

these were followed by angry confrontations between the soldiers and residents.

Eye witnesses said they saw soldiers spitting at Catholics and there were numerous complaints that the soldiers used vulgar, foul and filthy language against the residents, the Pope and girls living in the estate.

Mr. Cooper, who has a dossier of complaints and has visited all the searched houses, said last night that as many as 20 homes were searched and at least one house was damaged. Articles were taken from other houses.

He accused them of driving their Saracen armoured cars and Landrovers recklessly through the streets of the Creggan estate without care for playing children.

He also demanded to know if, in fact, the soldiers were out of control, and recalled that early yesterday a stone was thrown at him by a British soldier.

Since the "Jocks" arrived in Derry, a double line of fortifications has been strung around the Bligh's Lane Army post and with their base secure from attackers the troops are now patrolling the streets carrying rifles and sub-machine guns.

Mr. Cooper has called for the evacuation of the Bligh's Lane post by the British Army.

"This is a planned campaign on the part of the Army or else the troops are out of control," he said.

"Yesterday morning workers entering the Essex factory at Bligh's Lane were stoned again by the Scots.

"This is nothing, other than provocation and I have got the impression that the British soldiers are trying to provoke another Sharpville."

At the weekend when Mr. Cooper, Father M. Rooney, the priest in charge at Creggan, and leaders of youth clubs and tenant associations in Creggan, went on a deputation to the Army they were refused a hearing and told to make their complaints through the proper machinery—the R.U.C.

The complaints have now been reported to a Chief Superintendent of the R.U.C. in Derry.

FEDERALIZING STATE JUVENILE COURTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, judicial tyranny under the guise of "judicial reform" in this country has taken another giant step down the road to absolute Federal control of independent State judicial systems through a dialog leading

to a uniform code of laws and standardized judicial procedures for juvenile courts.

The implications of the announcement of the creation of a "justice" panel that would "seek to formulate national standards of justice for those under 18 years of age" are shocking.

The problems faced by the youth of New York City are not the same as those faced by the young people of a small country town. To attempt to impose a "national standard of justice" through uniform codes of law and standardized judicial procedures on young people from which such radically different environments is absurd unless we are ready to admit our children are no better than robots.

I include a news article from the New York Times on Monday, July 26, 1971, at this point in the RECORD.

TWENTY-SEVEN APPOINTED TO JUSTICE PANEL: TO ADVISE ON A 1-YEAR U.S. STUDY OF JUVENILE COURTS

The names of the 27 persons—judges, lawyers, public officials and others—who will serve on an advisory committee for a one-year study of juvenile justice to be coordinated by the Institute of Judicial Administration were made public yesterday.

The project was announced in June by Attorney General John N. Mitchell, who said it would seek to formulate national standards of justice for those under 18 years of age. It will be financed by a \$164,341 grant from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

The institute, in announcing the names of the advisers, said in a statement:

"Recidivism among juveniles is discouragingly high. According to one source, 74 per cent of juveniles found guilty of an offense will later be rearrested. Critics of the present juvenile system argue that rather than rehabilitating youthful offenders, the system is creating future criminals."

"BASIS FOR MODEL CODES"

The statement noted that "public concern about crime and the availability of Federal funds make this an excellent time to start significant reforms in court proceedings as well as such important related areas as police and correctional practices." It went on:

"The standards which result from this project would provide the basis for model codes and administrative guidelines for such diverse topics as the selection and training of judges and other criminal justice personnel, the role of prosecutors and defense attorneys, probation and parole procedures, diversion of cases for nonjudicial treatment, and correctional programs."

The chairmen of the advisory committee are Roger M. Blough, the president of the Institute of Judicial Administration, and Judge Irving R. Kaufman of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

The other committee members are: Judges Florence Kelley and Nanette Dembitz of the New York Family Court; Deputy N.Y.C. Police Commissioner Theresa Melchionne;

Arthur Zitrin, a professor of psychiatry at New York University;

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, former United States Attorney General and now the general counsel to the I.B.M. Corporation;

Allen Breed, director of the California Youth Authority;

Justice William H. Erickson of the Colorado Supreme Court;

Judge William Fort of the Oregon Appeals Court;

William T. Gossett of Detroit, former president of the American Bar Association;

Erwin N. Griswold, United States Solicitor General;

Patrick Healy of Chicago, the executive director of the National Association of District Attorneys;

John Irving, the director of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission;

Jacob Isaacs of New York, the chairman of the American Bar Association's section on family law;

Judge Norman H. Johnson of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia;

Norman Lefstein, the deputy director of the District of Columbia public defender agency;

Judge James Lincoln of the Detroit Probate Court;

Richard Lindsey, the chairman of the Pennsylvania Board of probation and parole;

Judge Sam P. McKenzie, of the Georgia Superior Court;

Monrad Paulsen, dean of the law school of the University of Virginia;

Cecile Pool of San Francisco, chairman of the American Bar Association's section on individual rights;

Milton Rector of Paramus, N.J., executive director of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency;

Mrs. Margaret Rosenheim, professor of social service administration at the University of Chicago;

Ivan Scheler, a psychologist, of Boulder, Colo.;

Daniel Skoler of Washington, the staff director of the American Bar Association's commission on correctional facilities and service;

Robert Switzer, a psychiatrist at the Menninger Clinic, Topeka, Kans.;

Mrs. Patricia Wald, a lawyer and a member of the Center for Law and Social Policy, Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 27, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

My soul, wait thou only upon God: For my expectation is from Him.—Psalm 62: 5.

Eternal God, our Father, who art the source of wisdom, power and love, whose mercy is over all Thy works and whose will is ever directed to Thy children's good, grant that with increasing faith in Thee we may find light to lead us, strength to sustain us and spirit to steady us in the midst of the swiftly moving scenes of these days.

CXVII—1718—Part 21

Bless thou our country with the power of Thy presence—our leaders in church, in state, in court, in business, in labor, and all our people that we may stand before the world as a nation devoted to righteousness and justice, to truth and good will.

In the mood of the Master we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4762. An act to amend section 5055 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to establish and carry out a program of exchange of medical information.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9020. An act to amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide that certain plants which process egg products shall be exempt from such act for a certain period of time.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1139. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, so as to permit certain persons under twenty-one years of age to obtain insurance coverage under such act.

PERMISSION TO FILE A CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9417, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 9417, the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1972.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-386)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9417) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 23, 26, 29, 38, and 40.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 12, 13, 17, 24, 27, and 39, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$71,035,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$273,787,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$42,315,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$361,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$29,652,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,488,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$130,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$48,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,126,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$56,457,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,092,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$238,678,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$153,027,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$30,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$54,210,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$44,701,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 15, 18, 19, 21, 28, 31, and 32.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
DAVID R. OBEY,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
NICK GALIFIANAKIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
WENDELL WYATT,
DEL CLAWSON,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
GALE W. MCGEE,
JOSEPH M. MONTROYA,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CHARLES H. PERCY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALIB BOGGS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9417), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

**TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Bureau of Land Management**

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$71,035,000 for management of lands and resources instead of \$76,080,000 as proposed by the House and \$69,930,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$350,000 for the North Alaska Land Use Plan and \$755,000 for Alaska pipeline inspection.

The managers agree that in addition to the funds provided in this appropriation account for the North Alaska Land Use Plan, the State of Alaska shall contribute not less than 50 per cent of this amount to be used for development of the Plan. The contribution may be in dollars or kind, but shall be made available not later than the latter half of fiscal year 1972.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$273,787,000 for education and welfare services instead of \$273,487,000 as proposed by the House and \$274,662,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$25,000 for law and order work on the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming; \$350,000 for adult vocational training; and \$500,000 for emergency housing for California rural Indians.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$71,226,000 for resources management instead of \$71,866,000 as proposed by the House and \$71,667,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the amount proposed by the House includes \$540,000 for fire suppression and emergency rehabilitation, and \$100,000 for tribal operations. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Of any funds becoming available that will not adversely affect other budgeted soil and

moisture conservation programs, priority shall be given to additional funding for the Anadarko Area, Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$42,315,500 for construction instead of \$37,206,000 as proposed by the House and \$43,055,500 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$175,000 for continuation of construction on the Indian irrigation project, Duck Valley Indian Reservation, Nevada; \$100,000 for advance planning of a day school, Fort Totten Reservation, North Dakota; \$440,000 for additional school facilities, Rocky Boy Indian Reservation, Montana; and \$25,000 for a temporary gymnasium, Busby, Montana.

The managers agree that the allocation of Federal funds for the East Charles Mix School District 102, Wagner, South Dakota shall be in the same ratio as the number of Indian children to the non-Indian children projected to be enrolled for the first school year following essential completion of construction.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$608,000 for construction of additional school facilities on the Rocky Boy Indian Reservation, Montana. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$25,600,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authority) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$3,949,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,999,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$361,500,000 for the Land and Water Conservation Fund instead of \$350,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$366,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$29,652,000 of land and water conservation funds for the Forest Service instead of \$19,652,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,652,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$3,488,000 of land and water conservation funds for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife instead of \$1,988,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,988,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Territories

Amendment No. 12: Provides a limitation of \$395,000 for the Office of Territories as proposed by the Senate instead of \$233,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$21,699,000 for administration of territories as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,537,000 as proposed by the House.

The managers agree that the President's personal representative and his staff for the purpose of negotiating the future status of the Trust Territory shall not be financed by the Department of the Interior.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$130,400,000 for surveys, investigations, and research instead of \$130,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$131,175,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the House includes \$500,000 for expanded geothermal energy activities, \$400,000 for an earth resources observation systems data center; and a reduction of \$500,000 for urban pilot studies.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with language proposed by the Senate for the use of the Government-owned site donated for the Earth Resources Observation Systems Data Center for lease construction at Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$48,700,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of \$49,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$47,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction below the amount proposed by the House includes \$300,000 for initiation of studies on subsurface waste disposal.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$74,630,000 for health and safety as proposed by the Senate instead of \$73,630,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Coal Research

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$25,530,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$21,880,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,080,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The increase over the amount proposed by the House includes \$2,600,000 for operation and maintenance of a pilot plant at Cresap, West Virginia; \$1,000,000 for the clean coke and fuels project; and \$50,000 for research on low grade coal use as soil conditioners.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 19: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$65,184,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$64,794,000 as proposed by the House and \$65,180,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the House includes \$70,000 for fishery management assistance, Wind River Reservation, Wyoming; \$65,000 for the Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, North Dakota; \$140,000 increased funding for the enforcement staff; \$120,000 increased funding for cooperative fishery units which will also provide \$55,000 for the cooperative wildlife research unit at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin; \$95,000 for increased funding for cooperative wildlife research units which will also provide \$54,000 for the cooperative fishery unit at the Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee; and a reduction of \$100,000 for Alaska Pipeline investigation.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$7,126,000 for construction instead of \$6,225,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,890,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the House includes \$213,000 for rehabilitation of the White Sulphur Springs National Fish Hatchery, West Virginia; \$198,000 for a flood control structure, Lake Ardoch National Wildlife Refuge, North Dakota; \$540,000 for additional facilities, Green Lake National Fish Hatchery, Maine; \$60,000 for two residences at Jones Hole National Fish Hatchery, Utah; \$150,000 for a feasibility study of means to control water quality, Salton Sea, California; and reductions of \$65,000 for the relocation of the fish control laboratory at La Crosse, Wisconsin; and \$195,000 to complete the master plan and begin construction on Muscatatuck Wildlife Refuge, Indiana.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 21: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$70,895,000 for management and protection instead of \$71,077,000 as proposed by the House and \$70,961,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$66,000 for Voyageurs National Park. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$56,457,000 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities instead of \$56,230,000 as proposed by the House and \$56,507,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$50,000 for repair of Harpers Ferry streets, West Virginia.

Amendment No. 23: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to appropriate \$50,000 for reconstruction of certain streets in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$39,307,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$37,849,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$19,092,000 for parkway and road construction (liquidation of contract authority) instead of \$18,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,204,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$112,000 for planning of roads, North Unit, Theodore Roosevelt National Park, North Dakota.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$8,325,000 for preservation of historic properties as proposed by the House instead of \$8,205,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Provides \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate for transportation of children in nearby communities to and from any unit of the National Park System used in connection with organized recreation and interpretive programs of the National Park Service, instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Saline Water

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the amendment of the Senate providing \$27,025,000 for saline water conversion.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 29: Restores language deleted by the Senate to appropriate \$500,000 for research under the special foreign currency program.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$238,678,300 for forest land management instead of \$238,718,000 as proposed by the House and \$236,178,300 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the House includes \$164,000 for watershed treatment, Murry Canyon, Humboldt National Forest, Nevada; \$6,300 for administration of ski trail expansion, Colorado; and a reduction of \$210,000 for wildlife habitat management and stand improvement, Clark National Forest, Missouri.

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$54,325,000 for forest research instead of \$54,208,000 as proposed by the House and \$51,685,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$1,000,000 for aerial fire suppression techniques; \$350,000 for urban forestry; \$400,000 for watershed management, Beaver Creek

Project, Arizona; \$650,000 for forest sciences research, Corvallis, Oregon; \$40,000 for the LaGrande Range and Wildlife Habitat Laboratory, Oregon; and \$200,000 for research on logging residuals.

The managers are in agreement that \$200,000 provided in the bill for shrub genetics research shall be allocated among the laboratories at Reno, Nevada; Corvallis, Oregon; and Provo, Utah. It is further agreed that the \$250,000 added by the Senate shall be for watershed management in Hawaii.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$35,291,200 for construction and land acquisition instead of \$31,858,000 as proposed by the House and \$31,821,200 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The increase over the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$951,000 for Timberline Lodge, Oregon; \$300,000 for recreation facilities, Lava Lands Complex, Deschutes National Forest, Oregon; \$125,000 for the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center, Oklahoma; \$89,000 for Roby Lake, Texas County, Missouri; \$1,680,000 for a Southern forest fire laboratory, Macon, Georgia; \$140,000 for Redwood Research headquarters, Arcata, California; \$110,000 (planning) for a forest science laboratory at Auburn, Alabama; and \$75,000 for land acquisition, Institute of Forest Genetics, Rhinelander, Wisconsin.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Health Services and Mental Health Administration

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$153,027,000 for Indian Health Services instead of \$147,404,000 as proposed by the House and \$158,293,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$486,000 for community health representatives; \$250,000 for increased dental care (of the amount provided, \$25,000 shall be allocated to the small tribes of Western Washington); \$500,000 for establishment of a pilot transportation project; \$3,000,000 for contract medical care; and \$1,030,000 for additional personnel for the increased sanitation facilities program.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$30,400,000 for Indian health facilities instead of \$20,289,000 as proposed by the House and \$36,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction of \$6,000,000 below the amount proposed by the Senate is for additional sanitation facilities. The additional funding for sanitation facilities over that proposed by the House will provide \$6,800,000 for existing homes; \$1,700,000 for new units in Alaska, and \$500,000 for existing housing at locations of new units in Alaska.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$54,210,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$54,460,000 as proposed by the House and \$53,460,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Provides \$20,750,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts instead of \$21,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$44,701,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$45,259,000 as proposed by the House and \$44,681,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the Senate is for public service programs.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$1,300,000 for the Science Information Exchange as

proposed by the House instead of \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$695,000 for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars as proposed by the Senate instead of \$565,000 as proposed by the House.

National Council on Indian Opportunity

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$275,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1972 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1971 total amount, the 1972 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills for 1972 follows:

	<i>Amount</i>
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	\$2,034,220,900
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (as amended)	2,194,594,035
House bill, fiscal year 1972	2,159,508,035
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	2,226,023,035
Conference agreement	2,223,980,035
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	+189,759,135
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (as amended)	+29,386,000
House bill, fiscal year 1972	+64,472,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	-2,043,000

¹ Includes \$27,025,000 for Office of Saline Water (H. Doc. 92-15) and \$3,000,000 for Indian Health Services (S. Doc. 92-20), which were not considered by the House.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
DAVID R. OBEY,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
NICK GALIFIANAKIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOSEPH M. McDADE,
WENDELL WYATT,
DEL CLAWSON,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
GALE W. MCGEE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOKA,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CHARLES PERCY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALEB BOGGS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

INVOCATION BY REV. GEORGE CLEMENTS BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

(Mr. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1971, the congressional black caucus was honored with the presence of one of Chicago's most outstanding clergymen, the Reverend George Clements, who gave the invocation of what was to be the most historical affair of the year.

Reverend Clement's invocation set forth a challenge to the members of the caucus that also, in my opinion, is a challenge for each Member of this House. I was so impressed by this prayer that I

thought I would share it with you. With your kind indulgence, may I read this prayer to you?

Lord, make the Congressional Black Caucus instruments of Your peace.

Where there is hatred, let August Hadkins and Walter Fauntroy sow love.

Where there is hatred, let August Hawkins and Robert Nix bring pardon.

Where there is doubt let Shirley Chisholm restore faith.

Where there is despair let Ronald Dellums bring hope.

Where there is darkness let Charles Diggs bring light and where there is sadness let William Clay bring joy.

O Divine Master, grant that John Conyers may not so much seek to be consoled as to console;

That George Collins may not so much seek to be understood as to understand;

That Louis Stokes may not so much seek to be loved as to love;

For it is in giving that Parren Mitchell receives.

It is in pardoning that Ralph Metcalfe is pardoned;

And it is in dying that the Congressional Black Caucus is born to eternal life.

I would hope that each of us would accept this challenge, and in behalf of the Members of this 92d Congress, I would like to extend Godspeed to the Reverend George Clements.

BILL TO REDESIGNATE THE RESERVOIR AND DAM ON THE SAVANNAH RIVER NOW KNOWN AS TROTTERS SHOALS AS THE "RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND RESERVOIR"

(Mr. LANDRUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have today, with the cosponsorship of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), introduced a bill to redesignate the reservoir and dam on the Savannah River now known as Trotters Shoals as the "Richard B. Russell Dam and Reservoir."

A similar bill is being introduced today by Senator TALMADGE in the other body.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE SUNDRY PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file sundry privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION TO MAKE FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order any day after today to consider a joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

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

There was no objection.

THE FLIGHT OF APOLLO 15

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker many of us had an opportunity to witness the most spectacular launch in the Apollo program to date at Cape Kennedy yesterday. Apollo 15 lifted off at 9:34 a.m. yesterday, precisely as scheduled, with Astronauts Scott, Irwin, and Worden aboard. The flight is going well and is now 27½ hours into the mission, en route to the moon.

One problem has arisen, which is now being studied by the experts at the Mission Control Center at Houston. Yesterday afternoon the computers noted that apparently two valves controlling the propulsion system for the engine in the service module appeared to be open, which could cause a malfunction of the service module engine.

The problem as isolated thus far appears to be a loose wire.

The Mission Control Center proposes to ask the astronauts to operate the service module engine at approximately 2 o'clock this afternoon. Assuming that the engine functions properly, the mission will continue as planned, with lunar landing scheduled for 6:15 p.m. Friday, July 30.

