DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WEL-
FARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

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 considera-
tion of the bill (H.R. 14745) making ap-
propriations for the Departments of
Labor, and Health, Education, and Wel-
fare, and related agencies, for the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1967, and for other
purposes; and pending that motion, Mr.
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
general debate be limited to 17 hours.

The motion was agreed to.
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Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union for the considera-
tion of the bill (H.R. 14745) making ap-
propriations for the Departments of
Labor, and Health, Education, and Wel-
fare, and related agencies, for the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1967, and for other
purposes; and pending that motion, Mr.
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
general debate be limited to 17 hours.

The motion was agreed to.
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fare, and related agencies, for the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1967, and for other
purposes; and pending that motion, Mr.
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
general debate be limited to 17 hours.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move
that the House resolve itself into the
Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union for the considera-
tion of the bill (H.R. 14745) making ap-
propriations for the Departments of
Labor, and Health, Education, and Wel-
fare, and related agencies, for the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1967, and for other
purposes; and pending that motion, Mr.
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
general debate be limited to 17 hours.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move
that the House resolve itself into the
Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union for the considera-
tion of the bill (H.R. 14745) making ap-
propriations for the Departments of
Labor, and Health, Education, and Wel-
fare, and related agencies, for the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1967, and for other
purposes; and pending that motion, Mr.
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
general debate be limited to 17 hours.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move
that the House resolve itself into the
Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union for the considera-
tion of the bill (H.R. 14745) making ap-
propriations for the Departments of
Labor, and Health, Education, and Wel-
fare, and related agencies, for the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1967, and for other
purposes; and pending that motion, Mr.
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
general debate be limited to 17 hours.

The motion was agreed to.
Most of the trainees (about two-thirds) were unemployed before they joined the program.

We estimate that the average on-the-job trainee earns $59 a week during 19 weeks of training, and that his after-tax earnings amount to about $490 a trainee in 1966. Some cost more, some less.

According to the Internal Revenue Service the average Federal income tax for married workers with one child who earn $3,761 a year is $301.

Thus, in the first year, a typical on-the-job trainee repays the Federal Government about 43 percent of its total investment in him. Before the second year is over, the Government has been repaid in full.

It has been estimated that these trainees already approved will earn approximately $392 million during their first year of training and work, and that their training will cost the Federal Government $61 million—with about $20 million being repaid in taxes during the first year and the remainder the second year.

The business community, along with Administrators who cooperated in making on-the-job training and apprenticeship training an exciting and successful program. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training's leadership and management in this country.

These programs were under the aegis of 24 different labor organizations and joint labor-management groups in 29 States.

This is an exciting and commendable record of achievement. On-the-Job and apprenticeship training programs are rapidly emerging as the special training institutions best fitted to meet the demands of the present manpower situation in this country.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training's lead-ship and management of this phase of the training program, in promoting and obtaining the joint cooperation of industry and labor in this program, should be commended. I expect improvements next year.

The Bureau of Employment Security and the State employment security agencies are and should rightfully be the backbone of the Department's manpower development and job placement programs. The State agencies have and are still performing exemplary service to employers, to people seeking work, and to people out of work in 1,200 communities of the United States.

Here are some examples of accomplishments last year:

First, the State agencies paid out $2.3 billion in unemployment insurance benefits to 5 million unemployed.

Second, they have provided special counseling, testing, and referral services to over 420,000 young people over a 10-month period.

Third, they made 6.5 million non-agricultural placements in 1965—a 31 percent increase over 1964—and 4.7 million agricultural placements.

Fourth, they placed 1.3 million people age 45 and over; 1.8 million youth under 22 years of age; 287,000 handicapped people and 60,000 veterans.

Fifth, in calendar year 1965 over 1 million industrial and commercial employers called on the public employment offices for services.

Sixth. They have succeeded in reducing the need for importing foreign agricultural workers by 83 percent from 634,000 in 1965 to 107,000 in 1966, all of which means more jobs for domestic farmers.

The committee was not happy with the budget for the Bureau of Employment Security agencies and has directed the Department to achieve a better balance within the allocation of the funds recommended by the committee.

There specifically would be a redistribution of funds to the tide line basic activities which are the essential underpinning to the new responsibilities added as a result of enactment of the Man-

power Development and Training Act, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps programs.

To say the least the committee was distressed with the Department's obvious lack of consideration for improving safe work practices for longshore workers and especially in view of the stepped up activity resulting from the upsurge in the Vietnam situation. The same thing is true of the apparent indifference to achieving a shorter timelag in payment of compensation costs to injured Federal workers-

The Education and Labor Committee has also expressed alarm about this situation. The committee has directed the Department to develop positive plans for action in both of these areas as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, in both the Department of Labor and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have dedicated all of the civil rights programs from every operating agency and have put them all in one place. That is why on page 58 of the report there is shown an increase of $14,000,000 for civil rights activities of the Department of Labor.

For the Food and Drug Administration, the budget request was $67,534,000, which is an increase of $8,735,000 in the amount appropriated for 1966. While this is a substantial increase, the committee felt that it was fully justified in view of the new legislation that has been enacted and the continuing increase in the volume and complexity of new drugs.

The next section of the bill is the Office of Education, which has already touched on in connection with the total increase in the bill. The committee is also recommending a few reductions from the amounts requested. The bill includes $853,000 under title I of the Higher Education Act, for grants to States for community service and continuing education programs, rather than $30 million which was requested. This program has been rather slow to start in fact it is still not actually in operation and a majority of the committee thought it would be wise to wait until there was a little more time to review before appropriating the larger sum.

The committee also deleted $81,372,000 budgeted for the National Teachers Corps. The amount of funds included for salary support for construction in federally impacted areas, is considerably below the amount appropriated for 1966. However, the $22,937,000 in the bill is the full amount estimated to be necessary to carry out the permanent provisions of the program. The temporary provisions expire at the end of fiscal 1965. If these provisions are extended, I assume there will be a supplemental appropriation to finance them.

The appropriation of $2,496,000 from the request for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education is made up of $1,615,000 that was budgeted for civil rights activities and $881,000 for the new positions budgeted for administering the expanded education programs. The amount allowed in the bill will be sufficient for approximately 490 such new positions.

The increase over 1965 for vocational rehabilitation is almost $100 million. This is practically all directly due to new legislation passed by the last session of Congress. The expanded program will bring rehabilitation services to thousands of people who need them and want them but who would not receive them under the previous level of appropriations.

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

Mr. FOOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill involving many billions of dollars.

It seems to me that the gentleman from Rhode Island is making a very important presentation of this bill and I think the membership should be here to hear it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 89]
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 gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, we were down to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration at the time the quorum was called. The reduction of $212,000 from the request for salaries and expenses of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the many small decreases in items under the Public Health Service are all due to the consolidation of civil rights activities. These activities were budgeted at a great many different places in the Department. The Committee deleted these every place they occurred and has consolidated all funds in the Office of the Secretary.

The committee believes that this will provide a more focused and effective program and will make readily ascertainable the level of funding for these activities. I recognize that a period of transition and reorganization will be necessary. A major part of the Department's civil rights effort must be carried out through the regional offices, so the Secretary should have some discretion and flexibility in allocating civil rights personnel to regional offices.

Under the appropriation, "Chronic Diseases and Health of the Aged," the Committee is spending a significant increase over the budget for kidney dialysis centers. The Public Health Service has assisted in establishing 14 such centers but the budget for 1967 did not include funds for any expansion. The fact that most of the 5,000 persons who suffer permanent kidney failure each year can be successfully treated at these centers and the fact that current facilities are only sufficient to treat a few hundred and the rest are simply left to die, indicates to the committee that further expansion is not only in order but is also needed. There is also an increase over the budget for this appropriation of $1 million to be used for grants to establish trial programs and demonstrate the benefits of programs for the daytime care of retarded children and adults.

Under the appropriation "Community Health Practice and Research," the committee has added $21 million to the budget for the health professions student loan program. The budget was based on a proposal to transfer this program from direct loan certificates to the National Health Service Corps. It is now obvious that such a change will not be made, at least not in time for next school year, so the committee has added sufficient funds to bring the program to the authorized level.

The committee did not make any particularly significant changes in the remaining Public Health Service items up to the National Institutes of Health. I intend to take a little time to discuss the NIH part of the budget and will skip over it for the time being.

The budget for the National Library of Medicine included a fairly substantial percentage increase over fiscal year 1966, most of which was for carrying out the new Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. The committee has increased the budget by $200,000 to start the regional medical libraries program. This program was authorized by the Medical Library Act to be started in 1966, and was authorized to expand to a level of $3,500,000 in 1967. The reason was to prevent the failure of the budget to include any funds for this very important program. The committee also found a considerable need to strengthen the National Library of Medicine's capabilities to disseminate existing information for the use of medical researchers, educators, and practitioners through the medical library network being developed and supported under the Medical Library Assistance Act.

However, the Library's current facilities and services for such things as graphic image storage and retrieval, filing, photoduplication operations, and so forth, are not adequate to meet this need. The committee has added $868,000 for this purpose.

The budget for St. Elizabeth's Hospital was only sufficient to maintain the current staff. The committee has added funds to enable the hospital to hire 250 additional people to fill the most serious shortages.

The funds included for the Social Security Administration show a considerable increase over 1966 but the increase is practically all directly tied to the legislation enacted by the last session of Congress. Actually, it developed during the hearings that the estimates are overly conservative and a supplemental appropriation will likely be required before the end of fiscal year 1967.

The committee made no changes in the budget for the Welfare Administration except to appropriate funds for civil rights activities and funds for 30 of the 60 new positions requested by the Bureau of Family Services for strengthening their regular staff. The committee also modified the provisions to be concerned about the ever increasing cost of public assistance. The committee is working now on plans for a committee investigation of this matter.

The small reduction of $25,000 made in the request of the Administration on Aging represents the amount budgeted for civil defense activities.

The committee made no change in the budget for any of the items under special institutions and there were no significant changes from 1966 included in the various budget requests. All of the increase for the Office of the Secretary is accounted for by the consolidation of civil defense activities in this office. I have already discussed this and the report is rather complete on the subject. The small reduction in the Office of the General Counsel is accounted for by civil defense activities budgeted in this office.

The relatively small changes included in the budget for agencies in the Department of Agriculture appeared to the committee to be well justified and the committee has made no change in any of them.

May 4, 1966

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend a little time discussing the National Institutes of Health.

The budget submitted on behalf of NIH was once again a great disappointment to me. I cannot understand why, year after year, we get budget requests for the vitally important activities of the National Institutes of Health that make the American reason was once again in jeopardy. For programs that have such a direct bearing on the welfare and happiness of every man, woman, and child in this country. I wish that those who are responsible for making up the budget would read the transcript of the hearings on the NIH programs. I wish they would talk with the eminent physicians and scientists who are struggling with the unsolved problems of disease and disability. I wish they would go out and visit—I have some of the laboratories in which the research is being done. I wish they would visit hospitals and mental institutions to see the tragic scope of the task that still needs to be done.

The investment we, as a nation, should make in medical research must be judged both in relation to opportunity and need. On the one hand, we must take into consideration the demonstrated ability of our biomedical scientists to discover the causes of disease, devise reliable diagnostic tests, and develop more effective treatments and preventive care. On the other hand, we must equally take stock of the many diseases and disabilities whose cause is not known; the unresolved difficulties of diagnosis that sometimes mean that a disease is not discovered until it is too late; the maladies for which no cure and, often not even a mitigating treatment now exists; and the ever-present threat to health which cannot yet be eradicated.

Modern medicine is still a relatively primitive science. Even the normal functioning of the body is not completely understood—I was surprised to learn during the hearings that the basic components of blood, which has been studied for centuries, are still being discovered. The contrast that exists between the state of knowledge in the physical sciences and that in the biological sciences is very disturbing to me. I cannot be content with the level of our biomedical research effort when it is true—

That the physicist can tell us how to put a man on the moon, but the physician cannot tell us how to prevent a stroke or a heart attack or just a migraine headache;

That the metallurgist can design a shield to ward off the searing heat of a space vehicle's reentry into the atmosphere but the geologist cannot tell us how to ward off the invasion of cancer cells; and

That the geologist can indicate, with reasonable accuracy, where we may suc- cessfully drill for oil, but the geneticists cannot predict whether an unborn child will be healthy in body and sound of mind.
It is very disturbing to me that we know more about the nucleus of an atom than we do about the structure of a gene. At present, the center can only take care of a handful of patients. This means that although research has developed the means of saving thousands of lives, all but a handful of the victims of kidney failure are still condemned to death because the hemodialysis machine is only in the experimental stage and facilities to care for them are unavailable.

They are bared by the action of viruses which poison, many of which have not even been identified, are waiting their opportunity to land.

Every day each one of us must fight a guerrilla war against incipient disease. This is the war I want to escalate.

Despite the great gaps in fundamental biological knowledge, the achievements of medical research are dramatic. Most of the drugs in use today were unknown to the medical practitioner 20 years ago.

There have been startling advances in surgery which have made it possible to operate on so vital an organ as the heart. Plastic surgery is now widespread use to replace damaged arteries.

Electronic devices have been invented to stimulate and control the beating of the heart.

The newspapers last week carried accounts of the first use in a human patient of a device which can take over part of the function of the heart.

Most of the infectious diseases that were common in my childhood are rare today. Mothers have not worried about the threat of smallpox and scarlet fever for years. Rocky Mountain spotted fever no longer takes its annual toll of campers and those who work outdoors in tick-infested areas. Infantile paralysis has at last joined the list of rare diseases.

NIH has just suggested in taking a major step toward the development of a safe vaccine for German measles which in the past has damaged several 10,000 newborn babies whose mothers were exposed to this disease during pregnancy.

There is slow but steady progress in lengthening the survival time for victims of cancer.

While mental health is a growing problem, the number of mental patients who must be kept in institutions continues to decline.

A good example both of the wonders that research can accomplish and of the challenging need for further effort is the so-called artificial kidney. A few months ago I visited the Artificial Kidney Center at Seattle which is now saving the lives of patients whose kidneys have ceased to function. These patients report periodically to the center so that the wastes and poisons normally removed from the blood by the kidneys can be removed by an elaborate machine. This process, known as hemodialysis, holds out the hope of saving the lives of several thousand new victims of kidney failure a year.

I was impressed by this remarkable accomplishment of science. I was also grieved saddened by my visit. The hemodialysis machine is complicated and must be operated by highly trained staff. It costs about $10,000 per year for each patient.

The immediate need is for a major effort to develop a simpler and less costly machine. The aim must be to make it possible for the victim of kidney failure to have a hemodialysis machine in his home which he can operate himself.

But this is not enough. At best, a hemodialysis machine is a poor substitute for a kidney. Work on organ transplantation holds out the hope that it will become possible to transplant a healthy kidney from a donor to a victim of complete kidney failure. This work—especially the search for ways of overcoming the body's rejection of tissue transplanted from another person—must be pressed forward as quickly as possible.

The aim, of course, is to prevent permanent kidney failure by preventing or curbing the diseases which lead to this tragic result. Developmental work on a more practical hemodialysis machine and research on the problems of organ transplantation must therefore be accompanied by continued research on kidney diseases and on the functioning of the kidneys.

I mention my concern over the artificial kidney only to illustrate the significant steps forward that are possible and the extensive and varied work that must still be done on one particular disease problem. Similar opportunities and needs exist in many other areas.

Faced with these opportunities and needs for a timid, mark-time budget for medical research makes no sense. It makes no sense from the point of view of our long-term national interest. It makes no sense from the point of view of the individual citizen.

I am sure that every taxpayer would rather have us spend his tax dollar on health research than on any other Federal activity.

More than 350 years ago the playwright, John Webster, one of Shakespeare's contemporaries, touched the hearts and minds of all who heard him by having one of his characters say:

"Gold that buys health can never be ill spent."

This is something on which all of us can agree today. In fact, we can be sure that if the Congress had made available for health research from the National Institutes of Health, the research could have been particularly well spent.

Last year the distinguished Woodruff Committee, appointed by the President to review the NIH programs, said in its report:

"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 that administered by the National Institutes of Health."

The question we must answer is how much more than we have bought so far—as much, in fact, as our hardworking and dedicated scientists and health practitioners can deliver.

"I am convinced that we are not investing enough in medical research and I am glad to see that some of our most eminent economists agree with me."

I quote briefly from the latest annual report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers:

"Such significant indicators of U.S. health as life expectancy, infant mortality, and the incidence of heart disease must cause concern when compared with rates prevailing abroad or when our recent progress is measured against that of other nations. Since 1940, death rates from heart disease and cancer have each increased by one-fourth; the heart rate for heart disease is among the highest in the world. Mortality rates among males in the productive age bracket of 40 to 54 years are substantially and consistently higher in the United States than in other industrial countries and almost twice the rate in Sweden."

The report goes on to say:

"Outlays for health are important in building and maintaining a productive labor force as well as in improving the lives of people and the quality of our society. The productivity of American workers could not have reached its present height if, in the past, there had not been investment in medical knowledge, in disease prevention, and in treatment and rehabilitation. Yet the potential return from further health investment remains large."

The Council estimated that in 1963 society lost potential product of 4.8 million man-years of work as a result of disease and mortality—without even taking into account the much larger losses due to deaths in earlier years of people who might still have been productive.

The total economic loss due to illness was calculated to have been $46.3 billion in 1963. Two weeks ago, Mr. Leon Keyserling, who served for a number of years as the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, sharply criticized the suggested cutbacks in some of our domestic programs and said that the United States can well afford to spend much more for health, for education, and for welfare. He pointed out that more than 9 percent of our GNP is spent on defense, international obligations, and space technology. Last year we spent just a little over one-quarter of 1 percent on health research.

Mr. Keyserling predicted that during the next 10 years the total value of goods and services produced in this country will rise by more than $200 billion a year and should rise to $1.1 trillion by 1975. He said that in view of these figures—

"It is perfectly preposterous for us to shrink from our prime moral obligations as a Nation because the increased expenditures for the war in Vietnam impose an additional burden upon our economy somewhere in the range of $10 billion to $15 billion."

