene in the biomedical sciences is characterized by an exhilarating interplay between the technology and concepts of the physical sciences and the problems of biology and medicine. New fields of activity are emerging in such areas as biomedical electronics, bioinstrumentation and so forth.

These trends are now being reflected in the program and budgetary needs of the National Institutes of Health. These activities bring with them two new requirements. Conduct of programs of this character require greater control over the course of technical activity and access to new fields of relevant information.

As a consequence of these requirements the National Institutes of Health will have to make more extensive use of the contract as the instrument of choice in the support of research and will be engaged on an increasing scale with private industry as a source of new kinds of scientific engineering and technological tools.

These are important developments into which the committee inquired at some depth during the course of the hearings. Pages 622 through 630 of the hearings present the description of what is taking place in this area. The Public Health Service, in testifying before the committee in connection with these developments, noted that the administration had submitted to the Congress legislation to broaden the authority of the Surgeon General to enter into contracts for research and development activities. This legislation encompassed in H.R. 3994 has recently been reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

It is a matter of considerable concern to the Appropriations Committee that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has recommended substantial modifications in the request of the Public Health Service for contract authority. The modifications recommended include limiting the use of this contract authority for a 3-year period establishing parameters of expenditures in this area under the Public Health Service and seems to take no account of the fact that the planned expenditures in this area under the President's budget for fiscal year 1966 would exceed some $90 million. Thus the effect of this amendment would be to cut back the Public Health Service research contract activities to well below last year's level and effectively stop further development of this program.

It also has a further most serious consequence. It is DHEW policy to re-
strict support for research in nonprofit making organizations to the use of the contract. Thus the kind of limitation that is encompassed within the present amendments to H.R. 2894 has the effect of barring the field of medical research to private industry just at the moment when the development of medical technology is such that effective use can be made of great technological capability and skill now present in the aerospace industry and in the field of private industry. This restriction will prevent access to this great resource. I hope it is possible in the coming debate on this bill to explore this matter in order that the action of the House will indeed reflect our concern with the proper use of legislative authority but will not arbitrarily forestall a course of research development in biomedicine of great significance or deny private industry its appropriate role in this evolution.

The general provisions of the Bill include a modification of section 293 providing recognition of the indirect costs of research projects. The committee believes that the indirect costs of research legitimately include not only those costs which are solely attributable to the research project but also those general operating and administrative costs that do not arise from any single activity but are essential to all the activities of the institution. The committee believes that the distinction between direct and indirect cost is necessarily somewhat arbitrary and rather meaningless. It is the Committee's view that the so-called indirect costs are part of the proper and inescapable costs of all of the institution’s activities, including research.

The Committee believes that Federal research-support funds should be available for any legitimate expense of eligible research projects and that arbitrary distinctions between kind of cost and another should not enter into the calculation of the support which the Federal Government is willing to provide.

However, we should not lose sight of the fact that the grant-in-aid concept assumes that the grantor is assisting the grantee in the accomplishment of some piece of work of mutual interest. The principal justification for the grant mechanism—and its principal distinction from research contracts—is that it deals with research projects which arise from the professional or institutional interests of members of the scientific community. Federal support is made available to them because—and only to the extent that it will further the interests of the nation or serve important national interests which the Federal Government is anxious to promote.

In these circumstances, it is not only fair but proper that the grantee institution should bear some proportion of the cost. This principle is, in fact, included in the enabling legislation for several grant programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such as the cooperative research or demonstration projects of the Welfare Administration, the cooperative research in education of the Office of Education, and the grants for special projects of the Educational Rehabilitation Administration. It is also observed in practice in the execution of NIH grant programs. With few exceptions the NIH grants do not pay the salary of the principal investigator on the project supported nor do they normally provide payment for the cost of equipment used in carrying out the project.

The provision in the bill that the funds appropriated shall not be used to pay the full support for research projects therefore does not mark a radical departure from present practice. On the contrary, the committee hopes that the abolition of the artificial distinction between direct and indirect costs will lead to a simpler and more equitable determination of the amount which the Federal Government will contribute to grant-supported projects.

The committee has not sought to establish any detailed guidelines for the calculation of the full cost of research and it has left the door open for determination on either a project-by-project or an institutional basis. The committee is only concerned, on the one hand, that the Federal Government shall maintain, and on the other hand, that the Federal Government should minimize the burden on the already strained resources of most universities and other research institutions by providing the maximum proportion of the total cost of grant-supported research that is justifiable in the particular circumstances, so long as it involves at least some participation by the grantee institution.

Mr. Chairman, there are the highlights of the bill and the changes that have been made in the budget after 3 months work of the committee to determine what is in the best interest of all the people of the country.

Mr. Chairman, everything considered, this is a good bill. If I were writing it myself there are a great many changes I would make. But I know compromise is the sine qua non of legislation. That this bill represents a good compromise is illustrated by the fact that this bill is unanimously reported. I hope and trust that the House will adopt it overwhelmingly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This bill is almost $8 billion, $7.5 billion some odd billion.

Mr. POGARTY. How much of the gentleman think his committee can hold this to when they come around to the supplemental appropriations stage later on, some months from now?

Mr. POGARTY. In the first place, I do not know what the supplementals are going to be. It is the plan of the committee, as I understand it at the present time, to hold hearings about the third week in May on an overall supplemental bill confined to the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. This is going to be a sizable supplemental bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are the highlights of the bill and the changes that have been made in the budget after 3 months work of the committee to determine what is in the best interest of all the people of the country.

Mr. GROSS. That leads me to ask this question: What progress has been made in heart and cancer research and its affliction for the enormous amount of money that has been spent for research in this field?

Mr. POGARTY. I am not a physician, as the gentleman knows. We do have physicians in the House. In addition we have listened to hundreds of them in the past 10 or 15 years, some of the best in the world, because we think we have some of the best doctors in the world, many who are specialists in heart and cancer. They tell us that because of the advances in heart surgery the last 4 or 5 years untold thousands of people are walking around today who otherwise could not have survived their heart ailments.

In the area of cancer, even though the numbers dying seem to be increasing, I think it is estimated that 350,000 will die this year because of some form of cancer, the reason for this increase given to us on the committee, is that the Nation’s population is increasing by leaps and bounds every year. One of the reasons for this increase is that we live longer now. As a result, the longer people live the greater the chance that they will get some form of heart trouble or some cancer. However, he has made substantial progress has been made. As we understand it, if people would go to their doctor in time much could be done to help save lives from cancer today because of the new knowledge we have. Whereas 20 years ago one out of four was being saved, or one of five, it is now up to one out of three. If they went to their own doctor in time perhaps one out of two would be saved. That is, if they went to their doctor in time, if they heeded the danger signals that are put out by the American Cancer Society, and by the medical profession, in this way additional lives could be saved.

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

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

Mr. DENTON. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing forth a very good bill. I believe every Member of the House knows the interest and the work we hope to have it on the floor about the middle of June. It is going to be supplemental to the Education and the Manpower Development and Training Act that was passed, the education bill which was passed, and four or five others including the antipoverty programs. We hope to have it on the floor about the middle of June. We hope to have it on the floor about the middle of June. It is going to be come around to the supplemental appropriations stage later on, some months from now.
that the chairman has engaged in connection with public health, medical research, care for the aged, retarded children, and education and welfare generally. The bill does not appropriate as much money as the chairman thinks it should, or as much as I think it should but it is a good bill and we are supporting it. I want to thank him again for this fine bill.

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

Mr. FOSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOSS. I read the discussion on the general provisions involving the indirect costs of research projects appearing on page 63. I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning section 203 of the general provisions of the Appropriations Act. As I understand it, the committee is removing the 20-percent limitation on indirect costs with the condition that grantee institutions must share in the full costs, both direct and indirect, of supported research. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSS. That is correct up to maybe an average of 5 percent.

Mr. FOSS. That is also the committee's expectation that the Bureau of the Budget, in promulgating regulations for appropriate levels of financial participation for guarantees, will be guided by the principle that an institution should share in supported research costs in proportion to the degree to which the institution is benefited locally in its teaching, research, and other institutional responsibilities.

Mr. FOSS. We are going to leave that up to the Bureau of the Budget. We are lumping, as the gentleman so well knows, the indirect costs and training costs, and we expect the Bureau of the Budget to come up with a formula so that all of these grantees would be participating to the extent of perhaps an average of 5 percent.

And I understand the national groups are supporting this provision in the bill. The Daddario committee, for one, has looked into it too. I think the committee of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] has looked into it too, and the Elliott committee—and they have made similar recommendations.

I cannot mention the Daddario committee without a comment about its great chairman. He is one of the most able Members of this House and did a magnificent job as chairman of that committee.

We have come up with this proposal with the understanding that it is also going to be in the independent offices bill and in the Department of Defense appropriation bill. These are the three large bills where most of the research grant funds are carried.

But it is my understanding that these institutions are happy and satisfied with this proposal as it is now written.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. But it is the committee's feeling that these institutions should share in the support of research costs in proportion to the degree to which the institutions are benefited locally in these various areas?

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, while I hope and expect that this House will approve the recommendation for an appropriation of $3,826,000 to continue financing our national education television program, I consider it deplorable and an evidence of a technical defeat in the authorizing legislation in that we are not considering instead the full $11,826,000 recommended by the President for this vital educational service.

It is evident that this very reason the committee cannot justify the larger amount lies in the State allocation provisions of the authorizing legislation. This means that many qualified applicants will be denied matching grants on the merits of their applications or the need for their educational services, but only because they are in States which have not utilized the amounts allocated to that State.

For example, in my State of California, there are at least five qualified educational television groups prepared to serve major segments of our school population, but California's share of Federal funds is nearing exhaustion and cannot possibly provide matching grants for these enterprises, into which local citizens are prepared to put substantial sums. I do not want to deprive any State of a full opportunity to participate in this program. They should be encouraged to do so. But if any State is not fully spending its entire allocation within a reasonable period of time, I firmly believe the remaining sum should revert for allocation to those States having qualified applicants whose needs cannot be funded under the original allocation.

If this were now the law, the entire $11,826,000 would be urgently needed and could be fully justified.

I have talked with the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee about the possibility of hearings here on how this educational television program is progressing. I am hopeful the committee will get into this important subject, and if it does so, I shall certainly strongly urge a revision of the authorizations along the lines I have discussed.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think it is the general consensus in this body that the gentleman from Rhode Island is one of the great legislators of this body, one of the finest representatives and certainly one of the best informed men in the United States on health education. It is always a pleasure to hear him bring this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I want particularly to compliment him and all who share responsibility for this bill, as reflected by the terms of this bill, to provide the funds to begin implementation of section 14 in Public Law 83-210—the section widely enacted by the 83rd Congress for Federal assistance for establishment of residential vocational training schools to meet a very urgent need for such facilities across the Nation.

Chairman FOSS. As members of his subcommittee, backed by the full committee, have recommended that funds be provided to assure at least two institutions in this field—a field in which the Congress has already authorized five pilot institutions.