In the event there is any question as to the capability of this engine to function, an alternate mission will be programmed, which would involve experimentation in lunar orbit and return to the earth without landing on the moon.

I have been assured by NASA headquarters that the safety of our astronauts is not in jeopardy as a result of this malfunction.

PERMISSION FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS TOMORROW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow for the Speaker to declare a recess at the pleasure of the chair.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this recess would be for the sole purpose of carrying out certain ceremonial business in the rotunda of the Capitol and for no other purpose?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct, and for no other purpose. There is scheduled for tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock a ceremony for the unveiling of paintings. That is the purpose. It is to permit Members who so desire to attend.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9270, AGRICULTURE - ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION PROGRAMS, 1972

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R.

9270) making appropriations for the agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 22, 1971.)

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we bring before you today the conference report on appropriations for agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for fiscal year 1972.

The bill totals \$13,276,900,500. Its impact on America is far greater than this sum would indicate. For it is this bill that provides for enhanced farm income which, in turn, helps those whose products farmers buy. It is this bill that encourages farmers to invest in good conservation practices through matching programs such as REAP and the Great Plains program which benefit us all. It is this bill which provides funds to encourage communities to invest in water and sewer systems and resource development. It is this bill which assures safe and wholesome food through research, food and drug, and agriculture inspection. And it is this bill that provides better nutrition to children and people who cannot afford a good diet. The bill is divided into four parts to help this body and everyone to understand its effect.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Title I includes programs of principal benefit to agriculture totaling \$654,299,500, exclusive of \$4,213,331,000, which is for full reimbursement of the net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

This title is \$10,659,700 over the President's budget and about \$10,853,000 below the Senate bill.

These increases in this section over the budget were principally for research, extension, and statistical work, where it is clearly evident that failure to maintain these services to Agriculture will endanger the supplies of food and fiber in the years ahead. One million dollars is included specifically for research and control of the dread Venezuelan horse disease; in addition, I should add, the Secretary is using certain emergency funds which will enable him to do all that is necessary.

I would also like to point out the conference language rejecting further limitation of payments in an appropriation bill:

Amendment No. 15: Deletes the language pertaining to the further limitation of payments inserted by the House.

This was one of the major items of controversy.

It is to be noted that, under the various laws passed by the Congress and signed by the President, a commitment was made to make payments under certain terms and conditions at not to exceed \$55,000 per person or corporation per crop. These payments really serve the purpose of enabling the processors to buy farm commodities, including cotton, at world prices while the producers in turn must pay American prices for all machinery, equipment, supplies, and so forth, while leaving out of production a part of their land.

It is apparent that American agricultural producers are dependent upon a stable return and that stability is directly related to the various Federal programs to stabilize production.

At any rate, this is a commitment at the present time.

These payments, whether it be wool, sugar, wheat, or cotton, come because of a law—a law passed by the Congress and signed by the President. The conferees have agreed to carry out the good faith commitment made to the American agricultural producer. After all, we must—for it is the consumer for whom they produce and industry and labor which is dependent upon what they buy.

People are quitting the farms at a rate of 400,000 to 600,000 per year, and have done so for 6 straight years. In 25 years farm producer income as a percentage of investment has dropped 50 percent which to a great degree explains why farmers are quitting the farm. Perhaps they need to but consumers cannot afford to have them do so.

I recall that I was asked some time ago why some payments were large with regard to wool, sugar, wheat or cotton. I was asked this by the manager of a motel. I told him, "I just paid you \$16.50 for a room. How many rooms do you have?" He said, "200." I said, "Well, can I pay you for all of them?" He said, "Sure." I said, "Can I get the whole 200 rooms for \$16.50?" He said, "Oh, no. It would be that much per unit."

Mr. Speaker, this explains the large payments. The recipients have "200 rooms." Thus, large payments go to those who have large production capacity and investment and who produce in large quantities and sell at world prices but pay American costs of production, with all the built-in labor and other costs that go into the retail price of tractors, combines, chemicals, and other expensive U.S. items.

Perhaps we should term this a bill to stave off financial depression and disaster, for it has been a drastic break in farm income, with the resulting break in purchasing power, which has led to every depression.

After all, the farm program was passed not as a relief program for farmers, but to restore farm purchasing power that the general economy might recover, and it did.

It would be well to review the great depression of the later twenties and early thirties, the seeds for which were sown in the 1920's following World War I when the Government announced the price of wheat would not be supported. The wheat which had brought \$2.94 a bushel in July 1920 brought \$1.72 a bushel in December 1930, and 92 cents a year later. Cotton fell to a third of its July 1920 price and corn by 62 percent. The value of agricultural products dropped from \$18,328,000,000 in 1920 to \$12,402,000,000 in 1921; 453,000 farm-

ers lost their farms, all reflected by failures of local banks.

In 1928 these prices were: wheat, \$1; cotton, 18 cents; and corn, 84 cents. By 1931 wheat was 38 cents; cotton, 5.5 cents; and corn, 32 cents. The Dow-Jones stock price averages followed by declining from a high of 381.2 in September to a low of 41.2 in July of 1932.

It has been said that there were more suicides during this period among those that did not know what a farm was as a result of the breakdown in farm or commodity prices—which had led to a fall in prices and values throughout the economy—than in any other period in our history.

I repeat—farm income, and resulting real purchasing power, has already dropped more than 50 percent on the farmer's investment since 1940, from 7.1 percent to 3.10. The warning signs are out.

Now, why cannot we get this story over? Perhaps too few are willing to study history; or perhaps it is because the news media is focused on the 95 percent of nonfarmers.

Whatever it is, the story must be gotten over, for the sake of all.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Title II includes programs for rural development totaling \$943,943,000. This title is \$272,076,000 above the budget and \$19,039,000 below the Senate bill.

The bill includes rural electrification and telephone loans totaling \$669,100,000, to be repaid with interest. These programs, vital to rural development and widely supported in the Congress, are raised \$221,900,000 above the budget.

Other loans programs include operating loans at \$350 million, insured housing loans at \$1.6 billion, and insured water and waste disposal loans of \$300 million. The bill also includes provision for rural water and waste disposal grants at \$100 million. This amount provides \$44 million in new authority above the budget, but is the same amount as the Congress approved last year.

The conference agreement includes \$20,867,000, which is \$6 million over the budget for R.C. & D. projects, and provides funds for the Rural Community Development Service recently established to coordinate rural development efforts.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Title III includes programs for environmental protection at \$3,490,477,500, which is \$573,813,500 above the budget and \$14,884,500 below the Senate bill.

The major increase above the budget included in the bill:

A \$500 million appropriation, plus re-appropriation of \$200 million, for a total of \$700 million for the HUD water and sewer grant program. Only \$150 million was spent in 1971, although the Congress appropriated \$350 million.

An increase of \$55,500,000 for the full \$195.5 million for the rural environmental assistance program. The House has also directed that all 1970 practices shall be available to be matched by the local farmers.

An increase of \$7,483,500 for the environmental programs of the Soil Conservation Service. The following table shows the total funds provided for the Soil Conservation Service and the increased funds available above last year.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

	1972 conference action	1972 amount above 1971
Conservation operations.....	\$154,734,000	+\$15,574,000
River basin surveys and investigations.....	10,091,000	+334,000
Watershed planning.....	6,740,000	+153,000
Watershed and flood prevention:		
Watershed projects.....	105,411,000	+27,061,000
Flood prevention projects.....	26,688,000	+4,704,000
Subtotal, watershed and flood prevention.....	132,099,000	+31,765,000
Great Plains conservation program.....	18,113,500	+1,884,500
Resource conservation and development.....	20,867,000	+5,914,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service.....	342,644,500	+55,624,500

This title includes \$2,448,400,000 for the many functions of the Environmental Protection Agency, including \$2 billion for waste treatment facilities. This total also includes an additional \$7.5 million above the budget for solid waste disposal.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the following provision in the conference report on the need for a balanced approach in assessing the environment:

The conferees believe it most important that the various agencies of Government and the Congress, in the review and appraisal of Federal Government programs, projects, and activities, have full information available not only as to the impact upon the environment but also the significant economic impact on the public and the affected areas and industries.

The conferees, therefore, direct that, in addition to the environmental effects of an action, all required reports from departments, agencies, or persons shall also include information, as prepared by the agency having responsibility for administration of the program, project, or activity involved, on the effect on the economy, including employment, unemployment, and other economic impacts.

The conferees expect the agencies involved to spend such additional sums as may be necessary, out of general funds available, to cover any additional costs of preparing such statements.

This requirement will apply primarily to the environmental impact statements required under section 102 of the Environmental Quality Act, and the reports required under the permit dumping programs based on the Refuse Act of 1899.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Title IV includes \$2,974,849,000, which is \$315,537,000 above the budget and \$300 million below the Senate bill.

Major increases above the budget include: \$104 million for the special milk program, which has been extended in keeping with the wishes of Congress. An additional \$198,816,000 for the food stamp program, for a total of \$2.2 billion in 1972. This level, together with carry-over funds, should be adequate to fully meet the needs for fiscal year 1972 and provide some program expansion into additional counties who have made application to enter the program. The conferees also agreed that no authorization exists for exchange of stamp for cash. An additional \$13 million for a total direct appropriation of \$25 million for the school breakfast program.

The bill also provides \$32 million for the nonschool food program which, together with \$17 million provided in House Joint Resolution 744, will make available about \$33 million for the summer recreation-type programs and about \$16 million for the full year preschool programs.

The following table indicates the program expansion in the food programs over the past 4 years:

FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

[Program level—in thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year				1972 conference action
	1969 actual	1970 actual	1971 estimated	1972 budget	
Child nutrition program:					
1. Cash to States:					
(a) School lunch (sec. 4).....	\$162,034	\$168,023	\$225,018	\$225,018	\$225,018
(b) Free and reduced price lunches.....	42,039	132,560	356,400	356,400	390,175
(c) School breakfast.....	5,557	10,877	15,000	15,000	28,000
(d) Nonfood assistance.....	10,261	16,715	16,110	16,110	16,110
(e) State administrative expenses.....	544	1,722	3,500	3,500	3,500
(f) Nonschool food program.....	3,244	7,258	20,775	20,775	32,000
(g) Nutritional training.....			750	750	750
Total, cash grants.....	223,679	337,155	637,553	637,553	695,553
2. Commodities to States.....	292,107	276,219	232,548	366,355	333,355
3. Federal operating expenses.....	3,995	6,194	7,099	8,081	8,081
Total, child nutrition programs.....	519,781	619,568	877,200	1,011,489	1,036,989
Special milk program.....	102,677	102,124	104,000		104,000
Total, child feeding program.....	622,458	721,692	981,200	1,011,989	1,140,989

Program	Fiscal year				1972 conference action
	1969 actual	1970 actual	1971 estimated	1972 budget	
Family feeding program:					
1. Food stamp program.....	250,982	578,222	1,670,000	2,001,184	2,200,000
2. Direct distribution to families:					
(a) Sec. 32 commodities.....	190,282	173,180	155,163	167,766	155,766
(b) Financial assistance to States.....	4,154	6,026	19,700	19,700	19,700
(c) Federal operation.....	3,936	3,539	4,363	3,566	3,566
(d) Sec. 416.....	79,278	74,274	70,706	91,723	91,723
3. Nutrition supplement.....	8,067	13,667	16,136	16,136	16,136
Total, family feeding.....	285,717	270,686	266,068	298,891	286,891
Direct distribution to institutions.....	32,227	21,436	19,418	27,480	27,480
Nutrition education program.....	9,948	29,876	50,249	50,249	50,249
Total, food assistance program.....	1,201,332	1,621,912	2,986,935	3,389,793	3,705,609

1 An additional \$17,000,000 was provided by Public Law 92-35, approved June 30, 1971, for the summer feeding programs, thus making a total of \$49,000,000 for the nonschool food program in 1972.

In short, then, this bill is \$1.172 million over the President's budget.

It is over the budget by \$544 million for urban and rural water and sewer grants with their important contributions to community growth and pollution control.

It is over the budget by \$221 million for electric and telephone loan programs, again so important to balanced growth and at a time when the power needs of this country are in danger.

It is over the budget by \$326 million in the people programs—food stamps and milk for children.

I would say, then, that this bill is large but clearly in keeping with the objectives of Congress and the people, and I urge that the conference report be adopted.

The following table shows the effect of the conference agreement in detail:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFEEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1971—BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS FOR 1972

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Agency and title	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal 1971	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal 1972	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, 1972	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, 1972	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conferees	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Conferee recommendations compared with—				
						1971	1972 budget	1972 House bill	1972 Senate bill	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE										
Departmental management										
Office of the Secretary.....	\$6,382,000	\$6,912,000	\$6,932,000	\$6,912,000	\$6,912,000	+\$530,000		-\$20,000		
Office of the Inspector General.....	13,461,000	14,354,000	14,054,000	14,354,000	14,354,000	+893,000		+300,000		
Transfer from food stamp.....	(3,685,000)	(3,777,000)	(4,077,000)	(4,077,000)	(4,077,000)	(-392,000)	(+\$300,000)			
Total, Office of the Inspector General.....	(\$17,146,000)	(\$18,131,000)	(\$18,131,000)	(\$18,431,000)	(\$18,431,000)	(\$1,285,000)	(+\$300,000)	(+\$300,000)		
Office of the General Counsel.....	6,147,000	6,525,000	6,525,000	6,525,000	6,525,000	+378,000				
Office of Information.....	2,355,000	2,378,000	2,378,000	2,378,000	2,378,000	+23,000				
Office of Management Services.....	3,724,000	3,867,000	3,867,000	3,867,000	3,867,000	+143,000				
Total, departmental management.....	32,069,000	34,036,000	33,756,000	34,036,000	34,036,000	+1,967,000		+280,000		
SCIENCE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS										
Agricultural Research Service:										
Research.....	161,633,000	169,422,000	169,532,000	180,183,000	173,479,500	+11,846,500	+4,057,500	+3,947,500	-\$6,703,500	
Transfer from sec. 32.....	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)					
Plant and animal disease and pest control.....	104,119,750	98,479,650	99,654,650	100,154,650	100,154,650	-3,965,100	+1,675,000	+500,000		
Special fund (reappropriation).....	2,000,000	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	-2,000,000				
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program).....	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+5,000,000				
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	272,752,750	277,901,650	279,186,650	290,337,650	283,634,150	+10,881,400	+5,732,500	+4,447,500	-6,703,500	
Cooperative State Research Service.....	69,533,000	76,434,000	82,034,000	83,784,000	82,934,000	+13,401,000	+6,500,000	+900,000	-850,000	
Extension Service.....	160,966,600	171,629,000	171,779,000	174,629,000	172,279,000	+11,312,400	+650,000	+500,000	-2,350,000	
National Agricultural Library.....	3,973,750	4,060,750	4,060,750	4,060,750	4,060,750	+87,000				
Total, Science and Education Programs.....	507,226,100	530,025,400	537,060,400	552,811,400	542,907,900	+35,681,800	+12,882,500	+5,847,500	-9,903,500	
Agricultural Economics										
Economic Reporting Service.....	19,069,800	19,702,800	20,500,000	21,430,000	20,980,000	+1,910,200	+1,277,200	+480,000	-450,000	
Statistical Research Service.....	16,148,000	16,252,000	16,500,000	16,252,000	16,252,000	+104,000		-248,000		
Total, Agricultural Economics.....	35,217,800	35,954,800	37,000,000	37,682,000	37,232,000	+2,014,200	+1,277,200	+232,000	-450,000	
Marketing Services										
Commodity Exchange Authority.....	2,729,000	2,799,000	2,799,000	2,799,000	2,799,000	+70,000				
Packers and Stockyards Administration.....	3,853,650	3,954,650	3,954,650	3,954,650	3,954,650	+101,000				
Farmer Cooperative Service.....	1,818,000	1,866,000	1,866,000	1,866,000	1,866,000	+48,000				
Total, Marketing Services.....	8,400,650	8,619,650	8,619,650	8,619,650	8,619,650	+219,000				

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFEREE RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1971—BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS FOR 1972—Continued

Agency and title (1)	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal 1971 (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal 1972 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority rec- ommended in House bill, 1972 (4)	New budget (obligational) authority rec- ommended in Senate bill, 1972 (5)	New budget (obligational) authority rec- ommended by conferees (6)	Increase (+) or decrease (-) Conferee recommendations compared with—				
						1971 (7)	1972 budget (8)	1972 House bill (9)	1972 Senate bill (10)	
International Programs										
Foreign Agricultural Service.....	24,998,000	26,036,000	25,036,000	26,036,000	25,536,000	+538,000	-500,000	+500,000	-500,000	
Transfer from sec. 32.....	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)					
Total, Foreign Agricultural Service.....	(28,115,000)	(29,153,000)	(28,153,000)	(29,153,000)	(28,653,000)	(+538,000)	(-500,000)	(+500,000)	(-500,000)	
Public Law 480.....	702,500,000	1,320,400,000	1,320,400,000	1,320,400,000	1,320,400,000	+617,900,000				
Total, International Programs.....	727,498,000	1,346,436,000	1,345,436,000	1,346,436,000	1,345,936,000	+618,438,000	-500,000	+500,000	-500,000	
Commodity Programs										
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:										
Appropriation.....	161,000,000	165,086,000	165,086,000	165,086,000	165,086,000	+4,086,000				
Transfer from CCC.....	(70,072,000)	(77,256,000)	(77,256,000)	(77,256,000)	(77,256,000)	(+7,184,000)				
Total, expenses, ASCS.....	(231,072,000)	(242,342,000)	(242,342,000)	(242,342,000)	(242,342,000)	(+11,270,000)				
Sugar Act program.....	83,600,000	86,000,000	86,000,000	86,000,000	86,000,000	+2,400,000				
Cropland adjustment program.....	77,800,000	69,800,000	69,800,000	69,800,000	69,800,000	-8,000,000				
Dairy and beekeeper indemnity programs.....	4,050,000	5,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-1,550,000	-3,000,000			
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:										
Administrative and operating expenses.....	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000					
FCIC fund (premium income).....	(3,209,000)	(3,451,000)	(3,451,000)	(3,451,000)	(3,451,000)	(+242,000)				
Total, administrative and operating expenses, FCIC.....	(15,209,000)	(15,451,000)	(15,451,000)	(15,451,000)	(15,451,000)	(+242,000)				
Subscription to capital stock.....		10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000				
Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.....	12,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	+10,000,000				
Commodity Credit Corporation:										
Reimbursement for net realized losses:										
Appropriation.....	3,363,155,000	4,213,331,000	3,613,331,000	4,213,331,000	4,213,331,000	+850,176,000		+600,000,000		
Liquidation of contract authority.....	(697,886,000)	(659,818,000)	(659,818,000)	(659,818,000)	(659,818,000)	+38,068,000				
Total, reimbursement for net realized losses.....	2,665,269,000	3,553,513,000	2,953,513,000	3,553,513,000	3,553,513,000	+888,244,000		+600,000,000		
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(36,500,000)	(40,200,000)	(40,200,000)	(40,200,000)	(40,200,000)	(+3,700,000)				
Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile.....	25,000					-25,000				
Total, Commodity Credit Corporation.....	(2,701,794,000)	(3,593,713,000)	(2,993,713,000)	(3,593,713,000)	(3,593,713,000)	(+891,919,000)		(+600,000,000)		
Total, commodity programs.....	3,003,744,000	3,901,899,000	3,298,899,000	3,898,899,000	3,898,899,000	+895,155,000	-3,000,000	+600,000,000		
Total, title I, agricultural programs.....	4,314,155,550	5,856,970,850	5,260,771,050	5,878,484,050	5,867,630,550	+1,553,475,000	+10,659,700	+606,859,500	-10,853,500	

