

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations 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; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14745, with Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] will be recognized for 1½ hours. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have the privilege of submitting for your consideration this afternoon the annual appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and HEW. First I would like to thank the gentlemen on the majority side, Mr. DENTON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MATTHEWS, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, and Mr. FARNUM for the fine support and attention they have given this bill. Also those on the Republican side, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. SHRIVER.

We bring to you a bill today that is a compromise among the members of the subcommittee handling this appropriation. This bill is a sizable one. It is getting bigger every year, and I think it is going to get bigger in the future. The bill we bring to you today totals \$10,573,272,500, which is \$1,709,713,500 over the appropriation for 1966 and \$490,088,000 over the budget requests for 1967 that were considered in connection with the bill. As both the report and the minority views point out, this is at most only about two-thirds of the budget for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for

1967. There is \$3.9 billion in the budget that is for going programs whose authorization for appropriations expires at the end of fiscal year 1966 and has not yet been extended. These are the elementary and secondary education program, \$1,342,410,000; grants to developing institutions under the higher education program, \$30 million; higher education facilities construction programs, \$722,744,000; grants for public libraries, \$57,500,000; and the economic opportunity program, \$1,750 million.

There has been considerable comment by Members, the public press, and elsewhere concerning the fact that this bill is \$490 million above the budget request. I would like to point out in the beginning that there are four education items that were increased almost \$450 million that account for 90 percent of the amount by which the entire bill is over the budget. These are the vocational education program, which the committee increased \$39,250,000; payments to land-grant colleges, where the increase was from zero in the budget to \$11,950,000 in the bill; payments to school districts in federally impacted areas under Public Law 874 for which we added \$232,800,000; and for student loans under the Defense Education Act, an increase of \$157,813,000. All of the appropriations recommended in the bill for these programs are within the limits established in the authorizing legislation, which in every instance passed this House by an overwhelming majority. I think everyone concerned fully expected these increases. I think the vast majority of the American people would approve them, and there is no doubt it would significantly detract from the educational opportunities available to students throughout the country if these increases were not granted. So, Mr. Chairman, the total bill is practically in balance with the budget except for these four items.

In the Department of Labor, the committee made very little change in the budget. The total request was for \$696,480,000, a reduction of \$11,186,400 below the 1966 appropriations. The committee recommends a further reduction of \$10,260,000 most of which is in one item. The request for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and exservicemen was \$107 million. The committee has reduced this to \$100 million or a reduction of \$7 million. This reduction was made solely because of lower unemployment than was estimated at the time the budget was prepared.

Let me say with respect to the Department of Labor programs that I am especially gratified that the record of accomplishments during the year continues to show improvement in performance and in economy of operations.

The committee's action provides resources to cover the training costs of 250,000 people. Out of this resources will be directed to improve the employability and economic status of 165,000 hard core unemployed and for expansion of apprenticeship and on-the-job training.

This kind of training has a high pay-off value and it is cheaper. A report from the Department of Labor has this to say about on-the-job training:

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 \$80 a week as a full-time worker after his training. Thus the average trainee earns \$3,761 the first year.

The cost to the Government of on-the-job training averaged about \$495 a trainee in 1965. 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 \$211.

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 those trainees already approved will earn almost \$392 million during their first year of training and work, and that their training will cost the Federal Government \$51 million—with about \$20 million being repaid in taxes during the first year and the remainder the second year.

The business community, along with American labor, has cooperated in making on-the-job training and apprenticeship training an exciting and successful program.

Joint labor-management and labor-sponsored on-the-job training projects covered nearly 6,000 trainees entering apprenticeship-entry and retraining or upgrading programs. These programs were under the aegis of 24 different labor organizations and joint labor-management groups in 28 States.

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

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training's leadership 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 even better results next year.

The Bureau of Employment Security and the State employment security agencies are and should rightfully be the backbone of the Department's counseling, referral, and job placement programs. The State agencies have and are still performing exemplary service to employers, to people seeking work, and aid to people out of work in 1,900 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 over 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 3.1-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 902,000 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 1964 to 110,000 in 1965 all of which means more jobs for domestic farm-workers.

The committee was not happy with the budget proposed for the State employment security agencies and has directed the Department to achieve a better balance within the allocation of the funds recommended by the committee. There especially should be a redistribution of funds to the oldline basic activities which are the essential underpinning to the new responsibilities added as a result of enactment of the Manpower 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 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 House Education and Labor Committee has also expressed alarm about this situation. The committee has directed the Department to develop positive plans for affirmative 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 deducted all of the civil rights programs from every operating agency and have put them all in one place. That is why on page 68 of the report there is shown an increase of \$414,000, all for civil rights activities of the Department of Labor.

For the Food and Drug Administration, the budget request was \$67,534,000, an increase of \$8,735,000 over 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 this agency has to administer and the continuing increase in the volume and complexity of new drugs.

The next section of the bill is the Office of Education, which I have already touched on in connection with the overall increase in the bill. The committee is also recommending a few reductions from the amounts requested. The bill includes \$10 million under title I of the Higher Education Act, for grants to States for community service and continuing education programs, rather than \$20 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 experience to review before appropriating the larger sum. The committee also deleted \$31,372,000 budgeted for the National Teachers Corps. The amount of funds included for assistance for school 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 authorizing legislation. The temporary provisions expire at the end of fiscal year 1966. If these provisions are extended, I assume there will be a supplemental appropriation to finance them. The reduction of \$2,468,000 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 \$853,000 for 100 of the new positions budgeted for administering the expanded education programs. The amount allowed in the bill will be sufficient for approximately 340 such new positions.

The increase over 1966 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 current level of program operations.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. 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. 83]

Andrews,	Fuqua	Nedzi
George W.	Griffin	O'Hara, Mich.
Andrews,	Griffiths	Ottinger
Glenn	Halleck	Pepper
Baring	Hanna	Powell
Beckworth	Hansen, Wash.	Roberts
Bolling	Harsha	Rogers, Colo.
Bolton	Harvey, Ind.	Rogers, Tex.
Bray	Harvey, Mich.	Rooney, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hays	Rosenthal
Burlason	Jacobs	Roudebush
Cederberg	Jarman	Roush
Chelf	Johnson, Okla.	St Germain
Clevenger	Jones, Mo.	Springer
Colmer	Karth	Stephens
Conyers	Kee	Taylor
Curtis	Keith	Thomas
Davis, Wis.	Kelly	Todd
Dawson	Kornegay	Toll
Diggs	Long, Md.	Utt
Dorn	Love	Vigorito
Dowdy	McEwen	Vivian
Fallon	Mackie	Whalley
Farnum	Mailliard	Williams
Feighan	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Ford,	Mathias	Wilson, Bob
William D.	Matthews	Wilson,
Fraser	Morris	Charles H.
Frelinghuysen	Morse	
Fulton, Tenn.	Murray	

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, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 347 Members

responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The 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 call was ordered.

The reduction of \$213,000 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 for a much more efficient and effective program and will make readily ascertainable the level of funding for these activities. I recognize that a period of transition and experimentation 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 recommending a \$3 million 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 almost demanded. 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 benefit 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 loans to guaranteed loans. Since it is now obvious that such a change will not be made, at least not in time for next school year, the committee has added sufficient funds to bring this 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 Assistance Act to be started in 1966, and was authorized to expand to a level of \$2,500,000 in 1967. No good reason was given for 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, preservation filming, photoduplication operations, and so forth, are not adequate to meet this need. The committee has added \$668,000 for this purpose.

The budget for St. Elizabeths 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 new legislation which was 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 delete funds budgeted 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, as is stated in the report, continues 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 the related agencies appeared to the committee to be well justified and the committee has made no change in any of them.

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 no allowance for carrying forward 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—as I have—some of the laboratories in which the battle for better health is being waged. 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 threats to health which cannot yet be averted.

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 new 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 physiologist 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 microbiologist cannot tell us how to ward off the invasion of cancer cells; and

That the geologist can indicate, with reasonable accuracy, where we may successfully drill for oil, but the geneticist 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.

We can control atomic energy but we are baffled by the action of viruses which seem to be able to cause disease long after they have apparently disappeared. Yet we are perpetually exposed to these unseen enemies. Not only viruses and bacteria but a host of environmental poisons, many of which have not even been identified, are waiting their opportunity to lay us low.

Every day each one of us must fight a guerrilla war against incipient disease. This 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 tubing is now in 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 2 years damaged some 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 some forms 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 achievement. I was also greatly 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.

At present, the center can only take care of a handful of patients. This means that although research has developed the means for saving thousands of lives, all but a handful of the victims of kidney failure are still condemned to death because the hemodialysis equipment is only in the experimental stage and facilities to care for them are not available.

My conscience would be uneasy, indeed, if I did not do all in my power to speed the day when it will be possible to help all those whose lives could be saved by hemodialysis.

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 ultimate solution, of course, is to prevent permanent kidney failure by preventing or curing 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, 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 of his audience 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 proud that the funds the Congress has made available for health research have been particularly well spent.

Last year the distinguished Wooldridge 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 of these valuable services we want to buy for the American people.

My answer to that is: 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 nearly enough in health research and I am glad to see that some of our most eminent economists agree with me.

Let me 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 U.S. 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 the potential product of 4.6 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 to stint on support for 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. A few days ago 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 the 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 all 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 for the NIH appropriations 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 no allowance 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 specialized research conducted overseas.

An increase of less than 11 percent for health research seem 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 \$132.6 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.

Surely 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 the Christian 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 allocated among the various appropriations, in such a way that each Institute will have a minimum increase of 8 percent in its research grant funds. The remaining \$12 million was allocated among the six Institutes whose immediate needs, as indicated by current estimates of 1966 budget deficiencies, would not be met by a basic 8-percent increase over the amount available in 1966.

As discussed at length in the committee's report, recent studies have shown that an annual increase of 15 percent is necessary to meet the needs 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 will 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 two 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 to 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 1966 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 it would require additional funds to reach its full operating level. The committee has therefore provided these funds. I hope that it will not be necessary for the Congress to override the Bureau's unwarranted resistance to 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. The present vigor of 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 1963 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, to meet our growing need 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 the budget request for fiscal year 1967 would be for \$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 an expected request for a 100 percent increase. As this action not only runs counter to the expressed intent of the Congress but will clearly be extremely harmful to further development of our national research capability, the Committee has restored the appropriation to the current level of \$50 million.

To meet the needs of approved construction projects at least \$140 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 begin. There is also a serious risk that a substantial delay in providing the Federal matching funds will cause the nonfederal 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 needed facilities will not be available 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, with 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-developed 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, \$1,950,000 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.

To strengthen 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 Computer Research and Technology which is engaged in developing automated clinical and laboratory tests, di-

agnostic procedures and clinical record-keeping.