"I agree with him that it is perfectly preposterous for us to think that we can afford a sting in health research, medical training, or for doing whatever is necessary to win the war against disease."
I was happy to hear that Secretary McNamara apparently agrees with me, too, as he said:

We can afford to do the things we want to do. We are an affluent Nation.

I am sure that one of the things every American wants to do is to protect himself and his family from disease. To strengthen our defenses against disease is the purpose of every one of the programs of the National Institutes of Health. That is the kind of defense program we can be enthusiastic about.

The committee added $74.3 million to the NIH appropriations. I would have been happier if we could have added twice that amount. The extensive hearings conducted by the committee, which cover more than 1,200 pages of transcript, identified urgent program needs far in excess of the increase the committee has allowed.

The budget estimate included an overall increase of only 4.7 percent over the level of expenditure in 1966. Such an increase is barely enough to cover the normal rise in the cost of doing business which affects the conduct of research no less than it affects other major enterprises. Such an increase makes it allowable for increased costs due to the steadily growing need for more complex, more versatile, and more accurate instruments required for research. Such an increase virtually prohibits any expansion of our medical research effort.

In fact, for two of the Institutes—Cancer and Mental Health—the budget actually proposed a reduction in the amount available for research grants.

The additional funds included by the committee will provide for an overall increase of 10.7 percent in the NIH appropriations which is little enough for a program that supports more than two-fifths of all the medical research conducted in the United States and makes a highly selective but very significant contribution to the specialized research conducted overseas.

An increase of less than 11 percent for health research seems modest indeed when compared with a 20-percent rise in corporate profits after taxes, a 12-percent rise in dividends received by stockholders, and a 22 percent increase in farm proprietors' income during 1965. A total increase of only $32.6 million in Federal expenditure for medical research also seems modest when compared with the record increase of $47 billion in our GNP last year and an expected increase of another $30 billion this year.

The President's optimistic economic report to the Congress notes that:

"Rising consumer income . . . will again largely be devoted to expenditures for better living— And the report emphasized those last four words.

"Spend the wisest and the most satisfying expenditure for better living is a greater investment in medical research. Good health has always been foremost among man's aspirations. In the first century of this era, the Spanish poet Martial wrote: 'Life consists not in living, but in enjoying health.'"

The specific purposes of the additional funds included in the NIH appropriations are described in detail in the committee's report.

A total of $30 million is provided for the regular research grant programs of the Institutes. Nearly $18 million of this amount has been taken out of the various appropriations in such a way that each Institute will have a minimum increase of 8 percent in its research grants fund. This million was allocated among the six Institutes whose immediate needs, as indicated by current estimates of 1965 budget deficiencies, would not be met by a basic 6-percent increase over the amount available in 1965.

As discussed at length in the committee's report, recent studies have shown that an annual increase of 15 percent is necessary to maintain the level of existing research programs resulting from rising costs and the growing complexity of the type of work being done. The funds added by the committee provide for an overall increase of only 11 percent for the NIH research grant programs.

A total of $37.3 million was added by the committee to restore serious budget cuts for important programs.

The smaller of these was an increase of $2.3 million to restore the funds available for the third year of the study on the relationship between drugs and heart disease. The level projected in the plans for this 7-year study. The Bureau of the Budget is apparently not interested in this study. In 1965, the Bureau held up the apportionment of the funds provided by the Congress for the study until just before the fiscal year 1966 hearings and included no funds for it in the fiscal year 1965 request. For fiscal year 1967, the Bureau only allowed the same amount that the Congress appropriated last year for the second year of the study despite the fact that the original plans for the study clearly indicated that no additional funds to reach its full operating level. The committee, however, has provided funds for this important project during its remaining 4 years.

An increase of $35 million is provided for the health research facilities construction program. Matching grants under this program have played a major part in building up this country's capability for biomedical research. I regard vigorous support for our research activity and much of the progress made during the past decade were possible only because the Congress had the foresight 10 years ago to launch this program.

Since 1953 the authorized level of this program has been $50 million and that is the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1966. Last year the Congress decided that matching grants were needed for health research facilities, the program should be expanded. Appropriations totaling $280 million for the 3 years 1967-1969 were therefore authorized with the expectation that requests for matching funds for fiscal year 1967 would be $100 million.

Actually, the budget estimate was for only $15 million although both NIH and the Department had requested the full $100 million. I find this action of the Bureau of the Budget completely inexplicable. No rational testimony was offered in defense of the substitution of a 70 percent cut for matching funds for a 100 percent increase. As this action not only runs counter to the expressed intent of the Congress but will also be extremely harmful to further development of our national research capability, the Committee has restored the appropriation to the current level of $50 million.

Funds to meet the needs of approved construction projects at least $149 million would be needed.

I want to emphasize that restrictions on this program do serious damage. Although it is nominally a 50-50 matching program, experience has shown that for every $1 contributed by the Federal Government, non-Federal sources contribute $1.50. Withholding $50 million of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1967 will, therefore, mean that $125 million worth of construction cannot be undertaken. There is the real risk that substantial delay in providing the Federal matching funds will cause the non-Federal matching funds to be diverted to other purposes.

Limitations now imposed on this program will have no immediate effect on medical research. The consequences will be felt 3 or 4 years from now when new facilities will not be ready and when it will be impossible to make up for lost time.

The remaining $7.5 million of the committee's increases are for six specific programs which are fully described in the committee's report.

The sum of $3 million is for creation of several dental research institutes, in various parts of the country. Facilities and programs similar to those of the National Institute of Dental Research in Bethesda, dental research has lagged behind medical research. Plans for these institutes are well advanced, and the committee felt that their implementation should not be further delayed.

To inaugurate a national blood program, under the auspices of the National Heart Institute, $1,050,000 is to meet our growing military and civilian needs for particular components of human blood for the treatment of a number of diseases.

The sum of $1 million is to accelerate research and research training on blindness which is a major but somewhat neglected national problem.

The strengthening of the research program on the artificial kidney sponsored by the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, $800,000. My personal feeling is that a great deal more should be invested in urgent efforts to overcome the obstacles that now condemn thousands of victims of kidney failure to a preventable death. I strongly urge the Institute to make the most effective use of the funds available to it in this great humanitarian effort.

The sum of $500,000 is to strengthen the activities of NIH's new Division of Research and Development—the technology which is engaged in developing automated clinical and laboratory tests, di-
agricultural procedures and clinical record-keeping.

Finally, the committee has provided $250,000 for the Office of the Director, NIH, for research and services appropriation, to meet the expenses of creating a central administrative framework for developmental engineering programs. The so-called artificial kidney departments in my heart are merely the precursors of a wide range of new devices which will apply recent engineering advances in electronics miniaturization, and the creation of new material to the solution of medical problems. The complexities of such a program and the scarcity of people with the regulate engineering skills and understanding of biomedical problems make it undesirable, uneconomic and, probably, impossible to mount and staff separate developmental programs in each of the Institutes that have a legitimate interest in this new field. The Committee, therefore, feels programs in each of the Institutes that number of very important program raising field.

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

Mr. FOOGARTY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks on the items in the bill unless Members have questions.

This appropriation bill affects every family in our country in one way or another. It affects every congressional district in many ways. There is not a dime in this bill of over $10 billion that is going to waste. It is going to help all human beings who are living at this time.

As is always and inevitably the case with a large bill such as this, no individual on the committee is satisfied with everything it includes or excludes. There are several places where I disagree, and especially, places where I think more funds should be appropriated. However, on the whole, I think this is a good bill and one which we can all support conscientiously.

I think that the bill will receive the overwhelming support of this House.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I again congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island as I do every year on his appropriation bill for the excellent manner in which he covered this huge subject. The gentleman from Rhode Island as usual has given the Members of the House of Representatives the benefit of a tremendous amount of information.

I also appreciate the generosity that the subcommittee always shows to the agencies which protect the life, health, and safety of the American people. But, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask you a question. Why was the $3.5 million in planning funds for the seven residential schools scheduled to be built around the country, including one in St. Louis, deleted?

Mr. FOOGARTY. There was a difference of opinion in the committee, and this is one of the ways in which the bill was compromised. The other body has always taken the stand that they would not support the House action until they found out where these schools were going to be built.

Now that seven areas have been named, I assume the Senate will change their attitude.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. One other question, Mr. Chairman. Do you not feel, as the experts in this field do, that these seven residential schools would serve a much different group from the Job Corps group and would help to meet a need not otherwise taken care of?

Mr. FOOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman, but it is a controversial sub-
Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to the able Member from the State of California that I deeply regret any misunderstanding which may have resulted from testimony before the subcommittee.

At the time the Surgeon General testified before the subcommittee in February, I had read a story about the "medicinal" values of wine in the Wall Street Journal. I have subsequently learned that the story did not completely report the facts as they were.

The time of the subcommittee hearing, I was not fully informed on the extensive research that had been conducted into the use of wine in medical practice. Since then, I have learned of the great amount of competent work that has been done in that field. I concur fully with your statements that this research activity has been a meaningful one, and that the findings have been properly used.

I believe that the use of "medicinal" in the Surgeon General's testimony was strictly in the limited sense of meaning "curative." His response seemed to me to have the same meaning as saying there is no evidence of the "medicinal" effects of aspirin, penicillin, or a host of others, in that none of these is curative although all are unquestionably invaluable in medical practice.

I am also aware that there is much evidence in medical literature to indicate that wine does have physiological effects which, for many patients, may play a useful adjunctive role in the treatment of various diseases, and that competent physicians are utilizing wine for these purposes. At the time the Surgeon General testified before this committee, was in a distorted story about the California wine industry.

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

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Nay. I say to the able Member from the State of California that I deeply regret any misunderstanding which may have resulted from testimony before the Appropriations Committee. At the time the Surgeon General testified before the subcommittee in February, I had read a story about the "medicinal" values of wine in the Wall Street Journal. I have subsequently learned that the story did not completely report the facts as they were.

At the time the subcommittee hearing, I was not fully informed on the extensive research that had been conducted into the use of wine in medical practice. Since then, I have learned of the great amount of competent work that has been done in that field. I concur fully with your statements that this research activity has been a meaningful one, and that the findings have been properly used.

I believe that the use of "medicinal" in the Surgeon General's testimony was strictly in the limited sense of meaning "curative." His response seemed to me to have the same meaning as saying there is no evidence of the "medicinal" effects of aspirin, penicillin, or a host of others, in that none of these is curative although all are unquestionably invaluable in medical practice.

I am also aware that there is much evidence in medical literature to indicate that wine does have physiological effects which, for many patients, may play a useful adjunctive role in the treatment of various diseases, and that competent physicians are utilizing wine for these purposes. At the time the Surgeon General testified before this committee, was in a distorted story about the California wine industry.

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

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Nay. I say to the able Member from the State of California that I deeply regret any misunderstanding which may have resulted from testimony before the Appropriations Committee. At the time the Surgeon General testified before the subcommittee in February, I had read a story about the "medicinal" values of wine in the Wall Street Journal. I have subsequently learned that the story did not completely report the facts as they were.

At the time the subcommittee hearing, I was not fully informed on the extensive research that had been conducted into the use of wine in medical practice. Since then, I have learned of the great amount of competent work that has been done in that field. I concur fully with your statements that this research activity has been a meaningful one, and that the findings have been properly used.

I believe that the use of "medicinal" in the Surgeon General's testimony was strictly in the limited sense of meaning "curative." His response seemed to me to have the same meaning as saying there is no evidence of the "medicinal" effects of aspirin, penicillin, or a host of others, in that none of these is curative although all are unquestionably invaluable in medical practice.

I am also aware that there is much evidence in medical literature to indicate that wine does have physiological effects which, for many patients, may play a useful adjunctive role in the treatment of various diseases, and that competent physicians are utilizing wine for these purposes. At the time the Surgeon General testified before this committee, was in a distorted story about the California wine industry.

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.
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that he knows this bill from A to Z, in the most intricate detail. He is very
dedicated to the programs embraced in
this bill. He has in the past always been
a great humanitarian.

But in this bill has been presented with unusual and exceptionally difficult problems. I know how difficult the prob-
lem was. I want to congratulate him for the
great courage he has displayed in standing up and fighting for what he
and I think was right. He has shown himself to be not only a great humani-
tarian, but to be a man of great courage.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the
gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentle-
man from Washington.

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would
like to join my colleagues in congratu-
lag the gentleman from Rhode Island
(Mr. FOGARTY) and the committee for its
action in restoring certain amounts to
impacted areas and National Defense
Education Act grants and particularly I
want to extend my appreciation to all of
us who have been working in the kid-
ney treatment field to Representative
FOGARTY for his concern and assistance to
those suffering from chronic kidney
failure.

This problem has been of deep concern to residents of my district in Seattle be-
cause one of the first centers using arti-
ficial kidneys to save persons whose kid-
neys have failed was developed by Dr.
Scribner at the University of Washing-
ton. One of the first dialysis centers
was created in Seattle which allowed a
limited number of persons who faced a
certain death to live and continue at
their jobs.

The problem, of course, is that this
treatment was originally very expen-
sive—averaging over $20,000 per year—
and the number of dialyzing units was
limited to less than 20. This meant that a
combination of medical and laymen board
was required to decide which individu-
als lived and which ones died. Last
November an NBC documentary pointed
out the tragedy involved in this whole proc-
ess. The expenses have now been reduced
to approximately $10,000 per year and hopefully can be further
reduced.

This matter came particularly to my
attention in the spring of 1965 when there was presented to me the case of a
father of a young family well-known to
my area who had stated he would rather die than have his family faced with the costs that would be in-
volved to maintain him.

At that time I introduced H.R. 11589
to authorize the additional construction and development of these artificial kid-
ney machines in centers throughout the
United States.

Since that time, through the wonderful
assistance of Congressman FOGARTY and
others in both the House of Representa-
tives and the Senate, we have worked
forward to broaden development of the
whole area of treatment of chronic kid-
nedney failure. In this connection, I have
introduced H.R. 14279 and have been
pleased to be joined by many of my col-
leagues with companion bills. I hope
that this matter will be acted upon before
the end of this session.

Once again I want to express my
appreciation to Representative FOGARTY
for the increase in appropriation in the
amount of $3 million to establish addi-
tional kidney dialysis centers, and the
addition of $200,000 to the National In-
itute of Arthritis and Metabolic Dis-
cases to expand their basic research in
this area.

I am hopeful that the new authoriza-
tion bills which have been proposed will
be available in the period of time after
fiscal year 1966 to continue the develop-
ment of this program so that committees
will not have to decide who lives and who
dies.

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we have
before us today contains a total of $490
million above the estimate sent to the
Congress by the President.

We here in the Congress should be
aware that the first problem is. that the
executive branch of our Government is indeed playing tricks with the Cong-
gress. Let me point this up to you today as clearly as I can. We have
evidence, on a daily basis, of what is
happening as far as the Congress is con-
cerned. You gentlemen in the majority
and you in the minority should all be con-
cerned about the game that is being
played.

I picked up the New York Times the
other day, and I saw a story, a kind of
background story, which told about the
President of the United States condem-
ning the Congress because there was going
to be a pay increase for the military per-
sonnel. This pay increase was going to
amount to 2.8 percent. This was over
and above the budget, but the President
did not know exactly what he could do
about it.

There is an awful lot he can do about
it, because his own Secretary of Defense
was appearing before the Armed Services
Committee just 3 days prior to the ap-
ppearance of that story, asking for this
pay increase for military personnel of
almost 3 percent. Yet, the President
of the United States does not send up any
estimates, any amendments to his
budget. Instead, he quietly sends his
Secretary of Defense to appear before the
Armed Services Committee, to agree
to an increase in military pay, but with
no budget estimate.

There are areas of increases—voca-
tional education; land-grant colleges;
payments to school districts; the student
loan program under the National De-
Fense Education Act, a longtime exist-
ing program; the nurse and medical stu-
dent loan program; the programs of the
National Institutes of Health, to carry
on the cancer, heart and stroke amend-
ments of 1965. All these programs have
increases over and above the President’s
requests and recommendations.

I intend to offer an amendment, to see
how many people will support the Presi-
dent of the United States on a few of
these areas, when this bill is opened up
for amendment, because, as I believe we
should test his support here in the Con-
gress on a few of these items.

But it seems the executive branch to-
day is not working to decrease any of the
items in this bill. The only effort being
made here today is to add on the Teach-
ers Corps, which is an administration
program, a new start, a new program.

The Secretary of Health, Education,
and Welfare, the Office of the Commiss-
ioner of Education—all of the power
of the executive branch is being applied
to go forward with the Teachers Corps
program. But the top lobbyists of the ad-
ministration, who have done so well and
who have been so successful in enact-
ing the authorizations for many of these
programs, are nowhere to be seen on
Capitol Hill today.

The Jack Valentis and the Larry
O’Brien and the other men of the White
House that have been up here working for
authorizations are not up here
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today working to stay within the President's guideline and the President's budget. They are not up here opposing the impacted area aid program. But they are putting out their press releases on how this Congress is going wild on spending. Still they are encouraging the Congress at every step of the way to go forward with these programs. And let us not forget that Congress is dominated by a 2-to-1 majority of the President's own party.

Now, if the President of the United States is serious about this matter of expenditure control as far as the public sector is concerned, he would be just as serious about having his people here working to stay within these budget figures that he sent up here as he is to have them increased. It is strange to me, that today the only effort being made by the executive branch is to increase this bill, that is, to add to the existing expenditures. The only effort made as far as the public sector is concerned in this battle of inflation and to keep down expenditures has to be made here in the Congress of the United States, because it is not being made in a straightforward manner as far as the executive branch is concerned.