TITLE II—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE										
Rural Development Service.....		\$250,000	\$230,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	+\$250,000		+\$20,000		
Resource conservation and development.....	\$14,953,000	14,691,000	15,691,000	25,421,000	20,867,000	+5,914,000	+\$6,176,000	+5,176,000	-\$4,554,000	
Rural Electrification Administration										
Loan authorizations:										
Electrification.....	337,000,000	329,000,000	545,000,000	545,000,000	545,000,000	+208,000,000	+216,000,000			
Contingency reserve.....	(.....)	(.....)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)			
Telephone.....	128,800,000	118,200,000	118,200,000	130,000,000	124,100,000	-4,700,000	+5,900,000	+5,900,000	-5,900,000	
Total, loans (authorization to spend debt receipts).....	465,800,000	447,200,000	663,200,000	675,000,000	669,100,000	+203,000,000	+221,900,000	+5,900,000	-5,900,000	
Rural Telephone Bank.....		30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+30,000,000				
Salaries and expenses.....	15,763,000	17,706,000	16,706,000	16,706,000	16,706,000	+943,000				
Total, Rural Electrification Administration.....	481,563,000	493,906,000	709,906,000	721,706,000	715,806,000	+234,243,000	+221,900,000	+5,900,000	-5,900,000	
Farmers Home Administration										
Direct loan account:										
Operating loans.....	(275,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(+75,000,000)	(+75,000,000)			
Soil conservation loans.....	(8,700,000)	(8,700,000)	(8,700,000)	(8,700,000)	(8,700,000)					
Total, direct loan account.....	(203,700,000)	(283,700,000)	(358,700,000)	(358,700,000)	(358,700,000)	(75,000,000)	(+75,000,000)			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund										
Reimbursement for interest and other losses.....	334,000	23,663,000	23,663,000	23,663,000	23,663,000	+23,329,000				
Direct loans.....	(19,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-9,000,000)				
Insured loans.....	(1,463,000,000)	(1,605,000,000)	(1,605,000,000)	(1,605,000,000)	(1,605,000,000)	(+142,000,000)				
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund.....	(1,482,334,000)	(1,638,663,000)	(1,638,663,000)	(1,638,663,000)	(1,638,663,000)	(+156,329,000)				
Emergency Credit Revolving Fund.....	65,000,000					-65,000,000				

Agency and title (1)	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal 1971 (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal 1972 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, 1972 (4)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, 1972 (5)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conferees (6)	Increase (+) or decrease (-) Conferee recommendations compared with—				
						1971 (7)	1972 budget (8)	1972 House bill (9)	1972 Senate bill (10)	
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund										
Reimbursement for interest and other losses		37,192,000	37,192,000	37,192,000	37,192,000	+37,192,000				
Insured real estate loans	(287,600,000)	(372,000,000)	(372,000,000)	(372,000,000)	(372,000,000)	(+84,400,000)				
Insured water and waste disposal loans	(230,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(+70,000,000)				
Total, Agriculture Credit Insurance Fund	(517,600,000)	(709,192,000)	(709,192,000)	(709,192,000)	(709,192,000)	(+191,592,000)				
Rural water and waste disposal grants	100,000,000		44,000,000	44,000,000	44,000,000	-56,000,000	+44,000,000			
Unobligated balance available from previous years		(42,000,000)	(56,000,000)	(56,000,000)	(56,000,000)	(+56,000,000)	(+14,000,000)			
Total, rural water and waste disposal grants	(100,000,000)	(42,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)		(+58,000,000)			
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000					
Mutual and self-help housing	775,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,225,000				
Self-help housing land development fund	400,000					-400,000				
Salaries and expenses	92,450,000	97,665,000	97,665,000	106,250,000	97,665,000	+5,215,000			-8,585,000	
Transfer from Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)					
Miscellaneous transfer	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)					
Total, salaries and expenses	(95,200,000)	(100,415,000)	(100,415,000)	(109,000,000)	(100,415,000)	(+5,215,000)				(-8,585,000)
Total, Farmers Home Administration	261,459,000	163,020,000	207,020,000	215,605,000	207,020,000	-54,439,000	+44,000,000			-8,585,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES										
Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses	(4,443,000)	(5,238,000)	(5,200,000)	(5,200,000)	(5,200,000)	(+757,000)	(-38,000)			
Total, title II, rural development	757,975,000	671,867,000	932,847,000	962,982,000	943,943,000	+185,968,000	+272,076,000	+11,096,000		-19,039,000
TITLE III—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION										
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES										
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	\$1,500,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000	+\$800,000				
Environmental Protection Agency										
Operations, research, and facilities	299,904,000	433,900,000	425,100,000	458,900,000	441,400,000	+141,496,000	+\$7,500,000	+\$16,300,000		-\$17,500,000
Construction grants	1,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	+1,000,000,000				
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program)	3,500,000	10,670,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+3,500,000		-3,670,000		
Total, Environmental Protection Agency	1,303,404,000	2,444,570,000	2,432,100,000	2,465,900,000	2,448,400,000	+1,144,996,000	+3,830,000	+16,300,000		-17,500,000
National Commission on Materials Policy	50,000	500,000	50,000	500,000	500,000	+450,000				+450,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT										
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities	\$350,000,000		\$500,000,000	\$500,000,000	\$500,000,000	+\$150,000,000	+\$500,000,000			
Unobligated balance available from previous years	(.....)	(\$100,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(+200,000,000)	(+100,000,000)			
Total, facilities	(350,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(+350,000,000)	(+600,000,000)			
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE										
Soil Conservation Service										
Conservation operations	139,160,000	154,646,000	150,146,000	154,743,000	154,734,000	+15,574,000	+88,000	+\$4,588,000		
River basin surveys and investigations	9,757,000	10,091,000	10,091,000	10,091,000	10,091,000	+334,000				
Watershed planning	6,587,000	6,107,000	6,740,000	6,740,000	6,740,000	+153,000		-633,000		
Watershed and flood prevention operations	100,334,000	127,599,000	132,099,000	127,599,000	132,099,000	+31,765,000	+4,500,000			+\$4,500,000
Great Plains conservation program	16,229,000	15,851,000	16,229,000	19,998,000	18,113,500	+1,884,500	+2,262,500	+1,884,500		-1,884,500
Total, Soil Conservation Service	272,067,000	314,294,000	315,305,000	319,162,000	321,777,500	+49,710,500	+7,483,500	+6,472,500		+2,615,500
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service										
Rural environmental assistance program:										
Advance authorization (contract authorization)	195,500,000	140,000,000	195,500,000	195,500,000	195,500,000		+55,500,000			
Liquidation of contract authorization	(185,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(-35,000,000)				
Water Bank Act program	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000				
Emergency conservation measures	5,000,000	5,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+7,000,000	+7,000,000			
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	200,500,000	155,000,000	217,500,000	217,500,000	217,500,000	+17,000,000	+62,500,000			
Total, title III, environmental protection	2,127,521,000	2,916,664,000	3,467,255,000	3,505,362,000	3,490,477,500	+1,362,956,500	+573,813,500	+23,222,500		-14,884,500

Footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERE RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1971—BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS FOR 1972—Continued

TITLE IV—CONSUMER PROTECTION AND SERVICES

Agency and title (1)	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal 1971 (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal 1972 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority rec- ommended in House bill, 1972 (4)	New budget (obligational) authority rec- ommended in Senate bill, 1972 (5)	New budget (obligational) authority rec- ommended by conferees (6)	Increase (+) or decrease (-) Conferee recommendations compared with—				
						1971 (7)	1972 budget (8)	1972 House bill (9)	1972 Senate bill (10)	
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES										
Office of Consumer Affairs ¹	\$810,000	\$1,609,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,410,000	\$1,410,000	+\$600,000	-\$199,000	+\$10,000		
National Commission on Consumer Finance.....	500,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	+125,000				
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE										
Consumer and Marketing Service										
Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs.....	162,476,000	178,548,000	178,468,000	178,468,000	178,468,000	+15,992,000	-80,000			
Payments to States and posses- sions.....	1,675,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	-75,000				
Total, Consumer and Market- ing Service.....	164,151,000	180,148,000	180,068,000	180,068,000	180,068,000	+15,917,000	-80,000			
Food and Nutrition Service										
Child nutrition programs.....	301,974,000	350,876,000	350,876,000	363,876,000	363,876,000	+61,902,000	+13,000,000	+13,000,000		
Transfer from sec. 32.....	(238,358,000)	(232,043,000)	(232,043,000)	(232,043,000)	(232,043,000)	(-6,315,000)				
Total child nutrition programs.....	(540,332,000)	(582,919,000)	(582,919,000)	(595,919,000)	(595,919,000)	(-155,587,000)	(-13,000,000)	(-13,000,000)		
Special milk program.....	104,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000		+104,000,000			
Food stamp program.....	1,670,000,000	2,001,184,000	2,001,184,000	2,500,000,000	2,200,000,000	+530,000,000	+198,816,000	+198,816,000	-\$300,000,000	
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	2,075,974,000	2,352,060,000	2,456,060,000	2,967,876,000	2,667,876,000	+591,902,000	+315,816,000	+211,816,000	-300,000,000	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare										
Food and Drug Administration.....	85,621,000	99,681,000	99,681,000	99,681,000	99,681,000	+14,060,000				
Federal Trade Commission.....	22,200,000	25,189,000	25,189,000	25,189,000	25,189,000	+2,989,000				
Total, title IV, consumer protection and services.....	2,349,256,000	2,659,312,000	2,763,023,000	3,274,849,000	2,974,849,000	+625,593,000	+315,537,000	+211,826,000	-300,000,000	
RECAPITULATION										
Title I—Agricultural Programs.....	4,314,155,550	5,856,970,850	5,260,771,050	5,878,484,050	5,867,630,550	+1,553,475,000	+10,659,700	+606,859,500	-10,853,500	
Title II—Rural Development.....	757,975,000	671,867,000	932,847,000	962,982,000	943,943,000	+185,968,000	+272,076,000	+11,096,000	-19,039,000	
Title III—Environmental Pro- tection.....	2,127,521,000	2,916,664,000	3,467,255,000	3,505,362,000	3,490,477,500	+1,362,956,500	+573,813,500	+23,222,500	-14,884,500	
Title IV—Consumer Protection and Services.....	2,349,256,000	2,659,312,000	2,763,023,000	3,274,849,000	2,974,849,000	+625,593,000	+315,537,000	+211,826,000	-300,000,000	
Total, new budget (obliga- tional authority).....	9,548,907,550	12,104,813,850	12,423,896,050	13,621,677,050	13,276,900,050	+3,727,992,500	+1,172,086,200	+853,004,000	-344,777,000	
Consisting of										
1. Appropriations.....	8,885,607,550	11,517,613,850	11,565,196,050	12,751,177,050	12,412,300,050	+3,526,692,500	+894,686,200	+847,104,000	-338,877,000	
2. Reappropriations.....	2,000,000	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	-2,000,000				
3. Contract authorization.....	195,500,000	140,000,000	195,500,000	195,500,000	195,500,000		+55,500,000			
4. Authorizations to spend from debt receipts.....	465,800,000	447,200,000	663,200,000	675,000,000	669,100,000	+203,300,000	+221,900,000	+5,900,000	-3,900,000	
Memoranda										
1. Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	882,886,000	809,818,000	809,818,000	809,818,000	809,818,000	-73,068,000				
2. Appropriations, including ap- propriations to liquidate contract authority.....	9,768,493,550	12,327,431,850	12,375,014,050	13,560,998,050	13,222,118,050	+3,453,624,500	+894,686,200	+847,104,000	-338,877,000	
3. Transfers from sec. 32.....	256,475,000	250,160,000	250,160,000	250,160,000	250,160,000	-6,315,000				
4. Transfer from CCC.....	70,072,000	77,256,000	77,256,000	77,256,000	77,256,000	+7,184,000				

¹ Combines into a single appropriation the former Watershed works of improvement and Flood prevention appropriations.

² Includes funds for the Consumer Products Information Coordinating Center.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It will be noted in the conference report that I did not sign the conference report. All other members did. But I should like to point out to the House that this conference report comes to us \$1,172 million over the budget—\$1,172 million over the budget request.

Now, this is not the only bill to come in here over the budget. There is one coming in this afternoon that is now \$321 million over the budget and I un-

derstand there will be an effort made to increase that bill another \$230 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are good programs, but I wonder where we are going to get the money, what is going to happen with reference to inflation and what is going to happen to the financial situation of this country if we continue by just simply saying that these are good programs and must be funded, without any knowledge of where the money is coming from and no knowledge as to what the actual fiscal situation is.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who complain about some funds being impounded. There are some who complain that we are spending too much and that we have not followed a sound fiscal policy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out why I did not sign this conference report. I am concerned about inflation, our fiscal situation and our budgetary situation. It seems to me that we should stop, look and listen and see just exactly what has happened on these budgets.

Again, I point out the fact that this conference report is 1,172 million over the budget. I do not complain that these increases are not for good programs. But I wonder how we are going to finance them and where we are going to get the money.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago there was a Member from Pennsylvania who used to open each session by asking, "Where

are we going to get the money"? Some of these committees have come in and stated that these various programs are fiscally sound. But, again, I ask the question, when are we going to stop this kind of spending?

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I admire the gentleman and his committee and I know of the hard work they have done, but I cannot resist at least stating my position as to why I did not sign this conference report.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), that I appreciate his sincerity and his viewpoint, and I too have a whole lot of the same feelings. I do think that in most instances here these budget requests should have been sent down to keep the committee from being in the position it was, but I do think in reality we were faced with decisions that, in the absence of agreeing on these amounts, we would have been faced with a greater amount being placed in the bill. So I think that the committee has done a fine job under all the circumstances.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) a member of the committee, and the ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding to me. I am sure that all the Members feel the concern of the gentleman from Ohio for the deficit problems with which we are faced, but I also appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Ohio pointed out that these are important programs. Nothing is more basic and more important to this Nation than food and our environment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) for yielding to me. I just want to express my disappointment at the House conferees for caving in on the \$20,000 limitation which the House passed.

As I said on the floor of the House, I am a practical politician, and I realize when I have had a setback, but as I said earlier last week we have lost the skirmish, but we have not lost the battle. I will be back next year.

Mr. Speaker, there is one further point I wish to make. There has been a lot of loose talk to the effect that by passing the 3-year farm bill we did a year ago with its ceiling of \$55,000 per crop, the Congress made some sort of a "commitment" not to reduce it further. My own minority leader even tried to make this point, claiming a lower ceiling would be "breaking faith" with the farmers in these programs.

Such an argument is absolutely without foundation. By its adoption of my amendment on June 23, 1970, the House demonstrated it is groundless. If there

has been any breaking faith it has been on the part of these giant farmers who have used every legal trick in the book to evade the present ceiling.

This argument is as fallacious as the claim that, because Congress has authorized certain funds, it is bound to appropriate that amount. All of us know this is absurd.

But, because this point, however groundless, has been made, let me serve notice now on the Secretary of Agriculture and all farmers in this program that it is my intention to offer a \$20,000 ceiling amendment on the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal 1973. Let no one claim there has not been fair warning to all concerned. Let the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff know that this will be done.

To go further, I am convinced that the House will again adopt my amendment. And perhaps it may take an election year to do it, but I also believe the other body will see the light next year.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would take this occasion to remind my colleague and the Members of the House that on June 23, in response to a point of order I raised with regard to two items in H.R. 9270, language was stricken from the House version of the bill which is again before us, as involving legislation on an appropriations bill. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23, 1971, at pages 21641 and 21642 records the points of order, the discussion I had with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), and the rulings of the chair sustaining the points of order.

The conference report now before us refers to similar obligations on the part of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency—to deal separately with the economic implications of activities regulated under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969—Public Law 91-190.

If it was improper to legislate in this fashion last month, it is equally so today. The record should show that the language in the report, to which I have reference here, does not provide any new authority or direction to the Administrator of EPA. If, under preexisting authority, he can and wishes to develop this information, we cannot prevent him from so doing. But any efforts in this direction must be entirely apart from his obligations under NEPA, and the guidelines that have been developed to provide detailed directions on how that act, and others applicable to EPA shall be administered.

One of the simplest and most fundamental of legislative interpretations is that statutes which are clear on their face need not and indeed may not be interpreted by allusion or reference to other documents and items of legislative history.

Hence, the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act are crystal clear and may not be amended by subsequent nonlegislative actions of the Appropriations Committee or conferees composed of representatives of the two Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

I wish to make it most plain in the legislative history of this day's activities that the language of the conference report does not in any fashion amend, alter or change the clear language or the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act with regard to the filing of section 102(2)(C) environmental impact statements.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the new grouping of programs into the three areas of agriculture, environmental, and consumer protection provides a much more accurate view of the purposes for which the funds are appropriated.

It also should prove helpful in striking down the all too prevalent notion that the entire Agriculture Department budget is some kind of a huge subsidy to the farmer. This grouping makes it plain that many other groups are benefiting from such programs as food stamps, child nutrition, meat inspection, and extension service activities.

My chief disappointment with this conference report, however, was the decision of the conferees on amendment No. 33.

That decision means that for at least another year farmers will be limited to a \$2,500 ceiling on Federal cost sharing for expensive feedlot improvements needed to combat pollution from animal wastes.

The other body adopted language which I had suggested to raise the ceiling to \$5,000 for this particular practice. That language was developed too late for consideration when this bill originally was before the House.

Instead of accepting the Senate amendment, which would not have cost the taxpayers any additional money for the rural environmental assistance program—REAP—administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—ASCS—the committee directed the department to study the need for such an adjustment.

The amendment simply meant that the cost-sharing arrangements worked out over the years would remain the same for normal conservation practices in the public interest, such as soil-building and tree-planting measures. It would have increased by \$2,500 the limit for helping farmers meet the extremely high cost of pollution abatement facilities they now are being required to install on feedlots as part of the Nation's environmental protection program.

In my State the cost of hard-surfaced feedlots, 6-month concrete holding tanks, and other such improvements has been running between \$8,000 and \$12,000 per farm.