I believe the committee's recommendations should have the full support of this body, and there should be no further delay in the program.
In one demonstration of what could be done, seven Indian mothers who were heads of families and receiving aid for dependent children were enrolled as vocational students at Oklahoma State Tech.

On completion of training, all but two were able to be self-sufficient. Within 5 years, the savings in aid for dependent children payments will more than pay the cost of training for all seven of these Indian mothers.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs at Muskogee has indicated it could refer "a minimum of 1,000 Indians" to receive vocational training at Okmulgee, from the several States which make up the Muskogee area alone, if funds and facilities were available.

Additional thousands of Indians could be expected to take advantage of the program, from other areas of the south, northwest, midwest and north, if a pilot school were established at Okmulgee in accordance with this legislation.

In no sense of the word, however, is the Oklahoma school a school for Indians alone.

On the contrary, Indian students have always been in the minority, and students of all races are included in the present enrollment. There are 28 States represented at Okmulgee today, and foreign countries have sent students to take advantage of the institution's program.

In the Nation today, no other location has established a site for a pilot residential vocational education program than Okmulgee, Okla.

I believe this fact is recognized by the professional leaders of vocational education, both in the Department and across the country. I am highly pleased that members of the subcommittee which heard testimony on this matter have frankly expressed their conviction that Okmulgee is an ideal location for this program. I hope and trust the funds will be approved and a pilot program will soon be underway at Oklahoma State Tech.

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

(Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to join with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman EDMONDSON, and other members of the Oklahoma delegation in supporting the establishment of a pilot residential vocational school under Public Law 88-210 at Oklahoma State Tech in Okmulgee.

With more than 100 experienced instructors on its campus, the Okmulgee school is in a splendid position to utilize an aid package most efficiently. Figures supplied to me indicate that more than 1,200 students are already living in campus housing at Okmulgee.

The student body at Okmulgee is a remarkable cross section of the American people with students from 28 of the States in the Union and 8 foreign countries. They are enrolled in 40 vocational-technical courses ranging from the skilled crafts to highly complex courses in modern electronics.

As a result of being on the research and development subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, and of being one of the three physicians in the Congress, I have had unusual knowledge of the heart boosters, as well as the artificial heart, to say nothing about the heart-lung bypass systems, in private life, because of work in a foundation which we established before I came to the Congress.

With the research and development features—new sensors and pulsers and devices now available to the engineers, as well as to those who do basic and allied research—there has been a distinct breakthrough. This has happened in private business and industry, as the gentleman so well said in his opening statement.

As to manned space flight, bioastronautics, and other activities, this is an area in which the Government should give support. We should not limit ourselves to what I think of as the vertical research, which refers back to the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN) in which we necessarily duplicate and must build on the building blocks: basic, then applied research, which refers back to the research and development subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.
for him, anyway. We should develop all this simultaneously, and then make the horizontal breakthrough needed, whether it be on cancer research, heart research, or whatever. We will come to the incubator, and the horizontal cannot be found alone with money and additional personnel. We are more likely to find the answer to cancer in the laboratory, and/or bedside research than in the ivory towers of the vertical approach.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. Emerson] in commending the chairman of the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee.

Ask any vocational educator where Okmulgee, Okla., is, and he will tell you. He will also tell you that the outstanding vocational school there, Oklahoma State Tech, which is the vocational-technical branch of Oklahoma State University.

The success of this school is a tribute to its founders and its leadership. Since it was established 18 years ago, it has never lost sight of its principal purpose for being—to turn out skilled craftsmen and technicians. Because it has held to this purpose, the school has compiled an outstanding record. It has taken young Indians from reservations and taught them skills, and it has taught them to live and work in society.

Its record in vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped is one of the best anywhere. It has done equally well with high school dropouts, and with ordinary young people seeking training to enable them to work for a good living.

For these and many other reasons, I urge that section 14 of Public Law 88-210 be funded. Oklahoma State Tech should be designated as a pilot residential vocational school under provisions of the act.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, Oklahoma State Tech, at Okmulgee, Okla., is the vocational-technical branch of Oklahoma State University.

The outstanding job already being done by this technical school has been recognized. It has received the subcommittee's vote of confidence, the Oklahoma Vocational Education Association, and the American Vocational Association.

The work already being done at Okmulgee is the best argument I know for funding section 14 of Public Law 88-210. Thousands of successful graduates of this school can testify to the job which its able faculty is capable of doing, and we know that the school has helped to reduce the welfare load in every county of our State, by making taxpayers citizens out of welfare cases who had no future.

We believe this school can do an even greater job for the Nation if the money provided by this bill is wisely invested in additional facilities, equipment and faculty at Oklahoma State Tech. We urge this course of action.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, on a statement, in Oklahoma, in buildings which once housed a World War II military hospital, one of the finest vocational education schools in the Nation has been training skilled craftsmen and technicians for 18 years.

The school, Oklahoma State Tech, is a branch of Oklahoma State University at Stillwater. Tech was created to serve the needs of World War II and, it served them well. Now it trains other Oklahomans—and, indeed, many from other States and foreign countries—and its reputation for turning out skilled and willing workers spreads wherever those young people go.

Oklahoma State Tech is a residential school, where students from all walks of life come to live together, work together and learn together. The school is doing an outstanding job, and a look at its record is a convincing argument for funding section 14 of Public Law 88-210 which provides for establishment of pilot residential vocational training schools.

And Oklahoma State Tech would be an ideal location for such a pilot school. It is in operation, it is successful, and the return on investment in this school would be high and satisfying. It is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in urging establishment of a pilot school under Public Law 88-210 in Okmulgee.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, every Oklahoman is proud of the job which has been done during the past 18 years by Oklahoma State Tech at Okmulgee. This fine school is a branch of Oklahoma State University at Stillwater, and was established initially to serve the needs of World War II veterans.

The outstanding job which it has done as a regional training center for vocational rehabilitation students, and its effective trade and vocational educational program, has already won for it nationwide recognition.

Vocational educators from all over the country and indeed from foreign countries come to Okmulgee to study the operation of this great school.

At no other location in the country could the Government invest funds for a pilot residential vocational program with greater economy of initial investment, and with a higher assurance of return on the investment than at Oklahoma State Tech. I am pleased to join other members of the Oklahoma delegation in urging that funds be appropriated for the establishment of a pilot training institution under the Vocational Education Act at Okmulgee.

Mr. DADARAZZO. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to support this bill which is being so ably handled by our colleague from Rhode Island.

I am particularly interested in the fact that the committee has eliminated the percentage ceiling on reimbursable overhead costs relative to Federal research grants which has been carried in prior appropriations bills.

In my veteran's humbly, I go to a deal of sense.

The committee has, on the other hand, inserted a requirement in section 203 that at least some of the costs of the research projects included in Federal grants be borne by the grantee institution. I agree with this point to whether the method adopted by the committee is the best one. It does appear to me to be a move in the logical direction.

In fact, both actions taken by the Appropriations Committee in this bill are similar to the conclusions reached by the Committee on Science and Astro- physics and its Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, which I have the honor to chair. In House Report No. 144, issued by our committee earlier this year, and following extensive hearings by the subcommittee last summer, recommendations were made that first, percentage limitations on indirect costs be removed, and, second, that beginning efforts be made to establish criteria for cost sharing based on the mutual interests of institutional grantees and Federal grantor agencies.

In a short time you will find the approach in the bill before us today indicating that the Appropriations Committee, quite independently, has reached conclusions not greatly different.

We are all, I think, striving toward the same goals. In essence, they are as quoted by the report on this bill—worth while research, adequately supervised and economically conducted. One could hardly find a more succinct summarization of that which we seek in making Federal grants for scientific research.

Mr. Chairman, the net effect of this language in the bill will be to make the Budget Bureau's directive—Circular A-51—on the assessment of reimbursable overhead apply to HEW research grants. This directive has been carefully worked out over a number of years and seeks to safeguard the fiscal interests of both the Government and the grantees institutions. Simultaneously, it will mean that costs will be given to the equities involved in cost sharing—but as a separate issue and not as a complicating offset of the overhead problem.

In my opinion this is a splendid bill. I should like to thank the committee and its chairman for giving their thoughtful attention to a complex and important problem.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that the report on the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recognizes two matters of importance to both Chicago and the country: the one pertains to water pollution control studies; the second insures the continued accessibility of Public Health Service hospital facilities.

In discussing the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965, I noted that there is nothing more local than a drop of water and nothing more national than what we do with it. I strongly believe that in learning what to do with water, our most important natural resource. We are learning to conserve it, to purify it, to reuse it, to control it. The demonstration grants provide for water supply and water pollution control appropriation give us an opportunity to
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learn more in the vital areas of water reuse, drainage, pollution, and flood control.

The Bureau of the Budget asked that only $1,165,000 be spent for such projects in 1966. That would be only enough to finance projects already approved and would not allow funds for any new projects. Fortunately, the subcommittee recognized the benefits to be realized in such programs and added $1 million to the bill. I have already, I believe, stressed the importance of water pollution as a menace. The figures showed that a shutdown would cost the Government more money than it would save.

The first two hospitals scheduled to be closed were in Chicago and Memphis. The committee discovered that the cost of caring for patients from these hospitals, in cross servicing and contract, would exceed the savings realized from closing them. The committee determined that such funds should be used to improve the present conventional sewer system in Chicago.

This approach is dramatic and revolutionary. It calls for intercepting the existing network of sewers with vertical shafts, extending 600 or more feet underground. The shafts were excavated galleries, which would flow into a tunnel leading away from the city. A pump-turbine plant at the tunnel outlet would use the stored water to generate electric power. Allowing for revenues from sale of this power, the estimated cost of the new system would be about the same as the cost of expanding the present conventional drainage system, and the protection from pollution and floods would be far greater.

Mr. Chairman, we have for too many years paid inadequate attention to our priceless water. We are now paying the penalty for our neglect, reaping a whirlpool of pollution. To correct the corruption of our water supplies, we require research, experimentation, and demonstration. These few projects represent a worthy step in that direction.

I am hopeful that the treatment of the pollution problem contemplated by the Chicago feasibility study will provide great benefits to every metropolitan area plagued with inadequate drainage and sewage systems. I am gratified that our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. Foss] and the members of this committee have had the foresight to include extra funds for these demonstration grants.

I would also like to address myself briefly to another matter contained in this bill—the retention of operating funds during the next year for Public Health Service hospitals.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare proposed to close seven such hospitals over the next 4 years. One of these hospitals is St. Elizabeth's, and it is a claim that it would save the Federal Government $1 million. I did not analyze the cost-saving ratio for all seven institutions, but I did carefully study the alleged savings that have been made by closing the U.S. Merchant Marine Hospital in Chicago. The figures showed that a shutdown would cost the Government more money than it would save.

The Public Health Service estimated it would save $17,000 by investing in new Veterans Administration construction instead of spending the $1,300,000 it said was required to modernize the Marine Hospital. It would take but 5 years for the annual amount of $2,344,000 to exceed the one-time savings in capital investment of $515,000. Thereafter, the Government would have lost $17,000 a year.