Finally, the committee has provided \$250,000 for the Office of the Director, NIH, in the General Research and Services appropriation, to meet the expenses of creating a central administrative framework for developmental engineering programs. The so-called artificial kidney and the experimental artificial 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 requisite engineering skills and understanding of biomedical problems make it undesirable, uneconomical 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 that steps should now be taken, while the administrative arrangements are still fluid, to develop a strong central management to insure the most effective exploitation of this new and very promising field.

The recommended increases in the appropriations for NIH will rectify the most serious deficiencies in the budget request and will add fresh impetus to a small number of very important program activities. The appropriations, as they now stand, are not, in my opinion, optimum in relation to opportunity and need nor are they, in most cases, anywhere near the amounts that could easily be justified. They will, however, enable the vital programs of NIH to continue to move forward.

I have no hesitation at all in saying that the recommended amounts are sound and conservative. I strongly urge that they be approved.

Last year the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and I collaborated in working out the problems related to cost sharing and we have been discussing this further this year. I think we are in agreement regarding this matter.

Last year the committee modified section 203 in the general provision of the bill in order to simplify and liberalize the payment for overhead cost of grant-supported research projects—the so-called indirect costs. Instead of arbitrarily limiting the indirect cost payment to not more than 20 percent of the direct cost, the new section 203, which has been retained in the bill again this year, specifies that a Federal grant may not equal the full cost of the research project being supported. This provision recognizes the long-established principle that the grant-in-aid relationship requires the recipient of a research grant to make some contribution to the total cost of the project which he has proposed.

The purpose of this section was fully discussed on the floor of this House during last year's consideration of the appropriation. It was, I think, generally welcomed by the House as a step which would create a better relationship between Federal agencies and the grantee institutions where so much of the Nation's research is conducted.

The record makes it quite clear that it was our intent to abolish requirements that forced artificial distinctions to be made between direct and indirect costs. It was our expectation that the revision would result in a simpler and more equitable procedure for funding the costs of research projects.

Section 203 deliberately does not specify that the grantee institution must make any particular percentage contribution because the committee felt that different levels of participation would be justified and appropriate in the wide variety of circumstances that will exist in different institutions and, perhaps, for different projects. The committee also wished to avoid having the Federal agency become involved in elaborate and expensive accounting and auditing procedures or in endless arguments about what is and what is not admissible as an allowable cost. The committee felt that each agency could satisfy itself quite simply that the grantee was, in good faith, making a contribution to the cost of the project. That is all that section 203 requires.

The same provision was written into the independent offices bill and into the Department of Defense appropriations bill. The Bureau of the Budget subsequently issued general instructions which are, I think, in harmony with the committee's intent.

It would appear, however, that the Department of HEW has misinterpreted section 203 and the Bureau of the Budget's instructions. HEW seems to think that to comply with section 203 it must require detailed statements of planned expenditures and exercise control over the funds which institutions contribute to grant-supported research projects.

The complaints received in my office since HEW brought its new cost-sharing system into effect a couple of months ago indicate that HEW is using section 203 to complicate and restrict a process which the committee sought to simplify and improve.

I shall take up this misinterpretation of congressional intent with the Secretary and ask him to correct it. I am making this statement so that other Members receiving complaints from institutions in their districts will know that the situation that has arisen was not intended by the committee and is not a necessary consequence of section 203 but is due to the manner in which it is being handled by HEW.

It was certainly not the committee's intent to create the accountants' paradise that the HEW regulations will bring into being. The purpose of section 203 is, first, to relieve universities and research institutions of an inequitable financial burden by removing arbitrary overhead requirements and, second, to relieve both the grantee institution and the granting agency of a complex and unnecessary accounting and auditing burden by accepting reasonable evidence that an institution is contributing to the overall cost of a project. The important considerations for the selection of a research project for Federal support should continue to be the quality of the research to be performed and its relevance to agency

programs, not arbitrary cost-sharing requirements.

I am confident that the unnecessarily restrictive regulations which have caused the complaints we are receiving can be quickly corrected.

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to say that I agree, as he already knows. All I would like to add is that I hope that this provision is administered so that it will apply equally to all institutions.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

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.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the bill will receive the overwhelming support of this House.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I again congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island as I do every year on this 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 vocational schools scheduled to be built around the country, including one in St. Louis, deleted?

Mr. FOGARTY. 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 go along with 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. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman, but it is a controversial sub-

ject in Congress and in our committee and between both Houses of Congress, and has been for years.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I might ask another question?

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. On the basis of the excellent testimony given by Dr. Goddard, the new Commissioner of Food and Drugs, do you not agree that we now need a complete overhaul of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require pretesting for cosmetics for safety, pretesting of therapeutic devices for safety and efficacy, and safeguards against accidental poisoning of children by drugs thought to be candy, and much tighter factory inspection, and so on, as proposed in my omnibus bill, H.R. 1235?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not a question for this committee to consider. That question should be directed to the Chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman. I want the Record to show, however, that in his testimony before the subcommittee, Dr. Goddard stressed these gaps in the law.

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

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

Mr. SISK. I would like to join the gentleman from Missouri in commending the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the great work he has done over the years, and particularly on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have read in the press in recent days of testimony given at a hearing by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which is deeply disturbing. The newspaper dispatch, in a report by the Associated Press, quoted the Surgeon General of the United States as saying:

There is no evidence of the medicinal effects of wine.

The newspaper story further reported that the Surgeon General, in answer to a direct question, responded:

There is no evidence to show that wine will cure heart disease—

And further, also in answer to a specific question:

No, sir, it [wine] will not cure alcoholism.

This story gives a misleading impression of the established and documented role of the uses of wine in medical practice, which I wish to correct.

The State of California, through its wine advisory board, has sponsored research into the medical aspects of wine for the past 20 years or more. These studies have included fundamental and applied research of microchemistry,

physiology, pharmacology, and therapy at a number of distinguished universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research centers. They have been directed by scientists and physicians of undoubted competence and integrity. The program, itself, has been directly continuously since 1946 by a pharmacologist who has been nationally recognized for his leadership in this field and is now serving as a consultant on alcohol and alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

From this research program, together with studies conducted independently by other investigators, has come substantial evidence of medicinal effects of wine. The investigators have reported in papers and in standard medical and scientific journals and in technical monographs that wine clearly serves as a tranquilizer and, in fact, represents one of the first tranquilizers known to medical men. They have reported that it serves as a sedative and was one of the first sedatives known. They have reported that wine is useful in the treatment of many patients with diabetes, hypertension, and anorexia, malabsorption syndrome and particularly in the treatment of convalescent and geriatric patients as well as in other situations.

These findings have been summarized in a monograph under the title, "Uses of Wine in Medical Practice," and in a newly published book, "Alcoholic Beverages in Clinical Medicine," which fully document the research which I have just described.

In addition, the wine advisory board is keenly aware of the problems of excessive drinking and alcoholism. It has supported long-term studies of the drinking patterns of normal drinkers and alcoholics. These have been conducted in cooperation with the Center of Alcohol Studies, first at Yale and now at Rutgers, and other groups in the United States and with universities and governmental agencies in Italy, France, Sweden, and other countries. From these studies has come the evidence to show that the low rate of alcoholism noted in some groups appears to be closely related to cultural attitudes and physiological factors involved in the traditional use of wine with meals.

The California wine industry has used the utmost care in disseminating the medical research findings. At no time has the wine advisory board or the wine industry in California or any of their representatives made any claim that wine is a cure for heart disease, or alcoholism, or any other disease. The only time such an inference has been applied to these research findings, prior to the testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee, was in a distorted story several months ago in a newspaper of national circulation. Surely there is no evidence, from a careful look at the record, of any claim or inference that wine is a cure for any disease.

I must conclude, therefore, that when the witness was using the word "medicinal" in relation to the uses of wine, he was applying it in the limited sense of "curative" and did not intend the other

often understood meanings—"palliative" or "used in treatment."

I would sincerely appreciate it if my distinguished associate from Rhode Island would clarify the misimpressions that may have resulted from the cited testimony before the subcommittee.

I thank the gentleman very much.

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 of 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 exist.

At the time of the subcommittee hearing, I was not fully informed on the extensive research that had been conducted into the uses 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, insulin, any anesthetic, 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 many competent physicians are utilizing wine for the alleviation of symptoms. The California State Wine Advisory Board deserves commendation for the support it has provided for many years through its medical research program. I realize it has contributed substantially to providing this evidence.

In addition, I am satisfied that this research program has been conducted with commendable dignity and restraint, and that the board cannot be justifiably censured for a newspaper publication of a distorted report over which it had no control. You may be assured that the integrity of the board, and of the scientific investigators whose work it has supported, is not being questioned in any way.

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

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

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman on the courage that he displayed during the hearings and in the markup of this bill and in his presentation of the bill to the full committee and to the House.

I served on this committee for a number of years with the chairman. I know

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 he has been presented with unusual and exceptionally difficult problems. I know how difficult the problem 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 humanitarian, but to be a man of great courage.

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

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating 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 express the appreciation of those of us who have been working in the kidney 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 because one of the first centers using artificial kidneys to save persons whose kidneys have failed was developed by Dr. Scribner at the University of Washington. One of the first dialysis centers was created in Seattle which allowed a limited number of persons who faced certain death to live and continue at their jobs.

The problem, of course, is that this treatment was originally very expensive—averaging over \$20,000 per year—and the number of lifesaving units was limited to less than 20. This meant that a combination medical and layman board was required to decide which individuals lived and which ones died. Last November an NBC documentary pointed out the intense tragedy involved in this whole process. 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 many of us in the area who had stated he would rather die than have his family faced with the costs that would be involved to maintain him.

At that time I introduced H.R. 11289 to authorize the additional construction and development of these artificial kidney machines in centers throughout the United States.

Since that time, through the wonderful assistance of Congressman FOGARTY and others in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, we have worked toward a broader development of the whole area of treatment of chronic kidney failure. In this connection, I have

introduced H.R. 14279 and have been pleased to be joined by many of my colleagues 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 Congressman FOGARTY for the increase in appropriation in the amount of \$3 million to establish additional kidney dialysis centers, and the addition of \$800,000 to the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases to expand their basic research in this area.

I am hopeful that the new authorization bills which have been proposed will be available in the period of time after fiscal year 1966 to continue the development 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 of several very simple facts. The first is that the executive branch of our Government is indeed playing tricks with the Congress. 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 concerned. You gentlemen in the majority and you in the minority should all be concerned 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 condemning the Congress because there was going to be a pay increase for the military personnel. 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 appearance 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.

Then we see the stories appearing that Congress is doing this, and the President opposes it. I always assumed that the Secretary of Defense was somewhat responsible to the Commander in Chief. It would seem to me that no one in the Congress should allow that kind of activity on the part of the executive branch to go on unchallenged.

Let us consider this bill, as an example, and the increases in this bill. I believe all Members know what they are.