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

This bill that is before us today is for partial funding of the activities of the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and certain related activities for fiscal year 1967. It should be crystal clear to every Member of this Congress that this bill, although it contains almost $11 billion in general-fund authorizations for expenditures and $33 billion in trust fund money, it only makes up about 75 percent of the funds which we will appropriate for the Department of HEW for the fiscal year 1967. Why is this? It is because there are five major programs that have not been authorized and could not be funded in this bill. What are those? First, the elementary and secondary education programs, a total of at least $1.4 billion; the Higher Education Facilities Act, which was passed yesterday but which cannot be funded because it has not passed the Senate and been signed by the President, $722 million; grants to public libraries, $52 million; a part of higher educational activities, $50 million; Office of Economic Opportunity, $1.73 billion.

It seems to me that if we are going to give proper consideration to the funding of the Department of HEW and the activities of that Department of HEW for the next 12-month period, all of these appropriation items should be considered at the same time. Why do I say that? Last year on the Higher Education Act a majority of legislators believe that money to carry on that program was added to the HEW appropriation bill through an amendment in the U.S. Senate. Not at any time during the consideration of the appropriations bill was the House given the opportunity to work its will on the appropriations for this program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I can show proof in every instance to the effect that the priorities are being established by the executive branch. One will find that if it is a present program or a program that has been started in the last 3 years, that is what gives it a high priority. However, if it is an old, existing program, like the Land-Grant College Act, it has been renewed, like last year, in a program such as the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, this program is cut back and the priority is not established by the Congress.

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

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Kentucky helps me make this point: that the House of Representatives should have something to say about how these priorities are established. There is only one way in which the House of Representatives can determine what the gentleman's legislative committee has done, and that is to fund all of these programs in the same bill so that Congress can work its will and establish priorities. You can pass the funds day after day, Congress after Congress, and they mean nothing if we surrender this entire question of priorities to the executive branch; and that is what your committee has done and that is what is being done in this bill, because we cannot even consider the National Defense Education Act as it relates to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because that will be added by the other body.

Mr. Chairman, there will be seven Members of this House of Representatives who will sit on the conference committee and establish the priorities. Not another one of the 436 Members of this House of Representatives will have anything to say about it when it comes to establishing or sustaining funds.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LAIRD. So I am going to make a suggestion.

I suggest that all the Members of the House read the additional views of the minority which are on page 80, and which call to the attention of the House of Representatives the fact that these programs have not been authorized.

We do not want the same thing to happen this year that happened last year when the Senate wrote the ticket on higher education and it was done only by a Senate amendment and did not give the House an opportunity to give any consideration to the appropriations as they applied to all titles in this education bill.

I personally favor more money in the facilities section of the National Defense Education Act. I think that should have a higher priority than title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. There is, I think, no way to express that feeling of higher priority in this section because we cannot not consider this at this time title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Committee on Appropriations is going to wait for the foreign aid authorization. We are going to wait for the space
authorization. We are going to wait for all of these other authorizations. But yet in the important area of health, education, and welfare, we find ourselves being told "No, let the Senate move on this as the House moves on this hidden session field." I do not think that we in the House of Representatives should yield on this point.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. First of all, I would like to commend the gentleman on the statements he is making. He is giving the House of Representatives some facts and the American people some facts that I think they should have. The question I have in mind is—How are we going to get the facts to the American people? Because as the gentleman has stated, the President is probably going to make a statement after this bill is passed that the Congress increases requests by such and such an amount. We then once again are going to be the whipping boy.

I am going to a point that the gentleman raised which I really should be emphasized. I refer to the failure to fund the heart, cancer, and stroke research program. Did the gentleman make that point?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes.

Mr. LATTA. You mean after the President of the United States had this signed into the bill down at the White House with all the nationwide publicity to do something about cancer, stroke, and heart disease and after we passed the authorization, then the President comes to the Congress without any request for funds for this program? Is that what he did?

Mr. LAIRD. There is a request for funds in this bill. But I would just like to point out to the gentleman, it is not an increase over the program of last year. I am sure most of us when we received the pens down at the White House thought there was going to be some sort of increase in this program.

Mr. LATTA. What the gentleman is saying is that actually then the country goes spending more on this program of research in these three very important areas.

Mr. LAIRD. Let me tell the gentleman that in the area of the National Science Foundation and in the area of the Atomic Energy Commission and in all of these other areas where research is carried on, the budget of the President has been given a 15-percent increase in grants for these various purposes. But this is not true in the area of heart, cancer, stroke, and mental illness. I think the gentleman from Rhode Island will bear out that simple fact—that the percentage increase in these other areas was not granted in this particular area.

The point I was trying to make is that the appropriations used by the executive branch should not be figures that we immediately feel we have to accept because if you will go over this bill, you will see that the areas that were given the percentage of increase were programs that were new starts by this administration.

In existing programs that have been going on for years and in the redirection that we gave vocational education in the legislation that we passed last year, we told the Office of Education that the vocational education program should be redirected. We passed legislation along that line and provided for the funding. I offered an amendment to reduce the training program and to increase the vocational education program which was a going and existing program.

It seems to me that these tried programs should be given priority. Simply because the land-grant college program happened to start at the time Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States is no reason for, in this year of 1968, saying that it is a bad program, and that is not the judgment that should be made by the executive branch on these programs today.

What I would like to leave with my colleagues here today is that we hear a great deal of talk about what the private sector of our economy should do about the very important things, and the concern for the dollar. Almost every day the housewife in the home, the farmer in the field, the worker in the factory, and businessmen throughout the country are lectured by representatives of the executive branch about what they can do about inflation and the cost of living. They are told what they should buy and what they should not buy.

My colleagues, it is not this private sector where you can place the blame for the cost-of-living and the inflation that we are experiencing today. It is the spending binge of the Federal Government. Unless the executive branch is willing to stand up and use the same kind of communication techniques with the Members, use the same kind of pressure that they used on a colleague in the U.S. Senate in order to get a vote for a particular motion to put something forth in Vietnam, then we have to go forward to carry on this kind of program when it comes down to the hard cases of expenditures and appropriations, because unless we begin to face up to the fact that it is the fiscal policies of the Federal Government that are causing our problems today and that those problems are caused by what the public sector is doing, then we are in for serious trouble.

So I call upon the executive branch of our Government to mean what they say and do what they say, but also to show by their work and their actions that they are not interested only when a program of theirs is cut. They should show that they are also interested in maintaining some degree of fiscal sanity as far as spending in the United States is concerned.

I am going to give Members a chance. The first amendment that will be up will be the one on the floor. We will see exactly how much aid the executive branch gives to the Congress in this area of keeping expenditures and appropriations as low as we can do so well as we can and not go on that, we can continue on down the line. But we will not take up all day today with a lot of amendments. We will start with impacted aid. That happens to be the first one. We will see how we do. We want to give the President and the people who are working for him an opportunity to show how well they can operate on Capitol Hill.

Mr. LAIRD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin have any further requests for time?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island has done an excellent job over the years in the field of health.

I would not want what I say here today to mean that I have opposed research and development in the medical field. I would not want what I say here today to mean that I have opposed the research and development in the health field.

But I think we are now providing research funds that perhaps cannot be used effectively.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, today marks my ninth appearance this year in the well of the House on behalf of fiscal restraint and fiscal responsibility. I have made these appearances because it is most right and our bounden duty to protect the economic well-being of our great Nation from the ravages of inflation, from the awesome burden of increased taxation, and from the chains of statutory wage and price controls.

The demand for fiscal prudence is made imperative by the fact that we are fighting a war in Vietnam and by the fact that we are now experiencing considerable price inflation.

It is apparent that the war in Vietnam will go on for a very long time. We now have 550,000 troops committed to the fighting in Vietnam and that number may have to be increased to 400,000 or more before a just peace can be reached. The demands for matériel with which to fight this war must necessarily increase as we commit additional manpower over there.

The consumer price index is currently advancing at an annual rate of 6 percent. Such an increase is robbing the poor and those who are living on pensions and other forms of fixed income of their ability to provide for the necessities of life. We are on the threshold of even greater inflation, which will further cheapen our money and reduce every-
existing but nonessential programs? I think we all know the answer—we shall have the runaway inflation which has destroyed the economic well-being of other nations and which certainly will destroy ours if let go unchecked.

We recognize these ills when they exist elsewhere and to the extent that we have and do lend a helping hand to our free-world allies, we demand that they do something about them. Let me just tell you what we said about one of the countries who gets aid from us:

In order to reduce the rate of inflation to no economic situations in other countries the authorities are expected to continue their efforts to eliminate the Federal budget deficit, curb wage increases, reduce subsidies to Government enterprises, and maintain credit policies which curb inflation without throttling private enterprise.

That citation is not an isolated one because we have demanded very nearly the same thing from other countries who are recipients of our aid.

Except for the reference to an inflation rate of 16 percent, and we may soon incur such a rate at home, this citation could apply to our own economic situation. What I do not understand is the fact that we recognize those dangerous economic situations in other countries and either cannot see them here at home or just would not face up to them when they are apparent.

What the President Has Done

The President, his economic advisers, and his Federal agencies have called on industry to curtail its capital outlays as a means of reducing these inflationary pressures.

He has called upon the housewives of the Nation to defer purchases that are not absolutely essential and to be more selective in their purchases of food and other necessities.

He has declined against starting an additional wing at the Texas White House as a personal example of deferring not absolutely essential expenditures.

He has delayed starting the construction of some Federal post offices and he has indicated that some nonessential, though desirable, Federal spending will be deferred throughout the balance of this fiscal year.

He has complained that Congress is trying to cut $3 billion to his 1967 budget.

He has said that he fears these additions to his budget may force him to ask Congress for a tax increase.

When he signed the cold war GI bill, he made a following warning:

I want to call attention, however, and make a most solemn warning about future legislation. Unless we can balance our requests for our needs, and our contribution of caution, then we are likely to get our figures back to that $130 billion which came over from Germany.

He has called and needed individual Members of Congress about these budget increases.

But he has also marched Postmaster General O'Brien and his legislative liaison troops up here to do battle to save the funding of the rent supplement program and the National Teachers Corps when it appeared that Congress might not go along with his request.

What has he not done?

He has held back General O'Brien and his troops up here to help those of us who have tried to make modest cuts that would have reduced proposed appropriations back to his budget request.

He has not seen fit to exercise his constitutional right to veto bills that exceed his budget requests.

In the past, even appropriation bills have been vetoed. As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower vetoed the Independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal 1959 because Congress had added about $530 million of appropriations to his budget request. Congress accepted that veto and finally provided appropriations that were in line with the request. President Eisenhower also vetoed the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 because it contained too many new starts and exceeded the President's request. Thereafter, Congress enacted a new bill with an appropriation which was slightly less than the President's request but which still contained all of the new starts. President Eisenhower vetoed that bill but Congress overrode the veto and it became law.

I would suggest that the President either send General O'Brien and his legislative troops back up here to give aid and comfort to those of us who are trying to help him to exercise his veto power on bills, such as the bill before us, that exceed his budget request.

What Congress Has Done

The President's plea for fiscal restraint have largely gone unheeded here in the House. Could it be that Congress wants to overcome the "rubberstamp" label we have earned in recent years and with no success at all.

If that is the situation, then I think we can all agree that the House has not only overcome but now might well be labeled as "defying the President."

Over the years I have urged the Congress to recapture its constitutional and historical position as a coequal with the executive and judiciary. If it proposes now to pursue its prerogatives as a coequal, then it must also be willing to accept the responsibilities that go with this newly found freedom.

Congress is responsible for providing the means and means of raising the revenues, appropriating funds to pay our bills, and authorizing Federal programs that promote the general welfare.

If Congress chooses not to follow the recommendations of the President, then it must assume the obligation of coordinating its actions to the end that income and outgo are balanced. And to the extent that we cannot afford at what we desire, Congress must be willing to assign priorities for spending.

This, it has done with little success in recent years and with no success at all this year.

Who Is Responsible?

The membership of the House is made up of 283 Democrats and 140 Republicans. Thus, we on this side of the aisle are outnumbered by more than 2 to 1.

It would follow that the majority party is responsible for the conduct of the House; however, the majority has failed to assume responsibility for the economic well-being of the Nation and it has gone along with the President's budget. That budget was beyond the realm of fiscal prudence when it was submitted and unless the majority faces up to its responsibilities, it probably will be beyond the jurisdiction when the President gets all of it back.

You may ask, Who is responsible? Each of us is responsible but much more importantly those responsible are: the distinguished Speaker, the majority leader, the chairmen and majority members of the legislative committees, and the Appropriations Committee, itself. If this budget is to be cut for that matter, even held at the level proposed by the President, then it will be up to the leadership on the other side of the aisle to move into the budget area with the aggressiveness and determination that our war and inflationary situations demand.

On several occasions, those of us on this side of the aisle who truly believe in fiscal responsibility have offered amendments which would have cut back on proposed spending by a modest 5 percent.

Just in case you do not recall, let me tell you how these amendments were received by the House. The big spenders on the other side of the aisle were here in force and we were shellacked on every amendment. The first time I offered the Bow expenditure limitation amendment, we received the magnificent support of 30 Democrat members. The second time, we got all of 17 Democrat votes. I think those votes clearly establish how little Democrats are concerned with fiscal responsibility.

I hope you will go home this fall and tell your constituents how hard you worked adding fuel to the fires of inflation and how you maintained that the people would be burdened with increased taxes. And if you should travel to Vietnam later this year, I hope you will tell our fighting men over there that it was your free spending actions which necessitated the increase in taxes that will cut their take-home pay, and I hope that you will tell them how you helped it along and reduced the purchasing power of allotment checks to their dependents back home.

The Bow Expenditure Limitation

Today, notwithstanding the reportorial conclusions of Mr. Arthur Krock of the New York Times, I offer the Bow expenditure limitation amendment. I am serving notice on each of you that unless there is substantially increased support for the amendment, then the majority party can assume the entire responsibility for future budget reductions. In that event, I can promise you that I will help deliver the votes for economy promised, of course, that the majority party has the courage to ac-
sume a responsible role in the fiscal af-
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few moments ago made the statement
that there was a lack of concern on the
part of the majority in limiting expendi-
tures. The gentleman made an effort to
justify this statement by citing the fact
that when he made a motion to recommit
the Interior Department appropriation
bill with a percentage factor 30 mem-
bers of the majority party supported the
recommitment motion. And, when the
gentleman made a similar motion to re-
commit the Treasury and Post Office De-
partment appropriation bill, only 17
members of the majority party supported
the motion to recommit.

Chairman, I do not believe that
this demonstrates in any way a lack of
concern for budget expenditures or a
budget limitation upon the part of the
majority party. I yield to no man in
this Congress in the matter of concern
for fiscal responsibility and I have the
record to prove it.

On the other hand, I sincerely believe,
because I voted against both those mo-
tions to recommit, that it demonstrates
on the part of the majority party a de-
sire to exercise congressional preroga-
tives and expend this money appropri-
ated for programs in which Congress
wants to expend the money rather than
deserting its responsibility and giving
this authority to the Bureau of the
Budget. I will vote to cut any item or
program and say remove this or any other appropriation bill if a case
can be made to justify it but I will not
support a motion to limit the appropri-
a\tion and expenditures of any agency
by this method. To argue, as these recom-
mit motions require to limit the expendi-
tures of an agency to 90 or 95 percent of
the Bureau of Budget recommendation,
and then give sole and complete dis-
cretion and authority to the executive
branch of the Government to decide
which items would be cut or completely
deleted, makes no sense. The committee
system and Congress. We do not need
a Congress if we are going to give the
Bureau of the Budget this authority.
We have given them too much authority
already. I can think of no worse way
to legislate than by this method.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from
Georgia [Mr. Landrum].

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

Mr. LANDRUM. Chairman, by
1970, 85 million persons will be in the
national labor force. The number of
teenage and young adult workers—age
14 to 24—who will enter the labor force
is expected to increase at a rate of
almost 700,000 a year. Our failure to
appropriate fully the authorized funds
as set forth in the Vocational Education
Act of 1963—Public Law 88-210—will
most certainly affect the possibilities for
success of many of these young and adult

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the
gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman
from Rhode Island will agree with me
that we are spending more than the
amount of money needed in the States
in these categorial welfare programs un-
der the Social Security Administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentle-
man stated the answer to the question
correctly. We tried to take action last
year by reducing this appropriation by
a couple of hundred million dollars on
the basis that unemployment was low
and all these programs to reduce de-
pendency, but had to make it up in a
supplemental. Congress has seven or
eight times increased the authorization
for public assistance payments.

Then, also, the States in the last few
years have changed their laws to increase
the payments to these individuals and
have made other changes for public
assistance. As a result, through ac-
tions of State legislatures and the Con-
grss itself, we have this figure now.

Mr. Chairman, last year we had a year
planned to make a complete inves-
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A recent study of high school graduates of vocational education programs revealed that 86 percent enter occupations for which they either were trained or for occupations closely related to their training; that vocationally trained graduates enjoy substantially greater employment security than do other high school graduates, and that vocational graduates have greater accumulation of earning over the 11-year period covered by the follow-up study.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 has provided new direction and stimulus to vocational education programs, which have been successful programs in our public schools since 1917, but the new emphasis toward gainful employment has increased and improved the avenues through which we can meet the needs of an expanding economy.

The area vocational technical school programs, I am proud to say, were some-what pioneered in my own State of Georgia. We now have 14 schools in full operation with 7 more to be opened this September and 2 others planned. The demand on these schools for training in technical, trade, health, and business training is so great that we are planning expansions to four of the existing schools if the full appropriation is forthcoming from this Congress. Failure to appropriate the full authorization under Public Law 88-210 will, in my State alone, mean a reduction in the area school budget of some $1,500,000 in Federal, State, and local funds proposed for use in operation of existing and new schools and for equipping new schools; for teachers and for conducting adult classes.

This reduction would have serious effects on the occupational training of some 6,000 day and evening students who will be enrolled in the 17 new schools and will affect the operation of the 14 schools now operating with an enrollment of 20,000.