It is clear that the closing could not be justified on economic grounds. Nor could it be justified on the grounds of better service. This 138-bed hospital has served Great Lakes seamen, as well as active and retired service personnel and their dependents, for 2 years. Remove that hospital, Mr. Chairman, and you are left with only one other Merchant Marine hospital on the Great Lakes—at Detroit—and that hospital was scheduled to close, too. Take away the Memorial hospital, and merchant seamen would have no facilities in the entire Mississippi River north of New Orleans.

Early in our history President John Adams took special interest in the health and welfare of merchant seamen and inaugurated this hospital system. Only 2 years ago President Kennedy said he wanted the Public Health Service to present a plan to provide treatment for seamen. What happened? The Public

Health Service decided to close the few hospitals it had in this area, reducing accessibility to treatment instead of increasing it.

I am grateful that the committee closely scrutinized these operations. Mr. Chairman, I urge that you assure yourself that unforeseen claims of the kind may be exposed. It is more important that satisfactory and accessible care remain available to seamen.

Mr. VECCHI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7765 with special attention directed toward title II. It is felt there is little need to go into great detail justifying your support of the bill now before us as the committee and subcommittees have done a tremendous job in scrutinizing every detail.

I do, however, feel a need to express my deep and profound regret that a $200,000 planning fund for a field laboratory for water pollution control was not included in the final bill submitted to the House. I am confident that these funds were omitted in the interest of budgetary considerations and not due to a failure to recognize the pressing need for continued advance in programs of this nature. The importance of water and the increasing dangers of its pollution to public health and safety is a matter about which we all are aware.

Obviously the seriousness of water pollution varies depending on the region in question. I believe there is a pressing need for an additional laboratory in the Missouri River Basin. This basin covers approximately 20 percent of the land mass of the country and serves the vastness of the midwestern agricultural areas and several tremendous metropolitan areas such as St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha. At present the closest field laboratory is located at Ann Arbor, Mich. Even the most bright-eyed optimist would not dare hope that the Midwest could be served by this laboratory alone due to the complexity of the Great Lakes pollution problem.

Therefore, how do we best serve the millions of people affected by Missouri River Basin pollution? It is imperative that we locate a laboratory in the basin and that we do it soon, while a solution is still within our grasp. Pollution in this basin should be the concern of every citizen who uses the products supplied by this area. And it concerns each person in the land for you all know of midwestern and industrial production. I again express my regret on this matter and vow that I will continue to press for the needed planning funds until the laboratory is built and we are on our way to the consumption and use of clean and safe water.

I ask that all of you consider the gravity of the problem and join me in the attainment of necessary appropriations when we next take this problem under consideration.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to commend the chairman and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for wisely revising section 203 of this bill. As has already been stated,
in the past an inflexible statutory limitation has been imposed on the amount of indirect costs which were permitted the Budget instead will establish flexible the kind of efficiency that guarantees the future, however, assuming this re-
section adopted, the Bureau of the Budget personnel is to see to it that we do attain maximum efficiency in the per-
amount, a significant element in the maximum control in managing public funds.

Prior to my coming to the Congress, and since I have been here, President Johnson has issued executive directives asking that agencies take cold, hard looks at their administrative procedures and that they eliminate those procedures and practices that contribute unnecessary ef-

In the expenditure of public funds, the of departments, and of the Bureau of the Budget instead will establish flexible administrative regulations authorizing amounts more closely approaching the true economy-false economy, and the real kind.

in the past was to be imposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to in-
stitutions receiving research grants; in the future, however, assuming this revised section is adopted, the Bureau of the Budget will instead make the determination that the administrative procedures used by the various agencies represented before our committee demand that, in my opinion, stimulate efficiency and effective administrative practices. Or, as I have said on another oc-

I am further pleased to hear the chair-

true economy and, of course, the extra burden results that will be placed on this department as a result in the administration of medical care, could go on and on citing more and more examples.

The opportunity that has been ac-
corded me as a result of the privilege of serving on this committee has made me increasingly aware of the powerful con-
tribution which computers have made to the progress of medical research.

Vast amounts of data have been cap-
tured by automatic instruments, and the analysis of the data should provide an unusually rich opportunity for physi-
cians, mathematicians, and engineers, working together, to identify some of the basic patterns of disturbance in normal function in heart disease, cancer, and other serious illnesses.

A large portion of the financial sup-
port necessary to establish computers in the research laboratories of our leading research hospitals has come from the Federal Gov-
ernment, through the National Institutes of Health. Moreover, the NIH has pio-
niered the use of computers in its own laboratories and in the operating rooms of the Clinical Center.

There, for example, patients in critical need of heart surgery receive the most advanced medical care. At the same time, they provide through the computer and other automatic instruments vital data which can help to save countless other lives in the years ahead.

The modern-day computer in medical research is much more than a set of boxes with complicated wiring such as are accustomed to see in business offices to-

day. The human or animal heart in ac-

tion does not produce a set of numbers. Its movement must first be sensed as a change in blood pressure within the heart walls. The blood vessels' pressure changes must be converted to con-
tinuous electrical signals which can be captured by tape-recording equipment. The information must then be displayed visually on a television screen to provide immediate vital intelligence to the sur-
geon on the condition of his patient, or to the researcher on the progress of his experiment.

An impressive array of equipment is required to perform these tasks, particularly if many variables are to be studied at the same time. To carry through the mathematical analysis of the data requires still more electronic equipment to select those portions of the continuous record which require further study, and to convert the electrical signals to numbers. Only then can one begin to use the vast power of the digital computer with which most of us have become familiar.

Computing the full power of this computer complex to the service of medical research and patient care requires two essential commodities: first, large volumes of data must be processed; second, and much more difficult to come by, topnotch mathematical and
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MR. POINDEXTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a quorum be permitted to extend their own remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Sixty-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 89]

Ashley
Ayres
Bandstra
Blattman
Brademas
Brophy, Va.
Clevenger
Crowdy
Curtis
Dickinson
Dingus
Dixie
Ford, Calif.
Ford, D. R.
Gatino
Goodell
Gooding
Hagen, Calif.
Haleck
Hansen, Wash.
Harmison
Hays
Hoffeld
Holiday
Homer
Hueb
Irwin
Jones, Mo.
Jones
Kreh
Latta
Leggett
Mcdowell
Maccoby
Mackie
Young

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 7765, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 363 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

LABOR-HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] is recognized.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the New and Labor appropriations bill for fiscal 1966 is a bill which I support. I am not going to brag about the bill because I am not particularly proud of all of it. But I defend and support this bill because I am a realist, and under the cir-
cumstances, it is not a bad bill. As the gentleman from Rhode Island has indicated in his remarks earlier today, our committee worked long and hard on this bill and conducted hearings over a period of several months. In marking up this bill, being a member of the minority party, understanding fully the organization of this House with its two one Democratic majority, I worked with the members of this committee to arrive at the best bill that could be presented on the floor of the House today.

We have talked about the cost of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and how costs have been on the rise each of the past few years. I have served on this committee for some 15 years. I remember when we considered the first bill from this Department. It was a little more than a billion dollars.

The bill before the House today covers about $8 billion in general revenues and some $24 billion in trust funds. It is the second largest appropriation bill which will pass this Congress. I should like to remind my friends in the House today that within the next 8 weeks we will add to this bill, in supplemental appropriations, more than $3 billion. We will add that $3 billion because of action which has been taken on the floor of the House in new authorizations, for new programs. I refer to the Medicare Act.

Today, after the House is acted upon, we will pass two bills which will add to the expenditures in fiscal year 1966 many millions more. There will not be a single vote against these bills, which have been reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when the roll is called a little later this afternoon.

This bill will be bigger than the Department of Defense appropriation bill, if this trend continues, by the year 1970.

This bill as it stands today carries $7364 million in appropriations, over $1 billion more than the bill we brought to you last year. It is $29 billion less than the President requested in his budget. Furthermore, the party of the Great—and very expensive—Society has a majority of 2 to 1 on our subcommittee and on the full Committee on Appropriations. There are some features and some dollar amounts, that had we had the vote we could have altered. But realism dictates that when you are weak, you negotiate. So, under the circumstances, this is a good bill.

As the gentleman from Rhode Island, the chairman of our subcommittee, has pointed out, this bill is the result of a compromise. Under the circumstances I have just outlined I feel that we on the minority side should be reasonably satisfied with the results.

Another factor that one must consider in making a realistic appraisal of this bill is that the Congresses passed a very considerable amount of new legislation that is requiring increasingly large sums of money to carry out. In the past few years passed the Congress by very large majorities. I am sure if it were coming up new in this Congress this legislation would pass by even larger majorities. The major-
cial participation to in direct costs. It has become increasingly evident to the committee, however, that tying financial participation to indirect costs results in considerable inequity. For example, the laboratories, the clinical research facilities, and the funds available are still far from enough to cover the indirect costs. Thus, the grantee would receive 100 percent of all costs. Other projects have indirect costs running as high as 50 percent and, thus, the grantee would receive a substantial percentage of total costs.

Another factor was brought out in the recent study of the National Institutes of Health conducted by the Wooldridge Committee. Its report stated:

"We believe that steps should be taken to make it easier for all involved—scientists, administrators, and Government representatives—to obtain a clear picture of all the costs legitimately associated with each NIH-supported project. Reliance upon an arbitrary cost percentage would be abandoned. Instead, each institution should be required to conduct a complete accounting of all the costs of "doing business" that it can support as chargeable or allocable to the project in question, with a minimum emphasis on formal direct/indirect distinctions.

Section 203 of the bill follows this principle. It simply will require that each grantee must bear a portion of the total cost of the project. In order that the provision may be administered in the most equitable way, the committee has not laid down any arbitrary formula, but will expect that the Bureau of the Budget will make a detailed and thorough study to determine how best to calculate this division of costs. It may well be that this will have to be a variable formula in order to be equitable for different types of projects and different types of institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island in his remarks said he would have liked to have added $100 million for the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1965. He proposed that in our particular committee. But we compromised between President Johnson's figure and the figure advocated by the committee that every one of the Institute's programs be supported project. Reliance upon an arbitrary cost percentage would be abandoned. Instead, each institution should be required to conduct a complete accounting of all the costs of "doing business" that it can support as chargeable or allocable to the project in question, with a minimum emphasis on formal direct/indirect distinctions.

Section 203 of the bill follows this principle. It simply will require that each grantee must bear a portion of the total cost of the project. In order that this provision may be administered in the most equitable way, the committee has laid down any arbitrary formula, but will expect that the Bureau of the Budget will make a detailed and thorough study to determine how best to calculate this division of costs. It may well be that this will have to be a variable formula in order to be equitable for different types of projects and different types of institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island in his remarks said he would have liked to have added $100 million for the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1965. He proposed that in our particular committee. But we compromised between President Johnson's figure and the figure advocated by the committee that every one of the Institute's programs be supported project. Reliance upon an arbitrary cost percentage would be abandoned. Instead, each institution should be required to conduct a complete accounting of all the costs of "doing business" that it can support as chargeable or allocable to the project in question, with a minimum emphasis on formal direct/indirect distinctions.