The pollution of our streams is a matter of grave national concern, and I do not feel the farmer should be made to bear a disproportionate share of the cost of such environmental protection when he is eligible for 50 percent or more cost sharing for other conservation practices in the national interest.

Right now the burden of making such feedlot improvements fall only on the larger operators, those feeding 1,000 or more steers or 700 dairy cows on confined feedlots.

It was my feeling that the added incentive offered by the Senate amendment would have encouraged many smaller operators to construct such improvements and thus would have made a much more positive contribution to the problem of cleaning up our lakes and streams.

Instead, the conferees directed the Agriculture Department "to make a thorough review of the need for such adjustment" lifting the ceiling for this one practice to \$5,000.

Had Agriculture Department officials had sufficient notice in which to testify on this suggestion, I am confident they would have endorsed it strongly, as they have in conversations with my office.

The department lacks the authority to take this action on its own. It needs language such as I had suggested, so that means it probably will be at least a year until farmers can get this added help in meeting their environmental responsibilities. Once they become aware that increased cost sharing for pollution

abatement practices involving feedlots is in the offing, many will delay their plans.

To me the amendment was so basically just and so much in tune with the current national effort to combat water pollution that I see no reason for this additional delay. I am sorry that the conferees decided on this study. I hope it does not mean that the suggestion will be put out of sight and out of mind as so often happens when studies are commissioned.

In that study, I hope the Department will consider the question of whether feedlot operators can qualify for a higher ceiling, such as the \$5,000 I have suggested, for feedlot pollution abatement practices while also qualifying for cost sharing for the traditional conservation practices under REAP, formerly known as the agricultural conservation program—

At this point, I include an illustration of the manner in which the Senate amendment would be applied to the program if it had been adopted:

	Example 1		Example 2		Example 3		Example 4	
	Com-puted	Pay-able	Com-puted	Pay-able	Com-puted	Pay-able	Com-puted	Pay-able
Practices other than animal waste pollution abatement.....	\$3,000	\$2,500	\$3,000	\$2,500	\$500	\$500	\$1,000	\$1,000
Animal waste pollution abatement practices.....	2,000	2,000	3,000	2,500	5,000	4,500	3,000	3,000
Total.....	5,000	4,500	6,000	5,000	5,500	5,000	4,000	4,000

I do hope the Department will expedite its consideration of the study called for in this conference report. Feedlot operators—particularly in the Northern States with long winters—are very much in need of this added assistance.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 162, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]
YEAS—230

Abbutt
Abourezk
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspin
Badillo
Baring
Barrett
Begich
Belcher
Bergland
Bevill
Biester
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boiling
Brademas
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Cabell
Caffery
Camp
Carney
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Corman

Culver
Daniel, Va.
Dantelson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Denholm
Dent
Dingell
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Drinan
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Evans, Colo.
Evens, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Fuqua
Gallianakis
Gettys
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagan
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hathaway
Hebert
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Holfield
Horton
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
King
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Link
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McFall
McKay
McMillan
Mahon
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Melcher
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Mink
Mitchell
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher

Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stuckey
Symington
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Udall
Ullman
Waggonner
Wampler
Watts
White
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Young, Tex.
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—162

Abzug
Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Archer
Ashbrook
Baker
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Biaggi
Bingham
Boland
Bow
Brasco
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Carey, N.Y.
Celler
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clawson, Del.
Clay
Cleveland
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conte
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dellums
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dow
Duiski
du Pont
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gaydos
Green, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harvey
Hastings
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hogan
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jonas
Keating
Keith
Kemp
Koch
Landgrebe
Lent
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lujan
McEwen
McKevitt
McKinney
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mailliard
Mann
Metcalfe
Mikva
Mills, Md.
Minish
Minschall
Morse
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Nix
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Rangel
Riegle
Robinson, Va.
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo
Rosenthal
Rousselot
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scheuer
Schmitz
Schneebell
Scott
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Waldie
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wolf
Wyatt
Wyder
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young, Fla.
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—41

Abernethy
Ashley
Aspinall
Blackburn
Byron
Carter
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conyers
Delaney
Donohue
Edwards, La.
Esch
Gallagher
Garmatz
Glaimo
Goldwater
Goodling
Hosmer
Hungate
Jones, Tenn.
Kyros
Long, La.
McCulloch
Montgomery
Nelsen
Pepper
Poage
Reuss
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Saylor
Sikes
Sisk
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Yatron

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Gaimo against.
Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Gallagher against.
Mr. Montgomery for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Yatron against.
Mr. Blackburn for, with Mr. Esch against.
Mr. Nelsen for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Goldwater against.
Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Halpern against.
Mr. Kyros for, with Mr. Reuss against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Collins of Texas.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Edwards of Pennsylvania with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Byron.

Messrs. CELLER, BIAGGI, BROWN of Michigan, MCKINNEY, HUTCHINSON, MCGEHEE, STEIGER of Wisconsin, and BOLAND changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 4: Page 6, line 7, insert "and \$950,000 shall remain available until expended for plans, construction, and improvement of facilities without regard to limitations contained herein:".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$70,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 34: On page 38, line 9, strike out "\$1,400,000, of which \$450,000 shall be transferred to the Consumer Products Information Coordinating Center for necessary expenses, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109" and insert: "\$960,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$1,410,000, of which \$450,000 shall be transferred to the Consumer Products Information Coordinating Center for necessary expenses, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 38: Page 41, line 21, strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$25,000,000 (of which \$6,500,000 shall be placed in contingency reserve to be released on determination of need)".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and that I may revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9272, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY of New York moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9272) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1971, the House passed the State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill by a vote of 337 yeas to 10 nays. It thereafter passed the Senate on July 19.

I heard on the radio this morning that there will be a motion to instruct the House conferees to accept the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 which would restrict the work of the Subversive Activities Control Board. The amount of money—to wit, \$450,000—which this Board is to receive has been approved by both Houses and is not in conference. The Senate amendment would prohibit the use of these funds "to execute any of the additional functions, duties or powers which Executive Order 1605, dated July 2, 1971, purports or undertakes to confer on the Board."

For several years now complaint has been made that this Board did not have enough to do. By adopting the Senate amendment this Board would be stopped from carrying out additional duties under the Executive order.

Furthermore, this amendment as written is legislation on an appropriation bill, and should have no place in it. It belongs with the House Judiciary Committee.

I submit that the House conferees should not be bound by any such instruction.

In the event a motion to instruct is offered, I shall be constrained to offer a preferential motion to table that motion.

The following is the Executive order referred to:

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11605

Amendment of Executive order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, relating to security requirements for Government employment

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States including 5 U.S.C. Sections 1101 *et seq.*, 3301, 3571, 7301, 7313, 7501 (c), 7512, 7532 and 7533; and as President of the United States, and finding such action necessary in the best interests of national security, it is hereby ordered that Executive Order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

1. Paragraph (5) of Section 8(a) shall read: "(5) Knowing membership in, or affiliation or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons (hereinafter referred to as organization) which is totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, subversive, or which has adopted a policy of unlawfully advocating the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any State, or which seeks to overthrow the Government of the United States or any State or subdivision thereof by unlawful means.

2. Section 12 shall read:

"(a) Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, as amended is hereby revoked.

"(b) The head of each department and agency shall be furnished by the Attorney General with the name of each organization which shall be or has been heretofore designated under this order. Except as specifically provided hereafter, nothing contained herein shall be construed in any way to affect previous designations made pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, as amended.

"(c) The Subversive Activities Control Board shall, upon petition of the Attorney General, conduct appropriate hearings to determine whether any organization is totalitarian, fascist, communist, subversive, or whether it has adopted a policy of unlawfully advocating the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any State, or which seeks to overthrow the government of the United States or any State or subdivision thereof by unlawful means.

"(d) The Board may determine that an organization has adopted a policy of unlawfully advocating the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their constitutional or statutory rights or that an organization seeks to overthrow the government of the United States or any State or subdivision thereof by unlawful means if it is found that such group engages in, unlawfully advocates, or has among its purposes or objectives, or adopts as a means of obtaining any of its purposes or objectives—

(1) The commission of acts of force or violence or other unlawful acts to deny others their rights or benefits guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States or of the several States or political subdivisions thereof; or

(2) The unlawful damage or destruction of property; or injury to persons; or

(3) The overthrow or destruction of the government of the United States or the government of any State, Territory, district, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein, by unlawful means; or

(4) The commission of acts which violate laws pertaining to treason, rebellion or insurrection, riots or civil disorders, seditious conspiracy, sabotage, trading with the enemy, obstruction of the recruiting and enlistment service of the United States, impeding officers

of the United States, or related crimes or offenses.

"(e) The Board may determine an organization to be 'totalitarian' if it is found that such organization engages in activities which seek by unlawful means the establishment of a system of government in the United States which is autocratic and in which control is centered in a single individual, group, or political party, allowing no effective representation to opposing individuals, groups, or parties and providing no practical opportunity for dissent.

"(f) The Board may determine an organization to be 'fascist' if it is found that such organization engages in activities which seek by unlawful means the establishment of a system of government in the United States which is characterized by rigid one-party dictatorship, forcible suppression of the opposition, ownership of the means of production under centralized governmental control and which fosters racism.

"(g) The Board may determine an organization to be 'communist' if it is found that such organization engages in activities which seek by unlawful means the establishment of a government in the United States which is based upon the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, which interprets history as a relentless class war aimed at the destruction of the existing society and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the government ownership of the means of production and distribution of property, and the establishment of a single authoritarian party.

"(h) The Board may determine an organization to be 'subversive' if it is found that such organization engages in activities which seek the abolition or destruction by unlawful means of the government of the United States or any State, or subdivision thereof.

"(i) The Board may further determine, after consideration of the evidence, that an organization has ceased to exist. Upon petition of the Attorney General or upon petition of any organization which has been designated pursuant to this section the Board after appropriate hearings may determine that such organization does not currently meet the standards for designation. The Attorney General shall appropriately revise or modify the information furnished to departments and agencies consistent with the determinations of the Board.

"(j) The Board shall issue appropriate regulations for the implementation of this section."

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 2, 1971.

[FR Doc. 71-9765 Filed 7-7-71; 12:01 p.m.]

I also include the release by the Department of Justice issued on Wednesday, July 7, 1971:

The Department of Justice today proposed legislation to Congress to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 in connection with changes instituted by the President in the government's personnel security program.

An Executive Order, sent to the Federal Register today, authorizes the Subversive Activities Control Board to hold hearings to assist the Attorney General with his responsibility of providing department and agency heads with a list of organizations considered to be subversive.

Membership in these organizations is a factor in determining whether the employment of a particular individual is inconsistent with the interest of national security.

Prior to the change, the Attorney General had the sole responsibility for determining whether an organization seeks to overthrow the government or unlawfully advocates violent acts to deny others their constitutional rights.

The new order assures certain rights to participants, including public hearings, an accurate stenographic record, the right to counsel, and the right to cross examination.

In addition to these "due process" features, an aggrieved party also shall have the right to petition the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to have the Board's finding set aside.

The proposed legislation would make the subpoena and contempt authority of the board applicable to its new fact-finding functions as well as change its name to the Federal Internal Security Board.

In letters of transmittal to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, Attorney General John N. Mitchell said the enactment of the legislation would provide a "sounder basis" for updating the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1971.

THE SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate reference a draft bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended.

In order to update the list of organizations which have been designated by the Attorney General, the President in accordance with his constitutional and statutory powers, has amended Sections 8 and 12 of Executive Order 10450, to permit the Attorney General to petition the Subversive Activities Control Board to conduct appropriate hearings to determine *inter alia* whether an organization is one which seeks to overthrow the Government of the United States or any state or sub-division thereof by unlawful means or unlawfully advocates the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any state. This would permit the Board to make an appropriate determination with respect to violent-action oriented organizations.

The proposed legislation would amend Section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, by renaming the Subversive Activities Control Board the Federal Internal Security Board. In addition the draft bill provides that subsections (c) and (d) (1), (2) and (3) of Section 13 and Section 14, of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended, shall apply to proceedings conducted pursuant to Section 12 of Executive Order 10450, as amended.

Misbehavior in the Board's presence is a punishable offense under Section 13(d) (3). Section 13(c) provides the Board with the power of subpoena. Section 13(d) (1) assures certain respondent rights by requiring public hearings, an accurate stenographic record, the right to counsel, and the right to cross examination. In addition to these "due process" features, Section 14 specifically provides that an aggrieved party shall have the right to petition the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to have the Board's findings set aside. The findings of the Board must be supported by the preponderance of the evidence.

The enactment of this legislation will also provide a sounder basis for updating the Attorney's General's list of organizations designated pursuant to Executive Order 10450. The last consolidated list of such organizations was issued on November 1, 1955 and many of the organizations listed thereon are currently defunct.

The early enactment of this legislation is recommended as a necessary complement to the recently issued amendment to Executive Order 10450 mentioned above, since the Executive Order cannot confer subpoena or contempt powers on the Board.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation is consistent with the objectives of this Administration.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MITCHELL,
Attorney General.

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Section 3(11) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is amended by deleting the words "Subversive Activities Control Board" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Federal Internal Security Board."

(b) Section 12(a) of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended by deleting the words "Subversive Activities Control Board" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Federal Internal Security Board."

(c) The caption to Section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is amended to read "Federal Internal Security Board."

Section 2. The provisions of subsections (c) and (d) (1), (2) and (3) of Section 13, and Section 14 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended, shall apply to proceedings conducted pursuant to Section 12 of Executive Order 10450, as amended.

Under the permission heretofore granted, I include the following memorandum submitted to the committee by the Subversive Activities Control Board:

MEMORANDUM

On July 19, 1971, following the defeat of Senator Proxmire's amendment to delete the appropriation for the Subversive Activities Control Board previously approved by the House, the Senate passed an amendment introduced by Senator Ervin reading as follows:

"Providing however, that none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be made available for the Board to execute any of the additional functions, duties, or powers which Executive Order 11605, dated July 2, 1971, purports or undertakes to confer on the Board."

The result of the passage of this amendment does not in any way curtail Board activities under existing law. The Board still has the power to hear cases presented by the Attorney General on Communist-action groups, Communist-front groups and Communist-infiltrated groups.

Executive Order 11605, signed by President Nixon on July 2, is basically an amendment and refinement of Executive Orders 9300, 9835, and 10450, issued respectively by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower in 1943, 1947, and 1953, for the purpose of establishing loyalty-security criteria for Government personnel employment. These orders have been the basis for the compilation of the Attorney General's list of so-called "subversive" organizations. Pursuant to these orders, Attorneys General Francis Biddle, J. Howard McGrath, Tom Clark, and Herbert Brownell cited almost 300 organizations in the United States as falling into one of the following six categories:

1. Totalitarian
2. Fascist
3. Communist
4. Subversive
5. Advocating force and violence to deny others their constitutional rights.
6. Seeking to change the U.S. form of Government by unconstitutional means.

Under the above-mentioned executive orders, affiliation with groups on the Attorney General's list has been a possible bar to Gov-

ernment employment. The head of each Government agency has had the responsibility of investigating the circumstances of affiliation to determine whether it was of such nature as to make a person unfit for Government service on loyalty or security grounds.

The courts have repeatedly upheld the constitutionality of Attorneys General compiling such a list pursuant to Presidential directive and also their utilization in the Federal Personnel Security Program.

President Nixon's Executive Order 11605 makes the following basic changes in the compilation of the list:

1. It establishes criteria which must be met for a finding that a group falls into one of the six kinds of organizations on the list—something no previous executive order has done.

2. It specifies that affiliation or membership in any such group must be "knowing" before it can be weighed as a negative factor in considering a person's fitness for Government employment (under previous executive orders mere membership or affiliation of any kind, whether knowing or not, was considered.)

3. It bars the Attorney General from placing any organization on the list unless, after a public hearing, the SACB finds that the organization in question, as charged by the Attorney General, falls into one of the above-mentioned categories. (In 1955, the courts held that the Attorney General had to grant a group a hearing before placing it on the list. This new provision not only conforms with this court decision, but goes beyond it by bringing in an independent, quasi-judicial body as the hearing agency.)

4. A stricter definition is provided for the sixth type of group on the list. The previous executive order referred to groups which seek to "alter the form of Government" of the U.S. by "unconstitutional" means. The new order requires that the organization must actually seek to "overthrow" the U.S. Government by "unlawful" means.

In addition, the President has sent to Congress legislation that would make certain parts of Section 13 and all of Section 14 of the Subversive Activities Control Act apply to Board hearings held pursuant to the executive order. If enacted, this means that in all such hearings, the accused organization will have the right to representation by counsel who can present witnesses in its behalf, cross examine adverse witnesses, etc. Further, that a finding of the Board can be appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and, upon certiorari, to the Supreme Court (this legislation has already been introduced by Senators Eastland and Hruska and by Representative John M. Ashbrook).

In summary, the recently issued executive order not only gives the SACB additional duties but introduces into the method of placing groups on the Attorney General's list much stronger constitutional guarantees and due process procedures than have existed under any previous order.

Senator Ervin challenges the constitutionality of the President's assigning to the congressionally-created SACB a responsibility previously exercised by the Attorney General.

Title III, United States Code, Section 301, is the general authorization for the President to delegate functions. It reads, in part, as follows:

"The President of the United States is authorized to designate and empower the head of any department or agency in the executive branch, or any official thereof who is required to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to perform without approval, ratification or other action by the President (1) any function which is vested in the President by law, . . ."

Rejecting a challenge to the constitutionality of the Attorney General's list, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals has held:

"It is the President's duty to take care that the laws are faithfully executed (Article II, Sec. 3 of the Constitution). It is his right and his duty to protect and defend the Government against subversive forces which may seek to change or destroy it by unconstitutional means." (JAFRC v. Clark, 177 F. 2d 79)

In view of the above and the fact that the Subversive Activities Control Board is an executive branch agency, it would appear that Senator Ervin's position is open to question. In addition, there are many precedents for Presidential executive orders that transfer functions of executive branch agencies:

Executive Order 8843 of August 9, 1941, authorized the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish consumer credit controls. These controls included licensing system and administrative hearings for revocation of licenses.

Executive Order 11423 of August 16, 1968, delegated authority for granting permission for certain facilities at U.S. borders. Ultimate authority is placed in the Secretary of State, but he is directed to request the views of the Interstate Commerce Commission on such matters.

Executive Order 10530 of May 10, 1954, authorized the Federal Power Commission to conduct hearings and issue permits for the construction and operation at U.S. borders of gas and electric transmission facilities.

The same Executive Order delegated to the Federal Communications Commission the power of the President to issue and revoke licenses concerning submarine cables and states the delegation to be made under the authority of Title 3, United States Code 301.

The above citations of precedent are not to be considered all-inclusive. Many other such delegations of authority under Executive Order exist but are not cited here for reason of brevity.