There is \$232 million for aid to impacted schools, and \$39 million for vocational education.

By the way, there were a lot of gentlemen and gentlewomen from this Congress who went down to receive those beautiful pens at the White House. They gave away nice pens, and got publicity all over the United States about how vocational education was being improved and how in 1967 we would have a big, massive program increasing the emphasis on vocational education.

When the budget came up here, because older, well established vocational education does not have the L.B.J. brand on it, it was reduced. But the programs they started, the new starts during this administration, were increased in the budget.

In the area of training there is \$1.4 billion in the overall budget, in the area of manpower training. But the increases are all in new programs that have been started by this administration. Any program which was an existing program, long tested, was reduced.

We can point to many examples of this, such as the land grant college program, the oldest aid to education program, which was started in the administration of Abraham Lincoln. Because it does not have the brand on it of the administration, of the executive branch, what happened? Every dollar was taken out of that in the budget.

I believe it is time the legislative branch exercised some control over these matters. Merely because an item is something the executive branch has started is no reason why we should place our stamp of approval on it.

There are areas of increases—vocational education; land-grant colleges; payments to school districts; the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act, a longtime existing program; the nurse and medical student loan program; the programs of the National Institutes of Health, to carry on the cancer, heart and stroke amendments of 1966. All these programs have increases over and above the President's recommendations.

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

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

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of the Commissioner 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 administration, who have done so well and who have been so successful in enacting the authorizations for many of these programs, are nowhere to be seen on Capitol Hill today.

The Jack Valentis and the Larry O'Briens and the other men of the White House that have been up here working for authorizations are not up here

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 the 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 this 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, it seems to me, that today the only effort being made by the executive branch is to increase this bill, that is, to add on to the future score. The only effort being 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.

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

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 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 expenditure 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 from general revenues. Now, why is that? 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 program, 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, \$30 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 major piece of legislation, the 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 this program was the House given the opportunity to work its will on the appropriations for this program.

Many of you are familiar, I am sure, with the controversy which surrounds title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which is contained in this bill. If any of you have talked to school administrators, you should realize that this particular program in the minds of many school administrators and school people throughout the United States has a lower priority as far as funding is concerned than does the facilities section of NDEA.

Mr. Chairman, in the National Defense Education Act, in the facilities program, the authorization is not fully funded under the appropriations budget.

Under the President's budget, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is fully funded, to the tune of over \$1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, when we consider this item, the House of Representatives should have the opportunity of deciding whether it wants to give a higher priority to the facilities section of the National Defense Education Act than it does to title I of the elementary and secondary education section.

But, Mr. Chairman, when we permit the other body to add these items, we give up, we completely surrender, the opportunity for this House of Representatives to work its will, to express its opinion, and to have anything to say about the direction of the funding of these programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the Committee that it is important when we consider the HEW appropriation bill, that all of the educational programs, by title are funded in the same bill in order that the priority which is given to these various items may be considered at one time in the House of Representatives. This is completely impossible at the present time.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman suggesting that the Subcommittee on Appropriations should set priorities after the authorizing committee has acted?

Mr. LAIRD. I certainly am. I am suggesting that the House of Representatives should set these priorities which is not now being done.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman suggesting—

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to answer the gentleman's question and then I shall yield further to the gentleman.

The authorization which was set for the facilities section of the National Defense Education Act is no priority, because the President did not even ask for full funding in this particular bill, although your committee authorized it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have surrendered the priority and the establishment of priorities under all of these authorizations to the executive branch of our Government.

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 within 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, which has been reenacted every year, 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 do that, regardless of 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 authorization 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 435 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 start on page 60, 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 which is not in this bill today. But there is no way to express that feeling of higher priority in this section because we cannot consider 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 they did last year in this higher education field." I do not think that we in the House of Representatives should yield on this point.

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

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

Mr. LATTI. 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.

But coming to a point that the gentleman raised which I think 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. LATTI. You mean after the President of the United States had this signing of 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 that there was going to be some sort of increase in this program.

Mr. LATTI. What the gentleman is saying is that actually then the country gets nothing 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 allows for 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 figures 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 greatest degree 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 manpower 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 1966, 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 inflation, the cost of living, 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 in a bill, unless they are willing to go forward to carry on this kind of program when it comes down to the hard cases of expenditures and appropriations, unless we are willing 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 impacted aid amendment. We will see exactly how much aid the executive branch gives to the Congress in this area of keeping expenditures and appropriations somewhat in line. If we do well on that, we can continue on down the line. But we will not take up all day to-

day 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. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The 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. Bowl].

(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.

He and I are both recipients of some of the fine work that has been done, as other Members of this House have been recipients of things in the past in research and development in the medical field.

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. 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 meet and 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 at war in Vietnam and by the fact that we are now experiencing considerable price inflation.

It is apparent that the war in Vietnam will not be over for a long time to come. We now have 250,000 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 materiel 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 everyone's buying power.

That is the condition today. I ask you, what will it be tomorrow and next month and next year and the year after if we persist in going merrily down the road of fiscal irresponsibility—approving low-priority domestic spending programs and appropriating funds for them and for

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 more than 10 percent by the end of 1966, [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 10 percent, and we may soon incur such a rate here at home, this citation could apply to our own economic situation. What I do not understand is the fact that we recognize these 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 economists outside the Federal service have all expressed concern about the inflationary pressures that are at work in the economy.

The President has called upon 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 decided against starting an addition to 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 add \$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 issued the following warning:

I want to call attention, however, and make a most solemn warning about future legislation. Unless we can balance our requests with prudence, and our concern with caution, then we are likely to get our figures back to that \$130 billion which came over from the departments.

He has cajoled and needled 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 not sent 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 \$580 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 budget 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 the President or that he exercise his veto power on bills, such as the bill before us, that exceed his budget request.

WHAT CONGRESS HAS DONE

The President's pleas for fiscal restraint have largely gone unheeded here in the House. Could it be that Congress wants to overcome the "rubberstamp" label with which it was tagged last year?

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 ways 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 all that 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 293 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 week after week adding to 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 realm of reason 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 or, 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 forthrightness 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 honestly tried to effect some economies in the budget. We have offered modest amendments that would have cut proposed appropriations back to the level of the budget request. We have offered amendments that would have cut back on proposed 1967 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 munificent support of 30 Democrat members. The second time, we got all of 17 Democrat votes. I think those votes clearly establish how little Democrat members 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 strived to be certain 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 inflation 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 shall again offer the Bow expenditure limitation amendment. I am serving notice on each of you that unless there is substantially increased Democrat 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 provided, of course, that the majority party has the courage to as-

sume a responsible role in the fiscal affairs of our beloved Nation.

Mark Twain once said:

Always do right, this will gratify some people and astonish the rest.

I hope the majority party will do right with respect to the budget. It will gratify some of us but, oh my, think how many it will astonish.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. I notice a third of the money involved in this appropriation bill goes as grants to States for public assistance. The country supposedly is enjoying extreme prosperity. We have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the history of the Nation. We pulled thousands of young men into our defense services and we have hundreds of thousands more working in defense plants and so on and so forth. How can we justify this large amount of grants for public assistance to States? I see it is \$145 million in fiscal year 1966. Yet the building of the so-called Great Society is piling program on program in order to eliminate poverty. How can anyone justify this? Will the gentleman be able to give me an answer to that?

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. It is very difficult for me to explain this. Perhaps my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who has attended all of these hearings, can give you a better answer than I can to the question. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for that purpose.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I have listened to these hearings on this particular item. I think this is a good estimate of the amount of money that will be expended by the States. One of the big items here is aiding dependent children and aid to the permanently and totally disabled and aid to the blind and these various welfare programs under the Social Security Administration. These are not in insurance areas and do not include any direct welfare payments to any welfare recipients on direct relief. This includes the specialized categorical programs in which the Federal Government pays the major portion of the costs in the States. I would like to tell the gentleman that old-age assistance is on the decrease, but aid to dependent children is on the increase. I would like to tell the gentleman that aid to the blind and the permanently and totally disabled is about the same as recent years.

In the old-age assistance area we can point to some improvement there with the social security program taking up some of the slack, but this program will continue to be a very major cost item.

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 this is a very good estimate of the amount of money needed in the States in these categorical welfare programs under the Social Security Administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman 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 dependency, 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 more people eligible for public assistance. As a result, through actions of State legislatures and the Congress itself, we have this figure now.

Mr. Chairman, our committee a year ago planned to make a complete investigation of the rise in costs in this area. However, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], wrote our committee a letter to the effect that they were going into this problem in depth. We thought at that time this was a problem for the legislative committee to handle.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further—

Mr. BOW. I shall be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to add this, because this is a very important section of the bill and there is a great deal of money contained in these items with reference to grants to the States:

Mr. Chairman, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965, the Kerr-Mills bill—all these programs have had a considerable impact upon the amount of money made available to the States under this program. I believe any reductions that would be made in this item in this year's budget would be a reduction which would be meaningless, because you would have to fund them in a supplemental request at a later date. We are matching State programs in this area. Any reductions here, therefore, would not represent meaningful budget reductions.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], a

few moments ago made the statement that there was a lack of concern on the part of the majority in limiting expenditures. 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 members of the majority party supported the recommittal motion. And, when the gentleman made a similar motion to recommit the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill, only 17 members of the majority party supported the motion to recommit.

Mr. 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 motions to recommit, that it demonstrates on the part of the majority party a desire to exercise congressional prerogatives and expend this money appropriated for items for which the 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 completely remove any item from 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 appropriation and expenditures of any agency by this method. To argue, as these recommit motions require to limit the expenditures of an agency to 90 or 95 percent of the Bureau of Budget recommendation and then give sole and complete discretion and authority to the executive branch of the Government to decide which items would be cut or completely deleted, makes a joke of 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.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, 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. Mr. Chairman, by 1970, 86 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

workers and consequently will have an adverse effect on the economic well-being of our people and our Nation.

More than ever before in our country's history we need educational facilities to train the technicians, the health workers, the skilled and semiskilled workers, even the very low skilled workers to fill job openings in business and industry. Automation of industry calls for retraining and upgrading of adult workers. The rapidity of changes demands that workers retrain at least from three to five times in their adult lives.

Can we ignore such needs as these? We cannot. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provides for vocational education programs to meet the needs of high school youth; persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study; persons who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining; and persons who have academic, socioeconomic and other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational programs. The act also provides for construction of area vocational education school facilities and ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational programs.

It is estimated that some 6 million persons will benefit from vocational education programs during fiscal 1966-67 at a Federal cost of \$260 million. State and local school systems have traditionally shown their belief in this type of training by greatly overmatching the Federal dollars with State and local funds. The average investment of Federal, State, and local dollars is approximately \$195 per person being served. This will not be enough to meet the expanding enrollments.

Can we ignore our responsibilities in helping State and local communities to continue to build sound educational training programs to provide for these 6 million people the skilled training they need to secure gainful employment? Gentlemen, we cannot afford to fail our people in their educational needs.