As a great supporter of the President, I add that this figure was not agreed to in our particular committee. But we compromised between President Johnson's figure and the figure advocated by the gentleman from Rhode Island, and there are $11.7 million in this bill for the National Institutes of Health. That is almost entirely in the area of heart, kidney, and drug research, and the undergraduate programs so far as the National Cancer Institute is concerned. These are very strategic areas. I support the action of the committee in encouraging these programs; particularly in the area of the 10 centers. In the area of the new drug research, and also in the area of the new kidney dialysis program.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health have no general, across-the-board increases.

Ample evidence was presented to the committee that every one of the Institute's programs is faced with important problems demanding research for which funds are not available. The catalog of diseases and human afflictions is long. The national resources devoted to medical research have been dramatically expanded in the last decade by the trained men, the laboratories, the clinical research facilities, and the funds available. Thus, under the old provision, the grantee would receive 100 percent of all costs. Other projects have indirect costs running as high as 50 percent and, thus, the grantee would receive a substantial percentage of total costs.

Another factor was brought out in the recent study of the National Institutes of Health conducted by the Wooldridge Committee. Its report stated:

"We believe that steps should be taken to make it easier for all involved—scientists, administrators, and Government representatives—to obtain a clear picture of all the costs legitimately associated with each NIH-supported project. Reliance upon an arbitrary cost percentage would be abandoned. Instead, each institution should be required to conduct a complete accounting of all the costs of "doing business" that it can support as chargeable or allocable to the project in question, with a minimum emphasis on formal direct/indirect distinctions.

Section 203 of the bill follows this principle. It simply will require that each grantee must bear a portion of the total cost of the project. In order that this provision may be administered in the most equitable way, the committee has laid down any arbitrary formula, but will expect that the Bureau of the Budget will make a detailed and thorough study to determine how best to calculate this division of costs. It may well be that this will have to be a variable formula in order to be equitable for different types of projects and different types of institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island in his remarks said he would have liked to have added $100 million for the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1965. He proposed that in our particular committee. But we compromised between President Johnson's figure and the figure advocated by the committee that every one of the Institute's programs be supported project. Reliance upon an arbitrary cost percentage would be abandoned. Instead, each institution should be required to conduct a complete accounting of all the costs of "doing business" that it can support as chargeable or allocable to the project in question, with a minimum emphasis on formal direct/indirect distinctions.

As a great supporter of the President, I add that this figure was not agreed to in our particular committee. But we compromised between President Johnson's figure and the figure advocated by the gentleman from Rhode Island, and there are $11.7 million in this bill for the National Institutes of Health. That is almost entirely in the area of heart, kidney, and drug research, and the undergraduate programs so far as the National Cancer Institute is concerned. These are very strategic areas. I support the action of the committee in encouraging these programs; particularly in the area of the 10 centers. In the area of the new drug research, and also in the area of the new kidney dialysis program.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health have no general, across-the-board increases.

Ample evidence was presented to the committee that every one of the Institute's programs is faced with important problems demanding research for which funds are not available. The catalog of diseases and human afflictions is long. The national resources devoted to medical research have been dramatically expanded in the last decade by the trained men, the laboratories, the clinical research facilities, and the funds available. Thus, under the old provision, the grantee would receive 100 percent of all costs. Other projects have indirect costs running as high as 50 percent and, thus, the grantee would receive a substantial percentage of total costs.
In a few years the number of people whose lives will be sustained by these devices, would number in the tens of thousands. The increase of $2 million included in the bill for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases for this project will help invest in research that will make it possible to measure in terms of the number of lives it may save.

I shall single out only one more example of the steps that are being taken to ensure the effective and judicious use of computers. This is the new Division of Computer Research and Technology. This is a new Division which is being set up to exploit the tremendous capabilities of computers both for biomedical research and for the treatment of patients. Computers are already being used for a variety of purposes in the treatment of patients—such as, for example, in the more accurate determination and control of radiation for cancer patients. Computers are also extensively used in drug-screening programs and some progress has been made in using computers to select the most effective drug for a particular patient.

The full range of the application of computers to medical problems, however, remains to be explored. The division will work on such projects as the application of computers to the rapid interpretation of X-ray photographs and electrocardiograms, the automatic analysis of laboratory specimens, the testing of blood samples, the retrieval and correlation of laboratory data, and the building of mathematical models of biological processes which will make possible close study of the disease processes and provide a powerful tool for their on-going research.

The committee is particularly impressed by the opportunities for new approaches to health research problems that will result from the harnessing of computer capabilities to the more traditional biomedical research procedures. It should like to see this field developed as rapidly as possible so that its potential benefits to the improvement of the diagnosis and treatment of disease will not be unnecessarily delayed.

I am convinced that the increases for the National Institutes of Health research amending the committee are a sound and wise expenditure of public funds. I cannot think of a more worthwhile contribution that the Federal Government can make to the national welfare than the continuing and energetic support of work that so directly affects the well-being of every citizen.

In the area of hospital construction last year we increased the authorizations under the Hill-Burton Act. The bill I bring before you today is $100 million below the authorizations. It is below the President's figure by about $40 million because of the formula which was in-volved in the Hill-Burton formula. I do not believe for a minute that the other body will not add some authorizations, but to me authorizations are not the same as money. What we can keep this spending level somewhere in line, because there are many other hospital construction programs which are in being at the present time, such as under the Appalachian program. In January we will have the Great Lakes program. We will now go forward with a new accelerated public works program and the depressed areas aid program, all in the area of hospital construction. So I think the recommendation of this committee is just and fair in this area.

Mr. Chairman, there is one area that I would like to deal with in some detail. It concerns an amendment enacted in the 2d session of the 88th Congress and deals with the vocational rehabilitation portion of the HEW appropriation bill. During the course of the 88th Congress, certain facts had come to my attention which, on examination, compelled me to offer an amendment to Public Law 565 to make possible the use of Federal funds for the vocational rehabilitation of persons who are in need of rehabilitation but who are not eligible for the services of the State rehabilitation agencies to serve as the State's share in the matching of Federal money for construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops. This amendment was accepted by the committee and by the Congress and came to be known as the Laird amendment.

For a few moments, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss, for the record, the background of the Laird amendment. In 1954 Public Law 656 was hailed in Wisconsin and other States as a historic milestone in rehabilitation history. It was a time when it was felt that within a few years this monumental legislation would pose a threat to the very functioning of the State of Wisconsin Rehabilitation because of its legal technicality. In 1956 the State agency was faced with potential audit exceptions in excess of $500,000, when Federal auditors determined that the law's funding matching procedures had not been followed properly in the case of the Racine Curative Workshop and a similar Madison project.

Wisconsin had amended its State plan in 1956 as a means of improving rehabilitation facilities in the State. The amendment reads in part:

The State funds required for the establishment of rehabilitation facilities will be obtained from contributions made by private organizations and/or individuals which will be deposited in the State revolving fund.

The regional office of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration—indicated OVR approval of the amend-ment, and the Wisconsin agency proceeded to discontinue and improve sections of Public Law 565 in the belief that its operations were fully within the law. Arrangements were made in 1956 for construction of badly needed sheltered workshop facilities in the Racine area, and expansion of a Madison rehabilitation center was under way. Private funds had been donated to the State agency for expansion of rehabilitation facilities in Wisconsin, and these funds served as the matching funds.

This seemed natural enough. Under Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, this procedure was followed in hospital construction, and in the provision of matching funds. It was not until 1961 that Wisconsin learned the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare treated matching funds in two distinct ways. For hospitals under Hill-Burton, community participation was fine. For workshops and rehabilitation centers under Public Law 565, community participation was illegal. And just what the difference? Certain wording in Public Law 565 did lend itself to that rigid interpretation, and the first State to feel the reaction was Wisconsin. If the Racine project had been developed under Hill-Burton principles, the financial participation of the community would have been encouraged, and accepted without question. It meant that two policies in basic opposition to each other existed in one Federal agency, and the resulting confusion was bound to result in a slowing down of the rehabilitation expansion intended by Public Law 565. For Wisconsin, a law that was designed to aid the disabled almost reversed the direction of the aid to the disabled. The $500,000 audit exceptions would have seriously impaired the Rehabilitation Division's functioning for many years.

In addition to sharply reducing case service, this interpretation of Public Law 565 would have dealt a damaging blow to the further development of sheltered workshops and rehabilitation centers in Wisconsin. The State legislature, pressed at every turn for departmental budget increases, has been unable to find funds to matches all available Federal funds. The State funds appropriated must be used primarily in regular agency operation. Wisconsin has taken the State position of rejecting Federal funds as unmachutable, while at the same time rejecting requests for aid in establishing the sheltered workshops for which the Federal funds were earmarked. Communities requesting these facilities indicated substantial amounts were available to the State for matching Federal funds. The State was amazed and confused to learn that though they built a general hospital on that basis, they could not establish or expand a sheltered workshop. This went against the grain of Wisconsin's philosophy of government which has always stressed the importance of cooperation at all levels between the statutory bodies and total community public.

One of the pioneers in vocational rehabilitation, Wisconsin was a leader in expanding services into the more difficult disability areas under Public Law 565. And even greater expansion was planned under the 1954 law, particularly in the development of sheltered workshops and rehabilitation centers
which are at the heart of modern rehabilitation programs.

Such development threatened to come to a halt as the result of the 1961 amendments to Public Law 665. This would have been a tragedy of the first order for the disabled and was averted only by the Laird amendment of Public Law 665. Now it is not only possible to match the funds of the private nonprofit agencies but the validity of the practice has been made retroactive to 1961 by the provision of this amendment to the procedures used in Wisconsin since that time.

Mr. Chairman, it should be realized that vocational rehabilitation service in any State is not complete with adequate sheltered workshops and medically oriented rehabilitation facilities. Certain categories of handicapped people can never be expected to enter and succeed in competitive employment. For this group, work opportunities must be provided that are compatible with the skills, attitudes and capacities of the individual.

Sheltered workshops provide a satisfactory solution to this problem, as they enable the worker to be profitably employed in a job that otherwise would be foreclosed to him.

Over half of the handicapped population is unemployed because they have been hospitalized for varying lengths of time in mental hospitals and colonies for the mentally retarded. In many instances a short period of adjustment is all that is necessary to develop suitable attitudes and behavior patterns leading to competitive employment. These basic truths of rehabilitation were put forth in Public Law 665.

If workshop services are not available, over half of the handicapped population cannot enter proper rehabilitation programs. This problem has long been recognized by professional rehabilitation workers, but in the absence of a State and Federal subsidy to lend impetus, the establishment of workshops has stagnated since it is entirely a local community responsibility. Unless an aggressive, energetic local group took the initiative, they were not developed.

On 16 workshops are in operation in Wisconsin at present, together serving an average of about 1,000 persons daily, or just a small portion of the total in need of sheltered workshop services.

With the exception of Racine, all of these enterprises have been established without the aid of Federal or State funds. They are doing an excellent job, to be sure, but they are only really touching the surface. At least triple the present number should be enrolled in workshop activity and would be if the service was available.