Can we deprive a Georgia boy or any other American boy of a starting salary of up to $150 a week in a technical occupation? A total of 18 percent of the graduates of Georgia's area vocational-technical schools in 1965 entered occupations at salaries of $101 to $150 a week. Only 8 percent entered occupations at salaries under $60 a week and 2 percent started at over $150 a week. Of those who complete training, 90 percent are employed in less than a month, 81 percent for which they trained, and 86 percent of them go to work within 100 miles of their homes. No wonder labor, industry, and business leaders consider area schools a vital link in their economic security.

If we fail to appropriate the full amount authorized in Public Law 88-210, my State will see a reduction in funds from $280 million to $220 million. The payroll to the 14 schools would be reduced from $1,214,000 under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and some $373,000 less than was anticipated under section 13 for the work-study program.

The industrial growth of the Nation demands better trained workers with more skills than they have ever needed before in our history, and our citizens, young and old, recognize that they must have this knowledge to compete for employment in the labor market. The enrollment in area vocational and technical schools in Georgia in 1965 was a 135-percent increase over the year before. Can we turn the tide on industrial growth by simply failing to provide the trained workers they need? Do we want to?

Can we ignore our responsibilities in helping to provide facilities to continue to build sound educational training programs to provide for these 6 million people the skilled training they need to secure gainful employment? Can we ignore our responsibilities in helping to provide facilities to continue to build sound educational training programs to provide for these 6 million people the skilled training they need to secure gainful employment? Can we ignore our responsibilities in helping to provide facilities to continue to build sound educational training programs to provide for these 6 million people the skilled training they need to secure gainful employment? Can we ignore our responsibilities in helping to provide facilities to continue to build sound educational training programs to provide for these 6 million people the skilled training they need to secure gainful employment?
mean that in all our vocational programs we would deny some 3,700 high school vocational students, some 1,350 post-high-school students and 1,600 adults the opportunity for occupational training. We must not do this. We cannot afford to do this.

The local school systems and the States cannot carry this burden alone. Vocational education has traditionally been a partnership with State and local dollars overmatching the Federal dollars traditionally on an average of 84% of State and local funds for every dollar of Federal funds.

We must continue the work we have started. We must continue the improvement and expansion of vocational and technical education programs to meet the manpower shortage existing in our Nation and in our States. We must continue to give full support to the act we passed in 1963. Failure to do this will impede the progress of vocational and technical education programs now underway and planned to meet the vocational needs of our people. We must appropriate the full $225 million authorized by section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

By next year this bill will be close to a 15 billion package. It is shocking. This Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is without a doubt the fastest growing department of Government.

Let me give you a brief rundown of total direct appropriations embodied in this bill over these past few years. What phenomenal growth.

Fiscal year

|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------------|-----------------|

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as has been brought out so ably by our chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, this bill does come to better than a $10½ billion appropriation for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

I call your particular attention to the additional views which appear in the report where we point out specifically that this is really only three-fourths of what we are going to have to appropriate in this coming fiscal year if we are to fully fund all the programs that have been authorized in this field of labor, health, education, and welfare.

Now let us take a look at the area of employment, as of June 30, 1965, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had 67,316 people. By June 30, 1966, that figure will grow to 101,000, and in another fiscal year, 170,000. Following is a revealing table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>67,316</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Labor Relations Board</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>10,042</td>
<td>10,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Retirement Board</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>2,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Mediation Board</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Adjustment Board</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Soldiers' Home</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Radiation Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total employment 1. 101,979 155,216 173,141


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

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. As one who recognizes the need for the vocational retraining and rehabilitation phase of this bill, I hasten to point out at this time that the gentleman from Georgia who just preceded the gentleman in the well conceived characterization to this, because when we have jobs going begging for skilled and semiskilled workers in this country and still we have unemployment, to implement this program with the Human Investment Act would be the best thing the Congress could do.
could always get into an argument as to whether or not there should be a selective cut or a cut across the board. We get into this area where we could have a good debate on the pros and cons of these two courses.

Our good subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], knows full well of my position in this respect. All of us revere the gentleman from Rhode Island. We know that he is very sincere in what he opposes in committee and on the floor of the House. His position is well known. While the two of us will probably cancel each other's vote on 90 percent of the legislative bills coming before this House, nonetheless I know he is sincere and we enjoy each other's respect and have a warm affection for one another personally.

We have some very sensitive items in this bill. Who wants to be against cancer research? Who wants to be opposed to doing more research in the field of heart and stroke? Who wants to be opposed to hospital construction? Who wants to be opposed to the Children's Bureau, to help for the mentally retarded, for the handicapped, for the blind, for the aged, or any of these popular programs? Who wants to be put in the position of doing more research in the field of disease control? Who wants to be opposed to nursing services? Who wants to be opposed to hospital construction? Who wants to be opposed to the Children's Bureau, to help for the mentally retarded, for the handicapped, for the blind, for the aged, or any of these popular programs?

We all know what the evils of the fires of inflation are burning brightly. We all wish there were enough money to take care of everybody's ills, but we just do not have the money to pacify everyone. This is our problem on this committee.

We all know what the efforts of the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], has been in this area. Time after time after time, he will tell a witness coming before our subcommittee, "Are you asking for enough money? I do not think you are asking enough. This is the most conservative budget I have seen sent to our subcommittee." Well, I am in a completely different position as Members of this House are aware. The point I am trying to get across is that we do have a difficult problem in keeping this bill within reasonable bounds and presenting to you the kind of bill that would meet everybody's wishes and demands.

I am going to support the proposal to make a 5-percent across-the-board cut, because it is the only practical way to make a significant cut in this bill and bring it in line with the budget figure. I think the proposal for 5-percent across-the-board cut offers sufficient latitude for economy and still not gut any particular program.

Of course, I have reserved in committee to support any selective cutting amendments that might be offered.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas.

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

Mr. SHriver. Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill, H.R. 14745, contains over $10.3 billion for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966. This is a substantial sum—but we only have a part of the total spending picture for these programs before us.

Considerable time has been spent by the subcommittee, of which I am a member, in examining the justifications and receiving testimony from the representative of the various bureaus and departments. We also have heard from other interested individuals and organizations.

However, our work on these appropriations is incomplete. Nearly $4 billion in additional requests await action following authorizations by legislative committees.

There are some important omissions from the multibillion-dollar spending bill before you today. Yet to be funded in fiscal 1967 are the programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; Higher Education Facilities Act; grants for public libraries; other higher education activities; and the so-called poverty program—Office of Economic Opportunity. We are talking about a final total of approximately $14 billion for these programs.

Significantly the committee report acknowledges the dangers in proceeding on a piecemeal appropriations basis. On page 3 of the report you read:

'It is unfortunate that there must be this delay in funding since all of these going programs and the inability to plan ahead will undoubtedly result in less effective programs and less efficient use of funds."

It seems to me to be just as inefficient to proceed today with only three-quarters of an appropriations bill. That is why I joined in signing the additional minority views and I shall support the recommit motion. It would seem to be a prudent and responsible action to defer final action on this appropriations bill until the rest of the package comes before the Appropriations Committee.

As expected, Congress is being made the villain by the administration because the fires of inflation are burning brightly.

This appropriations bill restores significant cuts made by the President in Public Law 874, the longtime program of impacted school assistance. I doubt that this congressional action comes as a surprise to the administration. Similar action was taken last week by the House when it restored funds for the school milk and school lunch programs, and agricultural research, soil conservation, and extension programs.

Since the President's budget was submitted in January the mail has been heavy in protest to sudden reductions in such longstanding and time-tested Federal programs.

Public Law 874, under the administration action, was to be cut nearly $144 million. The recommendations for this reduction were based primarily on a report by the Stanford Research Institute. Such a proposal, however, does damage to the intent of Congress. Public Law 874 was created under the concept that where the Federal Government is supplying a national need by putting a Federal installation into a district, the local problem which is thereby created for education the children of Federal employees, and its solving, should be assisted by providing Federal funds.

This has been an effective program and it has been done without any Federal funding for any this.

In Kansas, we have many school districts which already have planned their budgets on the basis of receiving their full entitlements under this law. In my congressional district, there are approximately 40 school districts which are eligible for impacted area assistance. If the administration's recommendations were adopted, these school districts would lose approximately $3,700,000 in impacted area assistance in the 1967 fiscal year; and 40 school districts would become ineligible for any aid.

We are well aware of the furor which was ignited by the administration's sudden proposal. The superintendent of the Derby, Kansas, public schools has indicated to me that the loss of Public Law 874 funds would cause damage to the educational program there. The ultimate losers in such an economic move would be our schoolchildren, local tax payers who already are overburdened with heavy tax loads would be faced with emergency tax increases.

For example, property owners in Wichita, Kansas, would have another 1/2 mills added to their tax levy. The superintendent of schools in Leavenworth, Kansas, recently wrote to me:

If recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget are followed, and reductions and are made straight across the board to all school districts, Leavenworth school loses $167,000 in Public Law 874 funds. To replace these funds from our local property taxes will require an additional property tax of 7 mills.

Other Kansas cities which would be seriously affected include Kansas City, Manhattan, Salina, Topeka, Olathe, and Junction City—home of Fort Riley where many schoolchildren await the return of their fathers fighting in the far-off Vietnam conflict.

With the growing military commitment of U.S. military forces into the Vietnam conflict, we know that Federal
activities on military installations and defense production facilities will increase steadily. The problems for impacted school districts across the Nation also will increase.

Now out of the blue comes this proposed cutback. The very least the administration could do, in the event it felt that some changes should be made in public assistance programs, is to give adequate advance notice so that a 5-year program could be phased out for those areas which no longer really need it. It is unfair and unwarranted to suddenly place the burden upon local taxpayers to make up cuts ranging from 55 to 65 percent in school budgets.

I am sure the administration expected the action taken by the Appropriations Committee in restoring these funds. If Congress is to be blamed for maintaining such educational programs and honoring our commitments, then let it be said clearly. The intent of Congress in the funding of grants to the States under the Vocational Education Act; endowment of land-grant colleges and universities; and student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

Last year amid enthusiastic public support the President unveiled plans for increased Federal support of programs aimed at the dreaded killers-heart, cancer, and stroke. However, this well-publicized Great Society proclamation has not been followed by budget requests which would permit initiating or accelerating research in these areas.

I supported the committee's action in increasing appropriations for many of the National Institutes of Health including the important artificial kidney program and research aimed at the prevention of kidney disease; the work of the National Cancer Institute which is fighting the Nation's second largest killer; and the National Heart Institute. Cardiovascular diseases continue to claim nearly 1 million American lives each year and more than a third of these deaths are due to coronary heart disease.

I, too, share the concern of many members of the committee over the rate of growth of appropriations for public assistance grants to the States by the Welfare Administration. The bill includes $3.7 billion for such assistance which is over $143 million higher than the current budget.

Despite the many programs which have been promoted because they would cut down on dependency, and the inclusion of more people under social security, we have seen the program grow from $65 million in 1936, the first year in which grants were made, to next year's record $31.7 billion.

Our subcommittee was satisfied that the public assistance programs still did not reach all those persons who now live in poverty, because of restrictive State eligibility requirements and assistance standards. It is estimated that as many people need assistance and are not receiving it as those currently on the rolls. This is alarming particularly during a period of high economic activity and low unemployment, and it seems in order that the Appropriations Committee should proceed with plans to carry out an investigation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the recommendation of the minority members of my committee, not because I am opposed to the appropriations included in this bill. As I have indicated there are many important, worthwhile, and necessary programs within this bill which I have consistently supported.

However, the time has come to declare an end to business as usual and this practice of piecemeal consideration of some very important and costly Federal programs.

Our Nation is involved in a war in Southeast Asia which is filled with many uncertainties. We do not yet know the eventual manpower commitment. We do not have a clear estimate of the costs of fighting that war. We are also faced with an inflation which affects most those we are trying to assist with many of the programs in this bill.

It is time for the administration to face up to the need for setting a realistic set of priorities on nondefense spending programs so that the Congress can act responsibly in the appropriations process. This cannot be done if our committee must bring to the House an incomplete budget requests.

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

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House bill 14745. This is my second year as a member of the Sub-committee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare of the Appropriations Committee. I wish again to acknowledge my good fortune in having the privilege of serving on this committee and participating in the review of the appropriation estimates covering many large and vital programs. I have been particularly impressed, in participating in this appropriation process, with the thoroughness and incisiveness with which agency heads supporting these requests. In these hearings my interests have been particularly directed toward two matters. In the first place, I made a special attempt to assess the evidences of administrative effectiveness and efficiency reflected by the agency use of the funds appropriated in previous years. In the expenditure of funds of the magnitude which this bill provides, I think the Congress must be assured that agencies have sound administrative and fiscal procedures, that they are making maximum use of new methods and systems which will guarantee the most economical use of public funds, and that, indeed, the funds are carefully directed to the accomplishment of the purposes to which they are appropriated.

As is true in any organized set of human activities, there is always room for improvement. However, I have been impressed with the evident concern and effort of the agency heads supporting these appropriation requests for matters of administrative efficiency and effectiveness, and I feel satisfied that there is proper recognition and arrangements to assure the achievement of these ends in the conduct of these programs. I shall continue to direct attention to these matters, both through my activities on the sub-committee and as a personal concern as a member of this House through discussions with the officials and on-the-job visits to the agencies involved.

The area, which has particularly impressed me in the course of the 2 years that I have served with this subcommittee in support of the great opportunities for progress in the solution of health and disease problems which can be made possible by the extension of knowledge about technology, new materials, and methods which are emerging from the physical sciences and engineering, I believe this area of activity has great practical significance for advancing both our research and
and service capability in the field of health and medicine.

During the course of the hearings covering the health programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I made a special effort to inquire into the extent to which advantage is being taken of this new technology in these programs. I am pleased to say that evidence of considerable progress. The range of this activity is considerable. It involves the more familiar aspects of the use of electronic data processing equipment for the solution of major problems in the management of information, both for scientific and administrative purposes. Emerging are prospects for great advance in the maintenance and management of medical and other health records arising out of the conduct of medical care programs. Advance of this capability will be of particular importance when the national medical care program in the state comes into effect in the forthcoming fiscal year. The possible development of regional health computer centers to provide for storage and effective retrieval of medical record information for a large population group will become ever more important as our improving arrangements for hospital and medical data. I note with interest that the report of the President's Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress has the following to say on this point:

Regional health computer centers could provide medical record storage for perhaps 12 to 20 million people, and give hospitals and doctors in the area access to the computer's diagnostic and other capabilities via telephone line connections. Such regional health computer systems could provide regional data processing for automated clinical laboratories, automation of certain aspects of medical diagnosis, storing and rapid recall of individual health records, and collection and evaluation of important medical statistics. They could help provide better care to remote areas of geographic location; reduce unit costs, thereby relieving the economic load on the Nation; provide for a more efficient use of manpower and alleviate the manpower problem that regional medical programs and Medicare will intensify.

The further developments of this concept is a matter to which I will pay particular attention during the forthcoming year.

During recent weeks we have had an impressive demonstration of how new technology can change the entire prospect for the treatment of what heretofore has been considered fatal illness. The remarkable effort of Dr. Michael DeBakey to utilize an artificial mechanism to assist a failing heart is but the beginning of development in this area. Impressive as this event was, it is only demonstrative of the potential that lies ahead and the even greater effort to solve the many problems that use of artificial devices of this kind brings. Members of the House I am sure will be interested in reading in detail in the hearings the inquiry of the committee into the state of the artificial heart development.

A comparable development of great importance is the in the practical use of kidney replacement, the artificial kidney. This device permits individuals with what heretofore would have been fatal kidney disease, to lead an active life through the assistance of mechanisms for hemodialysis. The device presently available, although successful for this purpose, is still cumbersome and costly. The bill before the House will provide additional funds for the further pursuit of the solution of the existing problems surrounding the development of an effective, efficient and economical artificial kidney.

The committee was also conscious that it could not stand by and wait for the total solution to these problems. That effort must be made to make more resources available for the establishment of medical dialysis facilities. Last year the committee added $2 million to this same bill in order to initiate the beginning of a national program for the establishment of medical dialysis facilities. The original budget request submitted to the Congress for this year provided no additional funds for this purpose. The committee was unanimous in its conclusion that this program must be expanded and it added $3 million over the budget request to be used for the establishment of additional kidney dialysis centers. I think the members of the House will agree with me that this is a vital and humanitarian act.

I could go on for some length outlining the areas of promise that emerge from those new concepts and the related technology in their application to the problems of biology and medicine. I am convinced that our committee is serving a vital function in providing particular support for these potentialities. The Members of the House will note that one of the increases included in the bill before it relates to expanding the support for the new Division of Computer Research and Technology at the National Institutes of Health. This new component of the National Institutes of Health was established last year to serve as a focal point for stimulating and developing the application of computer technology and related disciplines—mathematics, statistics, electronic engineering, and systems analysis—to NIH programs. We are all aware that the complex talents and skills required in this area of development are in very high demand. Federal programs suffer badly in competing for outstanding talent in this area. The salary disadvantage which the NIH operates under in attempting to recruit scientists in this area has unfortunately slowed the pace of such programs. You will note in the committee report an expression of the committee's view that every effort should be made to remove arbitrary restrictions which hamper the proper staffing of this important new Division. To continue to encourage the progress that is being made in this area, the committee has increased the budget request for this new Division by $500,000. This increase will help in the automation of laboratory diagnostic tests at the NIH clinical center and facilitate the fascinating work that is being done in simulating and experimenting with complex mathematical models of biological processes and physiological functions.

Beyond the emphasis given to the further development of computer capability at the National Institutes of Health, the committee has been concerned with the overall advance of biotechnology as a field of promise for medicine and health. The committee heard in testimony that the NIH is in the process of developing a management structure for the administration of programs of this kind. Again the limited availability of high quality biologists and engineers is causing many problems in the development of these programs. It seems likely that some central kind of organization at NIH will be necessary to make the most effective use of the limited manpower in this complex area. It also seems likely that the NIH, comparable to what has been done in defense agencies, will have to make use of a non-governmental bioengineering organization to contribute to advancing technology, planning, project development, and review and evaluation of programs in this area. The committee is convinced that this effort towards a better management structure should be vigorously pursued and to enlarge this effort has added $250,000 to the NIH budget for this purpose.