It is no mystery what becomes of students who successfully complete a course of study in vocational education. Public Law 88-210 requires that they have an occupational objective in mind when they enroll in a program; that the instruction includes up-to-date knowledge and skills necessary for competency required in the occupation and that instruction be given in cooperation with potential employers and with the counsel of advisory committees; and that facilities and equipment be in such adequate supply and quality that up-to-date, high quality training can be provided for the occupation.

With the assurance that the training is sound and that occupational goals are being met, a further safeguard is provided in the continuous evaluation of programs and their results at the local, State, and National levels.

A recent study of high school graduates of vocational education programs revealed that about 65 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 stimulants 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 somewhat 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 technical, trade, health, and business training is so great that we are already 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 7 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 16 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 \$50 a week while 2 percent started at over \$150 a week. Of those who complete training, 90 percent are employed in less than a month, 81 percent of them enter occupation for which they had 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 already budgeted for fiscal 1966-67 of \$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? If we do, it will result in economic disaster.

The Cold War Veterans Act of 1966 will certainly increase the number of young people and adults who will be seeking vocational and higher educational opportunities. With the advent of medicare, projections indicate that our country will need 10,000 new people a month for the next 10 years in health occupations alone.

If this country is to assure domestic tranquility, provide for common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure itself nationally, trained manpower must be made available to our labor force in ever increasing numbers.

The State-local-Federal relationship sponsored by the Federal vocational education acts is a national effort which can act quickly in times of emergency. It is a sound partnership based on years of successful experience and we know that even the full appropriation of funds under Public Law 88-210 will not do the total job as measured by the needs of all our people. But we must take every step to assure to the best of our ability the continuance of a Nation economically and socially secure.

The work-study provision of Public Law 88-210, section 13, provides opportunities for students who would otherwise be deprived of training for a job. Although funds were late coming to this program, some 85,000 students will have been served in fiscal 1965-66 at an average cost of \$294 per student. In my own State of Georgia failure to appropriate full funds under the act will mean denying financial aid and educational benefits to about 1,000 worthy young people.

Just listen to some of these actual cases of students now on the work-study program in Georgia—truly an antipov-erty measure:

A high school graduate living with mother and older sister who is a barmaid—a total annual income of \$2,880;

A 12th-grade graduate studying auto mechanics is one of a family of five with an annual income of \$1,200;

An 11th-grader of a family of seven with an annual income of \$1,920; and

A 10th-grader in a family of three on relief with an annual income of \$648.

These are just a few of the students we are hoping to keep in school; to keep them off the welfare and unemployment rolls and off the streets. On a larger scale failure to appropriate the full amount authorized under the act would

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 the Federal Government. It has been a successful partnership with State and local dollars overmatching the Federal dollars traditionally on an average of \$4½ 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 our 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 \$35 million authorized in sections 13 and 14 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

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

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

Mr. 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 made a very convincing argument for the need to consider the Human Investment Act, which was introduced by several Members of this House several months ago, which would certainly provide an incentive for private industry to engage in this great need for retraining many of our unskilled and semiskilled laborers.

I can only repeat at this time that the gentleman made a very fine argument for this program in the bill, but he also made a fine argument for the great need to consider the Human Investment Act. I hope before too long the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I have the honor of being a member, will give consideration 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.

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.

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:	Billions
1960	\$3.942
1961	4.362
1962	5.213
1963	5.435
1964	5.572
1965	7.226
1966 (estimated)	9.875
1967 (this bill)	10.555

Now let us take a look at the area of employment, as of June 30, 1965, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had 87,316 people. By June 30, 1966, that figure will grow to 101,000, and in another fiscal year, 107,500. Following is a very revealing table:

	June 30, 1965	June 30, 1966	June 30, 1967
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	87,316	101,000	107,500
Department of Labor	9,606	10,042	10,364
National Labor Relations Board	2,215	2,310	2,407
Railroad Retirement Board	1,074	1,039	1,070
National Mediation Board and Railroad Adjustment Board	147	150	150
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	442	443	997
U.S. Soldiers' Home	1,175	1,177	1,180
Federal Radiation Council	4	5	4
Total employment ²	101,979	116,216	123,141

¹ In addition the Department of Labor State agency employment follows: June 30, 1965, 56,327; June 30, 1966, 60,540; June 30, 1967, 59,729.

² Total employment including Labor Department State agency employment: June 30, 1965, 158,306; June 30, 1966, 176,756; June 30, 1967, 182,370.

We have also prepared a table pulling together figures to show the tremendous growth of expenditures in this HEW field not only by the Federal Government, but by the States, local governments, and private funds as well:

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Fiscal year	Gross national product ¹	Health, education, and welfare expenditures as percent of gross national product					National defense expenditures as percent of GNP	National defense expenditures ¹
		Total	Federal funds	State and local funds	Total public funds	Private funds		
1950	\$263.4	13.5	3.8	3.8	8.7	4.8	4.9	\$13.0
1955	398.0	12.8	3.6	3.6	8.1	4.7	10.2	40.7
1960	503.8	16.1	4.9	4.9	10.3	5.8	9.1	45.7
1961	520.1	17.1	5.2	5.2	11.1	6.0	9.1	47.5
1962	560.3	17.1	5.4	5.4	11.1	6.0	9.1	51.1
1963	589.2	17.5	5.6	5.6	11.3	6.2	8.9	52.8
1964	628.7	17.6	5.6	5.6	11.3	6.3	8.6	54.2
1965	676.3	17.7	5.9	5.9	11.4	6.3	7.4	50.2

¹ Source: Joint Economic Committee, Economic Indicators, April 1966.

I would call your particular attention to the above table showing per capita expenditures for health, education and welfare in this country for the year 1965 have grown to \$612 per person. That is made up of Federal, State, local, and private funds.

I have also included a table having to do with the percentage as it relates to gross national product. Ofttimes we hear, "Look how much we are spending for defense." Actually, when you take the total number of expenditures in the field of health, education and welfare, whether it comes from the Federal Government, State governments, or private funds, we find that 17.7 percent of the gross national product is made up of expenditures in this overall field of health, education and welfare, as opposed to 7.4 percent of expenditures of the gross na-

tional product in the field of national defense.

It has been brought out in the general debate earlier that the biggest line item in this bill is \$3,746 million, for grants to the States for public assistance.

As we pointed out in the course of the hearings, many of us, I am sure, were under the impression that with the enactment of all these Federal welfare programs, these grants from the Federal Government ought to diminish, but the exact contrary has proven to be the case. With the enactment of all these other programs, we still have to continue to increase these amounts to fulfill our obligation to the States in response to legislative enactments of years past.

I am going to support amendments to cut this bill, whether it be 5 percent, or any other arbitrary percentage. We

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 an 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. FOGARRY], 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 espouses 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 cutting down on communicable 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?

Who wants to be put in the position on this floor of saying "I am going to cut down on these programs"? The point is it cannot be done on the floor of this House. It cannot be done in the full Committee on Appropriations. It has to be done in the subcommittee. That is about the only place where these items can be held in line. Otherwise floodgates are opened up, and the demagogues can have a field day.

These are all popular programs. I 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. FOGARRY], 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 doing 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 2 of the report you read:

It is unfortunate that there must be this delay in funding since all of these are 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 recommendational 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 \$164 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 controls of any kind.

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 \$1,309,243 in operating revenues. The State of Kansas 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, Kans., 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 economy move would be our schoolchildren. However, local taxpayers who already are overburdened with heavy tax loads would be faced with emergency tax increases.

For example, property owners in Wichita, Kans., would have another 1½ mills added to their tax levy. The superintendent of schools in Leavenworth, Kans., recently wrote to me:

If recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget are followed, and reductions are made straight across the board to all school districts, Leavenworth stands to lose \$187,000 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 Haysville, Manhattan, Salina, Topeka, Olathe, and Junction City—home of Fort Riley where many schoolchildren await the return of their fathers fighting in far-off Vietnam.

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 mount.

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 Law 874, would be to give enough advance notice so that on a 5-year program it 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 35 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 so.

This bill also fulfills 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 half 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 this program grow from \$20 million in 1936, the first year in which grants were made, to next year's record \$3.7 billion.

Our subcommittee was advised that the public assistance programs still will 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 recommittal motion 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 escalation of 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 incomplete budget requests.

(Mr. FARNUM (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) 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 Subcommittee 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 thorough and exhausting examination which this committee has given the appropriation estimates covering the programs represented in this bill here today. Under the leadership of the great chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN FOGARTY, the subcommittee has spared no pains to make certain that the fund requests of the various agencies have been rigorously assessed in terms of the needs for the funds proposed, the value of the programs which they support, and the administrative effectiveness and efficiency which the justifications reflect.

I should like to convey to the House and to the people of the United States that the process of appropriation review carried out by the Appropriation Com-

mittees are, in my belief, a clear guarantee that the funds proposed for appropriation are necessary, cover important programs, and will be well spent.

The bill before the House today includes a number of increases above the estimates as submitted to the Congress by the President. These increases are the consequence of a most careful appraisal of the program needs which the funds will support, and particularly clear evidence of unusual opportunity for special effort or progress in areas of great promise and importance as they relate to education and health. I have personally satisfied myself that these increases are warranted and I am in full support of the provisions of the bill as presented to the House today.

I think the Members of the House must be impressed with the scope and intensity of the hearings from which this appropriation bill emerges. The volumes on the desk before you are testimonial to the persistence, vigor, and detail with which the subcommittee and its chairman pursued the examination of the fund requests. In the course of 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 subcommittee 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, is 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 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 there is 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 here 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 program of medical care for the aged 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 care develop. 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 everyone regardless 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 exists and the need for an even greater effort to solve the many problems that the 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, one that is in the practical working state at the present moment, is 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 broadly available the existing hemodialysis facilities. Last year the committee added \$2 million to this same bill in order to initiate the beginning of a national program in this area. 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 the exploitation of 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 the development of this Division. 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 permit more rapid progress 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 bioengineering 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 physical scientists and engineers poses 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 talent 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 nongovernmental 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. Thus the curricula of medical schools, schools of public health and training, programs for health professionals, must emphasize mathematics, computer technology, systems analysis techniques, and other aspects of the new and emerging technologies which are now so essential in both the solution of medical problems and the provision of health services.

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 schools of the United States so that 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 proposed, and give some indication of the many 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 of 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. FOGARTY], 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. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the full appropriations for the federally impacted school districts financial assistance laws, Public Law 874 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, headquarters 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 874.

Mr. Chairman, Chicopee School Supt. John L. Fitzpatrick, representing the Massachusetts school superintendents concerned with Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, advised me that if the full appropriation is not restored Massachusetts estimated loss will be \$8,177,476. The total estimated loss this year in my own congressional district will be \$1,036,316. The loss in Superintendent Fitzpatrick's school district will be more than \$400,000 while the estimated loss in Springfield will be an estimated \$451,729.