The following Wisconsin groups have indicated immediate interest in taking advantage of the matching provisions made by the Laird amendment:

- Curative Workshop of Milwaukee, Curative Workshop of Racine, and Curative Workshop of Green Bay, and Brown County Sheltered Workshop, all combination workshops and rehabilitation facilities;
- Fox River Valley Sheltered Workshop, Appleton; Holiday House, Manitowoc; Work Adjustment Services, Neenah; Opportunity Center, Sheboygan; Goodwill Industries, Milwaukee; Opportunity Center, Madison; Rock County Sheltered Workshop, Janesville; Christian League for the Handicapped, Milwaukee; DePaul Rehabilitation Center, Milwaukee, combination workshop and rehabilitation facility; Waupersia Training Center; Shelter for Handicapped Eau Claire; St. John's School for the Deaf, Milwaukee; St. Mary's Hospital of Wausau, St. Camillus of Milwaukee, St. Luke's of Milwaukee, Mount Sinai of Milwaukee, and University Hospitals, Madison, all medically oriented rehabilitation facilities.

In response to a recent questionnaire, the above facilities indicated that approximately $500,000 in local funds would be available during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, if they could utilize Federal matching in an approximate ratio of 20 to 80 percent.

This would mean a total expansion of $1,250,000, a tremendous boost to Wisconsin rehabilitation.

Indications are that the need for medically oriented rehabilitation facilities is not as acute in Wisconsin as in some areas. Many hospitals have not developed adequate departments of physical medicine and rehabilitation which are doing an excellent job of meeting the medical rehabilitation needs of Wisconsin's handicapped. Rehabilitation authorities stress that what is needed most is a comprehensive center which could offer both complete medical and vocational services.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, the Laird amendment now makes possible the matching, under the vocational rehabilitation grants to States program, of contributed funds earmarked by the donor for the establishment of rehabilitation facilities and workshops. It opens up an important avenue for the support and development of these facilities and workshops under private auspices.

Traditionally, most rehabilitation facilities and workshops have been started and operated under public auspices. We expect this practice to continue in the future. Consequently, this new resource for assisting in expanding rehabilitation facilities and workshops under private auspices will make a very real contribution toward increasing the resources needed for the rehabilitation of the disabled.

For a number of years, we have recognized joint public and private financing of the establishment of facilities as being one of the great untapped resources for development of vocational services for the disabled. This was recognized when authority to include rehabilitation facilities was added to the Hill-Burton Act in 1946. The proposed legislative program of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration took this into account last year, but no final action on these proposals was taken in the last session of the Congress. Consequently, this amendment to the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act passed last summer, makes it possible to use both public and private resources cooperatively toward this end, but it is felt there would otherwise be the case.

A number of States, particularly those with insufficient public State funds to match all of the Federal funds allotted to them, will find the "Laird amendment" a good way to increase rehabilitation facilities and workshops in the State, at the same time appropriations are being raised by State legislatures, and thereby have the services available when money to purchase them is at hand.

Projects that could use somewhere around $30 million in Federal funds next year have been identified by State rehabilitation agencies. These projects range from small additions to community workshops to extensive remodeling and expansion of comprehensive rehabilitation centers. The estimates range from no additional funds in eight States to $140,000 in Ohio and $1,240,000 in Washington.

Various kinds of projects are included in State estimates. For example, about 20 percent of the funds would be contributed by Goodwill Industries for the expansion and improvement of sheltered workshops, including rehabilitation facility programs located in such workshops. About 8 percent of the funds would be for facilities focusing on the needs of the mentally retarded and about 10 percent would be located in schools and universities.

Care must be taken to insure orderly development of the expansion of resources through the establishment of rehabilitation facilities and workshops made possible by this new source of financing. It is also important that the continuity of good standards be assured.

What can be done effectively next year should be in keeping with the total investment for establishing rehabilitation facilities and workshops in the total State program and the community and State support for the people served should be forthcoming.

It is expected that under the Laird amendment new rehabilitation facilities will be started and existing institutions will be assisted in services for the handicapped, not just in Wisconsin but throughout the Nation. New hope for the disabled grew out of Public Law 665. Now, as amended, the law provides still greater hope.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island, with whom I have worked long and hard and for whom I have great respect, has raised this bill was worked out in a spirit of compromise within our committee. Realizing full well the makeup of this Congress, I certainly believe that we have come out with the best kind of a compromise possible. I am proud of my support of the President of the United States in the committee on these appropriation items. I believe that this support was placed in many other ways. At the present time down in the Department of Defense there is a new request being set up for some $500 million of spending, on which request we are now holding hearings down-
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Mr. CHAIRMAN, let me say that this particular bill is a bill which I believe every Member of this House of Representatives can support and, Mr. Chairman, I am sure they will support it when the roll is called later on this afternoon.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel).

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, you have heard a very able presentation, pretty much on a line item basis, by our good chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fossey). Some of the concern that we have on the minority side has been very ably expressed in the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Larson). I think it should be pointed out, as many of you are aware, that this is really the fastest growing Department of the Government today, namely, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The biggest increases in appropriations over the past few years, with the possible exception of our space activities, have been in this area of health, education, and welfare. The bill here is for all practical purposes, an $8 billion bill, or $1 billion over the bill that we had before us last year. Our good chairman, Congressman Fossey, made mention of fact that it is $235 million over the budget request and he did make the point that $235 million of it is involved in grants to the States for public assistance. Personally I think this is a phony cut, because you recall several weeks ago, when we had the supplemental appropriation bill before the House we anted up $497 million for additions in grants to the States in this public assistance area. So I suspect that notwithstanding all we have been doing in this general area through this legislation that we will still be coming back for supplements, because our States have not taken appropriate action to clean up their programs, as was discussed by our good chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fossey). Mr. Chairman, the raised question of objection as to what would be involved in supplemental requests, and as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Larson) so well phrased it, it is somewhere in the neighborhood of $3 billion. I suspect that by the time we end up this fiscal year, 1966, we will have appropriations aggregating $11 billion for HEW.

This does raise some concern, particularly to those of us who heard the President this morning in his personal appeal for this appropriation request, to take care—and mind you, that is supposedly only for this current fiscal year—to take care of what is going on in South Vietnam. I could not help thinking this morning if the President declared it to be what the President declared it to be, we ought to be giving a lot more consideration and attention to these new programs that we are asking for, authorizing additional expenditures in this area of health, education, and welfare.

I think some of these programs are very fine, indeed. The chairman of our committee, I am sure, would support them to the ultimate, with the exception, possibly, of a time of openly declared war. But I am really concerned about it, because if it is $700 million for South Vietnam for 2 months, May and June, it is quite conceivable that it will be $5 billion for the next fiscal year if things go worse. We do not get any better, and they look to be getting worse rather than better.

This is going to bring about a larger deficit; then we are going to have inflation, and several of us on the way back from the White House this morning felt that possibly we ought to mortgage everything and buy something in real property, so that we can hedge against the inflation that surely is in store for us.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state this to the gentleman. I believe the $700 million special defense figure which was referred to and that the President spoke of this morning, when he said that this amount would be expended by June 30, I believe that is not the case. I just developed this point at some length with the Secretary of Defense and he made an error in the President's remarks. This error has now been corrected in the hearing before the House Defense Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to have that correction for the record. There is no question, as you read our report and read the line items, you will find research—research—research. It seems to be the sacrosanct area, ever since the launching of Sputnik. We have been devoting more and more time to education and research and I think to justify these increased amounts many of these agencies are coming up each year with requests simply for research and more research.

I want to point out for the Food and Drug Administration, for example, we have $55 million in the bill. Do you know that is an increase from $16 million just 5 years ago? And another subcommittee on which I serve, the Subcommittee for Agriculture, we deal with pesticides and research in that area. On the other side of the coin, Food and Drug Administration. There is an amount of $3.8 million for research, evaluation, and enforcement of pesticide control. So on one hand we appropriate for research on more and better pesticides in agriculture and through HEW we appropriate for research to control pesticides.

In the vocational education item we have $282 million, an increase of $104 million over last year. Some of us are of the opinion that maybe we are moving a little bit too fast in this area. Frankly, with all the attention that has been given to education and rehabilitation, the Job Corps and one thing and another, we hope that the money will be spent wisely in this area.

In the area of higher education, facilities construction, we have no alternative. We have authorized the legislation, and now we have to ante up the money. This will show as an increase of $178 million over last year and will provide full funding or a total of $641,750,000.

In vocational rehabilitation we have an item of $124 million which represents practically a $24 million increase over last year.

Research and training in this item totals $46 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of a call which I received on yesterday, a frantic call, from a mother of a 14-year-old girl who suffers from bubonic polio. She has been down at the Warm Springs Foundation for several months in each of the last 5 years and has been advised that they are strapped for money and this 14-year-old girl may be foreclosed from further help and assistance this year.

Mr. Chairman, this young lady is at that age, however, who could apply for assistance through our vocational rehabilitation program. In Perkasie, for example, we have one of the finest rehabilitation centers for the physically handicapped. Of course, here is one of those areas where we have Federal grants again to the States for a very important and vital program.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee pointed out so well that most of this bill embodies simply grants-in-aid to the States and are bound by formulae, and which, of course, we prescribe by legislative action here in the House of Representatives.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I wish we could have cut some items and held others to a more reasonable figure, but as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Larson) pointed out so well, we had to compromise and it is in this spirit of compromise, that we come to you today with this bill and I stand by commitment to support it when it comes to a vote.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bowl).

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any Member of this House who owes more to scientific research and research in medicine and the development of modern medical science than I do.

Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues will remember not many years ago I was paralyzed and came onto this floor for many months in a wheelchair, and then
Mr. LAIRD. I would like to join with the gentleman in his sentiment that this public welfare assistance program be reviewed personally. I believe this could be substantiated fully if the program was administered in all of the 50 States in accordance with many of the practices that are presently being followed. A very good start was made over this program some time ago. There was also a review here in the District of Columbia. They found in each case that the payments made to people who were not eligible in some jurisdictions was running as high as 30 percent. It would seem to me if the legislative committee does not go into this thoroughly and follow through with an investigation on the use of these welfare funds, and if they come back for more funds next year, I would hope that the Appropriations Committee would insist upon a full investigation of the use of these particular funds.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman, and I thank him for his contribution. We, in the Appropriations Committee, are going to conduct investigations upon investigations on how these funds are being used, and we still have the practice of not appropriating enough, then we are back in a supplemental if it is a grant-in-aid, or matching funds, and what can we do about it? It seems to be the committees should get down and take a real hard look at it, or we are going to run into a difficult situation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this is an $8 billion bill, $8 billion, and as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said within a few weeks it will be much more. Before too long we are going to have a bill here almost as high as the bill for the Department of Defense.

Mr. LAIRD. This bill was reported by the House Appropriations Committee and it has been published as cutting the budget by $529 million, $274 million in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and $50.7 million in the Department of Labor.

Of the $275 million cut in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $242.1 million is in the appropriation for grants to States for public assistance.

This is an annual situation. The budget request for public assistance comes to the Congress from the administration too low. Then Congress cuts it further. If we will agree to the cuts, cut our own record of cuts, look good, then a supplemental budget estimate comes up from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the following year to provide the money that should have been appropriated in the first place.