A substantial amount of Government regulation is delegated under Executive Order, most recently and particularly in the civil rights field in the area of equal rights for minority groups. To allow Senator Ervin's amendment to stand, restricting the activities of an independent executive agency under its legally delegated authority from the President, would subject to charges of illegality that substantial part of the Government's operations conducted under similar Executive Orders.

Most criticism of the Board during the past five years has been based on the small number of cases and workload given it by the Attorneys General. Since Congress did not grant the Board the power to investigate or initiate cases, the Board could do nothing to correct the situation.

Executive Order 11605 will correct it by giving the Board work that will materially assist the national security. Testimony of government officials before congressional committees has indicated weaknesses and gaps in the personnel security program due to the fact that the Attorney General's list is outdated, no groups having been added to it for 16 years. Board hearings under the Executive Order will update the list and make it representative of subversive groups operating today. This will close existing loopholes in the security program.

Assistant Attorney General Robert C. Mardian told the Senate Appropriations Committee on July 6, 1971, that there were 25 organization cases presently under study by the Department of Justice for submission to the Board for findings warranting their inclusion on the list. This, by the way, is nearly as many organization cases as the Board has heard since its inception in 1950. Secondly, Mr. Mardian testified that they had approximately 260 organizations to refer to the Board for removal from the list. This would provide more cases for the Board than it has had in its 21-year history.

In the event the Ervin amendment stands, however, the Board will be restricted in its workload to the two cases on which it has been holding hearings and to any others the Attorney General may submit the fiscal year.

I shall also include the following communications received concerning this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
July 22, 1971.

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: I am writing to advise that the Disabled American Veterans supports the concept of expanding the duties and responsibilities of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

We, as a Veterans Organization, firmly believe that an extension of the Board's power to investigate all suspected groups in these critical times is imperative for our Nation's internal security.

We urge your support in this crucial matter.

Sincerely,
CECIL W. STEVENSON,
National Commander.

JULY 22, 1971.

TO: All Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

From: Herbert R. Rainwater, Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars and its two million members urge you to kill Ervin amendment to Subversive Activities Control Board appropriation. Investigations and hearings on revolutionary and violent action groups long overdue. Support Subversive Activities Control Board appropriation without restriction on conferees.

HERBERT R. RAINWATER.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N.Y., July 23, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As veterans who have fought overseas and who are constantly aware of the meaning of the dangers that can disrupt a Democracy, we urge you to support the appropriation for the effective functioning of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and to vote against the emasculating Ervin amendment.

We remind you that the function of the SACB is to provide open public hearings on matters affecting our country and that the SACB is the only agency that provides factual reports on these stressing subjects to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House as well as the Executive Branch.

As veterans, we are deeply opposed to any secret or Star Chamber proceedings just as we are opposed to the self-seeking subversive elements who are diverting our youth. With this as our principle, we ask you to reject the Ervin amendment and to support the full appropriation for the SACB.

Sincerely yours,
HEYMAN ROTHBART,
National Council Member.

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY.

DEAR JOHN: Thanks again for all you have done and continue to do for all of us. I would have sent telegrams but Western Union is tied up. We all wish you the best.

Cordially,

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EDWARDS of California moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 9272) be instructed to agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I regret that by his privileged motion the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) has made it impossible for the House to debate this important issue. Many Members wanted to discuss it. It is indeed a shame that this House, referred to as the world's greatest deliberative body, is not allowed to debate a vital constitutional question.

Mr. Speaker, the issue involved in my motion to instruct is not whether or not the Subversive Activities Control Board should exist. Both the Senate and the House have voted to fund the Board for this year.

The issue is much larger. It has to do with the usurpation of legislative power by the President. That is why the Senate by a vote of 51 to 37 approved the Ervin amendment. That is why the House should support the Ervin amendment.

Let me repeat the timetable. This bill passed the House on June 28. It included \$450,000 for the SACB.

Ten days later—July 8—the President published Executive Order No. 11605, increasing the jurisdiction of the Board far beyond any jurisdiction contemplated by Congress. Briefly, it would give the SACB authority over what is called the Attorney General's list, a list which has been dormant for 15 years.

The Senate rebelled at this point and on July 19 it added the Ervin amendment barring the use of any of the appropriated funds to carry out any of the new duties in the Presidential order.

Senator ERVIN pointed out to the Senate that:

1. The Executive Order is legislation, in violation of Section I, Article I of the Constitution which vests all legislative power in Congress.

2. Congress cannot abdicate its legislative responsibilities. If the President desires to increase the Board's jurisdiction, normal legislative channels must be used. (Indeed, S. 2294 so provides and was introduced on July 15, 1971 at the request of the Administration by Senators EASTLAND and HRUSKA)

3. The Executive Order is clearly unconstitutional as a violation of the First Amendment.

Today the bill is about to go to conference and the House has had no opportunity whatsoever to consider this broad new jurisdiction assigned to the SACB by the Presidential order. If we do not accept the Ervin amendment we are ratifying, unread, the Presidential order. We will be saying that it is perfectly all right for the Board to have these new duties and we are not interested in having hearings, witnesses or any of the normal legislative procedures that should be used. By not going along with the Ervin amendment we are avoiding our legislative responsibilities and we are saying

to the White House that it is all right with us if the President does our legislative work.

Now as to some background about the SACB: It was created in 1950 with five Commissioners. It now has 10 clericals in addition. It has been in existence more than 20 years, spent \$7½ million, yet this past year, as in previous years, these five \$36,000 per year Board members and their 10 well-paid staffers have literally had nothing to do except question three witnesses.

The use of the Executive order to amend the law raises at least three questions:

First. How can the Internal Security Act be amended? It would appear that the standard way is by the Congress, the legislative branch of Government not by the Executive. If the Board's power is to be expanded, it should be by legislative action.

Second. Does this expansion of the Board's jurisdiction remove any of the problems raised by constitutional challenges? No! It would appear that the problems which gave rise to the 1969 Boorda against SACB decision still exist, namely, that the action of the Board is an infringement of the freedom of association guarantee of the first amendment.

Third. Is this expansion of the Board's authority consistent with the other provisions of the Internal Security Act? No; it is not. By giving the Board jurisdiction over groups which would deny constitutional rights by violence, we will be substantially extending the Board's powers beyond just those who advocate the overthrow of the Government. The "clear and present danger" exception to freedom of speech applies only to the overthrow of the Government and does not encompass the broader category. Therefore, the Board's new jurisdiction not only is in violation of the freedom of association, but also of the freedom of speech.

I would conclude by reminding you that while it would be more appropriate to let this anachronism die, we are faced with the simple choice of accepting the Presidential legislative fiat which would expand unconstitutionally the Board's duties and responsibilities or of supporting the Senate version and Senator ERVIN's amendment. We are faced with an unconstitutional attempt to curb constitutional liberties. The thought of shelling out all of this money to a ghost of bygone eras is bad enough but to sanction the President's move to expand the Board's activities to the investigation of all suspected subversive groups and return to the days of Joseph McCarthy is to lose faith in the due process of law and in our existing agencies, such as the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, probably the committee which I share is the real cause of this issue coming before the House because the House Committee on Internal Security for the past several months has been conducting oversight hearings into the operations of SACB and related employee security matters. Insofar as SACB is concerned I have very

straightforwardly stated that SACB should be put to work or it should be abolished. I have told the Department of Justice that it is time to fish or cut bait and I find it exceedingly difficult to oppose the position of the Department of Justice on this issue. Why? Because this is the first time in the 11 years that I have been in Congress that I have seen any recommendation coming from the Department of Justice relating to subversion. I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER), the Chairman of the subcommittee, the Department of Justice has made a mistake in proceeding as they did.

This is one of those questions where you never get to the real issues. The real issues are submerged in a maze of past mistakes, complicated rules and regulations, court decisions and parliamentary procedures. For this reason, I believe that the only proper vote on this matter is to support the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. ROONEY) even though my position on the Ervin amendment is the same as the gentleman from California but for different reasons.

Unfortunately, the question involved here insofar as the public is concerned by the time the news media finished with trying to relay the issues to the people is one of whether you are in favor of trying to control subversive groups or in favor of giving them a free rein. I do not question the sincerity or the integrity of the gentleman from California. His positions on these matters, I believe, are quite predictable. Granted, he has the same objectives as the majority of the Members of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem we face in this field, in my opinion, will never be solved by the approach of the gentleman from California. Simply put, the problem is how to effectively control subversive groups within the Nation who could destroy our free society without destroying or infringing upon the basic constitutional rights of the individual—that entity who constitutes the cornerstone of our free society. If the House chooses to follow the general philosophy of the gentleman from California in these matters it is my sincere belief that the destruction of our free society at sometime in the future is well assured. We must take affirmative steps to protect our free society from such groups and I believe that we can take such affirmative steps while still protecting the rights of the individual.

The Ervin amendment provides as follows:

Provided, however, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be made available for the Board to execute any of the additional functions, duties, or powers which Executive Order 11605, dated July 2, 1971, purports or undertakes to confer on the Board.

The effect of the adoption of this amendment would be to authorize the SACB to perform only those duties required of it under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 but would prohibit it from performing additional duties recently sought to be conferred upon it pursuant to an Executive Order (E.O. 11605) promulgated by President Nixon on July 2, 1971.

Let me briefly explain my position. Under the Subversive Activities Control Act, the Board has the function, upon petition of the Attorney General, to make determinations with respect to the character of certain Communist organizations, defined as Communist-action, front, and infiltrated. It is essentially a public disclosure statute, although there are certain collateral consequences set up under the act not solely related to its disclosure function.

On the other hand, the Executive order of July 2, 1971, is not intended as a public disclosure statute. It is offered to assist in the execution of the personnel security screening program established under Executive Order 10450, which was promulgated by President Eisenhower in 1953. The duties which would be imposed upon the Attorney General and the Board under the Executive order would to some extent overlap those now imposed upon it by the Subversive Activities Control Act with respect to the designation of certain Communist organizations, but would otherwise be increased with respect to many other organizations which are defined in the Executive order as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, subversive, and two other categories described as organizations which have adopted a policy of unlawfully advocating the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States, and organizations which seek to overthrow the Government of the United States, or of any State by unlawful means.

The principal complaint against the Board's appropriation has been the failure of its workload. It is suggested by the administration that the new Executive order will serve to increase the workload. The Board is a quasi-judicial agency the Executive order would serve to increase that workload, but the fact is that the Board has no control over its workload. The board is a quasi judicial agency which moves into action only on petition of the Attorney General. Both under the act and under the new Executive order, the Attorney General remains in control of the Board's work. The fact remains that the Department of Justice has not given the Board any work to do. I must raise the question as to whether there is any reason to suppose that the Department of Justice will operate with any greater zeal in instituting cases authorized under the Executive order?

It seems to me that we must first look seriously into the question why Attorneys General have not given the Board any work to do. I believe we should examine the issues and the facts before we permit the work of the Board under the act to be diverted to purposes other than for which it was originally established, and before we permit it to be assigned additional duties under an obviously hastily drawn and patchwork Executive order which may never be seriously enforced, or capable of enforcement.

Indeed, the Committee on Internal Security which I chair has oversight responsibility of the Subversive Activities Control Act and the loyalty and security program, and we have, during the past

year, addressed ourselves to these serious issues. The administration and operation of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and the related Federal civilian employee loyalty-security program, which the Executive order is intended to support, have been the subject of intensive investigation and inquiry by the committee in this Congress, through a subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER). The committee has already published two volumes of its hearing record, and the third is going to print. The subcommittee chairman, formerly a distinguished Federal district judge, has conducted several days of hearings and has heard the major departments and principal agencies of the Government, with the exception of the Department of Justice.

During the course of the subcommittee's investigation over a year ago, in the 90th Congress, and now in the 91st Congress, we had repeatedly requested the views of the Department of Justice and solicited the attendance of its representative to attend upon the committee and to inform it of the position of the Department. It is only within the last 2 weeks that the Department has agreed to let us have their views, or to appear. They are scheduled for this Thursday, July 29. So it appears that my committee may be responsible for the Executive order. I have stated that the Board should either be given work to do or it should be abolished.

Under the circumstances it is not clear to me why the Department has not made its proposals in the course of the committee hearings so that the matter could be dealt with in a regular way. The result has been that the House has not been prepared to give the Department's proposal necessary study and consideration, and this committee of the House which is charged with oversight responsibilities on this subject has not been able to advise the House fully on the issues.

Meanwhile, pending the completion of the committee's study, we have the Ervin amendment before us. The gentleman from California suggests that this amendment should be supported on three grounds:

First, that the Executive order is legislation and intrudes on the legislative power; second, that Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities—if the Board's jurisdiction is to be extended, this should be done through normal legislative channels; and third, that the Executive order is clearly unconstitutional as a violation of the first amendment. While I wholly disagree with the latter conclusion—it is not supported in the pronouncements of the Court on the subject—there is some merit to the first two grounds.

I seriously doubt that the executive can do what it seeks to do. Certainly the order has no real effect in and of itself because no subpoena power can be conferred upon the Board by Executive order. The duties sought to be conferred upon the Board cannot be carried out without subpoena power. I truly cannot see why the executive chose to proceed as it did.

However, I do not believe that we should instruct our conferees, because Mr. ROONEY has never had the opportunity to examine all the underlying issues. This matter has never been before his committee. These underlying issues can not be properly examined under this motion to instruct.

I would point out that the Ervin amendment does not save one dime, and this motion merely binds the House to the Senate's position. It is my belief that the Ervin amendment will be accepted by the House conferees for the reasons I have previously mentioned; however, I would not want to bind them without giving them the opportunity to examine all the underlying issues.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to instruct the House conferees to accept the Senate amendment to H.R. 9272—providing fiscal year 1972 appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies—concerning the Subversive Activities Control Board.

This Board—the SACB—is a body inimical to the freedom of association protected by the first amendment. This is the major indictment to levy against it. But, on a lesser level of concern, I would note that this is a body without purpose. It is largely a sinecure for purposeless bureaucrats, serving no function save the filling of empty jobs.

What makes the issue of continued survival of the SACB particularly relevant at this time is the issuance on July 8 by the President of Executive Order No. 11605. By virtue of this order, the jurisdiction of the Board is broadened; that extension occurs, needless to say, at the expense of the first amendment. Moreover, this expansion of authority has been created by Executive fiat, whereas clearly it constitutes legislative action solely within the authority of the Congress.

Fortunately, the Senate adopted on July 19 an amendment offered by Senator ERVIN barring the use of any of the funds appropriated by H.R. 9272 to carry out the new duties assigned in the Executive order.

While it is unfortunate that the amendment offered by Senator PROXMIER striking all funds for the SACB was defeated, at the least it is imperative that the Ervin amendment be accepted by the House conferees.

Executive Order No. 11605:

Transfers to the SACB the responsibility for conducting hearings and making determinations, on petition of the Attorney General, concerning certain organizations which he believes should be considered for designations on the Attorney General's list.

This transfer of authority to the SACB to list organizations on the so-called Attorney General's list is an attempt to resurrect the SACB by giving it the authority and responsibility to undertake investigations which are wholly outside the scope of its Congressional mandate. This attempt is premised on the fact that by virtue of the Supreme Court decision, *Albertson* against SACB, the Board was rendered in effect powerless. That decision, combined with the 1969 decision, *Boorda*

against SACB, has left this body moribund. Its only function now is to expend Federal taxpayers' dollars for salaries for unneeded employees.

The waste of taxpayers' dollars is a serious matter. That alone justifies final dissolution of this body. But what is the damning factor which makes this body anathema? It is that the Board constitutes an institution whose very existence has been an affront to the 1st amendment. That has been made clear by the courts.

Now, the President has sought to compound that affront by turning over to the Board authority to make investigations concerning so-called subversive political activity. In so doing, the Executive order provides criteria for the Board in its consideration of—

Whether an organization unlawfully advocates force or violence to deny others their constitutional or statutory rights.

It also provides criteria for the Board—

When it considers whether an organization seeks to overthrow the government of the United States, or any State or subdivision thereof, by unlawful means.

Without going into the criteria provided, it appears clear to me that the Executive order in no way mitigates the objections which have always existed concerning the functions of the SACB—the action of the Board is an infringement of the freedom of association guaranteed by the first amendment.

Moreover, the text of the Executive order embodies the fatal flaw of condemning the advocacy of ideas. No matter how obnoxious a thought, the first amendment is clear: speech is protected. That is the essence of our very society. Advocacy of ideas is embraced within the ambit of the Constitution. We have made the choice between suppressing speech and fostering it. We have opted for the latter.

That is immutable, and no Executive order can undo that choice. But, Executive Order No. 11605 seeks to cast a chill upon exercise of that speech.

Instead of relegating this obnoxious body to the realm of past history, the Congress has allowed it to survive. And now, the President seeks to reinvigorate it by expanding its powers. In so doing, not only does he thereby sustain an agency inimical to the first amendment. He also extends himself clearly beyond his constitutional authority.

Article I, section 1 of the Constitution is very clear:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

That word "all" is pretty conclusive. It leaves no nooks or crannies for the President to legislate. Yet, in fact, Executive Order No. 11605 constitutes executive legislation. The SACB was created by the Internal Security Act of 1950. It was given no mandate, no authority to compile the so-called Attorney General's list. The Executive order proposes now to give the SACB authority concerning anyone who might allegedly threaten security. Thereby, the Executive order clearly invades the province of the Con-

gress, as laid out by the Constitution itself.

That kind of assault on the Constitution was laid to rest by *Youngstown Steel and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579. There, as here, a Presidential action was at issue. As Mr. Justice Black said:

The President's order does not direct that a congressional policy be executed in a manner prescribed by Congress—it directs that a presidential policy be executed in a manner prescribed by the President.

And, as Mr. Justice Black also said in *Youngstown*:

In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent or equivocal about who shall make the laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

In brief, the Ervin amendment—barring the use of any funds appropriated for the SACB for carrying out the duties assigned by Executive Order No. 11605—should be accepted by the House conferees.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I support the Ervin amendment to H.R. 9272 and therefore voted against the motion to table. I regret that we were unable to have a full discussion of the motion as some important questions are involved. In purporting to enlarge the duties of the Subversive Activities Control Board, Executive Order 11605 represents legislation. The President by Executive order cannot give to a board created for one purpose a function which Congress did not authorize. Under the Constitution, the President's mandate is to ensure that laws are faithfully executed; he is not a lawmaker. His function in the lawmaking process is limited to the recommending of legislation which he considers wise and to the vetoing of measures he considers unwise. The consideration and enactment of legislation is clearly the proper function of Congress, not the President.

As authority for the President's action, the administration relies upon a provision at 3 U.S.C. 301 which allows the President to delegate certain of his functions to the "head" of any department or agency. This provision, however, does not allow the delegation of presidential power to boards, commissions or independent groups and there is nothing to indicate that Congress intended to allow this.

I am presently serving on a subcommittee of the House Internal Security Committee which is studying the Federal personnel security program. Providing for the integrity of Government employees is a serious and complex subject and one to which we have devoted many hours of hearings and research. Because membership in certain organizations can preclude Federal employment in some situations, such changes as set forth in Executive Order 11605 would be not only an improper utilization of Executive order, but also a most untimely action.