These increases are evidence of the careful assessment of need and opportunity which the committee brought to all aspects of the appropriation requests incorporated in this bill. Although these amendments are small, they represent the difference between maintaining the status quo and the opportunity to make a significant forward step.

Out of these many developments emerges another clear need which I should like to emphasize. The significance of mathematics, physiological sciences, engineering for medical research, for programs of health care and medical service and for the conduct of hospitals and other medical care facilities means that the training of the medical scientists, the physicians and the health practitioners of the future must provide for adequate grounding in these technologies. This must be built into the basic educational program for such personnel. Use of a non-governmental bioengineering organization to contribute to advancing technology, planning, project development, and review and evaluation of programs in this area. The committee is convinced that this effort towards a better management structure should be vigorously pursued and to enlarge this effort has added $250,000 to the NIH budget for this purpose.

These increases are evidence of the careful assessment of need and opportunity which the committee brought to all aspects of the appropriation requests incorporated in this bill. Although these amendments are small, they represent the difference between maintaining the status quo and the opportunity to make a significant forward step.

Out of these many developments emerges another clear need which I should like to emphasize. The significance of mathematics, physiological sciences, engineering for medical research, for programs of health care and medical service and for the conduct of hospitals and other medical care facilities means that the training of the medical scientists, the physicians and the health practitioners of the future must provide for adequate grounding in these technologies. This must be built into the basic educational program for such personnel. Use of a non-governmental bioengineering organization to contribute to advancing technology, planning, project development, and review and evaluation of programs in this area. The committee is convinced that this effort towards a better management structure should be vigorously pursued and to enlarge this effort has added $250,000 to the NIH budget for this purpose.
In this respect, I have been particularly interested in the efforts of the Division of Research Facilities and Resources of the National Institutes of Health to make broad computer and biomedical instrumentation resources available in the medical sciences. As the United States is an industrial society, the medical scientists and physicians being trained therein can gain a sophisticated understanding of this new technology. In the forthcoming year, I am going to make a special effort to inquire into the manner in which our educational base in health and medicine can be enlarged to bring the benefits of these new concepts to the training of our health manpower and thus to the betterment of the health programs of the Nation.

This review, I hope, will convey to the Members of the House the care with which these programs have been reviewed in the appropriation process. The importance of the increases which have been granted, and the indication that the values which flow from these programs. The expenditure of money here is an investment in human life and capability. Our ability to make this investment is a reflection on the growing economic capability of the Nation. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that there is no better area of human activity in which to invest our growing economic advantage.

I wish again to commend the signal efforts of the great chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fazio), and the other members of the subcommittee in reporting this complex and important bill. It has been a matter of great personal pride and pleasure to me, to have worked with them, in the consideration of these appropriation requests. I trust the Congress will continue its generous support of the programs here represented.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I rise in favor of the full appropriations for the federally impacted school districts financial assistance laws, Public Law 784 and Public Law 815, as contained in this bill making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee I voted to restore funds in the full committee meeting last week for these two important education assistance laws. My Second Congressional District in Massachusetts is federally impacted because of the historic Springfield Armory and the famous Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee Falls, headquarter for the 8th Air Force, Strategic Air Command.

Dependents of military personnel and civilians who live on and off these two installations attend the schools in Springfield, Chicopee, Ludlow, Wilbraham, Hampden, Granby, and South Hadley. School administrators in these communities plan their annual school budgets based on the number of dependents attending classes and the amount of impacted area funds to be received under Public Law 784.

I urge that they be extended as they are, and not amended. I am opposed to the recommendations of the administration for reductions in the Public Law 784 contributions to school districts for operating expenses in federally impacted areas. These recommendations are contained in a two-volume report, Public Law 815 and 874 for the U.S. Commissioner of Education who submitted them to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Public Law 815 provides Federal grants for school construction in impacted areas.

Mr. Chairman, my Second Congressional District in Massachusetts is federally impacted because of the historic Springfield Armory and the famous Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee Falls, headquarter for the 8th Air Force, Strategic Air Command.

Dependents of military personnel and civilians who live on and off these two installations attend the schools in Springfield, Ludlow, Wilbraham, Hampden, Granby, and South Hadley.

School administrators in these communities plan their annual school budgets based on the number of dependents attending classes and the amount of impacted area funds to be received under Public Law 784.

I am sure they will continue its generous support of the programs here represented.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I appreciate this opportunity to present my views on the extension of two very important public laws affecting my congressional district, Public Law 784 and Public Law 815. I urge that they be extended as they are, and not amended.

The estimated loss under Public Law 784 funds to the city of Chicopee for the next school year would be near one-half million dollars. The Chicopee School District estimates that it will receive $416,000 in impacted area funds in the 1966-67 school year if the law is not amended. The administration proposal would cut the estimated receipts down to approximately $50,000.

For these reasons, I am vigorously opposed to these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I know that Superintendent John L. Fitzpatrick of the Chicopee School Department wanted to accept this committee's very kind offer to testify on behalf of the Massachusetts and New England school superintendents on this very important legislation. He is recuperating from major surgery and cannot be here today, but he asked me to extend his warm thanks to the committee for the invitation, and his position on these administrative proposals.

Also, he wants to be recorded in opposition to any cutsbacks in the laws. I am including Superintendent Fitzpatrick's letter of opposition to the committee, and ask that it be included in the record.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. BOLAND
Member of Congress.

May 4, 1966
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HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND, Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Gentlemen: I understand that the full membership of the Committee on Appropriations will meet on Thursday, April 28, 1966, to vote on whether the amount recommended to the Senate to finance Public Law 784 for fiscal 1967 will be $38,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, or $416,000, which the Office of Education has estimated it will take to pay 100 percent of the 1967 entitlements.

Were the lesser amount to prevail, there would be a national curtailment of $482,000,000. It is that loose would result as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Estimated impact under Public Law 784</th>
<th>Estimated Public Law 784 entitlements</th>
<th>Estimated impact under proposed amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>181,192,468</td>
<td>82,556,952</td>
<td>$8,177,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d district</td>
<td>1,914,880</td>
<td>878,591</td>
<td>632,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>488,842</td>
<td>19,113</td>
<td>533,729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your support for the higher appropriation, $416 million, is earnestly requested. Will you kindly advise me as to the outcome of the April 28 meeting?

Sincerely,

JOSHD P. BUCKLEY
Assistant Superintendent

April 28, 1966

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

HON. CARL D. PETERS, Chairman, Subcommittee on General Education, House of Representatives

Dear Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate this opportunity to present my views on the extension of two very important public laws affecting my congressional district, Public Law 784 and Public Law 815.

In this respect, I have been particularly interested in the efforts of the Division of Research Facilities and Resources of the National Institutes of Health to make broad computer and biomedical instrumentation resources available in the medical sciences. As the United States is an industrial society, the medical scientists and physicians being trained therein can gain a sophisticated understanding of this new technology. In the forthcoming year, I am going to make a special effort to inquire into the manner in which our educational base in health and medicine can be enlarged to bring the benefits of these new concepts to the training of our health manpower and thus to the betterment of the health programs of the Nation.

This review, I hope, will convey to the Members of the House the care with which these programs have been reviewed in the appropriation process. The importance of the increases which have been granted, and the indication that the values which flow from these programs. The expenditure of money here is an investment in human life and capability. Our ability to make this investment is a reflection on the growing economic capability of the Nation. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that there is no better area of human activity in which to invest our growing economic advantage.

I wish again to commend the signal efforts of the great chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fazio), and the other members of the subcommittee in reporting this complex and important bill. It has been a matter of great personal pride and pleasure to me, to have worked with them, in the consideration of these appropriation requests. I trust the Congress will continue its generous support of the programs here represented.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I rise in favor of the full appropriations for the federally impacted school districts financial assistance laws, Public Law 784 and Public Law 815, as contained in this bill making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee I voted to restore funds in the full committee meeting last week for these two important education assistance laws. My Second Congressional District in Massachusetts is federally impacted because of the historic Springfield Armory and the famous Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee Falls, headquarter for the 8th Air Force, Strategic Air Command.

Dependents of military personnel and civilians who live on and off these two installations attend the schools in Springfield, Chicopee, Ludlow, Wilbraham, Hampden, Granby, and South Hadley. School administrators in these communities plan their annual school budgets based on the number of dependents attending classes and the amount of impacted area funds to be received under Public Law 784.

I am opposed to the recommendations of the administration for reductions in the Public Law 784 contributions to school districts for operating expenses in federally impacted areas. These recommendations are contained in a two-volume report, Public Law 815 and 874 for the U.S. Commissioner of Education who submitted them to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Public Law 815 provides Federal grants for school construction in impacted areas.

Mr. Chairman, my Second Congressional District in Massachusetts is federally impacted because of the historic Springfield Armory and the famous Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee Falls, headquarter for the 8th Air Force, Strategic Air Command.

Dependents of military personnel and civilians who live on and off these two installations attend the schools in Springfield, Chicopee, Ludlow, Wilbraham, Hampden, Granby, and South Hadley.

School administrators in these communities plan their annual school budgets based on the number of dependents attending classes and the amount of impacted area funds to be received under Public Law 784.

I am sure they will continue its generous support of the programs here represented.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I appreciate this opportunity to present my views on the extension of two very important public laws affecting my congressional district, Public Law 784 and Public Law 815. I urge that they be extended as they are, and not amended.

The estimated loss under Public Law 784 funds to the city of Chicopee for the next school year would be near one-half million dollars. The Chicopee School District estimates that it will receive $416,000 in impacted area funds in the 1966-67 school year if the law is not amended. The administration proposal would cut the estimated receipts down to approximately $50,000.

For these reasons, I am vigorously opposed to these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I know that Superintendent John L. Fitzpatrick of the Chicopee School Department wanted to accept this committee's very kind offer to testify on behalf of the Massachusetts and New England school superintendents on this very important legislation. He is recuperating from major surgery and cannot be here today, but he asked me to extend his warm thanks to the committee for the invitation, and his position on these administrative proposals.

Also, he wants to be recorded in opposition to any cutsbacks in the laws. I am including Superintendent Fitzpatrick's letter of opposition to the committee, and ask that it be included in the record.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. BOLAND
Member of Congress.
Mr. Chairman, this bill also carries an appropriation of $3,304,000 for the educational television facilities program. This represents the full amount remaining under the full authorization of $32 million. I understand that there is a carryover of approximately $3.5 million from fiscal year 1966 to 1967. Thus, some $6.8 million will be available in fiscal year 1967 for this program.

Under this program, the Office of Education provides up to 50 percent of the funds necessary to construct educational television stations. The balance can come from private or State and local public funds. The Office of Education does not require competitive bidding for their funds—only a showing as to how the price was arrived at—negotiation, advertising in local paper, and so forth. The Office of Education makes no requirement for standards of transmitter performance. Any transmitter that meets Federal Communications Commission specifications is suitable, for the FCC specifications are the standard of performance.

Mr. Chairman, there is a gross disparity charged by manufacturers for identical transmitters. Time and again, applicants for grants under the educational television program have purchased equipment—particularly transmitters—that could have been procured much cheaper. The less costly equipment is every bit as good and perhaps better. Approval of such applications by the Office of Education seriously impairs the ability to broaden this program to many interested parties that are willing and anxious to establish educational television.

Mr. Chairman, there is a real need for wide advertising to all manufacturers of television transmitters. Townsend Associates is a small but remarkable firm of transmitters in my congressional district. It is practically impossible for manufacturers to publicize their funds, at this time, without some local advertising in local paper, and so forth. The Office of Education makes no requirement for standards of transmitter performance. Any transmitter that meets Federal Communications Commission specifications is suitable, for the FCC specifications are the standard of performance.

Mr. Chairman, there is a gross disparity charged by manufacturers for identical transmitters. Time and again, applicants for grants under the educational television program have purchased equipment—particularly transmitters—that could have been procured much cheaper. Approval of such applications by the Office of Education seriously impairs the ability to broaden this program to many interested parties that are willing and anxious to establish educational television.

Mr. Chairman, there is a real need for wide advertising to all manufacturers of television transmitters. Townsend Associates is a small but remarkable firm of transmitters in my congressional district. It is practically impossible for manufacturers to publicize their funds, at this time, without some local advertising in local paper, and so forth. The Office of Education makes no requirement for standards of transmitter performance. Any transmitter that meets Federal Communications Commission specifications is suitable, for the FCC specifications are the standard of performance.

Mr. Chairman, there is a real need for wide advertising to all manufacturers of television transmitters. Townsend Associates is a small but remarkable firm of transmitters in my congressional district. It is practically impossible for manufacturers to publicize their funds, at this time, without some local advertising in local paper, and so forth. The Office of Education makes no requirement for standards of transmitter performance. Any transmitter that meets Federal Communications Commission specifications is suitable, for the FCC specifications are the standard of performance. It appears that the Office of Education seriously impairs the ability to broaden this program to many interested parties that are willing and anxious to establish educational television.

Mr. Chairman, there is a real need for wide advertising to all manufacturers of television transmitters. Townsend Associates is a small but remarkable firm of transmitters in my congressional district. It is practically impossible for manufacturers to publicize their funds, at this time, without some local advertising in local paper, and so forth. The Office of Education makes no requirement for standards of transmitter performance. Any transmitter that meets Federal Communications Commission specifications is suitable, for the FCC specifications are the standard of performance.

Mr. Chairman, there is a real need for wide advertising to all manufacturers of television transmitters. Townsend Associates is a small but remarkable firm of transmitters in my congressional district. It is practically impossible for manufacturers to publicize their funds, at this time, without some local advertising in local paper, and so forth. The Office of Education makes no requirement for standards of transmitter performance. Any transmitter that meets Federal Communications Commission specifications is suitable, for the FCC specifications are the standard of performance.
program. There is sound justification for this program, and a real need for it.

Members of the committee have reminded that the House has twice approved appropriations for this purpose, only to have the funds disapproved by the other body. Under the circumstances, the committee has understandably elected to avoid Senate action on this matter, before acting again on it.

I hope and trust the request of $3,500,000 requested to initiate a residential vocational school program will be approved in the other body, and feel confident it would be approved in conference once that step had been taken on the other side of the Capitol.

You may be sure, Mr. Chairman, that Oklahoma's delegation will be seeking that approval in the other body at the appropriate time, and our failure to press the point here does not reflect any reduced interest in this important program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, may I, at this time, request the Members of this House to approve the appropriations recommended for the Manpower Administration.

This program—started late in 1962—has proven itself.

It has helped the men and women—because of technological development and the increased use of automation—find their skills, their means of livelihood, obsolete and who were forced, therefore, to join the ranks of the unemployed.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, were it not for the manpower training program, hundreds of thousands of our people would still be on relief with no hope of ever regaining their self-respect nor their ability to again support themselves.

Through this program the inadequately educated can be taught sufficiently to qualify them for important and needed skills of our economy. We have found that, as our national economy increasingly depends upon the employment of highly skilled employees, our displaced workers cannot hope to receive occupational training without first receiving academic training. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act—the trainees is provided with both academic and occupational where necessary.

Last year alone, 100,000 people completed training under this Act.

In my own State of Pennsylvania—we now have over 21,600 in training—we have graduated over 6,000 and of those I am happy to say over 7,000 are again working full time, in newly acquired skills, supporting themselves and their families.

This is just one State, others have equally gratifying records.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to remind the Members of the House that Improving Adult Education through the Manpower Development and Training Act just last spring without a dissenting vote.

The Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, will start public hearings next week on additional amendments for this act, the philosophy for this program will be safeguarded.

It would seem only logical to expect the Members today to vote approval of the appropriations covering the cost of this program since the act and its provisions were so enthusiastically endorsed last year.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14746, being the appropriate bill, the philosophy of which is embodied in the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal year 1967.

On page 10 of the report there is what appears to be a relatively unimportant paragraph under title II of this bill, entitled "Payments to School Districts." Actually it has to do with a most important part of this program. This paragraph points out the bill as reported by the committee includes $446,500,000 or the full amount estimated to be required to pay 185 percent entitlements under the appropriate bill. About everyone knows that the Bureau of the Budget and the President recommended only about $182 million or to state the matter differently the amount in this report is $232,000,000 over the request. There is no reason to try to escape the fact that about $28 million more was appropriated than for fiscal year 1966.

But, Mr. Chairman, the philosophy of aid to impacted areas has been with us for quite a while. The Bureau of the Budget knew of the previous requirements of these school districts that are located near defense installations. In our own congressional district we have a Minuteman missile complex and an airbase as well as one of the most active Army ordnance plants. The need is very clear.

By whatever description, we call it a military struggle or our effort to repel aggression. Let us look at the facts. The existence that surrounding many defense installations are the families of military personnel who have been transferred either to Vietnam or to other installations preparatory to going to Vietnam. The men have left behind their wives and children. Now is no time to economize by withdrawing support of educational facilities for the children of those who have either been transferred to Vietnam or are on their way to fight for their country.

Some of us believe that a reduction in these funds were recommended by those who made the recommendation, knowing there would be a strong effort to restore these moneys. In this regard let me say that the time has come that we are going to cease providing funds for school districts that are federally impacted, then there should be a clear intention of policy announced well in advance in order for jurisdictions to plan for the withdrawal of Federal support for children attending their schools. It seems like almost every year there is a struggle or fight over this appropriation. It should not be necessary. It just should not happen each year, but if the time does ever come that there is to be a change in policy, the effective date should be put far enough in advance so let our schools have a chance to plan for a change rather than remain in a state of uncertainty or perhaps I should say a state of suspension, wondering each year whether or not the appropriation will be made in what amount.

Many of the school districts in our congressional district would find it difficult to carry on without this assistance. Some of our school districts are at the limit of their bonded indebtedness. Others are at the limit of their statutory levy.

Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to any of those who say that the addition of this money breaks the line of the President's budget limitations. If that is the charge, it will have to stand. Those of us who are for the addition of this money for impacted areas will have to be judged on this and our other actions, taking into account there have been and will be ample instances in which true emergencies can be excused by this reduction which might or could impair the educational attainments of the children of our military personnel, and which if not restored would certainly put many school districts in a financial bind.

It was reassuring to observe that the results of the teller count revealed these present on the floor were about 5 to 1 against the amendment to override the veto. Some of us who had hoped for a roll-call vote on this important appropriation bill on the day of its consideration were disappointed. A unanimous-consent request for a roll-call vote on Wednesday May 4, go over until May 5, out of deference for those attending the last rites of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain when a record vote is taken the House will overwhelmingly approve the restoration of the impacted areas money, and pass this bill by a large majority.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14746

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, and
Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, namely: the Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity to exercise its responsibility at one time on the entire Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations "package" for fiscal 1967.

The administrative budget portions of this bill represent at least 70 percent of the total general revenue appropriations that will probably be enacted by this session of the Congress. The bill before us contains $10,509,256,503 for the year ending June 30, 1967. It does not contain an additional appropriation of $4 billion which has been requested for programs already in operation and which will be acted upon by this committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

The balance-of-payments problem continues to deteriorate. The value of the dollar continues to decline.

The average wage-earner in this country—the low and middle incomes which have watched his real wages dwindle, in many cases, even in the face of wage increases.

Why? What cover is provided by social security making $6,500 or more a year are taxed on the order of $100 more than they were last year. Graduated withholding rates which went into effect next week will reduce take-home pay even more.

An inflationary rate of 2 to 5 percent will more than offset the increase in wages which those laborers who adhere to the President's 2 1/2-percent wage-price guideline will realize. And the talk of still another across-the-board tax increase in the air.

The underpayment of payroll taxes does not any further increase in hidden or overt taxes at this time. The lower income groups in our society are already too much overburdened. Prudent Government fiscal policies—for example, a reduction in nonessential domestic spending—are a better, more equitable and far more just method of restraint than about restraint in an overheating economy.

With prospects of an increase—not a decrease—defense costs in the future, necessity dictates that the Federal Government face up to the hard choices that lie ahead.

The Federal Government must face up to the need of setting a realistic set of priorities of nondefense spending programs so that the Congress, in its wisdom, can reduce dollar amounts in some instances and defer programs in other instances in order to bring the national security costs under control. This cannot be done if this committee and the Congress consider budget items for these defense programs on a piecemeal basis.

Administration spokesmen, Secretary of Defense McNamara among them, have indicated that the war in Vietnam could continue for several years at the present or an even higher level. We all hope this is not so. But, if it proves to be true, the inflationary pressures we are experiencing today will intensify at a rapid rate unless adequate measures are taken now by this administration.

The amounts do not include a continuation of "business as usual" here at home. They cannot encompass the steady growth of all new, as well as entrenched, inflationary pressures which continue to wage their way into our economic life.

The fiscal 1967 budget is an expansionary budget which, if not reevaluated, will feed the fires of inflation.

All indications are that the 1967 experience will probably approximate the experience of fiscal 1966 where, in the original budget submission, the financing needs of the increased activities in Vietnam were not taken into consideration.

The imprudence and risk of attempting to give national security costs second place in the Federal budgeting process is indeed too evident at this time. Reports are becoming all too frequent from Committees of Congress and in the Nation's press about the alarming diminishing readiness of this country to meet contingencies other than Vietnam should they arise in Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The Congress of the United States is charged with the primary responsibility of determining how large our economy can stand. But this the Congress, even were it willing, cannot do until the Committee in C tether person, can present a realistic estimate of what the total national security costs for fiscal year 1967 will be.

The balance-of-payments problem continues to deteriorate. The value of the dollar continues to decline.
place in Federal budgetary considerations has in fact led to inflationary pressures and an unknown economic climate.

The original fiscal 1966 budget request in the defense area was underestimated by more than $15 billion. The defense budget is that before this Congress for fiscal 1967 is underestimated.

The administration sought and was successful in obtaining funding for domestic programs for fiscal 1966 before the true bill for national security was presented to the Congress in the form of a supplemental. It apparently is attempting to repeat that performance for the fiscal 1967 budget.

In the Congress is to discharge its responsibility in this 2d session of the 89th Congress, it cannot proceed with “business as usual” on the domestic front at least until it demands and obtains a realistic assessment from the executive of what additional appropriations will be needed for fiscal 1967 in the area of national security.

Accordingly, we, the undersigned, strongly urge that the Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Bill, 1967, be recommitted to committee until such time as a realistic assessment of national security needs is presented to the Congress and until the additional programs for these departments totaling some $4 billion can be reviewed on one basis by this committee.

We, the undersigned, comprising all minority members of the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, unanimously subscribe to these additional views.

MELVIN R. LABS, Member of Congress.
ROBERT H. MICHELS, Member of Congress.
CAROL B. SHARER, Member of Congress.
FRANK T. BOW, Member of Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-three 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. 86]

Andrews, George W.
Barlow, Knowlton
Beckwith, William
Belling, Sam
Bolger, Raymond
Branch, Opal
Broome, Robert
Burleson, A. F.
Cederberg, Clevenger
Collamer, James
Cook, William
Curtis, George
Dinges, John
Dowdy, William
Fallon, James
Farr, Frank
Fehrman, John
Ferguson, John
Ford, Wm. H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the motion of the Chair, reported that a motion to discharge the Committee from further consideration of the bill H.R. 14745, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 399 Members responded to their names, a quorum,

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at the point before the amendment of Mr. LAIRD was offered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 17, line 16, strike out "$416,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$189,400,000".

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this is the first amendment that appears in the bill. It has to do with the largest increase over and above the President's budget request, which was included by the President in his authorization of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the full funding for the impacted aid program was not included by our subcommittee. However, when the full committee on Appropriations these funds were added to this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the 1966 supplemental, which goes to conference tomorrow, I hope that when the conferees, the full funding for the impacted aid program has been included—this full funding—for 1966 to the extent of some $41 million over and above the President's budget, was included on a motion which I made to that supplemental request, and I put that money in the supplemental bill, because in the school year of 1965-66 these schools are already operating on a budget and were assured by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and were assured by the Congress and assured by the President that in the school year of 1966-67 they would receive 100 percent of entitlement. Because that contract was made with the Federal Government, I felt it was only just and fair to include the full funding for the 1965-66 school year.

Now the question is somewhat different here for 1967. I support the President as far as 1967 is concerned and I hope the House of Representatives will support the President of the United States on this item. Why? This impacted aid program needs to be gone over very carefully and thoroughly by a committee of the Congress. One-third of the money that is being used in this program is going in areas that do not deserve additional aid as far as schools are concerned.

Let me give you an example of the county in which I live while I am attending the sessions of the Congress. Let me tell you about my next-door neighbor who happens to be a dentist. He works in the District of Hamilton. He pays the same real estate and income taxes as my next-door neighbor happens to work for the Federal Government—on the other side. Because he works for the Federal Government, a supplement is paid to the schools for his children. Yet
he pays the same real estate tax, and the same income tax.

The major portion of this money is going into these particular types of areas. I think the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations had a perfect statement in which he released after the committee meeting where he said that the Congress was running roughshod over the President of the United States. The chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations had a perfect statement and he said that the Congress was on a wild spending spree and that somehow or other we had lost our control because they were forcing a tax increase on that day just as good advice today as it was on Thursday in his press conference. The advice which was given on that day is just as good today.

The statement reads:

**CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON THE PRESIDENT’S 1967 BUDGET**

(Statement of George Mahon, of Texas, Apr. 23, 1966

I deeply regret it was not possible to hold the line on the President’s overall budget requests in the Labor-HRW appropriation bill reported to the House today. Of course, it is sometimes necessary to exceed individual budget estimates but generally the bills are below the overall budget total.

In fact, the ultimate expenditure effect on the Treasury, the increases made in the bill today will not be as great as appears on the surface. The $152.8 million for defense education direct loans to students was added only because of an amendment on Finance and Labor does not plan to report the administration bill that would have converted this loan process into an issuance of Federal guarantees of privately financed loans. The risks of the Government would be similar under both methods but, of course, under the direct financing method, the initial appropriation for these amendments in the overall best interests of the people.

Nevertheless, overall, the bill as reported is $490 million above the President’s budget requests.

The question of a tax increase is a tough one, and the Congress will face a Federal problem involved—if there is no income tax being paid and if there is no personal property tax and no real property tax being paid, a legitimate case can be made for supplemental aid. But I believe we should respect the request of the President of the United States that this program be made for this supplemental aid. But the Congress is overrunning the President’s budget for fiscal 1967 by upwards of $600 million with indications that the total may go even higher. This, to my thinking, is that sort of thing that should cause all Members of Congress to stop, look, and listen.

We ought not to have the urge to add or the urge to resist increases. We ought to take a harder line and a firmer position on spending in order to help dampen the flames of inflation and lessen the need for a tax increase. Inflation can do far greater damage to the people’s welfare than any of these enlarged programs could possibly do in the way of good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LAIRD. We could go on offering these amendments one after the other. But we are not going to hold the minoritiy—I realize we are outnumbered 2 to 1 on the bill in the overall best interests of the people. The $152.8 million for defense education direct loans to students was added only because of an amendment on Finance and Labor does not plan to report the administration bill that would have converted this loan process into an issuance of Federal guarantees of privately financed loans. The risks of the Government would be similar under both methods but, of course, under the direct financing method, the initial appropriation for these amendments is $490 million above the President’s budget on this amendment—although none of the White House aids are down here working very hard on it here today—and we evidently have the support of the President of the United States on this amendment—although none of the White House aids are down here working very hard on it here today—I have not seen many of them in the corridors. They have been more concerned about adding to the Teachers Corps than reducing the add-ons. But if we do well on this one and we evidently have the support of the President of the United States in this amendment—although none of the White House aids are down here working very hard on it here today—I have not seen many of them in the corridors. They have been more concerned about adding to the Teachers Corps than reducing the add-ons.

If the gentleman from Wisconsin disagrees with this, I would like to ask him to say so. If the gentleman from Wisconsin disagrees with this, I would like to ask him to say so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LAIRD. I could go on offering these amendments one after the other. But we are not going to hold the minoritiy—I realize we are outnumbered 2 to 1 on the bill in the overall best interests of the people. The $152.8 million for defense education direct loans to students was added only because of an amendment on Finance and Labor does not plan to report the administration bill that would have converted this loan process into an issuance of Federal guarantees of privately financed loans. The risks of the Government would be similar under both methods but, of course, under the direct financing method, the initial appropriation for these amendments is $490 million above the President’s budget on this amendment—although none of the White House aids are down here working very hard on it here today—and we evidently have the support of the President of the United States on this amendment—although none of the White House aids are down here working very hard on it here today—I have not seen many of them in the corridors. They have been more concerned about adding to the Teachers Corps than reducing the add-ons. But if we do well on this one and we evidently have the support of the President of the United States in this amendment—although none of the White House aids are down here working very hard on it here today—I have not seen many of them in the corridors. They have been more concerned about adding to the Teachers Corps than reducing the add-ons.

If the gentleman from Wisconsin disagrees with this, I would like to ask him to say so. If the gentleman from Wisconsin disagrees with this, I would like to ask him to say so.
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outline of the various amendments I think the gentleman should understand what we are doing here. This is the largest of the add-ons. This was not added on in the subcommittee. I am a member of the subcommittee, our subcommittee brought this bill to the full committee without this $322 million add-on.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would ask the gentleman what, in relation to the proposed 5-percent across-the-board cut, he would want and expect the Executive to do?

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman from Ohio will be offering an amendment relating to that subject. I will debate that amendment at the time it is offered. I do not believe you should confuse the 5-percent amendment with this impacted aid program in which the President has asked for certain reductions. The President of the United States has asked for those reductions.

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition of the amendment to cut $332,609,000 from the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for aid to federally impacted school districts.

I believe that the proposed cutback in this field would seriously hamper the education of thousands of youngsters throughout the country.

The First District of New Hampshire, which I represent, would lose over $1 million if the cutback is made effective. We have, in my district, many communities dependent upon this aid to educate those students whose parents are employed at nearby Federal installations or whose parents are members of the Armed Forces assigned to New Hampshire bases.

Nearly all of the more than $2 million allocated to New Hampshire in fiscal year 1967 will aid school districts and students in my district. Although $2 million is but a small figure when compared to the $332,609,000 asked for in the Appropriations Committee, it is a great amount for the small cities and towns in New Hampshire.

The city of Portsmouth, which encompasses both the famed Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and the Strategic Air Command at Pease Air Force Base, has a population of only 26,000. This particular area receives over $1 million each year under the impacted aid program. Because of this aid, the city of Portsmouth was able to construct a modern and completely equipped senior high school to accommodate the great influx of students from both military establishments—the results of which benefit all the students in the area.

This situation also exists in many other communities in the New Hampshire seacoast region. A serious cutback in Federal impacted aid to education would have those poor communities “holding the bag” and the only recourse would be to raise the already increasing taxes on property.

The Federal impacted aid program has been of benefit to my district, but throughout the country. When such a program is going well and accepted as a positive move to better education, it seems ill advised to reduce or stop it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot urge this legislative body too much to defeat the committee’s amendment and restore these funds. In the long run, it will benefit the complete system of education and substantially improve the country as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island seek recognition?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes being reserved for the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this section of the bill which I expect to offer in case the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin fails. Under this request of limitation, will I be precluded from offering the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the unanimous-consent request is limited to this amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would have no objection to the 20-minute time limitation, but I believe the questions should be divided.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I see just four Members on their feet.

Mr. LAIRD. I would have no objection to the 20-minute time limit, but the other request is out of order.

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, what is the unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. That debate be limited to 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes being reserved to the committee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I object to that, because that is not a legitimate unanimous-consent request.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 20 minutes.

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

There is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Mahon).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thought that each Member would have more than 2½ minutes, because the gentleman from Rhode Island had said only four Members were standing. It seems very possible to stand here and discuss this matter in only 2½ minutes, but I shall say a word and renew my statement at a later time.

I think we must have an impacted aid program. I do not think the present program is fully satisfactory. I think it should be revised. I think now, as I thought in the committee, that we ought to postpone appropriating action on this program until the legislative committee acts on the matter.

If the House votes for this amendment, and the legislative committee perfects the basic legislation, perhaps we will get an impacted aid program that is much improved. This is my general feeling on it.

I hope the amendment will be supported, not because I am against the impacted aid program, but because I am firmly opposed to the iniquities of the present program on which everyone in this House, as far as [I know], agrees.

With respect to Government spending generally, I think that we must be more cost conscious. We must not, in the House, ask the question: Does the program cost money? And, if it does, then embrace it.

I think we need to try to hold the line in spending. I would like to think that the people want to hold the line. I was surprised that, in the Appropriations Committee, certain amendments to the bill were to hold the line in areas which are not as politically important as impacted aid.

Certainly, the President’s budget, in most cases, is high enough.

I speak in a very nonpartisan way. But I speak as an American. I speak as a citizen. I speak as a man who represents a district, as a man who believes this country is going too far too fast in some Federal programs, spending too much money, and tending to sometimes overlook the war in Vietnam.

Are we giving the war in Vietnam the high priority that it really should have? Are we unmindful of the fact that it will cost many billions which have not yet been requested? This is an appropriate time to ponder these grave questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michael).

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as Members of this House know, I have been concerned with the education field, particularly at the primary and secondary level, but one program which I supported in the first instance has been aid to federally impacted areas, at a time when there was no school district whatever in my district which qualified for that aid. I believed there was a legitimate need under the originally conceived doctrine of payments in lieu of taxes to those heavily impacted areas where there were defense installations.

As I have seen this program grow through the years, and particularly what has happened in the area surrounding Washington, D.C., which gets practically one-third of the total appropriation, simply because people work for the Federal Government, I am inclined to agree with the President that this program needs drastic revision. Therefore, I supported the budget figure in committee and support this amendment wholeheartedly. I believe it is a good amendment, offered in good faith.
I shall be glad to yield any remaining time to the chairman of my committee, if he wishes additional time to make a point or two. If not, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Asby].

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

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not believe anyone would accuse me of being spendthrift, so far as my record in the Congress is concerned, but ever since I have been here I have supported the theory of payments to impacted areas. I feel this is a debt and an obligation of the Federal Government. The impacted areas are caused by Government installations. That condition is brought on by the Government, and I feel it is up to the Federal Government to live up to its obligations and duties.

This is an important matter. I agree with our chairman. We should hold the line. I believe my record shows that I am favoring a line of a lot of these giveaway, spendthrift, welfare programs. However, when it comes to meeting the Government obligation in these impacted areas in educating our children, that is a different matter.

I hasten to say that I am not an advocate of Federal aid to education generally, but with respect to vocational education and impacted areas in particular, this legislation, and I hope the amendment will be defeated. The place to cut expenditures is on these giveaway, welfare programs, both domestic and foreign.

The budget abounds with new spending proposals and increases in some older ones in the field of welfare. The budget can be cut and should be, but the place to reduce is in areas where the Federal Government has not assumed a responsibility or where the value of the programs is in question. No one can question the obligation of the Federal Government when it has already increased the demands on a local school system through the influx of additional students. I have always supported this principle and feel that the Federal Government should not renounce on its responsibility.

By the same token, the vocational education program has been tried and tested for years. It is known to people all over the country for its valuable contribution to the field of education and to young people in areas of agricultural education, industrial arts, distributive education, and other fields. Many young people still are unable to go to college and the value of this program is that it trains them in skills which they can use as soon as they leave school. These skills are among those most needed in our national economy. It is this program which is continued to keep pace with the growing needs. A serious deficiency will exist in our education program.

It has been demonstrated that the vocational education program is well run. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the State and local school systems, has exercised no unwanted degree of Federal control or interference. For this reason, I believe it is in the best interest of the Nation, and the children of the Nation, that this program be preserved. I urge the House to approve the committee’s recommendations in these two instances.