Last week we approved the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation that provides $407.9 million for public assistance. It was not in the regular annual appropriation bill last year for two reasons. The administration did not ask for emergency funds. Their estimate was short by just over $200 million. The balance—the other $200 million—was needed because of the congressional cut in this bill. When you look at this $242 million reduction in this bill, I can say to you you are going to get it back in a supplemental, so this $242 million, in my estimation, is not a true cut.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.
For hospitals and medical care it is $884,000 over the budget estimates, and that is a figure of $58,948,000.

For the National Institutes of Health, general services and research, it is $1,250,000 over the budget estimates. That particular one involves $38,719,000 over the budget estimates, and that is $140,905,000.

For the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases it is $2 million over the budget estimates of $119,205,000.

For St. Elizabeth’s Hospital, salaries and expenses, indefinitely, it is $133,000 over the budget estimates, and that figure is $25,755,000.

For the American Printing House for the Blind it is $91,000, and the budget estimate was $909,000.

These are all items which have great appeal. They are good items. But when we look at the millions in the budget and see the millions and millions of dollars, there is a question, “Why go over the budget estimates?”

Study of these items has been made by the Bureau of the Budget. Requests have been made by these divisions.

This gives me great concern. Let us take a look at the last monthly statement of receipts and expenditures of the U.S. Government for the period from July 1, 1964, to March 31, 1965.

This reveals that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is spending at a rate of $36,591,000 faster than in the same period in fiscal year 1964. This applies only to the administrative budget. So far this year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has spent $4,118,655,000 compared with $4,081,064,000 in last year. This item is going up. It is constantly increasing.

They are doing great things in this division, but all of it cannot be done with money. It requires brains. It requires manpower. People must be hired. One cannot have it both ways. It seems to me this could have been cut down.

I am not going to offer amendments today to make it look that I want to reduce the money even though I hope that in the future we could keep closer to the budget estimates, because this will get completely out of hand if we keep giving them money of this kind.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be appropriate at this point to say that though I do not have all the figures for increased personnel for the entire bill, in one office, the Office of Education, this bill calls for more than 1,600 employees for the coming fiscal year, as compared to 1,165 in 1964. That is for the Office of Education.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his very thoughtful presentation.

I know he has long given earnest and very fair and unbiased consideration to this problem. One of the problems we are facing throughout the country is the inability to keep our medical graduates coming to various schools of medicine in the local areas. I am sure that the gentleman is finding in Ohio the same problem that we are finding in my own State of Indiana.

Mr. BOW. That is right.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. And in the course of a discussion of this subject not very long ago with some of the authori- ties of the Federal Government was made that the Federal Government in its various activities is preempting so many of our medical graduates for one type of effort or another that they are not leaving enough of these qualified men who would otherwise become local practitioners in Indiana or in the gentle- man’s Ohio State of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on that.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. The Government is moving into this field and, it is true, in all areas of education. So many Government contracts being made with colleges and universities for everything that we are doing that you have the professors from the universities working on theses and under contract for making reports to the Government and have students teaching now in the colleges and universities. The professors are doing this Government work on contract and are leaving the teaching to students. When the time comes I believe that we have to have a discussion about this at some time, because instead of having these employees of the Government do the job for us, all of this work is going out to the colleges. I have been utterly amazed at the increase in this sort of thing over the last 5 years as shown by the studies being made now. In commerce alone it has gone up about fivefold. They are doing more and more of it and they have got so busy now in the colleges and universities of this country, being paid by taxpayers’ dollars to make reports to the U.S. Government, that the professors just do not have time to teach our children any more.

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. In connection with his observations, I want to mention a fact that came to my atten- tion recently with regard to the diver- sion of talents and efforts in our edu- cational institutions in areas that are not considered normally to be their proper function as educational institu- tions. The figure was quoted to me that Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which I think is usually regarded as one of the outstanding engineering institu- tions in the country, today counts more than 80 percent of its total budget in terms of receipt from the Federal Gov- ernment.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. One thing I was going to say about
some of these things going on at NIH is that I was particularly impressed by the one of the scientists going down now to Tokyo and getting frogs and whistle to them and chucking them under the chin in order to get some serum or something from them by that process. I do not know whether it is necessary to teach our scientists to whistle to frogs and chuck them under the chin in order to attain some results.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman made some reference to an appropriation in excess of the budget request here.

Mr. BOW. Yes, I do.

Mr. COLMER. Can the gentleman tell us what the net result is in the entire bill?

Mr. BOW. My recollection is, on the items which I called to your attention, about $34 million.

Mr. COLMER. I was wondering what the difference is between the budget recommendations in the overall bill and the amount appropriated here.

Mr. BOW. Of course, the bill shows a reduction of about $242 million, but I understand for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the 1966 fiscal year.

In this bill we are providing nearly $8 billion for the operations of these departments with over $7.3 billion budgeted for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Committee on Appropriations has reduced the spending requests of the various departments by nearly $330 million, but this bill provides $361 million more than was appropriated for the 1965 fiscal year.

The subsequent requests were thoroughly considered and reviewed by the committee. Our subcommittee conducted hearings from early February until the latter part of March. More than 4,000 pages of testimony is included in the printed hearings. I commend the Chairman for his thoroughness, his energy and his dedication.

There is a candid discussion in the committee report on a number of the weaknesses and shortcomings relating to the budget activities of certain bureaus and agencies.

The bill includes $3 billion for public assistance grants to States by the Welfare Administration. This is a reduction of 8 percent below the appropriation for 1965 and has been said before over $242 million less than requested in the administration's budget.

This presents a modest decrease when we consider the expansion of programs under the social security program in 1962 which were aimed at reducing dependency; expansion of vocational rehabilitation to take people off welfare roles; and in view of the massive spending advocated in the antipoverty programs.

The committee has made several significant restorations and additions in this appropriations measure. In the light of what appears to be a deemphasis of certain veterans programs by the administration, the committee has recommended restoration of a proposed $427,-500 cut in the funds of the Veterans Employment Service in the Labor Department budget. No new funds, however, are required. The Department will absorb this restoration.

The committee, and many of us in the Congress, believe that health programs will lead us to new advances in the attack on major disease problems. Following testimony of medical and research authorities and by Inspector General organizations across the Nation, the committee added funds over the budget request for the National Heart Institute to launch an artificial heart development program; an increase for the Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases to accelerate its research on various aspects of kidney disease; an increase for an intensified program of research on breast cancer by the National Cancer Institute; and restored $2 million in the appropriation to continue the important undergraduate training program in medical and dental schools to advance the treatment of cancer.

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

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REINECKE. I am interested in some of these health research grants. From the testimony before the committee, is the committee basing these additional allocations on past work or is this just a continuation of programs in the past? Do we have an effective evaluation method to know that we are getting something for these hundreds of millions of dollars that we are spending?

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I think if the gentleman has carefully read the hearings he will find that we have both.

Mr. REINECKE. Of course, I did not have a chance to read 4,700 pages of testimony, as the gentleman can well understand.

Mr. SHRIVER. I understand.

Mr. REINECKE. It is the gentleman's opinion that we are getting full value for the money that is being expended?

Mr. SHRIVER. It is the unanimous witness of the advances that have been made in the area of health have been fully substantiated by appropriations made by the Congress in past years. The subcommittee has reviewed that we are getting full value for the research that was being done.
And there is heavy emphasis upon existing health and education programs. However, there are many new programs which have been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SHRIVER. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island. As I stated, Mr. Chairman, there are many new programs which have been authorized and others awaiting action which will have even a greater impact upon the Federal Treasury.

The administration has requested a substantial increase of $1.3 billion in spending next year for the poverty program. While the much-heralded economic development program for Appalachia is not yet off the ground, plans are under way to initiate similar regional programs in other areas throughout the Nation.

The impact of new social security legislation, including the medicare program, is not reflected in the trust fund appropriation of the Social Security Administration. However, the expenditures from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund will increase by nearly $1.4 billion next year.

It has been stated many times before, but as we consider this appropriation measure it bears repeating; it is difficult to hold the line on spending after a program has been authorized by the Congress. We have a responsibility to the taxpayers of the Nation to effect meaningful economies at the time authorization legislation is considered in the House.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has done its best to seek full justification for the budget requests which are subject to House action today.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Crowell].

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield, the Department of Education, and Welfare had asked for $75 million in order to carry out this program.

Mr. FOGARTY. There are some very high figures involved, but I do not remember that one. I might have said twice as much. I had in mind they had $140 million worth of applications for construction of libraries that could be used out of the appropriated funds.

Mr. CONTE. I agree with the chairman, and I realize that $155 million would be a big step to move out on this program. I think it is a lot more important to build our libraries and teach our children rather than spending money in other ways around the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express a word of regret and dismay over the decision of the administration to short change the vital public library program contained in this appropriation bill. I think we have here another classic example of the fundamental inconsistency between the thrilling rhetoric we get from the White House and the more measured and modest attitude of the President toward the honest needs of the Nation.

I feel strongly enough about this library matter that I would like to at least appeal to the taxpayers to support the same taxpayers, I might add, who are being asked to pay for such activities as a colossal gardening program in Washington and the most stupendous sectional pork barrel windfall of all time, the Appalachia program, which, I must confess, I am still at something of a loss to explain to my constituents.

I will not burden this body or waste its time with a harangue on the virtues of education and the merits of the broadest possible free library facility. I will rely on the good judgment and sincere concern for the Nation's welfare, which I am certain each of us feels in full measure. But I would like to call attention to some of the facts and figures in regard to the library appropriation.

The Office of Education framed a request for $75 million for its public library grant program in fiscal 1966. The request was the distillation of, first, the fact that State and local funds available under the matching provisions of this program at present do not exceed the Federal Government's available funds. Further, the indications are that even more matching funds at the State and local level will be available in fiscal 1966.

Thirdly, we have the estimate that some $400 million is presently needed for construction alone, which does not include books, staff, maintenance, and upkeep merely to meet our present requirements.

These facts notwithstanding, the Bureau of the Budget chipped the amount requested for public library grants to $50 million.

I am disappointed to note that the Appropriations Committee upheld this cut and has reported out an appropriation only for this important program. I am disappointed, because I have read the testimony and the statements, and I have noted the sympathy of the members of the subcommittee and its fine chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

During the hearings, the gentleman expressed amazement over the fact that $20 million had been scrubbed out of the library program by the administration. I echo his amazement.

In conclusion, the gentleman expressed the feeling during his hearing on this matter that the appropriation ought to be $55 million instead of $155 million. I can echo his sentiments on this point too, and I am delighted to note his enthusiasm for this vital activity.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of legislative record that this library grant program has been among the most popular programs of its kind in each of the States. It has been popular because it is an honest, effective, worthwhile program which has yielded tangible benefits. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that it is worth the effort to cut this program.

What is the use of creating such programs if they are not to be supported? The library program was extended last year by act of this Congress in recognition of its importance. I think we have here another classic example of the administration's manipulation of the books in an effort to work miracles for us while still keeping the budget under that mystical $100 billion ceiling.