No one has an unqualified right to a job

with the Federal Government. The difficult question is: What constitutes legitimate qualifications for Government employment? Should loyalty to the principles and goals of an organization—in this instance, the Government—be required of persons in clerical or nonsensitive positions? Loyalty would seem to have a bearing on efficiency, certainly in sensitive positions and, arguably, in nonsensitive positions as well. And is not efficiency a legitimate end in the Government as well as in any other organization?

At this date in history I assume that few would question the outright denial of a sensitive job to a Communist. But what about a member of a non-Communist but disloyal group such as the SDS? Should SDS members hold non-sensitive positions? How can the line be drawn as to where in Government employment a member of the Black Panthers may be tolerated? Should it be drawn between clerical and routine posts and supervisory or policymaking decisions? Can Panthers be tolerated even in clerical or routine positions? Wherever the line is drawn, should not it be drawn openly, by code, and not secretly?

Our committee will make recommendations to Congress on these questions. Our committee will also make recommendations on the role, if any, which the SACB should have in the Government personnel security program. Perhaps we can find a less controversial and more effective way to fight subversion than to continue to use the SACB, which has been so seriously discredited by its 20-year history of ineffectiveness and its "witch-hunt" image—deserved or not.

There will be differences of opinion on our committees' recommendations, but these differences should be resolved by the Congress, not by Executive fiat.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of my colleague from California (Mr. EDWARDS), instructing House conferees to accept the Ervin amendment to H.R. 9272, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations bill. The Ervin amendment would prevent the expansion of the jurisdiction of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I take this stand for three principal reasons, each of which would by itself be conclusive. First, this Board, the maintenance of which has cost the taxpayers \$5,598,000 in the 20 years of its bizarre and fruitless existence, has produced absolutely nothing by way of work product. As a trustee of the taxpayers' money, I cannot in good conscience support additional funding for this Board. Second, in my judgment and the judgment of many others, the President's July 2, 1971, amendment to Executive Order 10450, which purports to expand the jurisdiction of the Subversive Activities Control Board, contains provisions which are patently unconstitutional. I cannot support the unlawful expansion of activities of a Government agency. Third, the President's July 2 Executive order is an improper exercise of power, which, like other recent Executive encroachments into the legislative area—including vital foreign policy, essential changes in the

system of taxation, and refusal to spend appropriated funds—must be stopped. The executive branch must not be allowed to expand the purpose and scope of a board created for specific and limited purposes by the Congress. In my judgment, our acquiescence in this encroachment on the central prerogatives of the Congress would gravely compromise our system of government, which is founded on the principle of separation of powers.

I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that in my capacity as a member of the House Internal Security Committee, and otherwise, I have observed the accelerating attack, under the imprimatur of Government agencies and committees, upon freedom of association. The revival in our time of guilt by association is one of the most ominous and horrible trends in Government. I urge each of my colleagues to oppose appropriations which would enable this Board to persecute individuals who fall within the unconstitutionally vague standard set forth in the July 2 Executive order:

Membership in any organization which is totalitarian, fascist, Communist, subversive, or—has adopted a policy of unlawfully advocating the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights. . . .

The full text of the July 2 order may be found at page 25892 of the July 19, 1971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the peculiar history of the President's order is instructive. On July 6, a week after House passage of H.R. 9792, Mr. John W. Mahan, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, admitted at a hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee that the Board has virtually nothing to do. He admitted that in its more than 20 years of existence the Board has not registered anyone, notwithstanding its legislated function as a registry for subversives. He admitted that the decisions of the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have held the central functions of the Board to be unconstitutional.

Two days after these incredible admissions, there appeared in the Federal Register the Executive order whose expansion of the unconstitutional functions of the Subversive Activities Control Board is the subject of this motion.

In essence, Mr. Speaker, what we are presented with today is the baldest attempt by the executive branch to substitute its power for the proper role of the Federal judiciary and the Congress. A vote against this motion is a vote to further erode the role of the Congress.

I have noted the abiding desire of many of my colleagues to prevent featherbedding in all areas. Even where the need has been great for additional funds, many of my colleagues have declined to expand the Federal payroll. Only last week, a very substantial number of my colleagues—with whom I did not agree—voted to withhold funds to provide a critically needed administrative assistant for the Chief Justice of the United States.

No Member of this House who truly believes in fiscal responsibility, can vote an increase in funds for a Board which

has had, and can have, nothing whatever to do. No Member of this House who is opposed to wasting money, should be intimidated by the discredited and shameful ploy that he is "soft on communism."

Every loyal American opposes subversion. In neither its prior, nor its proposed incarnations is the Subversive Activities Control Board necessary or even relevant to the fight against subversion. If the U.S. Department of Justice is not competent to locate, prosecute, and convict subversive individuals, then there is something gravely wrong with the administration of justice in this country.

Each of us is a free man who loves his country. Free men must know that subversion appears in many shades and forms. Suppression of political enemies within—be they real or imagined—is as insidious a form of subversion as support of external enemies and alien ideologies. I support this motion in the name of fiscal responsibility, political freedom, and human rights.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY of New York moves to lay on the table the motion of the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 141, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]
YEAS—246

Abbutt
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Baker
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burlinson, Tex.
Burlinson, Mo.
Byrnes, Wis.

Byron
Cabell
Caffery
Camp
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conable
Coughlin
Crane
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denholm
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson

Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Forsythe
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gettys
Gialmo
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.

Griffin
Gross
Grover
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hammer-schmidt
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hébert
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hillis
Hogan
Horton
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lent
Lloyd
Lujan
McCollister
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKevitt
McKinney
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Mahon
Mailliard

Mann
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minshall
Mizell
Morgan
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pettis
Peysers
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Rousselot
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Scherle
Schmitz
Schneebeli
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shoup

NAYS—141

Abourezk
Abzug
Adams
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Barrett
Begich
Bergland
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Beland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Carey, N.Y.
Carney
Celler
Chisholm
Clay
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Corman
Cotter
Culver
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
Dellums
Dent
Dingell
Dow
Drinan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Fascell

Findley
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Gaydos
Gibbons
Grasso
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hicks, Wash.
Hollfield
Howard
Jacobs
Karth
Kastenmeier
Koch
Leggett
Link
Long, Md.
McCloskey
McClure
McCormack
McKay
Madden
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mikva
Minish
Mink
Mitchell
Mollohan
Monagan

Moorhead
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Perkins
Pickle
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Rangel
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Riegle
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Roncalio
Rosenthal
Roy
Ryan
St Germain
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Schwengel
Seiberling
Stanton, James V.
Stokes
Sullivan
Symington
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Vanik
Waldie
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates

NOT VOTING—46

Abernethy	Goldwater	Pepper
Addabbo	Goodling	Poage
Aspinall	Gubser	Rostenkowski
Blackburn	Heckler, Mass.	Roybal
Blanton	Hosmer	Saylor
Brasco	Hungate	Sisk
Carter	Jones, Tenn.	Smith, Iowa
Collier	Kyros	Stephens
Conyers	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Delaney	McClory	Stuckey
Diggs	McCulloch	Teague, Calif.
Donohue	McDonald,	Van Deerlin
Edwards, La.	Mich.	Vigorito
Esch	Montgomery	Whalen
Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.	Yatron
Garmatz	Nelsen	

So the motion to table was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Teague of California.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Garmatz with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Yatron with Mr. Goodling.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Hungate.
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. McClory.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Whalen.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Kyros.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Donohue.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Roybal.

Mr. O'NEILL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GIBBONS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DENHOLM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY of New York, SIKES, SLACK, SMITH of Iowa, FLYNT, MAHON, BOW, CEDERBERG, and ANDREWS of North Dakota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the motion that I previously offered and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9272 DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Managers may have until midnight

Wednesday, July 28 to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 9272) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York, chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations, is asking permission to file a report for the conferees who have just been appointed within the last few minutes?

The SPEAKER. The request is that the Managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Wednesday, July 28, to file the conference report.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must object.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold or reserve his right to object?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to withhold my objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman, my friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. For about a week we have had an engagement for 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. When I say "we," I mean the conferees on the part of the House and the chairman of the conferees on the part of the other body. I am a trusting soul. I think the other body will yield to us on most of the items because we shall make a good case. If that is so, why not let us get this matter behind us and file a report by midnight tomorrow and then take the conference report up at the first available time? We shall then be finished with another big appropriation bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my distinguished friend, in answer to his query, that only the Lord knows whether those conferees will be alive at 10 o'clock in the morning or not.

Second, the gentleman can ask unanimous consent any time tomorrow to file by midnight tomorrow night, if and when the conferees have met, in fact.

Third, the real reason for my objection is because this violates the Reorganization Act of 1970, which states that a conference report shall be in the hands of the Members for 3 days before it is taken up for consideration, and I know from the history and the tradition of the action of this House, that the next request will be for unanimous consent to take it up before this weekend whether it has laid over and been in the hands of Members 3 days or not.

I renew my objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman briefly yield further?

The SPEAKER. Objection has been heard. Does the gentleman from Missouri continue to reserve his right to object?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad

to continue to reserve my right to object and yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, my friend, Dr. HALL, that this is a situation where, if those conferees are not there tomorrow morning, as he suggests, we will not have it filed by midnight tomorrow. We do not intend to bring up the conference report for consideration tomorrow. What we would like to do is to get it printed as soon as we can, and in the hands of all the Members so they can see what is in it. Usually the distinguished gentleman cooperates in this regard.

Mr. HALL. That is exactly correct, and, Mr. Speaker, I will, if the request is renewed tomorrow, knowing that the conference has met. For the reasons enumerated above, I continue to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 200 on the motion to recommit H.R. 4354, I am recorded as paired against. I wish to make a statement that this is incorrect. If I had been present I would have voted for recommitment and against passage of the bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 20, I am recorded as not voting on Rollcall No. 297 concerning House Resolution 424 on the rule for House Joint Resolution 3, which established a Joint Committee on the Environment. I was unavoidably detained, due to a meeting on small business conditions in my district and the Nation as a whole. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the resolution then before the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7109, NASA AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7109) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 21, 1971.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House bring back a conference report on H.R. 7109 to authorize appropriation for fiscal year 1972 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This conference action reconciles differences in authorization for research and development, construction of facilities, and

research and program management and for other purposes.

The bill passed the House on June 3, 1971, and passed the Senate on June 29, 1971. In acting on the bill, the Senate struck all after the enacting clause and substituted new language.

The committee of conference agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain substitute amendments and with certain other stipulations insisted upon by the managers on the part of the House.

There were 10 items in disagreement all involving amounts to be authorized for appropriations and there were two other items of legislative language to be reconciled.

A summary of the substitutes agreed upon by all members of the committee of conference is as follows:

For fiscal year 1972, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested \$3,271,350,000.

The House bill authorized \$3,433,080,000.

The Senate version authorized \$3,280,850,000.

As a result of the conference, the total amount to be authorized was adjusted to \$3,354,950,000. This is \$79,830,000 less than the House approved and \$83,600,000 more than the NASA budget request.

In total, the Committee of Conference has agreed to authorize research and development programs totaling \$2,603,200,000, construction of facilities totaling \$58,400,000, and \$693,350,000 for research and program management.

The conference report contains a detailed listing of the program areas and projects and the amounts to be authorized for each as recommended by the Committee of Conference.

The conference report contains a more detailed listing of construction of facilities items resulting from an agreement to a Senate modification to section 1(b) of the bill which requires NASA to specify the individual construction project at each NASA center covered by the budget request. Each major construction project therefore will be listed in the authorization bill rather than a consolidated total amount for each center covering a number of projects as has been done in the past. The House conferees agreed with this language change since it facilitates the oversight of new construction by the committee. Also the activity of NASA should be carried out in a deliberate, planned manner in the future without the need for the haste, reprogramming and modifications that were necessary in the early stages of the space program.

Specific limitations were placed on the use of funds for the nuclear rocket program and for research and program management. The Committee of Conference agreed to the Senate increase of \$43 million for the Nerva nuclear rocket program, making the total amount available for this program \$58 million. However, the language included in the bill restricts this amount for use only for this nuclear rocket development.

In the research and program management item, the NASA request was reduced by \$4 million. And further, the

amount available for personnel and related costs was limited to \$529,916,000. This constitutes a reduction of \$1 million for personnel costs in addition to the planned reduction of 1,500 personnel included in their budget submission.

Briefly, other highlights of the conference action resulted in a reduction of \$10 million to the NASA request for the lunar and planetary exploration program. The committee of conference agreed that NASA should examine the concepts currently planned for the outer planets missions with the view of designing a less sophisticated and less expensive spacecraft for the grand tour missions.

The conference also agreed to increase the aeronautical research and technology item by \$12,500,000. These funds are for use in solving pressing problems of aircraft noise abatement, traffic congestion, safety, and the need to attract new, younger scientific personnel into aeronautical research.

Mr. Speaker, we consider that the committee of conference has agreed to a good conference report and represents one that can be supported by our Members for the fiscal year 1972 authorization.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the amount of the original House authorization bill, \$3,433,080,000, was simply a 5-percent increase over the authorization of last year. This was to take care of the inflationary costs which are being incurred. This year's increase would mean the budget would be just about the same as last year's budget without the inflation.

Some of my colleagues ask what this conference agreement will do to the budget. The budget in the report adds \$83.6 million to the NASA request; it is 2.6 percent above the 1972 administration budget. However, the conference report is \$78.13 million below the House figure.

I have been asked to report on the present Apollo 15 and the status and safety of the astronauts. I shall be glad to give a report.

At 2:06 p.m., E.D.T., which will be about 10 minutes from now, on July 27, NASA will begin a detailed status check of the signal light which has been causing the trouble. This signal light indicates a problem in the main propulsion engine system. This system does not affect the security of the astronauts, because the main propulsion engine will not be used until lunar insertion.

The decision of whether or not to perform lunar insertion will then come by Thursday, July 29, at the scheduled time for lunar insertion. The insertion into lunar orbit is planned for 4:06 p.m. eastern standard time. We must determine whether the fault is in this signal light or switch or some other more critical component in the main propulsion engine.

If the problem is serious such as a pressure valve malfunction, then, in order to avoid what happened to the three Soviet cosmonauts, we will have to protect our astronauts and bring them back before going into moon orbit.

What will happen if NASA decides to bring the mission to a halt is about the same that occurred with respect to

Apollo 13. Apollo 13 made a half orbit around the moon. We call it a gravity turn. Apollo 15 will simply go around back of the moon, just as Apollo 13 did, and then the astronauts will return.

On the return course we will perform the separation. We must have the separation of the command and service module prior to the descent and the atmospheric reentry. The lunar module must be jettisoned.

I will place in the RECORD the schedule of the Apollo 15 mission as it was originally planned. This schedule would have brought the astronauts back to earth for Apollo 15 splashdown in the South Pacific at 4:46 p.m. E.D.T.

TIMELINE OF APOLLO 15 MISSION EVENTS

Event	Time from liftoff (hr/min)	CDT/date
Launch.....		8:34 a.m. July 26
Earth orbit insertion.....	00:12	8:46 a.m.
Trans lunar injection.....	2:50	11:24 a.m.
Lunar orbit insertion.....	78:31	3:05 p.m. July 29
Descent orbit insertion.....	82:40	7:14 p.m.
Spacecraft separation.....	100:14	12:48 p.m. July 30
Lunar landing.....	104:42	5:15 p.m.
Stand up EVA.....	106:10	6:43 p.m.
EVA 1.....	119:50	8:24 a.m. July 31
EVA 2.....	141:10	5:44 a.m. Aug. 1
EVA 3.....	161:50	2:24 a.m. Aug. 2
Lunar liftoff.....	171:38	12:12 p.m.
Spacecraft docking.....	173:30	2:04 p.m.
Trans earth injection.....	223:44	4:18 p.m. Aug. 4
Trans earth EVA.....	242:00	10:34 a.m. Aug. 5
Pacific Ocean splashdown.....	295:12	3:46 p.m. Aug. 7

¹ 26° N. lat. 158° W. long.

As far as the day Apollo 15 may land if the mission is shortened, when Apollo 13 was abbreviated, it returned 5 days from date of launch. By Thursday, however, we will have the final decision as to whether to go into moon orbit or complete the half orbit around the moon, and then return. We have hopes, though, that we can fix this switch and this pressure control of the main engine before Thursday. We still have the time to do it, and NASA experts are working on it. But there will be no trial and error type of experimenting. We can bring them back to earth with equipment that we have, and the equipment will not be used for any other purpose but that which it was designed for. So the astronauts will be safe. There is no doubt that NASA will not put Apollo 15 in a lunar orbit if there is any question of the pressure switch on the main engine. As I said before, we will be risking the same eventuality that unfortunately occurred with the Russian astronauts.

I would also like to explain that it has been quite positively settled that it was the lack of pressurization on the return which killed the cosmonauts. When the astronauts enter the atmosphere they encounter the equivalent of a 500-pound shock. This caused the trouble to the U.S.S.R.'s Soyuz flight and caused the death of the cosmonauts.

Mr. Speaker, there is one point that should be made with regard to the moon exploration. Amazingly we have found that the bacteria which is the greatest killer on earth, is affected by the materials we find on the moon. The material in the core of the moon that has been

brought back and on contact with the staphylococcus bacteria either kills or inhibits the staphylococcus. We may have discovered an entirely new antibiotic advance.

Likewise we have reached a point where we may have an agricultural revolution. We now find ordinary earth vegetables growing twice as fast and often twice as large in moon soil as they do in earth soil. We do not know the reason why, as yet, but the fact is that the moon soil, acting as a fertilizer, may be one of the big advances in the moon program for our agriculture people.

Finally, there is the field of miniaturization. In Pennsylvania we have been able to have heart pacers put into almost 18,000 people through a simple operation. Previously, implantation of a pacer required a full operation, which was a major operation at that. Now, because of the miniaturization which has been accomplished in the space program, it is simply a matter of inserting the heart pacer with a very simple slice in the flesh. Furthermore, the pacer will last for 3 or 4 years.

As chairman of the Pennsylvania heart fund, I am glad to report that we have now decreased the national rate of heart deaths through many of the space procedures which have been developed since the space program began in 1958. Our space work has advanced the Nation tremendously, not only in terms of peacetime benefits, but in terms of the national security of this country.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing in our committee on the peaceful use of space and what we have accomplished has a direct effect on the security of every one of our cities and municipalities, as well as our military installations. We should progress in space because any nation, or groups of nations, which gets overwhelming superiority in any strategic area will be able to assume total global control without the firing of a shot.

This is why our space program is so important and why I ask for the same support on the conference report that we received on the bill when it was being considered by the House.