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

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. I rise in opposition to the amendment. My colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Powers Hardy, I, and I represent districts in Virginia which are heavily impacted with governmental installations and military commands.

There may be, as some have alleged here today, areas in this country which receive impacted aid money when they are not entitled to it. I assure you Mr. Chairman that such is not the case in the Tidewater area of Virginia. The money which these districts receive is desperately needed if good education is to be available for an expanding population, and which is not connected with federal installations, through the United States which have already been prepared and if this expected promised aid is not received, education in this country will suffer a severe and unnecessary setback. I urge my colleagues to vote against this proposed crippling amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Let me commend the gentleman for his remarks. I join him in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most equitable and meritorious programs of Federal financial assistance. It is fully justified by the facts and nearly every Member of this body has heard me express this position in times past.

Mr. Chairman we should soundly defeat this amendment.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I share the sentiments expressed by my Virginia colleagues. This is a Federal responsibility. Uncle Sam has imposed upon the taxpayers of local areas where Federal installations are located a critical burden. Children of employees of such installations are in school in local schools. Yet, Uncle Sam pays no local real estate taxes or other local taxes for local school support, and when the Federal employees live on the Federal installation, they pay no local taxes for local schools.

Moneys paid by Uncle Sam to local schools are simply payments in lieu of taxes. To the extent that Uncle Sam is benefiting from local schools, Uncle Sam should be willing to pay.

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

By unanimous consent, Mr. Asby yielded his remaining time to Mr. Fogarty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I believe I made the points needed on this amendment earlier today.

I should like to yield at this time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Manz].

As the gentleman from Texas said, this effort to modify and to bring up to date the impact aid legislation has been a bipartisan effort so far as the White House is concerned. Former President Eisenhower urged certain changes in the legislation. Former President Kennedy did the same. President Johnson, both in his legislative recommendations and in his appropriation requests, has sought to bring about a change in the law so that there will be adequate support for those schools outside the Washington area which were hitherto supported in a bona fide and legitimate way under the original intent of the law.

I believe it is recognized by the various administrations, both Democrat and Republican, and by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, that the law today has given too much money in too many instances to some areas which for all intents and purposes do not qualify if we go back to the original intent of the law.

I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I believe we ought to cut back the appropriation in order to bring about those necessary amendments in the basic law, so that we can all support the legislation in a modified and to date way.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we had a commitment for the fiscal year 1966 which covers the school year that is just closing. We have no similar commitment for the school year 1967. The way to get a proper revision of this program is to adopt this amendment.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynn] for 2½ minutes.

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. I hope the amendment will be soundly defeated.

I support the action of the Committee on Appropriations in restoring the funds which the Bureau of the Budget proposed to delete and which the pending amendment would reduce. I feel that is the right thing to do if we are to keep faith and keep faith with the school boards in school districts throughout the United States which have already prepared their budgets and have begun to make their arrangements for the operation of schools during the school year 1966–67, in anticipation of this program being continued.
The funds which will be provided in this appropriation bill if the Laird amendment is defeated will be utilized to aid materially in the funding of the school operations for the school year 1966-67. The proposal it affeeted by Public Law 874. It would be bad faith to withdraw these funds at this time. This program is sound and it has been tested and proved to be necessary for many more than 15 years. It must be funded for the fiscal year 1997.

I am glad to yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time. I want to compliment you on your position, I support you and the members of the committee. I would like to see this amendment defeated.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Georgia and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me. I wish to say that I am in full accord with his cogent and cogently expressed remarks, and that I join with him in urging the defeat of this amendment from across the aisle. I commend him and desire to associate myself with his remarks.

Let me go. The difficulties which Mr. Chairman, with examples of what the proposed reduction in Public Law 874 support would mean to school districts in the Sixth Congressional District of Washington, which I am privileged to represent in Congress. Note that I said "would mean," not "could mean." It would happen automatically, because the 874 reduction would come long after school district budgets have been drawn up—the time for budgeting is set by State law—so that all other sources of revenue for the 1966-67 academic year are fixed and must be budgeted in the way for the district to adjust except by cutting staff and salaries.

Clover Park School District absorbs a great many children of people assigned to Fort Lewis, McChord Air Force Base, and Madigan Army Hospital. Its enrollment has more than quadrupled in the past 15 years. Of its 13,500 pupils, 61.29 percent are "impact" youngsters. Because of the presence of nonexempting federal installations within the boundaries of the school district, Clover Park's valuation per pupil is $3,426, compared with the Washington State average of $6,119. Clover Park must compete on staff salaries with a district near the top of the statewide list in per-pupil valuation; to really compete, it would be necessary for Clover Park to vote 9%, or the extra millage levied in the other district, if 874 funds were to be cut as proposed.

On a very specific basis, the proposed 874 reduction would mean that this school district would have to fire 40 teachers. And this in a district which needs more teachers than most, because the impact pupils bring extra problems. Because of the movement of military personnel, the district can count on a pupil turnover of 25 percent per year. In the 1964-65 school year, 5,960 pupils attended Clover Park, which is the full term, and 2,909 left and a like number replaced them. This, remember, is in a school district whose total enrollment is 13,500.

Added to this is the fact that such heavily impacted areas can be educationally depressed areas; the culprit is not poverty, as in most cases, but transition—and, the transitional difficulties because of an abnormally large percentage of non-English-speaking pupils in the lower grades.

As another example let me cite the school district that serves most of the second largest city in the congressional district which I represent. That is Bremerton, a real "navy town." It is the home of Naval Shipyards, and consequently of nearly 10,600 civil service breadwinners employed in the shipyard—and of a fluctuating number of the naval officer and enlisted families.

This condition brings about a situation similar to that of Clover Park district, as I outlined a moment ago. Of the pupils enrolled in this district, 58.4 percent are impact pupils during the current school year. I will not go through Bremerton's problems item by item, for they are identical in form and hope to limit them just say that the proposed reduction in Public Law 874 is equivalent, in Bremerton, to more than the budgeted capital outlay, or one-half of the maintenance budget, or almost as much as the administrative budget, or a little more than budgeted for transportation and health services. These can hardly be wiped out, or halved as the case may be. What it most likely would mean is the loss of 16 teachers.

What it most certainly would mean, no matter how the problem is solved here, would be that Bremerton could no longer maintain an educational program to attract good teachers, nor train students to compete in the rapidly changing areas in educational work.

In short, Bremerton could not offer an adequate education for the children there, so many of whom are sons and daughters of military personnel who would, I should think, receive at least equal consideration with other Americans in this time of crisis when so much is demanded of military people.

Just to the south of Bremerton, and serving the same military installation, is South Kitsap School District. The reduction would cost this smaller school district eight teachers, $15,000 worth of books, $5,000 worth of instructional equipment, and some operational staff.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the cost of 1 year without 874 funds in these 3 districts, and what about many other school districts in the congressional district which I am proud to represent, nor to other districts from coast to coast. These three school districts, it must be admitted, are operating on special mill levies which must be voted upon year after year merely for operational purposes. To this already precarious method of financing basic education the additional mill levies which would be necessary if 874 were reduced and you get a very gloomy picture of the education we would be able to offer our children. Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, that these are children of parents who are making sacrifices for the country in military services—children who in many cases already are educationally disadvantaged by reason of frequent moves and frequent changes in educational exposure because of these moves.

I most earnestly hope that my colleagues will not put these and so many other children like them at a further disadvantage, and will vote to reject this amendment from the other side of the aisle.

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

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

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

Mr. MILLER. I, too, want to join the gentleman and thank him for the statement he is making. I support the position he has taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) for 2 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in opposition to this amendment, also. Basically I agree with the contention of my colleagues who offered this amendment, that the impact aid program needs drastic revision. However, it is also true that there are some districts—and, of course, the one I represent in Florida, which includes Cape Kennedy—which do have compelling and legitimate arguments in favor of this program. Presently there are over 51 percent of the students in this county school system in Brevard County that are federally connected. To cut this bill as proposed by the administration, in this particular county would reduce their participation by something like 80 percent and actually create chaos in the school system. This program could stand revision, but a revision that is approached on the shotgun basis proposed here that would vitally hurt the school districts in the country that are legitimately receiving the aid. I do not think is the proper way to do it.

I urge the House to vote down this amendment to cut impacted area school funds.

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

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Is it not true, however, that while budgets in some school areas were set up on the basis of receiving impacted area funds, as a result of the Primary and Secondary School Act many of these areas are receiving funds through this other program in excess of what they were receiving as impacted area funds that they did not anticipate in their budget? And, therefore, in many instances such funds are actually
replacing funds which heretofore were sent into those school districts as im-
pacted funds. The impact of this type of amend-
ment would be considerable more than the effects of edu-
cating those children, paying it from State revenues, because the im-
Pacted area funds which we receive do not operate as much as the tax
base removal.

While I agree that there are inequities contained in this program, we cannot
take a meat-ax approach to the prob-
lem. This type of amendment is crucial to our people.

Mr. Chairman, we hear about the war in Viet
We are providing these funds
students as a result of the war in Viet-
am. We have 450 new students this
year because of the war in Vietnam. And,
and we are expecting to educate those chil-
dren with the 75 percent cut, which is
being advocated by these people who are
saying "cut these funds out of here.

So, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the
Committee on Education and Labor, a
committee that is working on this now
and is studying this subject now. I can
to the Members of the Committee
that we are finding some inequities, but
this meat-ax cut approach is not the
way to cure them.

Mr. Chairman, the way to cure these
inequities is to straighten out the pro-
gram.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in
support of sustaining the current level of Federal assistance to federally im-
pacted school districts. These funds are
vital to many school districts in South
Dakota.

Under the present makeup of the pro-
gram, South Dakota receives more than
$3.1 million annually in payments to its
local districts. It is only fair that these
districts receive assistance for educating
the children of Federal employees be-
causo these payments in lieu of taxes on federally
owned land which is exempt from local taxation.

In my congressional district, the Dou-
glas Independent School District is one of
the finest examples of educational
quality and progress which has been
achieved largely through an excellent
use of Federal aid to districts where most
of the children’s parents live and work
on Federal property. Without the aid,
the Douglas School District would col-
lapse financially.

The superintendent of the Douglas
school system, Mr. Robert R. Speltes, has
spent countless hours planning for the
coming fiscal year as well as document-
ing the actual effect in dollars and cents
that the proposed change would have on
the Douglas school system. This school
district educates the children of parents
who serve at Ellsworth Air Force Base.

The district collects from taxes $57,399
per year and from this program it re-
cieves $1,110,074. This district could
operate just about 2 days on its tax
money.

The staff of the Education Subcom-
mittee has published a committee print
with a statistical table, showing the ef-
fects of reductions on each of the par-
ticipating school districts in each of the
50 States. Even a casual glance at this
report shows conclusively that every
school district will be adversely affected
by the proposed cut; some districts might
lose up to 25 percent of their current
funds under the program.

In South Dakota, for example, the cur-
rent level of assistance of $3.1 million
will be reduced to $1 million.

In many cases the school board and
the superintendent of schools have been
making their plans for the coming year.
In many cases, they have hired their
teachers, they have set up an intensified
effort to try to improve the quality in the
various school districts. Out of the blue
comes this threat to cut off funds which
have already been taken into account
when the budgets were prepared, the
teachers hired, and the decision made
to try to upgrade the quality of the
schools.

It is an incredibly difficult situation
when the school board and the school
superintendent should not be required to
encounter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recog-
nizes the gentleman from Rhode Island
(Mr. FOGARTY) for 3 1/2 minutes.

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
mark.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I
hope that this amendment will be sound-
yly defeated.

Mr. Chairman, since 1960 when this
bill was first passed, we have had at
least 10 record votes in the House of Repre-
sentatives to cut back or to amend
this act. On every single occasion the
attempts to cut back the program were
soundly defeated by a record vote of the
membership of this House on both sides
of the aisle.

The example given by the gentleman
from Rhode Island is absolutely correct. In
district after district in this country, you
are going to shut down schools and you
are going to create chaos in the budgets
of school districts in some 350 congres-
sional districts that are represented
in this impacted area program. This will
be at a time when we are trying more than
ever before to give kids in our coun-
try a decent education.

Our Elementary and Secondary Edu-
cation Act was passed last year even
though the programs under Public Law
815 and Public Law 914 were authorized
for another year. We in this House of
Representatives by an overwhelming
vote only last year voted to extend this
act for 2 more years—1967 and 1968.

If we do not put this money in the bill
today as our committee has recom-
manded, we will be breaking our word
and we will be reneging on our promise
to every school district affected by this
legislation. Let us make no mistake
about that.

This motion lost in our subcommittee
by a 3 to 2 vote, but all of the members of
the subcommittee on the democratic side
who listened to all the testimony voted
solidly to put this $233 million in the bill
in the subcommittee but it was voted
down on a tie vote.

We took it up only last Thursday morn-
ing in the full committee. We carried it
in the full committee by a vote of 30 to
12. I think that indicates what the
majority in the House of Repre-
sentatives is thinking at this time. Even
now the Committee on Education and Labor
is considering extending this act. Do
you think they are going to adopt any of
the amendments sent by the
President? You know what they are go-
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the three categories which are set forth for the purposes of the limitations on an appropriation bill and are proper in its context. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here today by Members who feel that this program should not be, and that there are some inequities in it that ought to be corrected. What I seek to do by this amendment is to correct some of those inequities.

The amendment would not scuttle the program. It would merely bring the program down to where it will be examined. I am advised that the amendment which I am offering is very much in line with the administration's desire as to how the new legislation should be written.

Under existing law payments are made on the following basis:

First. Where parents both live and work on Federal property, payments are made for all federally connected children in excess of 6 percent of total children in average daily attendance.

Item 1 of the amendment would limit payments for federally connected children to an average of 6 percent of total children in average daily attendance. In other words, if federally connected children constituted less than 3 percent, no payment would be made. If they constituted 3 percent, then payments would be made only on behalf of 2 percent.

Second. Where parents work on or live on Federal property—but not both—payments are made for all federally connected children if they constitute 6 percent of total children in average daily attendance.

Item 2 of the amendment would limit payments for federally connected children in excess of 6 percent of total children in average daily attendance. If federally connected children constituted less than 6 percent, no payment would be made. If they constituted more than 6 percent, then payments would be made only for those in excess of 6 percent.

This is not a scuttling amendment; it is a corrective amendment. It is a limitation on the present legislation in operation until the Committee on Education and Labor corrects the inequities now existing in the program. Every day we hear people say that the Impacted Aid Act is wrong but we must have it because of impacts. I agree. I think the purpose of impacted aid is correct. I think we have got to take care of federally impacted areas. But we ought to begin now to correct the inequities. This is a time when we can attempt to put some corrective language in the bill in order to give the Committee on Education and Labor an opportunity to bring out a new bill so that we can debate all the inequities that we have seen.

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the gentleman from Ohio give us an illustration of a base or an installation that would be affected? As the gentleman knows, I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the basic law ought to be changed, and I believe what he is doing is right.

Can the gentleman identify an installation?

Mr. BOW. I cannot take any individual installation and explain it to the gentleman, except to say that in all these areas where they go above these amounts there would be a reduction. It would eliminate some of those which are not true impacted areas at this time.

I might say in some of the discussions we have had here about the inequities of this aid, the gentleman is here ready to look after me, as I have done in the past on these bills, my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Brophy).

Let us take taxi drivers at the National Airport who are working for ATA. They drive a taxi cab out of the airport. Their children are federally impacted simply because they are driving taxicabs out of the airport. They do not work for the Federal Government. The ordinary taxi driver in the city does not have federally impacted children. You can go down the list of those who are not Federal employees but are federally impacted; there are many of them. There are many such persons we could reach with this amendment and bring this aid into line with truly impacted situations.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that this amendment would take something away from every impacted area?

Mr. BOW. Yes. That is right.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I have a district which has many which are totally impacted.

Mr. BOW. What percentage of the attendance are impacted?

Mr. HAGEN of California. Total? One hundred percent? Then you would get 97 percent. You are going to object to getting 97 percent?

Mr. HAGEN of California. They have a problem now. In the State of California they could not amend and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BOW. Under this, you would still be able to get 97 instead of the full 100 percent. It is not as drastic as taking away all the money. The point I am making is that we are trying to correct some of the more glaring inequities now existing in the program.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in the name of the majority. We are revising the basic law, although it may be parliamentary correct, I would hope we could detect precisely what it is that he is proposing to do. As I understood it, he would want to and eliminate that for those districts qualifying.

Mr. BOW. Yes. Those with 3 percent or less would get nothing.
Mr. CORMAN. And for any one over 3 percent, we would deduct the 3 percent?

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. CORMAN. Even in China Lake 3 percent from 100 percent leaves only 97 percent. I take it also this amendment would get us back to the 6-percent requirement for the large school districts; is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. CORMAN. It is on that point that I wish to address myself, because I would suggest we have been unfair to the large school districts in this Nation for all the time we have had this impacted program. We worked for a long time to try to correct that inequity. In the school district in Los Angeles, where we have had for a number of years about 5 percent of the students qualifying under the impacted aid program, we have never received one dime because the formula required 6 percent.

What that means, is that the people in Los Angeles apparently lost approximately $3 million a year that they would have collected if the Federal Government had not held title to almost all of the defense installations in that county.

For example, on a simple amendment in an appropriation bill that it took us years to accomplish through the legislative committees of this Congress would be a real disservice to the people in the large metropolitan areas. We have waited long and patiently for the House to correct that inequity of the 6-percent requirement for large districts.

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

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with my colleague in that observation. This is a vast and complex and technical field of support of education. The very distinguished Subcommittee on General Education had this matter under its jurisdiction and study for several years. We are currently engaged in an exhaustive study of the effects of these provisions on individual school districts.

To run in here now with a quick amendment of this kind, to do an across-the-board cutting into these school districts, is like running a patient into the anteroom for surgery, without preparation or even diagnosis. In fact, I might say this amendment would be passed with anesthesia.