The administration is juggling the books and the victims are the taxpayers. Let us not kid ourselves and let us not kid the taxpayers. Let us not be duped by the promise that the Great Society is going to cleanse us of ignorance and poverty completely free of charge. It cannot be done. We get only what we pay for. What we are unwilling to pay for is a loss to explain to my constituents.

I think what we have here is another example of this administration's manipulation of the books in an effort to work miracles for us while still keeping the budget under that mystical $100 billion ceiling.

The administration is juggling the books and the victims are the taxpayers. Let us not kid ourselves and let us not kid the taxpayers. Let us not be duped by the promise that the Great Society is going to cleanse us of ignorance and poverty completely free of charge. It cannot be done. We get only what we pay for. What we are unwilling to pay for is a loss to explain to my constituents.

I submit that this public library program is something we can ill afford to sacrifice on the altar of false economy.

I think it is high time we applied a little practical common sense to some of these proposals. I am all in favor of green grass and pretty flowers—I have spent enough time in my own backyard trying to get these things to grow—but I wonder, on the balance, whether these are important enough to warrant the administration's austerity posture on such vital issues as support for the Nation's free public libraries.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton].

Mrs. BOLTON. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am very anxious to ask a question or two, and am glad of this opportunity to do so.

In the matter of mental health: I wonder if this committee has made any statement or taken any position of any extraordinary work that is being done in Princeton in psychiatry in the building of the hospitals for the mentally ill, and in the treatment of the mentally ill?
Mr. FOGARTY. We do not have all specific projects brought to our attention, because we do not pass on specific projects. These are funded after applications from the universities are submitted and approved and unless funds are earmarked in this appropriation bill we do not always hear about the work that is being carried on in the many different institutions under thousands of different grants.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have been living under the impression that your committee was one having oversight over these various studies and various methods of going forward with them.

Mr. FOGARTY. No. They have the best people in the country operating the National Institutes of Health.

Mrs. BOLTON. Who does the gentleman mean by "they"?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Government. The Science Foundation, the Defense Department, and almost every other agency in Government with a large research grant that has followed the formation established by the National Institutes of Health because that has been determined by people in this area to be the best form up to this point.

Mrs. BOLTON. Who reviews these applications and the Council. On Mental Health passes on all of these particular applications and the Council.

Mr. LAIRD. I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOLTON. Who is the gentleman whom we mean by "they"?

Mr. BOLTON. If one wants to find out, one should go to the ME, or where?

Mr. LAIRD. I can assure the gentlewoman this approval would be by the Council on Mental Health.

Mrs. BOLTON. Then the National Mental Health and Welfare Council passes on them?

Mr. LAIRD. The National Advisory Council on Mental Health is the council that reviews these applications, and the continuation of this program is decided by the Council. I can assure the gentlewoman from Ohio this is in the approved category, as I understand it. I will check on this so that we have the correct information, but I can assure the gentlewoman there are funds in the bill for this program if the Council approves it.

Mrs. BOLTON. I was wondering who passed on the applications.

Mr. LAIRD. The Council which is appointed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Luther Terry. These councils are recommended by the National Advisory Council on Mental Health and submitted to the Director of the National Institute of Health, Dr. Shannon, and finally appointments are made by the Surgeon General of the United States with the approval of the Secretary of HEW. These are all eminent, well-qualified people in the various areas. The Council on Mental Health passes on all of these particular applications and I shall place in the Record at this point the names of the members of the National Advisory Mental Health Council.

Dr. Jack R. Ewald (55), professor of psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Louis S. Goodman (66), professor and head, Department of Pharmacology, University College of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. Mike Gorman (66), executive director, National Committee Against Mental Illness, 1069 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. George C. Ham (65), professor of psychiatry, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Mrs. Geraldine Joseph (67), 5 Red Cedar Lane, Minneapolis, Minn.

Dr. Paul V. Leukau (61), professor of mental hygiene, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. J. Quigg Newton Jr., (66), president, Commonwealth Fund, 1 East 76th Street, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Charles R. Strother (67), professor of psychiatry, Rush Medical College, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Senator Robert D. Williams (66), the senate, California Legislature, State Capitol, Sacramento, California.

Dr. Robin M. Williams, Jr. (67), president of sociology, Department of Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Dr. Cecil L. Witton (66), dean, College of Medicine, University of Nebraska, Omaha, Neb.

OFFICER MEMBERS

Dr. Luther L. Terry (Chairman), Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Washington, D.C.

Dr. John J. Blasco, Director, Psychiatry, Neurology, and Psychology Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C.

Capt. Ralph M. Christy, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, Head, Neuropsychiatry Branch, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman very much as well as the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished member of our subcommittee, Mr. Mottes, from the great State of Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee for the magnificent work he has done and to say how much I have enjoyed working with the Members on both sides of the aisle on this particular appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I first assumed my duties on this subcommittee dealing with the medical sciences after having served 10 years with the Committee on Agriculture and Amending the distinguished doctors who were visiting us one day that I felt like the gentleman of whom my colleague from Florida [Mr. Roczen] told about one day some years ago.

This gentleman was a porter in a drugstore and all in the world he had to do was to sweep the floor. He never asked any questions. He never answered any questions. He just swept the floor. But on that particular occasion, the owner of the drugstore had to leave a little bit earlier so he called the porter and he said, "Now, John, all you have to do is close the door when you get through sweeping. Do you understand?" The porter said, "Yes, sir." The owner closed the door and left. The telephone rang. The porter went to the telephone and he said, "Hello." A voice on the other end of the wire said, "Do you have Aureomycin, streptomycin—penicillin?" The porter said, "Hello," and the voice on the other end of the wire repeated, "Do you have Aureomycin, streptomycin—penicillin?" The porter said, "Boys, when I told you 'hello,' I told you everything I know."

So I had somewhat that feeling about these medical terms when I first began to discuss this important bill. But it was not long before it made sense to me. I have thoroughly enjoyed my association with this great committee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call particular attention to page 11 of the committee report to a statement concerning compliance with the Civil Rights Act. I quote from the report of the committee:

A clear statement of the problems of Federal funds and federally subsidized services.

I have had extensive conversations with our State superintendent of public instruction in Florida, Hon. Thomas D. Bailey, about this problem. We all agree that Senator Hart had the right idea when he said that there should have been a larger enforcement of the Civil Rights Act, that there have been undue delays in processing these applications.

After many, many days and weeks of effort, the statement of compliance by the Florida State Board of Education was finally approved by the Commissioner of Education on April 14th, thus enabling Florida to channel certain Federal funds to eligible county school systems and to secure approval of other grants for vocational and other programs. We, of course, are grateful to Commissioner Keppel and his assistants for this favorable action, but it is just one little step forward. While we take this one little step forward, we take, I am afraid, two steps back, because we have not solved the problem of getting approvals for channeling Federal funds and Federal services to our county school systems and our other educational institutions.

We in Florida have three principal problems.
First, our public junior colleges and two of our county school systems, Dade and Charlotte, signed HEW form No. 441, assurance of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Under a plan formulated by the U.S. Office of Education personnel that there was no alternative for them to sign form No. 441 and also on the assurance that was proper for them to do so, our junior colleges executed this form. Dade and Charlotte school boards executed the form on the basis that they were in good faith de-segregating their systems and institutions which have properly executed form No. 441 are eligible to participate in Federal subsidized educational programs without restriction or question. However, it is my understanding that Superintendent Bailey has been advised by telephone from the U.S. Office of Education that Florida should not channel funds and services to these institutions and counties until further notice from the U.S. Office of Education. Now, these counties and colleges apparently have compiled with all requirements of law and regulations, and I think they are entitled to be advised whether they are in order, or notified specifically that they are not and why they are not so they can plan accordingly.

Let me point out another problem facing us in Florida. School districts which are not fully desegregated or under court order for desegregation are permitted under U.S. Office of Education regulations to provide plans of compliance leading to desegregation. Such plans have been submitted by 52 of the 67 counties, the earliest under date of February 5 and the latest on March 12. Approval of these plans by the U.S. Office of Education is necessary if these counties are to continue to participate in Federal funds. As of the last time I talked with Superintendent Bailey in February, titles and plans submitted on April 19, and there may have been some changes since, but I doubt if—Florida had received no official notice whether they were acceptable or nonacceptable of any of these 52 plans of compliance. Our people have been told informally by telephone that two plans have been found acceptable, and two have been found unacceptable, but no official word has been received about any plan. Thus, our county school boards are left in the position of not knowing which way to turn. They cannot work on revising their plans, if they are not in good order, because they have not been notified that they are unacceptable. Most of these plans provide for notices to parents and pupils before the end of the present school year. With the approach of the closing of schools, time is running out to implement these plans this year, even if they are found to be acceptable. This is developing into an impossible situation for our county school boards in Florida. An early decision on the part of the other, is imperative.

Let me emphasize now, the third problem. We in Florida are asking the U.S. Commission of Education for a favorable ruling that expenditures will be valid for National Defense Education Act audit and matching purposes, provided they are made subsequent to the submission of plans of compliance to the State Department of Education. We have submitted the plans of compliance to the U.S. Office of Education, even though this date may precede the date when final approval of the plan for compliance will be given by the U.S. Office of Education. If a favorable ruling on this is not received, our county school systems and other institutions will lose very large amounts of federal money for educational programs which will be damaged. Let me emphasize that students of all races, colors and creeds will suffer. Our people in Florida have been advised by personnel in the Office ofEducation who are responsible for administering the Civil Rights Act that this proposal does not affect the civil rights aspect of their program, but relates only to the acceptable purposes. I think, then, Mr. Chairman, that the statement of the committee is certainly an understatement of fact. Surely we need an emphatic statement by the committee that the expedientious way of processing applications which have been forwarded by local, State and district school boards signifies cooperation with Civil Rights Act. I hope the appropriate authorities will take this suggestion of the committee to heart and will give people all over America much prompter action in this important matter.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand the use of the word “applications” in this connection, because libraries in my district have been served with notice that they must sign no applications but an “assurance of compliance.” They are not called applications. The title of the form, as issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is “Preliminary Plans of Compliance.” I do not understand where the committee in its report on page 11 gets the word “applications.”

Mr. GROSS. I will point out the action of the committee was directed toward the Office of Education. What the gentleman is talking about is connected with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that problem was not called to our attention.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. LATER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FELLY).

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

Mr. FELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have noted with approval the statement contained in the committee report on page 11, which points out that the Congress has a right to expect the executive branch to present a forward-looking budget. This report points up further that additional funds would provide the growing capability of science itself as well as the increasing cost and sophistication of our scientific effort. This report goes on to state that in the absence of adequate budget estimates, it is necessary for the committee to examine the real needs of the programs.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that anyone familiar with my voting record in the House will feel that I am wringing the President’s ear when it comes to appropriations; but I do think the committee statement with regard to adequate budget estimates, and feel that the committee has called attention to a matter which will have a tremendous effect for years to come. I am sure that everyone, in one way or another, understands that the committee has added funds not requested in the budget for several new programs having to do with the health needs of our time and our country. I refer, for example, to the fact that the committee has included $31.2 million over the budget request for the National Heart Institute, to launch an artificial heart development program. In addition, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is an immediate need for an artificial heart device which can be safely used, and that in spite of the fact that the budget request failed to ask for funds for developing this new equipment along this line, funds should be provided, and I am glad they are provided in this legislation for this purpose.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, I fully support the inclusion of $3 million in this bill, over the budget request, for the Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, to accelerate research on hemodialysis and related methods of blood and lymph purification, and for studies on the possible use of artificial hearts; these developments, it is said, the testimony fully supports the need and desirability of funds for developing new methods in connection with kidney failure.