The bill passed the House on June 3 by a vote of 302 to 64. That is a ratio of about 5 to 1 in favor of the program. Further, we are only 2.5 percent above last fiscal year's budget figure.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the chairman of the committee and the conferees because it has taken hard work. Our work is a small reflection of the fine work of the many engineers and scientists in our NASA organization. We have come to a reduction of 1,600 employees in NASA, 100 employees more than the administration recommended. We are cutting down on personnel, we are cutting down on costs and still we continue to make real progress.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 7109 which authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1972. There is unanimous agreement on the conference report by the Senate and House conferees. The final report which we present is the result of the most careful consideration by all conference mem-

bers. I wish to commend the conferees of the House on the competent work they have done on the fiscal year 1972 NASA authorization.

The committee of conference agrees to a final fiscal year 1972 NASA authorization level of \$3,354,950,000. The House on June 3, 1971, by a vote of 302 yeas to 64 nays on final passage of H.R. 7109, originally authorized a budget level of \$3,433,080,000 which represents an increase of \$161.73 million above the 1972 fiscal year NASA administration request of \$3,271,350,000. The figure agreed upon by the Conference Committee represents a reduction of \$78.13 million from the initial House NASA authorization, but represents an \$83.6 million increase in the 1972 fiscal year NASA budget above the administration request.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION
BUDGET PLAN SUMMARY

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year—		
	1970	1971	1972
Obligational authority:			
Research and development.....	3,110,427	2,555,000	2,517,700
Construction of facilities.....	50,112	24,950	56,300
Research and program management.....	702,178	688,579	697,350
Total.....	3,862,717	3,268,529	3,271,350
Proposed supplemental for Government-wide civilian pay act increase.....		+29,854	
Total budget plan.....	3,862,717	3,298,383	3,271,350

The \$83.6 million added to the NASA 1972 fiscal year request corresponds to a dollar increase of 2.6 percent. Congress must recognize the budget, with present inflation, that we are recommending is at a minimal level. This is a budget that delays or defers programs which are in the national interest and which should progress at a faster pace. I refer to a faster pace not only in terms of providing quicker practical return for the tax dollars which have been invested, but also in terms of meeting the competition of the important advances being made by other members of the international space community.

I believe that the recent advanced programs of the Soviets in space, particularly in manned operations, makes it clear that space is no longer a place for simple exploration, but a place to utilize and to progress in many useful fields. Many other countries of the world press on with vigorous and expanding space programs. The United States must continue in its pursuit of space at a level which is balanced between costs and space benefits and practical results.

The resources and the people the United States is committing to the U.S. space program have declined from past levels. The annual NASA budget has dropped from its peak in 1965 of \$5.2 billion to this year's \$3.7 billion. The numbers of NASA personnel have dropped from a peak in July 1967, of 34,126 to less than 29,850 at the end of fiscal year 1971. We can be satisfied that the NASA program for this year does preserve our capabilities in the most essential areas.

The final dollar figure which is agreed upon by the conferees for research and development is \$2,603,200,000. This figure is \$85.5 million above the administration's request of \$2,517,700,000. In the program category of construction and facilities, the final budget level agreed to was \$58,400,000, or \$2,100,000, above the administration's request of \$56,300,000. Within the third major program category of research and program management—new name is administrative expenses—the Conference Committee agreed to a figure of \$693,350,000. This figure represents a reduction of \$4,000,000 below the original administration request of \$697,350,000. The bulk of the dollar increases are within the research and development category. This is money oriented to specific programs.

The research and development figure contains four of the major dollar additions to the administration's request. These changes are in the area of space flight operations. The original budget request of \$672,775,000 is increased by \$30,000,000 to a final figure of \$702,775,000. The two programs for which this money is earmarked are the Skylab, the orbiting space laboratory, and the space shuttle, the reusable space transportation system.

The \$15 million additional which is authorized for the Skylab program is designated for providing a Skylab rescue capability. The Skylab mission, beginning in April 1973, involves sending three teams of three astronauts each to the orbiting laboratory for periods ranging up to 56 days. It is incumbent upon our Government, particularly after the tragic experience of the U.S.S.R. with the Soyuz 11 program, to provide for a rescue capability in the event an emergency requires an immediate return of the astronaut team to earth. We are spending this money for insuring the safety and protecting the lives of our U.S. astronauts.

The remaining \$15 million of the total \$30 million added to the administration's request for space flight operations is designated for the more rapid development of long lead time systems within the space shuttle program. The space shuttle is the reusable space transportation system designed to furnish airline type accessibility to space at very low operational cost. Today's space program requires an entire series of seven different expendable different boosters to place payloads in earth orbit at a minimum cost of approximately \$1,000 per pound. By use of the shuttle, satellites can be placed in earth orbit at a cost less than \$100 per pound—a 90 percent reduction in price.

Each shuttle is being designed for 100 or more flights with a minimum of ground maintenance over the vehicles' estimated 10-year lifetime. Space payload transportation thus approaches commercial airline practice. The vehicle can carry a varying payload of satellites, passengers, and cargo. In a passenger mode, 10 people plus a crew of two can be accommodated. Passengers and crews on shuttle launches do not require space suits. This will permit more in-orbit activity. Average people in good health will be able to fly into space without extensive flight training.

Once developed, the space shuttle will

replace all present launch vehicles except for the very small Scout class vehicle and the massive Saturn V. With the low operational cost and the versatility of the shuttle, the vehicle can accomplish a variety of missions. These include delivering or retrieving satellites from low earth orbit, visiting orbiting satellites for regular servicing in orbit, delivering propulsive stages and payloads destined for deeper orbits, supporting short duration science and application missions, serving as an in-orbit research laboratory. Transporting personnel and cargo to manned space stations is also one of the major advantages.

The additional \$15 million for fiscal year 1972 will support a more intensive development of the pacing vehicle development tasks, the thermal protection system, and the vehicle structure. The shuttle is one of the most important programs being pursued by NASA in terms of both future utilization of space and national security and this program should proceed with efficiency and speed.

The third major effort to which additional funding was provided is the space nuclear power and propulsion program. I originally proposed by my amendment the increase in the budget for this program in the House authorization bill. My proposal was to add \$39.9 million to the original NASA request of \$27.72 million. My recommendation made the revised figure \$67.62 million. The action the Senate took on the House bill for the nuclear power and propulsion program was to add \$43 million to the NASA request. In the conference committee, all conferees unanimously agreed to raise the funding for this very important program to the higher Senate figure of \$70.72 million.

The funding under this program will be directed to the further development of the NERVA, which is an abbreviation for nuclear engine for rocket vehicle application. The NERVA is a transportation system designed to complement the capability of the space shuttle vehicles in transporting space cargoes from close earth orbit, where there will be no danger of fallout, through completion of final mission. In operation, a space payload will be coupled to, or picked up by, the NERVA propulsion system once the payload has reached an altitude of a few hundred miles above the surface of the earth.

The NERVA system is important because of the improved versatility, flexibility, and economy it offers over competing advanced propulsion systems. As an example, NERVA doubles the payload and mission capabilities of the Saturn V launch vehicle in terms of maneuvering payloads in earth orbit, for landing payloads at any point on the moon's surface, and for sending probes into deep space. In other words, for such missions the payload capability of the Saturn V will be increased by as much as 100 percent. This represents a major advance in efficiency and economy in space operation.

The NERVA system is capable of being stored in orbit for unlimited periods of time. Chemical propulsion systems are greatly effected by the varying tempera-

tures in space. Temperature differences of as much as 500°—+240° F. to -240° F. are encountered. The NERVA system is not effected by these varying temperatures. This means that with the orbiting of the NERVA system, the United States would have the capability, in terms of a space transportation system, to carry out virtually any type of mission to any location in our universe, at any time.

The NERVA system can also be completely ground controlled. Furthermore, the NERVA can be operated at varying power with no loss in efficiency such as that now encountered in the operation of our existing chemical engines. The 50,000 miles per hour speed of the NERVA permits it to go to the moon in approximately 5 hours. In addition, the system can be started, stopped, and restarted an indefinite number of times. I would also add that the system thus far has had one of the most successful test records of any system ever developed by NASA. The system test is performed at the Nuclear Rocket Development Station in Nevada.

Under the level of funding originally requested by the administration, the NERVA program would have been required to drastically curtail effort and to cutback program manpower. With the increased funding provided by the Conference Committee, the program will be permitted to proceed in an orderly fashion, and, in addition, avoid the needless and expensive disassembly of the entire NERVA team.

I feel the NASA and contractor personnel participating on the NERVA program are among the most dedicated personnel in this Nation's entire space program. Furthermore, the system they are engaged in developing is destined to be a keystone to this Nation's future space program.

The fourth major program within the research and development category to which substantial money was added was the aeronautical research and technology program. NASA had originally requested \$110,000,000 to which the conferees added \$12,500,000. This increase is designed to deal with a number of serious problems in aviation including noise abatement, safety, the need for short takeoff and landing aircraft systems, and the need for new and younger individuals in the field of aeronautics research and development. While the Senate limited its initial authorization to the administration requested figure, the Senate did agree with the intent of the House authorized funds and the necessity to pursue effort in this area on a more intensive basis. The Senate, therefore, agreed in the conference committee meeting to adding \$12.5 million to the NASA request.

Within the second major category of the total NASA budget, construction of facilities, \$2.1 million was added to the original NASA request of \$56,300,000. The final budget level for construction of facilities as agreed to by the conference committee is \$58,400,000. The \$2.1 million was authorized to modernize and expand the existing Visitors' Information Center at Cape Kennedy. This facility is provided to serve the needs of the general public and to offer a means by

which Cape Kennedy visitors, primarily tourists, are able to learn more about and to experience firsthand the activities of our national space program.

I emphasize that this facility is a profitmaking undertaking. In fact, the distribution of gross profits from the present Center based upon operation between May 1, 1968, through April 30, 1971, resulted in direct payment to the Treasury of the United States of \$163,403. The present facility is inadequate to handle the number of persons visiting the Cape area. The existing facility was designed to accommodate 3,000 persons on a daily basis. By contrast, the daily average visitor load to the information center in 1970 was 5,500 people. In fact, the peak for a single day was 15,000 persons which represented a severe strain on the center.

With the opening of Disney World East in 1971 and its being located only 50 miles to the west of the Space Center, the Center is expected to attract a minimum of 5 million people annually. The visitor load is therefore expected to reach between 12,000 and 15,000 persons per day in 1972. To meet this anticipated increase in visitor load a new and expanded facility will be required.

The last major category of the NASA program concerns research and program management. The House had originally increased the administration request of \$697,350,000 for this activity by \$9,500,000 for a total budget authorization of \$706,850,000. The Senate, however, had recommended a reduction of \$16,000,000 in the administration request for a final authorization of \$681,350,000. Furthermore, the language within the Senate bill established a limitation that not more than \$517,916,000 could be authorized for personnel and related costs. The administration request had provided for a reduction of 1,500 personnel throughout the NASA organization over the 1972 fiscal year. This cutback would have reduced the existing NASA work force from 32,150 to 29,150.

The intent of the House increase was to reduce this 5-percent personnel reduction by limiting the cutback to 1,000 personnel. In contrast, 3,000 NASA personnel would have been cut back by the Senate proposed budget level. This would be a reduction in force in 1 year of greater than 10 percent.

By virtue of the stand taken by the House conferees, the Senate dropped its insistence on its originally proposed cutback and agreed to a total amount of \$693,350,000. The conference report further stipulates that not more than \$529,916,000 can be utilized for personnel and related costs. This ceiling will nonetheless require NASA to reduce its work force by approximately 5 percent, or some 1,600 total personnel.

This, in summary, highlights the major areas of disagreement between the House and Senate of NASA authorization bills. There were a total of 10 items in conference which involved amounts to be authorized for appropriations.

There were also four other areas of disagreement; two involving changes in legislative language and two involving conforming amendments.

In conclusion, the conference committee has drawn up a good bill and one which deserves your support. The committee has worked diligently in arriving at the final recommended level for our space program for the coming year. In conclusion, I strongly urge the passage of this conference report as it offers this country the means by which to preserve its preeminence in space.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. 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. The Chair will count. Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9388) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9388, the AEC's fiscal year 1972 authorization bill, which passed the House on July 15 with amendment, was considered in the other body on July 20. At that time six amendments were offered to the bill as passed by the House, of which four were accepted by the other body. The first three are included in amendment No. 1 as transmitted by the Senate.

The net effect of the amendments adopted is to increase the total amount authorized to be appropriated by \$4 million as follows:

First, increase by \$500,000 the authorization for research on the nuclear cardiac pacemaker;

Second, increase by \$2,300,000 the authorization for research relative to nuclear safety; and,

Third, increase by \$1,200,000 the authorization for research relative to development of controlled thermonuclear reactions—fusion.

This represents an increase of less than two-tenths of 1 percent over the amount provided for in the bill as reported by the Joint Committee and as approved by the House.

On July 15, when the House considered this measure, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) offered an amendment somewhat similar to a combination of the amendments adopted by the other body relative to increased funding for safety and fusion research. The amendment offered in the House would have increased funding for these two programs by \$5.4 million and it was rejected. The combined increase in authorization under the Senate amendments for these programs will be \$3.5 million, \$1.9 million less than that proposed by the gentleman from New York.

SENATE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9, and insert:

"(a) For 'Operating expenses, \$2,029,571,000, of which not less than \$31,000,000 shall be available for controlled thermonuclear fusion research and development, and of which not more than \$116,400,000 shall be available for operating costs for the high energy physics program category.'

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PRICE of Illinois moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 10, after "\$3,500,000" insert ", except that no funds shall be obligated or expended for the acquisition of a fee simple interest in land, or any other interest in land which exceeds three years from the date of enactment of this Act, until an advisory council appointed by the President of the United States reports to the Congress that construction and operation of such project and the transportation of waste materials to the project can be carried out in a manner which assures the safety of the project, the protection of public health, and the preservation of the quality of the environment of the region".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PRICE of Illinois moves to concur in the second Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the Senate amendment insert "": *Provided*, That—

"(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (E), no funds shall be obligated or expended (1) for the acquisition of a fee simple interest in land or for the acquisition of any other interest in land which exceeds three years from the date of enactment of this Act, or (ii) for or in connection with the burial of radioactive materials at the proposed site other than for experimental purposes, including demonstrations, and then only when and if such materials are fully retrievable throughout such three year period.

"(B) The President of the United States shall appoint an advisory council which shall be composed of nine members at least three of whom shall be from Kansas. The advisory council may report to the Congress from time to time.

"(C) The Atomic Energy Commission (acting directly or by contract) shall conduct laboratory and other tests and research (whether onsite or elsewhere) relating to the

safety of the project, the protection of public health, and the preservation of the quality of the environment before any high level radioactive waste material is placed in salt mines at the proposed site except as provided in subparagraph (A).

"(D) No high level radioactive materials shall be buried or used, other than as provided by clause (ii) of subparagraph (A), at the proposed site until the advisory council reports to the Congress that construction and operation of such project and the transportation of waste materials to the project can be carried out in a manner which assures the safety of the project, the protection of public health, and the preservation of the quality of the environment of the region.

"(E) The limitations provided by subparagraph (A) shall not apply after the expiration of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the advisory council submits its report under subparagraph (D). For purposes of the preceding sentence, continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the 60-day period."

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 2 involves no change in funding. Offered by the Senators from Kansas, it imposes a limitation in the AEC relative to the acquisition of the site to be developed for the demonstration nuclear waste repository in Lyons, Kans. This limitation would preclude the AEC from acquiring title to the site or any other interest in the site for a period greater than 3 years from the date of enactment of this act. That restriction would be eliminated when an advisory council, to be appointed by the President, reports to the Congress that construction and operation of the project and transportation of nuclear waste materials to the project can be carried out in a manner which assures the safety of the project, the protection of public health, and the preservation of the quality of the environment of the region.

The substitute amendment which I have sent to the desk represents clarification and refinement of the language of the amendment as passed by the Senate but substantively includes the same restrictions on acquisition of title to the land. This substitute amendment has been cleared with the House members of the Joint Committee and the Members of the Kansas delegation from both Houses. We, therefore, recommend that the House accept the substitute amendment.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take a moment to express my thanks to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) for his gracious courtesy—in permitting all of us time to work out a satisfactory conclusion of the provision covering the authorization for an atomic waste repository in Kansas.

He has been the soul of cooperation—and I want the record to show that all of us—the entire House delegation from Kansas—and I am sure my two colleagues in the other body as well—are grateful to him.

A word about the revised language of the Senate amendment.

It is the end product of the concern of the Kansas Members of Congress. Its objective was to produce legislative language that would result in the greatest possible protection for Kansas and its people—for the health and welfare of human beings and the protection and preservation of their environment.

I would want the record to show that although I have been a concerned Member of Congress about this atomic waste depository—there is no pride of authorship involved here.

What is now before this House for approval is merely a refinement and clarification of the original Senate amendment.

The circumstances required that amendment to be handled under great time pressure—resulting in perhaps somewhat looser language than any of us thought desirable in these circumstances.

Now—with the cooperation of the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—who gave of their time last weekend and yesterday—we have an amendment which I am sure all will agree carries out what was the original intent of the Senate amendment.

I feel that perhaps I owe one bit of personal explanation in that the new language permits the temporary and experimental burial of high level wastes.

I have assented to that against my own instinct and the position of the Kansas scientific community—that all the necessary and essential tests and experiments can be carried out without burying high level wastes.

The AEC has felt otherwise—and strongly so.

I believe the conditions under which such burial can now take place are so controlled and constrained that Kansas is protected.

I, therefore, wish to commend the AEC for accepting such constraints.

Finally—may I say that I would like to again congratulate and thank individually Senators PEARSON and DOLE and Congressmen SHRIVER, WINN, SEBELIUS, and ROY—each of whom supported the necessity of protecting Kansas interests—and all of whom participated in making the pending amendment a more meaningful bit of law.

I cannot close without also paying a tribute to the chairman of the joint committee, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), who from the very earliest stage of the hearings on this issue has shown a warm consideration for Kansas problems—and for the concern of the Governor and myself.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois yielding to me.

I wonder if there are copies of this bill, or the Senate amendments to the House amendments thereunto, available in the House?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri I am sure

recognizes that there was a committee report, and we have had copies of the committee report, but the bill, of course, has been returned to the House during the past week, and has been available. This is the bill that was passed by the House except for these few changes.

I might recite to the gentleman from Missouri the differences in the bill.

First, the amendment about which we have just been talking, dealing with the salt mine project in the State of Kansas, has been worked out to the satisfaction of the Kansas delegation. In addition, there was an increase in authorization that provided an increase of \$500,000 for research incident to nuclear cardiac pacemaker, and there was an increase of \$2.3 million for authorization for research relative to nuclear safety.

There is another increase of \$1,200,000 for research relative to the development of controlled thermonuclear reactions.

That is the difference in the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I feel it is fair to assume that he is going to recommend we take the papers which have been returned from the other body with these amendments and concur with the amendments, and thereby make it in order to submit this to the White House for signature into law.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is the intention. The bill now, of course, will have to be returned to the Senate because we are amending one of the Senate amendments.