Mr. Chairman, I am also opposed to the administration proposals to change Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. I have expressed my opposition to Chairman CARL D. PERKINS' Subcommittee on General Education, and ask that my statement be included at this point with my remarks, along with a letter from Assistant Superintendent Joseph H. Buckley of the Springfield School Department expressing opposition to the proposed appropriations cuts in the impacted school laws:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,
April 25, 1966.

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

DEAR EDDIE: 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 floor to finance Public Law 874 for fiscal 1967 will be \$183,400,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, or \$416 million which the U.S. 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 \$232,600,000. It is that losses would result as follows:

Area	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	1967 estimated Public Law 874 entitlements under proposed amendments	Estimated loss
Massachusetts.....	\$11,163,468	\$2,985,992	\$8,177,476
2d district.....	1,914,880	878,564	1,036,316
Springfield.....	469,842	18,113	451,729

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,

JOSEPH E. BUCKLEY,
Assistant Superintendent.

APRIL 26, 1966.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on General Education,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. 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 874 and Pub-

lic Law 815. 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 874 contributions to school districts for operating expenses in federally impacted areas. These recommendations are based on a two-volume study of Public Laws 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, headquarters 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 874. Proposals to make these communities absorb 3 percent of the category A pupils, and 6 percent of the category B pupils are harsh indeed. This would mean that 63 percent of the eligible school districts in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts would lose their entire entitlement, and the remainder would have their Public Law 874 contributions severely reduced. The total estimated loss for the school year 1966-67 in Massachusetts would be \$8,177,476.

The estimated loss under Public Law 874 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 \$1,100,000 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 \$700,000.

A change in the law would virtually wipe out Public Law 874 funds to the city of Springfield. The Springfield School District estimate under impacted area funds is \$489,000 for the 1966-67 school year. The administration proposal amendments would slash this estimate down to a mere \$18,000. The administration proposal would also eliminate the Ludlow, Wilbraham, Hampden, Granby, and South Hadley School Districts from receiving Public Law 874 funds.

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 with us, but he asked me to extend his warm thanks to the committee for the invitation, and his concern over the administration's proposals. Also, he wants to be recorded in opposition to any cutbacks 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 all 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 builder of transmitters in my congressional district. It is practically impossible for an organization as small as Townsend to have a national sales force that can constantly check local publications for notices relating to local educational television applicants and requesting bids on equipment. It appears that the Office of Education considers the publication of notice in a local newspaper as appropriate public advertising. It seems to me that this is not sufficient notice. How can a regional and relatively small corporation such as Townsend Associates in my district become aware of the publication of such notice? The Office of Education also contends that the requirements under the statute are met by "circularizing three or more competitive vendors." I am informed that there are only three domestic manufacturers of UHF television transmitters—Radio Corp. of America, General Electric, and Townsend Associates. I am further informed that Townsend Associates has never been circularized with respect to submitting bids for ETV transmitters.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that local public advertising does not

give fair and adequate notice—further, circularization of builders of educational television equipment under routine requirements is completely inadequate. Thus, Mr. Chairman, the large manufacturers receive an unfair advantage. Their prices are often out of line and have been proved to be so with respect to UHF-ETV transmitters. Consequently, the higher prices deplete the available funds and result in the impossibility of spreading the great advantages of ETV among more communities.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and other committee members and expressed my concern over this problem. The Office of Education has been apprised of our arguments. I deeply hope that a more equitable arrangement can be worked out by the agency and that smaller ETV equipment suppliers will be given more consideration with the consequent savings of many dollars in this area.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the members of this Subcommittee on Appropriations know—I have vigorously expressed my discontent and concern over the President's recommendation to cut out the Federal assistance to the so-called impacted school districts.

Again, today, I will maintain this same position and will vote to support the reinstatement of these funds and against any amendments to cut this assistance. This aid would more properly be described as a payment in lieu of taxes to school districts that are faced with the responsibility of providing education to children of military personnel and employees of military installations. This comes about as a result of the fact that the property of the Federal Government in these areas is not on the local government tax rolls.

Therefore, I have always held strong convictions that this is one area of responsibility the Federal Government must continue to accept.

While I would agree with the statements that the program is being abused in some sections of the country and, in particular, around our National Capital I am equally certain that certain revisions in the program are necessary to assure those school districts having a genuine impact are adequately protected and the abusers are dealt with accordingly.

In fairness to the school boards, the administrators, and teachers of the impacted school district we must avoid these stop-and-go tactics. I ask you, Is it fair to subject these people to this type of fiscal harassment. The school population in the schools of my district are increasing rapidly because of the escalation in Vietnam. The problems are with them now. They must establish and approve their budgets to meet the educational needs of their respective communities. We must pass this legislation now and then suggest the committee study this impacted area legis-

lation to clear up the unqualified areas. Having reviewed the requests from our First Congressional District schools, I am fully satisfied their requests will withstand any amount of scrutiny.

But I hope we can resolve this problem once and for all so that our school officials can plan their budgetary requirements in a more orderly manner. Certainly they are entitled to this consideration. We have the responsibility to accord them this courtesy.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies includes the full amount estimated to be required to pay 100 percent of entitlements to school districts in federally impacted areas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14745 and strongly urge my colleagues to approve without reduction the section dealing with payments to school districts under Public Law 874.

I have been opposed to those suggestions for reductions in the budget that would curtail our program to aid federally impacted school districts.

As a former schoolteacher and administrator, I am personally familiar with the value of the program to aid our federally impacted school districts. I am sure most of us here are familiar with the Stanford study which indicated that financial burdens created for those school districts by the establishment of a Federal installation are not restricted to the project's initial impact. A burden added to a school district by a Federal project must be viewed as a continuing one, and a reduction in funds is simply not justified. Nothing is more important than a good education for our children.

I am certain that my colleagues share this feeling with me and that is why I am anxious to see the appropriation for the Federal impact program approved without reduction. Any reduction would seriously affect the program's value. Funds must be increased to meet the rising cost of education and the expansion of our school population. I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this appropriation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the committee bill and thoroughly agree with the committee judgment on increases over the budget for education. It would indeed prove disastrous in our impacted area school districts if the full amounts authorized were not appropriated.

The additions recommended for vocational education and defense educational activities also appear to be urgently needed. Reductions in student loan funds, at this time, would work a real hardship on many students. Surely experience has demonstrated fully that loans in this program are among our Nation's wisest investments in its future?

I regret very much the committee's decision to delete \$3,500,000 requested for initiating a residential vocational school

program. There is sound justification for this program, and a real need for it.

Members of the committee have reminded me 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 await 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, who—because of technological development and the increased use of automation—found 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.

This program has been accepted, I believe, as a permanent one. Perhaps not officially as yet—but it has become the one hope for individuals and the one solution, to date, for providing skilled workers for the many new fields of employment.

Through this program the inadequately educated can be taught sufficiently to qualify for occupational training in the 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 trainee 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 21,000 in training—we have graduated over 8,000 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 amendments were approved for 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.

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. 14745, being the appropriation bill for the Departments 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 the bill. This paragraph points out the bill as reported by the committee includes \$416,200,000 or the full amount estimated to be required to pay 100-percent entitlements under the authorizing legislation. Just about everyone knows that the Bureau of the Budget and the President recommended only about \$183 million or to state the matter differently the amount in this bill is \$232,000,800 above 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 aid 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. The school districts near these installations have no alternative but to expect some Federal assistance because their districts have been overrun by the children of both military and civilian personnel brought into these areas because of such installations.

By whatever description, whether we call it a military struggle or our effort to repel aggression or use the term war, the fact exists 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 if the time ever comes 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 that our school districts can 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 to let our school administrators 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 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 economies can be exercised rather than 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 those present on the floor were about 5 to 1 against the amendment to override the restorative action of the Appropriation Committee. In other words the efforts to cut back these funds to the previous budget figure was soundly defeated, by about 5 to 1.

Those of us who had hoped for a roll-call vote on this important appropriation bill on the day of its consideration are disappointed. A unanimous-consent request previously granted provided roll-call votes 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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. 14745

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:

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LAIRD

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAIRD moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out and that the bill be referred back to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this motion in accordance with the additional views which are contained in the committee report—I offered a similar motion in the full committee—to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that this bill should not be considered until all of the other authorizations affecting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are ready for funding.

I make this motion to point up the additional views, which are to be found on pages 60, 61, and 62 of the report.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, I will include the text of the additional views at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, we should not allow the Senate of the United States, through amendments to this bill, to have complete control over the funding of these vital programs in the area of higher education, elementary and secondary education, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The Appropriations Committee waits for the authorization for the foreign aid bill. The committee waits for the authorization for the space bill, which involves some \$5 billion. Why should not the House of Representatives and the Appropriations Committee wait, in accordance with these additional views, for the \$4 billion in authorizations for this bill to be enacted, and then come forward with a bill?

This motion would refer the bill back to the committee, with a feeling expressed by the vote that these authorizations should be completed so that the House of Representatives could start the appropriations for these vital programs.

In general debate I pointed out the problem involved with the elementary and secondary education program as compared with the NDEA program. It seems to me it is absolutely vital that this bill be referred to the committee and that we wait for these authorizations and then proceed in a proper fashion in these important areas of health, education, and welfare.

The additional views referred to above follow:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF THE MINORITY

This bill is just a start on the appropriation requests covering the Federal activities under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. We, the minority members of this subcommittee, are unanimous in our conviction that final action on this bill should be held up by the House of Representatives.

All appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity should be considered at one time. A motion to recommend this bill to committee will be offered so

that the Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity to exercise its responsibility of reviewing at one time the entire Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations "package" for fiscal 1967.

The administrative budget portions of this bill represent at most 75 percent of the total general revenue appropriations that will probably be enacted by this session of the 89th Congress. The bill before us contains \$10,360,250,500 for the year ending June 30, 1967. It does not contain an additional appropriation of some \$4 billion which has been requested for programs already in operation and which will be acted upon by this committee and this Congress in a forthcoming supplemental. (See table I below:)

Table I

[Amounts in millions]

Program:	Budget request
Elementary and Secondary Education Act.....	\$1,342
Higher Education Facilities Act.....	722
Grants for public libraries.....	57
Higher education activities (portions).....	30
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	1,750
Total.....	3,901

Table I contains five of the larger items not considered by our subcommittee.

There can be no justification for enacting an appropriation bill that is so demonstrably incomplete.

There can be no justification for proceeding full tilt with "business as usual" on the domestic front in light of the rapidly rising cost of living, the progressively deepening economic crisis and the alarmingly rapid growth of the costs of national security.

Many of the programs contained in this bill are designed to help and assist those less-fortunate members of our society who find themselves in unfavorable economic positions whether through low or fixed incomes, pensions or disabilities, or a variety of other factors that are well known to this committee and this Congress.