Mr. Chairman, I have observed firsthand these methods developed in recent years which permit the saving of lives of patients who have suffered the loss of kidney function, through the repeated failure of the kidney mas to regulate the blood. This technique, while expensive and limited in its capacity, is available at the University of Washington Medical Center, and I understand that the Government is in congressional district in Seattle. The equipment and artificial kidney facilities are constructed in my district; in fact, originally planned in Seattle and I know firsthand that people are being kept alive and leading normal lives who, otherwise, because they have lost the use of their kidneys, could not survive.

So, as I say, in spite of the fact that these new programs are not in the budget, I commend the committee for providing additional funds for these specific new programs.

It is as simple as this, Mr. Chairman, these increases will enable many of our citizens to live useful and purposeful lives; failing to provide these increases will, in effect, condemn a number of afflicted people to death. So, as I say, I express my appreciation to the committee for providing these funds, even though I know the President had not requested them.

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

The Clerk read as follows:
Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I rise to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I see that on page 5 the committee put in a statement in its report concerning the domestic farm labor program. We in Florida have had great difficulty, particularly now and in the preceding years, during the current harvest. I have found that the Bureau of Employment Security is a very difficult agency to deal with. They have been very unsatisfactory and most unhelpful in trying to handle adequate farm labor for Florida. Everyone agrees domestic labor ought to be hired first if available, but after that there is a law which the Congress passed and which is now on the books, Public Law 414, which says that if domestic labor is not available, then the Attorney General has authority to act with the Attorney General. I want to ask the chairman if this was the understanding of the committee as to the intent of Congress.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOOGARTY. That is the understanding of the committee, I might say, and that is why we put this language in the report that if domestic labor is not available, then the Attorney General has authority to act.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. I would like to bring to the attention of the Secretary of Labor who, I hope, will read this Recos, that we do need some help in the celery crop and the sweet corn crop in Florida. For the Secretary's benefit I want to quote the committee:

The committee agrees that foreign labor should not be imported if there is capable domestic labor available to do the job. Foreign labor may be available with the need for harvesting perishable agricultural products is essential. Lack of it can mean hardships for individual farmers and shortages and higher prices for consumers. Timely availability of labor under current circumstances is necessary to the success of domestic farm labor programs we have had in the past.

I agree completely with the statement the committee has made in its report. I hope the Secretary of Labor will act now before it is too late to do something about getting the proper kind of labor to these farmers who have the crops ready to harvest. I hope this will spur the Secretary to some action.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the Committee for rising so soon after I have already spoken just a few minutes ago. But I consider it a very serious problem. We all know that there are good men on both sides of this issue, but I said to Mr. Wirz that in Florida we feel that we simply cannot get enough domestic labor. We have been most unrealistic in the amount of labor we have been promising to the State of Florida and to many other parts of the Nation. That is my own personal opinion. And I think that is the opinion of the majority of our farm producers in the State of Florida.

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

Mr. FOOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my good friend from Florida that I am very grateful for that fact. I believe Secretary Wirtz has approached this matter with the utmost fairness. Since that time, of course, he has been to our own State of Florida and these Secretary Wirtz visited here to the State of California and to our great sister State of California and to many other parts of our great Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I want to say to my colleague from Florida that this is a serious problem not only in the State of Florida but in many other parts of the Nation. Many States are having the same problem. We must have a practical understanding of what is involved here. At certain times of the year in the gathering of perishable crops it is necessary to have a tremendous amount of labor, and unless you have it at the particular time you can lose a whole season's work. I, too, hope that the Secretary will be practical about this matter. We have given Secretary Wirtz full support to Florida but to our great sister State of California and to many other parts of our great Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I want to say to my colleague from Florida that this is a serious problem not only in the State of Florida but in many other parts of the Nation. Many States are having the same problem. We must have a practical understanding of what is involved here. At certain times of the year in the gathering of perishable crops it is necessary to have a tremendous amount of labor, and unless you have it at the particular time you can lose a whole season's work. I, too, hope that the Secretary will be practical about this matter. We have given Secretary Wirtz full support to Florida but to our great sister State of California and to many other parts of our great Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I want to say to my colleague from Florida that this is a serious problem not only in the State of Florida but in many other parts of the Nation. Many States are having the same problem. We must have a practical understanding of what is involved here. At certain times of the year in the gathering of perishable crops it is necessary to have a tremendous amount of labor, and unless you have it at the particular time you can lose a whole season's work. I, too, hope that the Secretary will be practical about this matter. We have given Secretary Wirtz full support to Florida but to our great sister State of California and to many other parts of our great Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I want to say to my colleague from Florida that this is a serious problem not only in the State of Florida but in many other parts of the Nation. Many States are having the same problem. We must have a practical understanding of what is involved here. At certain times of the year in the gathering of perishable crops it is necessary to have a tremendous amount of labor, and unless you have it at the particular time you can lose a whole season's work. I, too, hope that the Secretary will be practical about this matter. We have given Secretary Wirtz full support to Florida but to our great sister State of California and to many other parts of our great Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I want to say to my colleague from Florida that this is a serious problem not only in the State of Florida but in many other parts of the Nation. Many States are having the same problem. We must have a practical understanding of what is involved here. At certain times of the year in the gathering of perishable crops it is necessary to have a tremendous amount of labor, and unless you have it at the particular time you can lose a whole season's work. I, too, hope that the Secretary will be practical about this matter. We have given Secretary Wirtz full support to Florida but to our great sister State of California and to many other parts of our great Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.
did not want it to be because this sub-
committee had denied to him $1 of the
funds which he said were necessary.
We urged him, and I think the Secretary
is well aware of the extreme impor-
tance of agricultural labor in gathering
the crops off the trees, as in the case of
my State, or gathering the crops on the
plants as is the case in other States at the
time they are at their maximum peak for
harvesting.
Mr. Chairman, there are many more
jobs involved in this problem than just
the jobs of people who harvest the crops.
There are transportation jobs and jobs in
the canneries and there are distribution
jobs and indeed the whole field of
consumer relations is involved.
I believe we can assure this House that
this committee has fully fulfilled its re-
sponsibilities.
Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will
the gentleman yield?
Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. I yield to
the gentleman from Michigan.
Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I
agree with the gentleman and share the
gentleman’s concern about what is happen-
ing in this particular area. We in the State
of Michigan are concerned particularly
with the Northwest but it is not a Big
problem but it is one of concern in
our area. The pickers are farmers are
unable to get the people necessary to hand-
crop this product, and unless something is
done there is going to be a tremendous loss.
As the gentleman pointed out, there are
people who work in canneries that are
involved. So, unless the Secretary of
Labor gets this problem, I think that in his
present attitude, I feel we are going to have a
real economic loss to many farmers in the
State of Michigan and the stump labor
just is not available to do the job.
As far as we are concerned, if the Sec-
retary of Labor can find them, we would
be glad to have them to do the job.
Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. I think everyone in this room will agree that the
does ought to be performed by American
labor if American labor can be found to
do the job. It is the purpose of the
application procedure to give each State
the present time to assist the Secretary in
locating and bringing to the field the
necessary domestic labor. If it is avail-
able I can assure the Secretary will ful-
fill his responsibility to see that the crops
are harvested.
Mr. BYRNEs of Wisconsin. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the requisite
number of words.
Mr. Chairman, I would like to make
inquiry about the funds and the distri-
bution of funds for manpower develop-
ment and training activities. It seems to
me this is one of the programs that we
have that has great potential for good in
operating and increasing the training of
our people. Yet, I understand there are some
complaints about the question of whether
these funds are being distributed to the States
on the basis of the formula that was conten-
tiated by the original substantive legis-
lation. I see where we are appropriating in
this bill $273,500,000 for this pur-
pose. I am wondering how is this to be
allocated to the States, and whether it is being allocated in accord-
ance with the fundamental formula that
was anticipated in the substantive legis-
lation.
Mr. FOGLARTY. I may say briefly that
these funds are distributed on a formula
basis, mainly on population. If some of
the States do not take advantage of these funds then the Secretary can
allocate the funds to other States that have
applications pending. As I understand it,
this redistribution is made almost auto-
matically. The gentleman from Wis-
consin Mr. Laird has made a thorough
study of this matter and more about it than
I do. Maybe he can give you a better
answer.
Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will
the gentleman yield?
Mr. BYRNEs of Wisconsin. I yield
to the gentleman from Wisconsin.
Mr. LAIRD. I appreciate the com-
pliment of the gentleman, but I assure
the House that the gentleman from Rhode
Island does know more. I believe the
Secretary can give you a little more
about this than I do. Maybe he
would like to make
Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman this is not a question of
whether these funds are
allocated between the States, and
Wisconsin Mr. Laird said that
Wisconsin has fully fulfilled
its commitment to

Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
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Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
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Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
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Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
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Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
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Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
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Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
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Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
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Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS of Oregon. Mr.
Chairman, I move to strike the rec-
quisite word.
Mr. GROSS. This then is the money that is used to finance U.S. participation in the International Labor Organization?

Mr. FOGLARTY. It does not finance the participation; no. But it backs up the international labor movement.

Mr. GROSS. Then there is money in another bill for that purpose?

Mr. FOGLARTY. Yes, in the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. I see. A subcommittee of which I am a member held some hearings early this year or late last year in connection with the International Labor Organization and it appeared then that the U.S. representation was quite dissatisfied with what is happening in recent international conferences.

Mr. FOGLARTY. That is in the State Department appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose the gentleman is acquainted with the dissatisfaction on the part of the American representatives in that they are having trouble with delegates of the Communist-dominated countries and with sympathizers of communism from other countries? I would hope that this committee would keep a close check with a view toward cutting this appropriation further if this situation continues to get worse.

While I have the floor, I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning, I believe it is, the Office of Equal Opportunity and the medical examinations of the individuals applying for training under this new setup. Is there any money in this bill for these physical examinations or is that to be found in some other bill?

Mr. FOGLARTY. No; you are talking about the Office of Economic Opportunity—the anti-poverty program?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FOGLARTY. There is no money here for those purposes and we expect them to ask for any funds they need for personnel and any other services when they come before our committee in May—if the program is extended.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I asked the question because I was amazed to learn the other day that where there is no veterans' facility or no USPHS facility to provide for Federal examination of applicants that local officials are authorized to pay as much as $80 per person for examinations by private physicians.

Mr. FOGLARTY. If they do that, it comes out of their appropriations and not out of this appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no money in this bill for that?

Mr. FOGLARTY. No, there is no money in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the report of the committee.

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

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7769) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. FOGLARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGLARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGLARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I have permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

There was no objection.