This whole field of impacted aid is before our committee right now. The early signs indicate the adjustments we are contemplating would probably require a lot more money, not a lot less money. I hope that the gentleman's point will be well taken by the House. We have worked long and hard to get deserving school districts under this bill. It will become a member of the Appropriations Committee now to seek to do away with long years of preparation in the authorizing committee by an amendment at this time.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. HAGEN of California. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks and for his reference to China Lake.

If I correctly understand the Bow amendments, as a package, they are what the administration proposed, and they would cut the school budget of a very valuable school district about 50 percent.

The children involved are children of high-level scientists, who developed the Sidewinder missile, et al. They live in a remote area. I would say the action proposed would make it impossible to operate that very valuable naval station, if the Bow amendment should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, all of the amendments directed at the amount of money appropriated to implement the program of impact aid to school districts seek to reduce that appropriation in violation of law establishing the program, Public Law 874.

Seeking to legislate by rider in an appropriation bill or by failure to meet money requirements established by law is not only illogical but not always may be unjustified but it is certainly unjustified when it creates insolvable planning and financing problems for numerous local government agencies. This is the case with these amendments.

All of them would adversely affect several districts in the area I have the honor to represent and in the case of some of my school districts could result in a total failure of their programs of top-flight education. One of these is the China Lake Elementary District. This district is coterminous with the naval ordnance test station which makes no in-lieu-of-tax payment to the district. As a consequence of our normal property tax base this district is wholly dependent on a mix of funds from the Public Law 874 program and increments of aid from the State of California. The State of California has basically a statewide formula basis and a substantial cutback of Federal funds would not be met out of the State contribution. Therefore the result of a cutback in the federal contribution would be a failure to provide basic education for the children of some of the people most valuable to our defense effort. Such a failure could only result in their abandoning their government work with an adverse effect on a major military research and development effort.

I strongly urge the defeat of all of these amendments.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Is it not true that the amendment falls to take into consideration that there is a different impact on students in the civil service area compared to military personnel? The military personnel have available to them the commissaries and medical and dental care and other things, as compared to others who do not have the same advantages?

Mr. CORMAN. Frankly, I cannot tell all the mischief that the amendment would do. I assume it would do what the gentleman says.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I should point out that this amendment would amend the basic authorizing legislation, a matter now before the general Subcommittee on Education.

An identical amendment is before our subcommittee at the present time. I will tell the Members what the amendment would do. If the amendment should be adopted, it would put into effect a substantial portion of the total $335 million cut being proposed in H.R. 13169 now being considered in our subcommittee.

School districts would get no payment for federally connected facilities. Category A—children whose parents both reside and work on Federal property—for the number of those children who represented 3 percent of the total student enrollment. On the contrary, in a Bell County, where either of the parents works on a military installation or lives on a military installation but not both, the absorption requirement would be twice as great, 6 percent.

We also have pending before the general Subcommittee on Education an amendment which would eliminate the 3 percent eligibility requirement in the present law. I know Members realize what that amounts to. If under present law a school district does not have at least 3 percent of its enrollment consisting of federally connected children it gets no Public Law 874 aid. The 3 percent federally connected requirement would be completely removed by the amendment to H.R. 13169 pending in our subcommittee.

I say that the subcommittee certainly should have an opportunity to work on this amendment itself. With all due respect to this amendment, in any way of thinking, the amendment on the floor is purely legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BROHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. In fact, I believe the amendment is worse than the prior amendment, which was overwhelmingly defeated. It is worse because it would cause a great deal of confusion as to what each of these school districts would be entitled to.

I made a point of order against the amendment, which was properly overruled, in order to emphasize the fact that the amendment was pending before the prior legislative committee, as pointed out by the gentleman from Kentucky, who preceded me.

This involves a complicated, confused legislative situation in the funding, and we have extensive consideration and deliberation by a proper committee. I
have done their share in taxing them—$487,4, the northern Virginia communities themselves for the construction of new schools. The Washington metropolitan area of Washington. They over-taken off of our local tax rolls and ex-posed to the suburban communities in the metro-politan area for quite some time. I do agree with the gentleman. It will actually have a greater effect on the smaller, less impacted areas. My district has approximately 50 percent of its school population consisting of Federal impact. Therefore, it would not lose a large per-cent-age of its impact funds as a result of this amendment and would possibly be in a better position to absorb the ef-fect of this amendment than many of the school districts. The Washington metropolitan area for quite some time has been used as a whipping boy on this legislation. I regret that some of my colleagues seem to be envious of the beauty and alleged economic health of the suburban communities in the metro-politan area of Washington. They over-count the fact when they point with envy to what we receive from this Federal im-pact legislation that there are thousands of military people who live in our community. We are faced with having to provide for them because they are good citizens, but they are taken off of our local tax rolls and ex-empted from payment of the State in-come tax and the automobile license tax and the real property taxes by virtue of Federally owned property. The Speaker having resumed the chair, accordingly, the Committee rose; and we have living near those establishmen-ts. I am glad the families are there. I am glad we are able to provide the children of these men with schools. But can we provide the schools they need if we take away a large part of the support for the ex-ceptions due to the fact that this amendment would be to the budget next year. I wish, therefore, that some of my col-leagues would quit begrudging the fact that many of our communities surrounding the metropolitan area of Washington, or at least stop showing their envy and enjoy a little more living in these communities with us while they are representing their people in Wash-ington.

I hope this amendment is defeated. Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the follow-ing Members failed to answer to their names:

[Names not listed here.]

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOROWSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under considera-tion the bill H.R. 14745, and finding itself without a quorum, he had di-rec-ted the roll to be called, when 372 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.
Mr. POAGIE. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I know that he and his subcommittee are working on the problem.

The amendment simply provides that the administration may spend in fiscal 1967 only 95 percent of what the President proposed in his budget to spend on the items provided in this bill.

If adopted, it will have the effect of strengthening the President's resolve to curtail, wherever possible, Federal spending in fiscal 1966 and 1967.

The amendment is worthy of favorable consideration by each Member of the House.

I am not going to debate it any further, but I am going to ask, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be made so

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. I can still stand for a few minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Ohio earlier today made an excellent speech to all of us pointing out that when the administration wants to spend more money and when the House or the committee might be disposed to make some reductions, the White House makes available the amount of money appropriated but his interest is primarily in the basic rules under which this money is to be used. Surely, that ought not to be allowed. We ought to change the rules so that no committee of this House could so blantly violate the spirit of those rules.

This amendment should be defeated not only because it is unnecessary, but also because it is presented in complete violation of the spirit of our rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 68, immediately following line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 1206. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 356)."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. I am sure that Members are tired, as I am. To borrow a phrase, I have shed blood, sweat, and tears here this afternoon. My head has been bled before from trying to bring about these economies. I know what is going to happen to this one, too. The troops just are not here. General O'Donnell and the rest of them just don't come up the hill. This is the Bow expenditure limitation of 5 percent which would bring spending back to about the level of the budget request.

It should not require any further explanation. I will, however, explain it briefly just in case there is a question in some Member's mind as to what it would accomplish.

The amendment simply provides that the administration may spend in fiscal 1967 only 95 percent of what the President proposed in his budget to spend on the items provided in this bill.

If adopted, it will have the effect of strengthening the President's resolve to curtail, wherever possible, Federal spending in fiscal 1966 and 1967.

The amendment is worthy of favorable consideration by each Member of the House.

I am not going to debate it any further, but I am going to ask, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. CHIEF FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. I can stand for a few minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Ohio earlier today made an excellent speech to all of us pointing out that when the administration wants to spend more money and when the House or the committee might be disposed to make some reductions, the White House makes available the amount of money appropriated but his interest is primarily in the basic rules under which this money is to be used. Surely, that ought not to be allowed. We ought to change the rules so that no committee of this House could so blantly violate the spirit of those rules.

This amendment should be defeated not only because it is unnecessary, but also because it is presented in complete violation of the spirit of our rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. (Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to review for the Members of the Committee the $10.9 billion which is contained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us understand that this $10.9 billion is proposed to come from general fund revenues.

In addition to that there are $33 billion from trust fund revenues for the various activities of the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.

Mr. Chairman, this is but the first of the HEW appropriation bills for fiscal year 1967.

Because of the procedure we are using today, a second amendment to this bill for HEW will be before this House in the not-too-distant future, to fund the Office of Economic Opportunity, to fund the higher education bill, to fund the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to fund the Library Service Act, as well as other programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will have another bill before the Congress before we adjourn.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of the funds contained in this bill are not to be touched by the Congress. Any reduction or any cut that we would make in these aids to the various agencies would not be a realistic cut. I like to use the word that it would be a phony cut.
Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think that it was most unfortunate that my very, very good friend, the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who stood up and tried to support the President on his budget request got virtually no support on the floor of the House on his side of the aisle. It is not so much that—here on this occasion to pass money or to cut the committee's request for the Department of Health and Labor—but I feel sorry for my friend from Texas.

Mr. LAIRD. I hope you felt sorry for me too.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I did.

Mr. LAIRD. In closing, I would like to add that I hope we have seen here today a budgetary and so far as the administration concerned, a budgetary program that from now on this Congress is not going to be pressured one way or the other on any of these measures that come to Capitol Hill and that in the future all of us on both sides of the aisle will be able to go forward and not be subjected to any kind of executive branch pressure. Because it was very pleasant today to see that the White House had abandoned its highly publicized program of trying to influence the Congress. That was abandoned today by our Chief Executive.

Mr. MAHON. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sympathy of the minority leader who pointed out to the House that when the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations supported the President, only very few Members on the Democratic side of the aisle stood by the President and the gentleman from Texas.

I must say that I saw over on the left—on the Republican side of the aisle—Members speaking and making speeches and voting with those who were likewise opposing the amendment. So the amendment to encourage improvement of the impacted areas program seems to have been overwhelmingly defeated on a nonpartisan basis.

But no one was so naive, I think, as to believe that this amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin would absolutely be passed. Certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin, who said that it was a test amendment and that he would not offer it if it failed, knew it did not have a ghost of a chance.

It did not have a ghost of a chance because the Members of the House are fearful that their positions on aid to impacted school areas might be misunderstood by the folks back home who might think that the Members were against improving them. I am not wedded to the budget; the budget can be wrong just as easily as Congress can be wrong. There is room for differences of opinion. I realize that people did not wish to be misunderstood as to their attitude on impacted school aid.

But what we are doing in raising this bill to such a high level—about $600 million above the President's budget—this is one step further toward a tax increase and greater inflation. We have been saying that we are against inflation and against a tax increase. But the prevailing votes on this bill seem to indicate otherwise.

The President has used considerable restraint. We have authorized some $2.5 billion more for the Great Society than the President has appropriated in his budget for fiscal 1967. So he has exercised some restraint in not asking us to vote full funding for all of these programs. I think this is good.

But what has the House of Representatives done at this session? We must be honest with ourselves. The House has gone above the President's budget in several authorization bills by upward of $600 million as of a recent date and from all indications we are going much higher. Now we are above the budget in the appropriation bills. That does not alarm me; some people believe it does alarm and concern me, as I believe it does most of you.

I believe that we are moving generally in the wrong direction when we increase such already large requests as have been submitted to us for some of these programs.

I would like to make this point also. We may have to go above the budget in the defense appropriation bill. I think we probably will. But this is a different matter because we are at war. In this matter it would be so that we could and should pretty well hold the line on nondefense programs.

I think that additional funds will have to be requested by the President for the defense effort because of the escalation of the war in southeast Asia, and I just hope we can hold the line a little better in nondefense spending. I hope that what I have said will have a sympathetic ear from the Members of the House of Representatives.
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Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman let me finish this thought? Since the budget provided $1.3 billion for the National Institutes of Health—which, in my judgment, is all they should spend—and more, I think an amendment might be offered there. But these things were fought out and decided in the committee.

It does not please me at all to stand here and make the President look as if he had not been pressured. And the level at which we are right now is not a tax increase.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman let me finish this thought? Since the budget provided $1.3 billion for the National Institutes of Health—which, in my judgment, is all they should spend—and more, I think an amendment might be offered there. But these things were fought out and decided in the committee.

It does not please me at all to stand here and make the President look as if he had not been pressured. And the level at which we are right now is not a tax increase.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman let me finish this thought? Since the budget provided $1.3 billion for the National Institutes of Health—which, in my judgment, is all they should spend—and more, I think an amendment might be offered there. But these things were fought out and decided in the committee.

It does not please me at all to stand here and make the President look as if he had not been pressured. And the level at which we are right now is not a tax increase.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.
be supported. The bill is open for amendment at any point right now, and there are four or five areas in this bill where the committee has gone above the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge—Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking as a political partisan. This matter is of a non-partisan nature. It is our country, be we Democrats or Republicans. We are moving toward more inflation. Inflation is no respecter of persons or parties—it cheapens everybody's dollars. We are moving toward larger defense expenditures, and we are moving toward a tax increase. I think it will well to say so as we consider this bill.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his forthright statement on the floor of the House. Already the President is pointing his finger at the Congress and trying to lay the blame at our doorstep. Of course he has some reason, perhaps, to do so.

Also I would like to say to the President of the United States that he has the right of veto. I hope he abides by his own requests and vetoes some of these bills, if he feels strongly about it, rather than pointing his finger at the Congress. Mr. Chairman, the President will be in much the same position as we are on this bill. This bill covers $10 billion plus, most of which he agrees with and we agree with. There is a matter of judgment involved. I am going to vote for this bill, although I do not agree with all of it. I think the President will be compelled, as a práctica matter, to approve it when it comes to him, though, like some of us, he cannot agree with all the provisions in the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I take this time to make a few comments. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas said that it was naive to believe that the Congress would not increase certain portions of the budget submitted by the President. He was referring to the impoundment of the aid portion of the program and several other items in this appropriation bill.

If it was naive for us—and I speak collectively—I think that we could hold the line. I think it was just as naive for the President to submit the budget in this way with these reductions.

It was just as naive for the White House to propose a budget or totally unrealistic budget cut of this kind. The President knows the legislative situation, and when he sends it up here under those circumstances, to say the least, he is naive. Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The Committee rose; and 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. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House for the recommendation that the bill do pass.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Speaker. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. BOW moved to refer the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 6, in line 6, insert the following line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"Sect. 1006. Money appropriated in this Act shall be expended in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

Mr. BOW. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The Speaker. The question is on the motion of no quorum?

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do at this point.

The Speaker. Then, the vote on the motion to recommit will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, then.

The Speaker. Does the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his point of order of no quorum?

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do at this point.

The Speaker. Then, the vote on the motion to recommit will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I could expect the same consideration on this as was given to the gentleman from Ohio when it was too late on his motion to recommit. I have been standing on my feet trying to get recognized for a teller vote. I was trying to demand tellers all the time and I was not recognized. I ask for the same consideration as was given to the gentleman from Ohio.

The Speaker. The Chair will state that the Chair has already announced that the order of May 3, the vote will be on the motion to recommit. The Speaker. Is a teller vote a record vote?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, then.

The Speaker. Is the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his point of order of no quorum?

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do at this point.

The Speaker. Then, the vote on the motion to recommit will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with all of it. I hope he abides by his own requests and vetoes some of these bills, if he feels strongly about it, rather than pointing his finger at the Congress. Mr. Chairman, the President will be in much the same position as we are on this bill. This bill covers $10 billion plus, most of which he agrees with and we agree with. There is a matter of judgment involved. I am going to vote for this bill, although I do not agree with all of it. I think the President will be compelled, as a practical matter, to approve it when it comes to him, though, like some of us, he cannot agree with all the provisions in the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I take this time to make a few comments. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas said that it was naive to believe that the Congress would not increase certain portions of the budget submitted by the President. He was referring to the impoundment of the aid portion of the program and several other items in this appropriation bill.

If it was naive for us—and I speak collectively—I think that we could hold the line. I think it was just as naive for the President to submit the budget in this way with these reductions.

It was just as naive for the White House to propose a budget or totally unrealistic budget cut of this kind. The President knows the legislative situation, and when he sends it up here under those circumstances, to say the least, he is naive. Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The Committee rose; and 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. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House for the recommendation that the bill do pass.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Speaker. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. BOW moved to refer the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 6, in line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"Sect. 1006. Money appropriated in this Act shall be expended in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

Mr. BOW. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The Speaker. The question is on the demand of the Chair was made in favor of the Chair.

The Speaker. That is what I thought, Mr. Speaker. I offer a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, of the proposition that the Speaker, if the point of order of no quorum, the Chair will state, takes precedence over the demand for tellers...
and the gentleman from Ohio has made the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only point I make is I think the Chair ruled in favor of the gentleman from Ohio and against the gentleman from Rhode Island. That is the way it seems to me. If the Chair insists on it, there is not anything I can do about it. I just want my views known and expressed. That is the way I feel about it.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recommit is the right of the minority, and if the member of the minority seeks recognition and is qualified, then he is recognized. The gentleman from Ohio pursued his rights in demanding a call by the yeas and nays. An insufficient number rose. The gentleman from Ohio then made a point of order that a quorum was not present and objected to the vote on that ground. The Chair has already made its ruling that under the order of May 3, further proceedings under the call are postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. How am I to know that a quorum is not present?

The SPEAKER. The Chair counted. The Chair is aware of the number.

Mr. FOGARTY. I assumed that the Chair counted the necessary number for a rollcall vote and found an insufficient number arose for that purpose but not for the purpose of establishing a quorum. That was my understanding of the Chair at that time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will repeat for the benefit of the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY) that in accordance with the order of May 3, further consideration at this stage of the bill is postponed until tomorrow on a motion to recommit. That is the status of the matter and there is nothing left which the Chair can say.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I still feel that the Chair has not extended to this side the same consideration which was extended to the other side.

Mr. LAIRD. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Rhode Island, and if the gentleman from Rhode Island desires to proceed, the Chair is very patient.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, Mr. Speaker, I have stated my views and I would like the Chair to know how I feel. That is all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair respects the views of the gentleman from Rhode Island, but the Chair has already made a ruling.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 14745, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.