It would be an especially cruel joke if the very people these programs are designed to help are instead further burdened by the increasing costs of inflation—an inflation largely caused by a government imprudent enough to step on the accelerator instead of the brake pedal in the apparent hope that the private sector—the housewife, the farmer, the wage-earner, the businessman—will exercise the restraint and responsibility government refuses to impose on itself.

The hidden national sales tax called inflation that each American is now compelled to pay did not just happen.

It was caused.

And the signs did not just appear in the last several weeks.

They have been evident for well over a year.

In our minority views of a year ago on the first supplemental for fiscal year 1966, these signs were alluded to and the necessity for making hard choices on domestic programs in light of increasing national security costs was strongly emphasized. (See H. Rept. No. 818, 1st sess., 89th Cong.) [Not shown in the Record.]

Since that report was written last August, the economic situation in this country has in fact deteriorated:

The wholesale price index rose 1.4 percent during 1965.

It rose one-tenth of 1 percent each week in January 1966.

It rose almost two-tenths of 1 percent each week in February.

President Johnson indicated recently that the cost of living has been rising at an annual rate of some 5½ percent in recent months.

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-income citizen—has watched his real wages dwindle, in many cases, even in the face of wage increases.

Why?

Those covered by social security making \$6,600 or more a year are taxed on the order of \$100 more than they were last year;

Graduated withholding rates which go into effect next week will reduce take-home pay even more;

An inflationary rate of 3 to 5 percent will more than offset the increase in wages which those laborers who adhere to the President's 3.2-percent wage-price guideline will realize;

And the talk of still another across-the-board tax increase is in the air.

We, the undersigned, flatly oppose 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 bringing about restraint in an overheating economy.

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

This administration 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 inflationary pressures under control. This cannot be done if this committee and the Congress consider budget items for these departments 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.

Those adequate measures do not include a continuation of "business as usual" here at home. They cannot encompass the steady expansion of all new, as well as entrenched, programs without grave risk to our economy.

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 should be all too evident at this time. Reports are becoming all too frequent from Committees of Congress and in the Nation's press about the alarmingly diminishing readiness of this country to meet contingencies other than Vietnam should they arise in Europe, Africa, Asia, or Latin America.

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

Every Member of Congress is now aware of what members of this committee cautioned against last year in their minority report; namely, that defense needs were drastically underestimated and that to give them second

place in Federal budgetary considerations has in fact led to inflationary pressures and an unhealthy economic climate.

The original fiscal 1966 budget request in the defense area was underestimated by more than \$15 billion. The defense budget that is 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.

If 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 Appropriation 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 in one bill 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. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.
- ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Member of Congress.
- GARNER E. SHRIVER,
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. 84]

- | | | |
|------------|----------------|---------------|
| Andrews, | Fraser | Matthias |
| George W. | Frelinghuysen | Matthews |
| Baring | Griffin | Morse |
| Beckworth | Griffiths | Murray |
| Bolling | Hagen, Calif. | Nedzi |
| Bolton | Harsha | Nix |
| Brademas | Harvey, Ind. | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Broomfield | Harvey, Mich. | Powell |
| Burleson | Hays | Roberts |
| Cederberg | Holifield | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Clevenger | Jacobs | Rosenthal |
| Colmer | Jarman | Roudebush |
| Conyers | Johnson, Okla. | Thomas |
| Curtis | Jones, Mo. | Todd |
| Diggs | Kastenmeier | Toll |
| Dowdy | Kee | Tupper |
| Fallon | Kelly | Utt |
| Farnum | Kornegay | Vivian |
| Feighan | Leggett | Williams |
| Ford, | Mackie | Willis |
| William D. | Mailliard | Wilson, Bob |

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, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 369 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. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, to return this bill to the Committee on Appropriations. It would be a complete waste of time. It would cost more money.

There is no guarantee from any legislative committee how much further legislation will be forthcoming. We have no idea how long we would have to wait for all the committees to act.

It would be a very unusual procedure to return a bill to the Committee on Appropriations for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

All I ask at this time is that the Members turn down the gentleman's proposal to return this bill to the Appropriations Committee and that we continue with consideration of the bill today and complete action.

The amendment was offered in the subcommittee and was defeated. The amendment was offered in the full committee and was defeated. I hope it will be defeated now.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Rhode Island a question.

I am sure the gentleman realizes there is no intent on my part to jeopardize any of these programs. I tried to make this proposal in the subcommittee, so that we could wait for the authorizations.

I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island will agree with me that the manner in which we handled the Higher Education Act last year, letting the Senate add all those programs on that side, not giving any one of the 435 Members of the House an opportunity to exercise any control over that program, was not a proper procedure. With only 1 hour of debate, when it comes back in the form of a conference report, that is not the best way to legislate.

Mr. FOGARTY. I say to the gentleman, that was an exception last year. So far as I am concerned it will not happen this year. If the legislative committees act soon, the Appropriations Committee will act immediately and report back to the House, rather than let it go to the Senate. That is what will happen if I have anything to say about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. LAIRD.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 130.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAIRD

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 "\$180,400,000".

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 full Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

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

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the 1966 supplemental request, which goes to conference tomorrow, I happen to be one of 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. This 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 1965-66 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 this 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 this 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 Columbia. He pays the same real estate and income taxes as my other next-door neighbor as far as the State of Maryland is concerned. He pays the same income taxes and real property taxes. 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 all of us would agree if there is 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 this supplemental aid. But I believe we should respect the request of the President of the United States that this program be looked into as far as the school years 1966 and 1967 are concerned.

We hear a lot of talk about how the Congress is running roughshod over the President of the United States. The chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations had a prepared statement which he released after the committee marked up this bill. It made headlines in my local paper—that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had said that the Congress was on a wild spending spree and that somehow or other we had to bring Congress under control because they were forcing a tax increase. I am putting that statement in the RECORD at this point because I think that was sound advice, from the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations that day. But the advice that he gave on that day is 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 follows:

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON THE PRESIDENT'S
1967 BUDGET

(Statement of GEORGE MAHON, of Texas,
Apr. 28, 1966)

I deeply regret it was not possible to hold the line on the President's overall budget requests in the Labor-HEW 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, in terms of ultimate expenditure effect on the Treasury, the increases made in the bill today will not be as great as appear on the face of it. The increase of \$155.8 million for defense education direct loans to students was added only because of advice that the Committee on Education and Labor does not plan to report the administration bill that would have converted this loan program to a basis of Federal guarantee 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 the loans shows as an increase.

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

The question of a tax increase is a touch and go matter. When Congress overrides a budget which in total, in my opinion, is already probably too high—certainly high enough—we are indirectly voting for a tax increase; certainly at a time when the value of the people's dollar is threatened by inflationary pressures, we are inviting a tax increase. Thus, I think it is important that all of us—in and out of Congress—directly link these excesses above the President's budget with the question of a tax increase.

In making his budget the President manifested his concern on this score by trying to balance his requests with some prudence. He did not request full appropriation authorized by the Congress last year for some of the so-called Great Society programs. Something approaching \$2.5 billion more

would have been needed to come up to the full authorizations for fiscal 1967.

I believe it to be only simple prudence, in the overall best interests of the people and the buying power of their dollars, that the Congress make a greater effort to restrain its ebullient tendencies which already have resulted in the House—in bills other than those from the Committee on Appropriations—breaching the President's budget for fiscal 1967 by upwards of \$600 million with indications that the total may go even higher. This, to me, is an ominous sign that should cause all Members of Congress to stop, look, and listen.

We ought to resist the urge to add and add to 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 minority—I realize we are outvoted 2 to 1—we are not going to hold everybody up here all afternoon on a long series of amendments. But if we do well on this one 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, we will certainly continue. We are not trying to hold anybody up here this afternoon, but this is \$232 million that is involved. Let us see what kind of support we have for this kind of study. The President of the United States has asked for that study. Let us see what happens to this which I think is a legitimate request. I have supported the President of the United States and I think he is right. I supported President Eisenhower when I thought he was right, and when I thought he was wrong I disagreed with him. In this particular case, I think the President of the United States deserves support for this reduction of \$232 million.

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

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to comment on the statement of our friend from Wisconsin that he is not going to offer a series of amendments.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. We will have amendment after amendment if we are successful on this. On the other hand, if we find we are just running into a stone-wall on this proposition to hold the President's budget I do not think the

gentleman from New Jersey would want us to just continue offering futile amendments. In fact, in the committee I offered some 30 amendments in working out this bill. I believe the gentleman from New Jersey understands that thoroughly. This amendment happens to be the biggest add-on over the President's budget, and I just wanted to give the gentleman from New Jersey an opportunity to support the President of the United States.

Mr. JOELSON. During the debate of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I heard talk about "fiscal insanity" on the part of the Democrats. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] was more merciful. He merely charged us with fiscal irresponsibility, and for that we are very grateful. But I am concerned about the blunderbuss 5-percent-cut approach. The reason I suggest that there is not a long series of amendments being offered—

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

Mr. JOELSON. I cannot yield further. I have only 5 minutes. If I have time when I am through, I will yield.

The reason those amendments are not being offered is that we are dealing with some very, very popular programs. So instead an approach is made, "Well, let's just cut out 5 percent and let the Executive decide." That proposal comes from the Republican Party, which has been bewailing and bemoaning the fact for years that the Executive is encroaching upon the Legislature. Yet they come before us today, as they have in the past weeks, and say, "Let us not exercise our responsibility; let us abdicate it to the Executive. Let the Executive decide how it will spend the money."

If that is good, sound Republican gospel, I think there has been a great change and shift in the party's point of view.

I should also like to comment on the fact that when we had the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill before the House only a few weeks ago there was no attempt made by the Republican leadership to cut 5 percent across the board, and I cannot help but wonder aloud if that was not due to the fact that many of our Republican colleagues have districts that are agricultural in nature.

Only yesterday we authorized \$5 billion for the space program, and yet we talk about fiscal responsibility today.

I think my credentials in this respect are fairly good, because I was one of 10 who voted against it yesterday, just as I was one of the 6 who voted against wholesale removal of excise taxes.

So I think what we have had today has been oratorical irresponsibility and political exigency, and I hope we get back to legislative maturity.

If the gentleman from Wisconsin wishes me to yield to him at this time, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. LAIRD. Is the gentleman addressing his statement to me?

Mr. JOELSON. I thought the gentleman desired me to yield to him.

Mr. LAIRD. Earlier in your discussion, when you were talking about the amendments, I was going to give you an

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, and our subcommittee brought this bill to the full committee without this \$232 million add-on.

Mr. JOELSON. 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. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition of the amendment to cut \$232,800,000 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 \$416,200,000 asked for by 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 new 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 same situation also exists in many other communities in the New Hampshire seacoast region. A serious cutback in Federal impacted aid to education funds would leave these local 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 a big success, not only in my district, but throughout the country. When

such a program is going so 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 subsequently the country as a whole.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 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. LAIRD. 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 was 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 hardly possible to adequately 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 for schools. 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 inequities 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 pending bill were not adopted 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. MICHEL].

(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 opposed to Federal aid in 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 proposition 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. ABBITT].

(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. 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 in favor of holding the line on 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 I believe this is highly important, 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 expenditures 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 enlarged 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 renege 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 training of our 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, and unless this program 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 that the House 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, PORTER HARDY, 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, the greater portion of which is federally connected school budgets in the Tidewater districts, as well as others throughout the country, 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 communities where Federal installations are located a critical burden. Children of employees of such installations are students 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 support of local schools.

Moneys paid by Uncle Sam to local school districts 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. ABBITT 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. MAHON], for the views which he expressed on the floor a few moments ago.

I also wish to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for offering the amendment.

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 would qualify 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 up-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 1966-67. 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. FLYNT] 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 these funds should be restored if we are to keep faith and keep good faith with the school boards in school districts throughout the United States which have already prepared their budgets and have begun to make their financial 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 in every district which is affected 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 satisfactory for more than 15 years. It must be funded for the fiscal year 1967.

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 eloquently 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 illuminate the difficulties, 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 there would be no way for a 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 nontaxpaying 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 in 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 3¼ times 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, 5,998 pupils attended district schools less than the full term, and 2,999 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 transience—and, in this case, linguistic 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 Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, and consequently of nearly 10,000 civil service breadwinners employed in the shipyard—and of a fluctuating number of the Navy 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, 59.4 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 scope to Clover Park's. Let me 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 more likely would mean is the loss of 16 teachers.

What it most certainly would mean, no matter how the problem were solved, 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 education, business, or industry.

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 they are not dissimilar to 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 might be noted, already 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 funds 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 already are making substantial sacrifices for the country in military service—children who in many cases already are educationally disadvantaged by reason of frequent moves and frequent changes in educational exposure because of those 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 statements he is making. I support the position he has taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in opposition to this amendment, also. Basically I agree with the contention of my colleague who offered this amendment, that the impacted 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 60 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.

Mr. COLLIER. 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 impacted area districts.

Mr. GURNEY. In answer to the gentleman's question I would say this, that I am not expertly knowledgeable in this subject sufficiently to answer for other school districts. But I can tell the gentleman that in the case of my own district this is not so. As a matter of fact, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as a result of the abysmally poor formula that we passed in this House of Representatives last year, the school districts in Florida that are doing the most to generate most school funds, which includes the school districts in my own congressional district, receive the least back. So, indeed, these new Federal funds are not replacing impacted aid funds in the district which it is my privilege to represent.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] for 2½ minutes.

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the step that we will be taking by cutting in this portion of the budget would be a very serious step.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman of the committee, that there are some inequities in this program. I do not believe anyone denies that.

However, I am getting tired of hearing talk about Montgomery, Fairfax, and Arlington Counties being mentioned as examples of impacted aid programs across this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, under the formula proposed by the administration; that is, by the cutters, permit me to give to the Members of the Committee an example of what would happen. The percentage of cut to Montgomery County would be less than it would be to areas like the China Lake Elementary School District—

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MEEDS. I have no time to yield to the gentleman. I have other points to make.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman is completely wrong.

Mr. MEEDS. It would be less than it would be to the China Lake Elementary School District, which district is located in a naval test ordnance area, and every student is certainly connected, every one of them, with the Federal activity, and as a result thereof the entire tax base is removed from that community.

The State of California is paying, over and above what the Federal Government is paying, for the education of those students.

Mr. Chairman, there is example after example across this Nation. I have several of them in my congressional district where we in the State of Washington are paying considerably more than it is costing to educate those children, paying it from State revenues, because the impacted area funds which we receive do not represent 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 problem. This type of amendment is crucial to our people.

Mr. Chairman, we hear about the war in Vietnam. At one air base in Washington we are receiving more impacted students as a result of the war in Vietnam. We have 450 new students this year because of the war in Vietnam. And, we are expecting to educate those children 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 say 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 program.

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

Under the present makeup of the program, 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 because these funds represent payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned land which is exempt from local taxation.

In my congressional district, the Douglas 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 collapse financially.

The superintendent of the Douglas school system, Mr. Robert R. Spelts, has spent countless hours planning for the coming fiscal year as well as documenting 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 \$57,358 per year and from this program it receives \$1,110,074. This district could operate just about 2 days on its tax money.

The staff of the Education Subcommittee has published a committee print with a statistical table, showing the effects of reductions on each of the participating 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 60 percent of their current funds under the program.

In South Dakota, for example, the current level of assistance of \$3.1 million will be reduced by more than \$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 programs were prepared, the teachers hired, and the decision made to try to upgrade the quality of the schools.

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

It is imperative that the full appropriation be made for fiscal year 1967, and that no changes be made in this program for future years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for 3½ minutes.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be soundly defeated.

Mr. Chairman, since 1950 when this law was first passed, we have had at least 10 record votes in the House of Representatives 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 Florida 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 congressional 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 country a decent education.

Our Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed last year even though the programs under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 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 recommended, 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 tie vote, but all of the members of the subcommittee on the democratic side who listened to all the testimony voted solidly to put this \$232 million in the bill in the subcommittee but it was voted down on a tie vote.

We took it up only last Thursday morning in the full committee. We carried it in the full committee by a vote of 30 to 12. I think that indicates what the membership of the House of Representatives 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 down here by the President? You know what they are go-

ing to do. In my estimation they are going to change it and they are going to increase the authorization for this program. When they report it out, it is going to carry this House of Representatives by at least 3 or 4 to 1—as I hope this amendment will be defeated. If we do not defeat it in the House today, then tomorrow on a rollcall vote I will almost guarantee that we can defeat this amendment by at least 3 or 4 to 1 as has been the past experience since 1950 when this legislation was put into effect. Who do we think we are kidding here today? Are we going to try to legislate on an appropriation bill by knocking this money out? That is what you are trying to do—you are trying to take away the responsibilities of the proper legislative committee of the House and assume it in connection with an appropriation bill. Well, you cannot do it and get away with it. I hope this amendment is soundly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAIRD) there were—ayes 25, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 17, at the end of line 18, strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided further, That this appropriation shall not be available for payments to any local educational agency on account of (1) three per centum of the total number of children in average daily attendance in cases of children of parents who reside and work on Federal property, or (2) six per centum of the total number of children in average daily attendance in cases of children of parents who reside or work on Federal property, or (3) local contribution rates not determined in accordance with the first two sentences of section 3(d) of such Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 238(d)), with respect to the areas covered thereby."

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I make a point of order in that this would be legislation on an appropriation bill, because it would change the basic formula which is contained in the authorizing legislation. It would add confusion to the distribution of these funds. In fact, there is legislation pending before a legislative committee to do just what the gentleman seeks to do by his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, most of the argument of the gentleman from Virginia is not addressed to the point of order. The things he suggests are certainly not points of order. I think it is strictly a limitation upon an appropriation bill, and I believe the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the three categories which are set forth in the amendment are merely 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 go on, but that there are some inequities in it that ought to be corrected. What I seek to do in the 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 if they constitute 3 percent of total children in average daily attendance.

Item 1 of the amendment would limit payments for federally connected children in excess of 3 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 5 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 now 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 which would be 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. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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 he has done in the past on these bills, my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Let us take taxi drivers at the National Airport who are working for ATA. They drive a taxicab 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, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

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.

Mr. BOW. 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 operate.

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 existent in the program.

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

I rise in part to pose some questions to the maker of the motion. Certainly we are revising the basic law, although it may be parliamentarily correct. I would hope we could detect precisely what it is that he is proposing to do. As I understood, we would take the 3 percent 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 have lost approximately \$5 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 us to undo 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. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CAREY. 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 engaging in an exhaustive study of the effect 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 without 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 ill becomes 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 the 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 legislation may not always be unjustified but it is certainly unjustified when it creates insoluble 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 topflight 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 a total lack of the 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 program operates on 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 fails to take into consideration that there is a different impact on students of those in the civil service as compared to military personnel? The military personnel have available to them the commissaries and medi-

cal 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 \$233 million cut being proposed in H.R. 13160 now being considered in our subcommittee.

School districts would get no payment for federally connected children under 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 category B children, 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. 13160 pending in our subcommittee.

I say that the subcommittee certainly should have an opportunity to work its will on all these amendments. To my way of thinking, the amendment on the floor is purely legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BROYHILL 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 previous 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 this matter was pending before a proper legislative committee, as pointed out by the gentleman from Kentucky, who preceded me.

This involves a complicated, confusing change in the formula, which should have extensive consideration and deliberation by a proper committee. I

doubt whether there is any Member on the floor of the House at this time who knows what the effect of this particular amendment would be to the budget next year in his school districts.

I am opposing this amendment, even though it actually will hurt my congressional district a lot less than it will hurt most school districts.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. This amendment will affect every impacted school district in the Nation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Indeed it will.

Mr. PERKINS. This is the recommendation of the Stanford Research Committee, and we have called witnesses in from throughout the country to try to analyze this amendment. In certain areas which have military installations it is going to have a tremendous effect in respect to reducing funds.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I 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 as a result of Federal impact. Therefore, it would not lose a large percentage of its impact funds as a result of this amendment and would possibly be in a little better position to absorb the effect 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 metropolitan area of Washington. They overlook the fact when they point with envy to what we receive from this Federal impact legislation that there are thousands of military people who live in our community. We are glad to have them, because they are good citizens, but they are taken off of our local tax rolls and exempted from payment of the State income tax and the automobile license tax and so on by virtue of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, which is a Federal law. We have living in my congressional district—and I am glad they are living there—over 100 Members of Congress who are exempt from the payment of the automobile license tax and the State income taxes. I do not think they should be taxed, but still the children of these colleagues are going to these schools. So we do not receive tremendous tax benefits due to the fact that this happens to be a Federal area.

Arlington County, for example, has one-half of its real property taxes lost by virtue of federally owned property. The Federal Government owns one-sixth of the land area in Arlington County. If this land were assessed on the same basis as other real property it would double the amount of revenue it receives from real property taxes.

During the past 15 years since the original enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874, the northern Virginia communities have done their share in taxing themselves for the construction of new schools

caused by the tremendous growth of the Federal Government in the Washington metropolitan area. In fact, insofar as school construction is concerned the communities have spent approximately five times as much as the Federal Government in school construction costs while approximately 50 percent of the pupils have parents who live or work on tax-free Federal property.

For example, in Fairfax County, during the past 15 years \$109 million has been spent for new school construction alone. Fairfax only received \$19 million of Federal assistance through Public Law 815 and created a bonded indebtedness of \$90 million. In Arlington County the figures are \$29 million total construction costs, \$5.5 million Federal funds and \$27 million local bonds. For the city of Alexandria, \$17 million total costs with \$635,000 Federal grants and \$16,370 bonds.

As stated above, these figures show that there has been a tremendous burden placed upon the communities by virtue of the growth as well as being the result of the Federal impact, and the ratio of Federal assistance is very little.

I wish, therefore, that some of my colleagues would quit begrudging the fact that we have attractive 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 Washington.

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 following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 85]

Andrews, George W.	Fraser	Murray
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Nedzi
Beckworth	Griffin	Nix
Bolling	Griffiths	O'Hara, Mich.
Bolton	Harvey, Ind.	Powell
Broomfield	Harvey, Mich.	Roberts
Burleson	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Cederberg	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Clevenger	Jarman	Roudebush
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Thomas
Conyers	Jonas	Todd
Curtis	Jones, Ala.	Toll
Diggs	Jones, Mo.	Utt
Dowdy	Kee	Vivian
Everett	Kelly	Whitener
Fallon	Kornegay	Williams
Farnum	Mackie	Willis
Feighan	Mailliard	Wilson, Bob
Ford,	Mathias	
William D.	Matthews	
	Morse	

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, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed 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. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, there are two aspects of this amendment which I believe are worthy of our consideration at this time.

The first is the timing of the amendment. We are engaged in whatever we want to call it—a military struggle, a war, or some kind of peace operation in southeast Asia. We have a quarter of a million men in southeast Asia today. Most of them came from military establishments in the United States, and most of them have families who are still living near those establishments. 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 these schools have been receiving in the past from the Federal Government?

I can only cite what I know from personal experience. Near the little city of Killeen there are two divisions stationed at Fort Hood, one of the largest military establishments in the United States. More than 50 percent of the troops making up the regular personnel of these divisions are now gone to southeast Asia. Most of their families and most of their children are still there. They pay no taxes. They cannot support the local schools.

The community obviously is depressed as a result of the absence of the troops who normally maintain the economy of the community. Yet these hard-pressed local people would be called upon at this time to make up the reduction in assistance which the Government has so long provided for those schools. Could we pick a more inappropriate time for such a reduction in governmental assistance?

How are people to maintain schools in a situation of that kind? And yet, this is not an isolated instance. The same thing is occurring all across this Nation. We are not faced with any fine-spun theory of how we should work this out. We know there is only one way to maintain the schools. We know that the continuation of the present program is the only thing which will enable us to maintain decent schools in a great many communities in a great many places. I think we, at least, owe our men in Vietnam a continuation of as favorable educational facilities for their families as they enjoyed before these men were sent overseas.

I believe we ought to take into consideration the fact that we are faced with this situation and faced with it now and that this would be the most inopportune time of the past 15 years to make such a change.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. The point the gentleman is making is important. Dozens of witnesses have come before the subcommittee to point out the buildup in the military installations throughout the country. That is one of the problems we must take into consideration in connection with this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I know that he and his subcommittee are working on the problem.

This points up the next aspect of the situation to which I should like to call attention; that is, the way the author of this amendment proposes to reach the problem. He comes before us with what he calls a limitation on an appropriation bill.

I fear it does come under the existing rule. I am not complaining about the ruling of the Chair. I think it comes under the letter of rule, but the spirit of this thing is exactly the contrary to the clear intent of the rule. The author of the amendment, himself, stood on this floor within 3 minutes after winning his parliamentary victory and said that there were defects in the present law and he proposed to start curing them with this amendment. In other words, he proposed to make changes now in the present law by his amendment. Oh, he had just said it was nothing but a limitation on an appropriation bill. However, when the very author of the amendment comes to you and tells you his purpose is to change and improve the basic law, does it not show that what he really intends to do is to legislate and his interest is not primarily in 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 blatantly violate the spirit of those rules.

This amendment should be defeated not only because it is untimely, 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 read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 63, immediately following line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 1006. 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. 335)."

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 bloodied 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'Brien and the rest of them did not 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.

It does not in any way cut the appropriations provided in this bill but it does provide for a 5-percent cut in aggregate 1967 spending proposed by the President for items in the bill.

If adopted, it will have the effect of strengthening the President's resolve to curtail, wherever possible, Federal spending in fiscals 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 it be voted on.

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 a valiant, vigorous, determined effort not only in the Capitol but in all of the office buildings across the street. However, the other side of the coin is that when there are honest and sincere efforts made really to cut the bill back, to the budget recommendations of the President, there is an obvious lack of interest on the part of the White House toward trying to achieve this desirable end.

This is unfortunate, I think, from the point of view of the taxpayers. The President and all of his advisers, including my good friend, the Postmaster General, would be in a better light from the point of view of the public if they would make the same effort on the legislative proposals for reductions as they are apt to do when they are increases.

And, I hope that the pattern of the past will not be repeated in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we could, with some honest help, some sincere help from all of those who work at the White House, have achieved some reductions or at least have held the line. But I see no evidence of any effort of that nature whatsoever.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the Committee at this late hour to debate this amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has offered the amendment to other appropriation bills, and it has been soundly defeated. I hope that the Committee will follow the same example in this instance and vote it down by a resounding vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

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 here today a second appropriation 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 cannot be touched by the Congress. I believe all of us should understand that the \$4 billion which is in the social security programs, other than the insurance program, are categorical programs, such as aid to dependent children, aid to the totally and permanently disabled, aid to the blind, and aid to those who are receiving old-age assistance.

Mr. Chairman, these various categorical programs cannot be touched by the Congress. Any reduction or any cut that we would make in these aids to the various States would not be a legitimate cut. I like to use the word that it would be a phony cut. However, my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] objects to my using the term "phony." So I will say that it would not be a realistic cut.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are other areas in which reductions could be made. However, I have had experience for 14 years on this subcommittee, and know that the place at which we have to work out many of these cuts is right in our subcommittee, because when we get out here on the floor of the House it is almost impossible on occasion to explain that this program or that program with these very appealing names might be overfunded.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to my colleagues here today that no further amendments will be offered.

We offered the amendment on the impacted aid program, and there was not much support for it. However, I felt that it should be offered, in deference to the President of the United States, and since no one on his side of the aisle would offer it, I did so here on the floor of the

House because I thought we ought to have an opportunity to vote. There were not very many Members who supported the President on that particular amendment, and there was not much work done by the White House staff or the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the legislative liaison division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on these increases that have been added to this bill.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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. I did not hear about a single person from the White House staff going through the halls of the House Office Building trying to urge people on this occasion to save any money or to cut the committee's request in accordance with the President's budget submission. I felt 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 new departure so far as the administration is concerned—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.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sympathy of the minority leader who points 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 applauding 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 actually be passed. Certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin, who said that it was a test amendment and that he would not offer others 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 any impacted areas program.

I do not advocate abandoning the aid to impacted areas program; I advocate improving it. That is what the President is advocating. We can improve it some, I think.

The gentleman from Kentucky pointed out that at this very time the legislative committee is considering certain amendments. My desire was to let the Committee on Education and Labor consider the proposed amendments and when that committee has taken action, we would then provide the appropriations. That would be the orderly way to proceed.

Now, with respect to emissaries from the White House walking the corridors and undertaking to support the President on this issue, I admit I did not stumble over any as I walked down the corridors. But I would like to think that the Members of the House could make sound and appropriate decisions without having to be urged to do so by employees of the executive branch. Legislation is our responsibility.

But I must say in all fairness that the President himself, in my presence, on several occasions urged—and strongly urged—support of his position with respect to this matter.

Further, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, urged upon me the fullest possible support of his position on his budget. But he did not have many votes here today; the amendment on impacted aid was defeated.

But it seems to me that if an amendment had been offered to reduce the \$42,750,000 above the budget for vocational education, it might have fared better. I think the Democratic side of the aisle might have stayed with the President on that and maintained the appropriation at the same level as last year's. Such an amendment, however, was not offered.

Mr. Chairman, on another matter, the bill carries \$74 million above the President's budget for the National Institutes of Health. Medical research is a very popular and essential program. The appropriation is about \$1.4 billion for the National Institutes of Health, which is about twice what it was 5 years ago. I think that many Members would have been willing to stay with the President on this.

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 In-

stitutes of Health—which, in my judgment, is all they can reasonably 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 these references. 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 \$500 million above the President's budget—is to move us 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 asked us to appropriate 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, and 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 going above the budget in the appropriation bills. That does not alarm some people but 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 situation, it would seem to me 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 Executive 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.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows that amendments can still be offered at any time or place to the bill right now.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So I think it would be appropriate, in the light of the gentleman's statement, if someone on the Democratic side would offer an amendment—just one, just one—to take the budget back to the level that the President recommended. This would be an indication of good faith on the part of those who say that the President should

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 suggest—I urge—that a Democrat, just one, offer an amendment to support the President's budget in these instances. The Republicans have offered amendments to support the President's budget in certain items, to help him hold the line he drew in these instances. I would like to see some Democrats, just one Democrat, do this.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking as a political partisan. This matter is of a nonpartisan 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. We are moving toward a tax increase. I think it well to say so as we consider this bill.

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

(On request of Mr. ARENDS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

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. MAHON. 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. In the course of his remarks, 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, I am sure, to the impacted school aid portion of the program and several other items in this appropriation bill.

If it was naive for us—and I speak collectively—to think that we could hold the line, I suggest that 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 phoney 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. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee 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, and 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 with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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 read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 63, immediately following line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 1006. 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. 335)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House of May 3, further proceedings will be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, is this on the motion to recommit, or on passage?

The SPEAKER. This is on passage.

Mr. LAIRD. That is what I thought, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understood it, the question was on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, it did not appear to me that the motion to recommit had been put to the House.

The gentleman from Ohio was on his feet and the assumption was, from that fact, that he was objecting to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will always try to protect the intent of a Member. Without objection, the question will be on the motion to recommit, and under the order of May 3, that vote will go over to tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair has already announced that under the order of May 3, the vote will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is a teller vote a record vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already passed upon the demand of the gentleman from Ohio who objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and made the point of order that a quorum was not present on the motion to recommit. The Chair has already passed on that and stated that under the order of May 3, the vote is postponed for further consideration 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 would expect the same consideration on this side 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 would expect the same consideration be given to me as was given to the opposition. I was trying to demand tellers all the time and I was not recognized. All I ask for is the same consideration as was given to the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair has made its ruling that under the order of May 3 further proceedings will go over on the motion to recommit and on the final passage of the bill until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. I never realized a teller vote was a record vote.

The SPEAKER. The point of order that no quorum was present had been made by the gentleman from Ohio. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Rhode Island that that point of order takes precedence.

Mr. FOGARTY. I was trying to get recognized before the point of order of no quorum was made and before the decision of the Chair was made in favor of the gentleman from Ohio and against the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The SPEAKER. 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.