Mr. HALL. So that it might still be subject to a future conference report, if the other body does not accept our amendment?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. If they disagree, yes. But my understanding is that that will not be the case.

Mr. HALL. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is just one more way of evading the spirit and fact of the Reorganization Act of 1970. If the gentleman will yield for one further question, can the gentleman advise us whether or not the Members on the minority side have been consulted and concur in this procedure?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes; they have been fully informed on this and they have been working and cooperating with the chairman and the Kansas delegation on this matter.

Mr. HALL. I think it is obvious they have been working with the Kansas delegation, but I do not see the ranking minority Member on the floor, and that is what prompted the question.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That may be, but it was anticipated that sometime this afternoon we would call up the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman and the joint committee for approving the increased expenditures in nuclear safety research and in the development of fusion—a pollution-free energy source for the future. I am especially gratified and reassured by this action as the two increases constitute the substance of an amendment which I offered during House consideration of this bill 2 weeks ago.

Most gratifying to me is the committee's acceptance of a restoration of the funds cut by the President's Office of Management and Budget in reactor safety research. By restoring this \$2.3 million, as proposed in my amendment, this Congress will clearly demonstrate its concern that the Atomic Energy Commission should give a high priority to the swift development of a scientifically proven emergency core cooling system. I have long been a proponent of atomic energy, but I cannot overemphasize the necessity of predicating all future expansion in the nuclear industry upon absolute guarantees to public safety. Tests to date on the emergency core cooling system cannot offer to the public such an absolute guarantee, and yet it is this emergency system which stands between the public and horribly poisonous pollutants in the event any nuclear plant suffer a loss-of-coolant accident.

My amendment also called for increasing fusion-research funding by \$3.1 million, a sum I believe to be small in light of the incredible promises fusion holds out to the American people and to the world. The potential payoff from successful fusion research and development is unlimited electrical energy, safe and virtually pollution free, plus a fusion torch which could convert garbage and other solid waste back into its constituent atoms for reuse. The amount I called for would have constituted only a 10-percent increase over expenditures on fusion research last year. The \$1.2 million increase now provided for research in this important field represents an increase of only 4 percent. Nevertheless, the fact that Congress will put into effect this small increase over and above the amount recommended by the OMB is an indication of congressional interest in this essential field.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has been a long time friend of the development of coal, and I wonder why so many billions of dollars are spent on the development of atomic energy and such paltry amounts for coal?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman is aware of the fact that this committee has no jurisdiction at all in the area to which he refers although I am sure almost every member of our committee certainly would support any funds that might be appropriated or authorized by the Congress for coal research.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the able gentleman from Illinois. Although atomic energy has always received strong Federal funding, apparently because of its "glamor boy" status is something sensationally new, we are going to have to rely on coal to power a substantial portion of our energy and we therefore ought to support coal research at a comparable rate at least.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the

motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. 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. 10061) making appropriations for the Departments Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) and by myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10061, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we have already completed congressional action on the Office of Education appropriation bill for 1972, and it has been signed by the President. That bill contained a total of \$5,146,311,000, the largest appropriation for education in history.

The bill that we bring to the House today covers the balance of the programs, authorized at the time when the committee concluded its hearings, for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and the related agencies.

This is the bill dealing with the kind of things that are about as close to you

and your people as you can possibly get. I know about your mail because we see a great deal of it. But keep in mind, and I am sure you know, for every letter you get, we receive a thousand.

Some of the things in this bill will be useful in your TV reports, your radio reports, your newsletters, and, with the help of God, we are going home on recess early next month, and you will be talking in fire houses, chambers of commerce, and whatnot. These are the things that people will stop you on the street to talk about. So certain pages of this report I really think you should tear out and put in your pockets.

This bill contains a total of \$20,364,746,000. Now, hear this. This is \$321,750,000 above the budget. If and when you hear amendments offered, when Members break a lance here for God, country, and Yale, keep that in mind. The amount is \$321,750,000 over the budget, and it is \$2,878,523,500 above the amount appropriated for 1971.

We feel the increase over the budget is a very reasonable compromise. Between those who would hold to the budget, or below, and those who reportedly feel the budget should be increased by up to \$1 billion. I think both are unrealistic.

With respect to the increase over 1971, I would like to point out that \$14.9 billion of the total appropriations of \$20.4 billion carried in this bill is for programs over which the Congress and the executive branch exercise little or no control through the annual appropriation process. There is the large uncontrollable appropriation for grants to States for public assistance programs, payments to the social security trust funds and to the railroad retirement funds, unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen, and special benefits for disabled coal miners.

The total uncontrollable appropriations in this bill amount to an increase of \$2,200,000,000 above the appropriations for exactly the same things in fiscal year 1971. Thus, of the total increase over the 1971 level of approximately \$2.9 billion, over 75 percent is in this uncontrollable category.

As has been the policy of the subcommittee for the past several years, it did not act on budget requests for activities that were not authorized at the time the subcommittee finished its hearings. We have always done that. A table of budget requests not considered is included on page 5 of the report. This table totals over \$3.5 billion, most of which is accounted for by the economic opportunity and health manpower programs, for which authority expired last June 30, and the recent request for \$1 billion for the Emergency Employment Act.

One other thing I would like to call to your attention regarding the overall aspects of this bill is the table on page 3 which reflects the total appropriations for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare programs for 1971 and proposed for 1972. As you will note, when permanent appropriations for the trust funds are included, the grand total is over \$83 billion.

Let me add something there. I serve

on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Defense. I have been on that subcommittee since it was formed some 25 years ago. I have heard down through the years about Defense, how Defense is eating up all the taxpayers' dollars, how we are sacrificing the welfare of our people for defense, for missiles, airplanes—the whole story. You have read it and heard it.

This I do not believe you know. The budget for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare programs is going to be \$83 billion plus action which will undoubtedly be taken subsequently on the \$3.5 billion of deferred items. So before the end of this session of Congress this total will be \$86 billion for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, or more. It will be billions of dollars more than the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. Did you know that?

This bill has not been simple enough to deal with, item by item, in a presentation of this kind since Frank Keefe was chairman in the 80th Congress. I have given you some overall statistics and I will highlight some of the changes from the January budget, but I will not attempt to cover all of the important activities for which there are appropriations in this bill. That would take all afternoon. Of course, the 71-page report you have deals in some detail with all of the appropriation items in the bill.

I think most of us will agree that the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that was sent to Congress last January was deficient with regard to several programs. The fact that the President has sent budget amendments to Congress increasing the January budget for 12 of the Department's programs indicates that the President himself recognized certain deficiencies. The fact that Members have received an unprecedented volume of mail telling why items should be increased is also an indication that the budget was tighter than usual. We have a section in the report on pages 3 and 4 under the heading "items of special interest."

This outlines the committee's recommendations with regard to some of those programs that have generated the bulk of our mail on this bill. Let me go through these with you.

For psychiatric training, in the National Institute of Mental Health, which the budget aimed to phase out completely over a period of a few years, the bill includes \$6,750,000 over the budget. This will restore the program to the 1971 level.

For the construction of community mental health centers neither the 1971 nor the 1972 budget requested any funds. The bill includes \$10 million to keep this program alive.

For staffing of community mental health centers the bill includes an increase of \$30 million over the budget. This will enable the Department to fund all approvable applications regardless of how construction was funded, and in the report we tell the Department to reverse its current policy of refusing staffing grants to community mental health centers that were constructed with non-Federal funds. In other words,

if your people back home were able to raise local funds in order to construct these centers, they could not get any Federal staffing aid. Can you imagine anything that ridiculous? Well, we stopped that.

For the new mental health of children program authorized in Public Law 91-211, the budget contains no funds. The bill includes \$10 million to initiate this program.

For the new alcoholism prevention and control legislation, that passed Congress by a huge majority last year, the budget contains no funds for formula grants to States which is certainly an important component of that legislation. The bill includes \$25 million.

The largest budget amendment the President sent to Congress that affects this bill was \$67 million to initiate HEW's part of a comprehensive drug abuse control program. The committee applauds the President and has approved the full amount of the request.

For venereal disease control and vaccination assistance programs the President submitted a budget amendment for \$10 million. The committee recommends an increase of another \$10 million and has earmarked \$16 million just for venereal disease control which is the exact amount of additional funds estimated by the director for the center for disease control to be necessary to initiate an effective program in 1972.

For rat control the original budget reduced the project grant program to zero. It is my guess that it was largely as a result of critical questioning by the subcommittee during the hearings that a budget amendment was later sent to Congress restoring this program to its 1971 level of \$15 million. The subcommittee has, of course, included that amount in the bill.

I am sure you have all received letters concerning the lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act for which the original budget included no funds. Again a budget amendment was sent to Congress, this time in the amount of \$2 million. In the opinion of the committee the estimate was extremely conservative. Your committee is recommending \$5 million.

For hospital construction—the old Hill-Burton program—the budget continued the policy of last year's budget in asking for very little in the form of grants, but depending almost entirely on the interest subsidy program. The bill includes the funds for the interest subsidy program, but has also restored the reduction of \$87.2 million below the 1971 appropriation level in the grant program.

For the National Institutes of Health the only institute that received a true increase above the program level of 1971 was the Cancer Institute, and this resulted from the special \$100 million request for a new conquest of cancer program. The committee has added \$87,841,000 to the NIH budget. This is the amount necessary to bring up to the 1971 program level all research and training grant and contract programs that were cut below that level in the budget.

You have all received correspondence concerning the cut in the budget for

rehabilitation and social work training. The committee has fully restored that reduction.

It is a relatively small item, but has generated a considerable amount of interest—the Developmental Disabilities Act formula grants to States. The budget includes \$11,215,000 which many experts in the field consider to be inadequate. The bill includes an increase of \$5 million over the budget.

It varies by State, but some States have really put on a campaign against the limitation proposed in the bill language which would not allow any State to receive more than a 10-percent increase in 1972 in funds for services, staff training, and administrative expenses in connection with the public assistance program—generally referred to as the 10 percent limitation. The subcommittee has not included this language in the bill.

So much for the items of special interest.

I am sure most of you are aware of the fact that the report contains nine pages of separate views of a few members of the committee. I wish you all had time to read these views. They seem to agree with the action of the committee more than they disagree. Of course, they come to the conclusion that the bill is too low, but they are very generous in their commendation of the committee. I appreciate such remarks as, "the members of the Flood subcommittee did a very creditable job in reviewing the very difficult and complex HEW budget," and "the committee is to be commended in its increases in the programs of the National Institute of Mental Health and the regional medical programs." One of the members of the staff told me there are eight such commendations of the committee and I want my friends who signed these separate views to know that the committee and I, personally, appreciate their kind remarks very much.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if there will be an amendment or amendments to increase this bill. I hope there will not. This is a good bill. We sincerely believe that. But if there are amendments to increase the bill I hope Members will forget about the January budget which, as I commented earlier, most people will agree was deficient, and recognize this bill for what it is. The President has sent budget amendments to Congress containing program increases totaling \$151,310,000 for the activities covered by this bill, and the committee has included increases over the amended budget totaling \$321,750,000. Mr. Chairman, this bill is already almost half a billion dollars over the January budget. We hope Members will keep that in mind if they are called on to vote on amendments to increase it.

Mr. Chairman, these are my concluding words. This bill is already almost half a billion dollars over the January budget. Please keep that in mind.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, in quick capsule form, we bring this bill to you with increases

over the budget in appropriated amounts totaling \$321,750,000.

There was a provision, section 208, in the budget presentation that would have limited grants to the States for public assistance in the fiscal year 1972 to 110 percent of those in 1971. The deletion of that section will for all practical purposes, add another \$244 million to the budget. So, we are really talking about a bill that comes to you at a level of \$565,750,000, over the budget.

In addition to these figures, you should be aware that there will very likely be a supplemental request for health manpower totaling \$541 million, and another for health maintenance organizations—HMO's—in the amount of \$42 million, which in the health field gives us a total in expected supplementals of \$583 million. And while on the subject of supplementals, brace yourself for another \$1 billion or thereabouts in grants to the States for public assistance.

Mr. Chairman, before discussing the specific details of our committee's recommendations for health, I think it is important to summarize the extent of the Federal commitment directed at conditions of ill health and disease and designed to improve the health of all of our citizens.

In the briefest of terms, the Federal Government's involvement in health programs has grown significantly during the past decade, and now affects all aspects of the Nation's medical- and health-related activities. This includes extensive support for biomedical research, the development of new approaches to the delivery of health care, the safety, quality and effectiveness of food, pharmaceuticals and other consumer products, and medicare and medicaid.

Since 1960, Federal spending for the health activities of the Federal Government has risen from \$3.5 billion to the \$22.2 billion that is requested in the 1972 budget. The 1972 budget represents an increase of more than \$5.6 billion for health programs since the Nixon administration took office.

The issue of increasing amounts of moneys is often overestimated. We have grown too accustomed to viewing health care needs within the narrow confines of specific categorical problems—problems caused by a certain disease or problems afflicting certain population groups.

In contrast, the most basic and widespread problems contributing to the "health care crisis" are systemic; further categorical and piecemeal efforts, with a few exceptions, are very likely to exacerbate rather than ameliorate the problems.

The administration's national health strategy as outlined in the President's health message of February 18, 1971, is designed to come to grips with the basic problems in the system of delivery of health care.

In that message, the President observed that—

We are investing more of our Nation's resources in the health of our people but we are not getting a full return on our investment.

For this reason, the President called "not only for new programs and not

merely for more money but for something more—for a new approach.”

We have considered the President's proposal and we believe that the recommendations in this bill are responsive both to his approach and to the commitment the Congress has made to the American people.

Our committee recommendations are based on an assessment of our greatest health needs, but are also consistent with priorities of the administration's national health strategy. They recognize as well the concerns of the health and biomedical research communities and concerned citizens.

Our committee bill provides the following specific increases: A major commitment to mental health through—

Provision of the full budget request for research.

Restoration of the \$6.7 million in psychiatric residency training.

Provision of \$10 million for construction of community mental health centers.

A \$30 million increase over the budget for community mental health staffing grants—this amount will fund all anticipated approved grants through June 30, 1972.

An additional \$10 million to fund the previously unfunded part F provisions of the Community Mental Health Centers Act concerned with the mental health of children.

An increase of \$25 million over the budget for formula grants to States for alcoholism as authorized by Public Law 91-616—this in addition to allowing the full budget request for project grants—a 150-percent increase over the amount available in 1971.

Provision of the entire budget request of \$67 million for the administration's major initiative in drug abuse.

An increase of \$16 million for project grants for venereal disease and \$4 million for other communicable diseases in the partnership for health.

The full budget request to establish Family Health Centers—\$15 million.

The full budget request to implement the Emergency Health Personnel Act—\$10 million.

The full budget request for continuation of the rat control program—\$15 million.

The full budget request for family planning services and research, including—

An increase of \$52 million for family planning services—an increase of over 100 percent.

An increase of \$10 million for family planning research—an increase of over 25 percent.

An increase of \$30 million in budget authority for the regional medical program combined with the \$10 million in the second supplemental of 1971—this \$10 million remains available through June 30, 1972—would provide funds for an obligational level of \$115 million for RMP grants in 1972.

An increase of \$87.2 million to restore the 1971 level for the Hill-Burton hospital construction grant program in addition to allowing the full budget request

for the administration's guaranteed loan program. The amount of loan authority available through June 30, 1972, is \$1 billion.

An increase of \$87.8 million for the research institutes at NIH to restore reductions in the perinatal and aging research programs, and maintain all programs at the 1971 level by allowing a 6-percent cost-of-living increase. This is in addition to allowing the full budget request which provided increases for sickle-cell anemia, dental caries, and environmental health and family planning research. The \$100 million for cancer research was included in the second 1971 supplemental in order to make these funds available as promptly as possible.

An increase of \$800,000 for the National Library of Medicine.

The committee did not consider the budget for health manpower because legislative action on the authorization has not been completed.

The committee was assured that a budget amendment will be transmitted to insure continued operation of the PHS hospitals if the administration's proposal to transfer these facilities to community control and use require more time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a minute to touch on the perpetual problem we have in the appropriations process trying to determine just how much money a department or agency really had to spend during the past fiscal year. Part of the problem stems from the fact that when the budget is being prepared, the Federal Government is not even halfway through the current year, so the estimates in many cases are little more than educated guesses.

Another difficulty is that as new authorizing legislation is enacted by Congress, programs change, and funds that were appropriated for one purpose must sometimes be rechanneled or reprogrammed—sometimes even transferred to another agency entirely. Then, there are pay raises, which must be added in, and other types of budgetary changes which affect spending levels.

So, as your Appropriations Committee considers the budget, the prior-year budget figure is continually shifting and changing. Even now, almost a month into the new fiscal year, the final 1971 figures are not yet available because of the enormity of the task of collecting and compiling them.

For someone trying to obtain an exact spending figure for a specific program or project, this state of affairs can be incredibly frustrating. This also makes it extremely difficult to prepare any accurate comparative tables to show the difference between last year's budget and the one recommended for this year. However, there are several ways of approaching this particular challenge.

One approach is that used in our committee report—taking last year's basic appropriation figure and adding in the pay increases, then comparing that with the recommendation for 1972. This is a very sound approach and avoids the confusion of fund transfers, but its drawback is that it does not completely reflect the amount of funds actually

available to an agency, or the amount actually spent.

This drawback can be partially overcome by using what is called the comparative budget, which takes into account all budgetary changes of any kind that have the practical effect of increasing or decreasing funds which can actually be spent by a particular agency.

So, the comparative budget tells us what was actually available for obligation. But, this method has a drawback, too, in that the figures can change almost overnight as budgetary changes, transfers, and so forth occur.

Because each of you has a copy of our committee report analyzing the Labor, Health, and Welfare budget by the other method, I think it might be helpful as I discuss these individual items to give you the comparative figures as well. You will then have information on not only what was actually appropriated for each agency last year, but also on just how much of that appropriation was available for obligation by each agency—how much they had available to spend. Then, that should give you a more complete picture of the impact your committee's recommendations have for 1972.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower development and training activities within the Department received \$886,962,000 in 1971. This year the amount requested was \$748,799,000. This amount has been allowed by the committee and is a reduction from the fiscal year 1971 appropriation of \$138,163,000. The primary reason for the reduction in the bill below the 1971 level is the absence of \$132 million for the summer youth employment program which was included in a supplemental for 1971; no funds were requested in the 1972 budget or included in the bill for this program. It is quite possible that in the spring of 1972 there will again be a supplemental appropriation for the youth program. In addition, the committee has deferred action on the part of the budget that was for programs authorized by the expired Economic Opportunity Act.

The committee has again earmarked funds for the important activities of the Veterans' Employment Service to the amount of \$2,474,000, an increase of \$290,000 above the fiscal year 1971 appropriation for this activity.

An important development for the department in fiscal year 1972 will be the increased capability of the job bank system. They expect to go from 100 job banks as of July 1, 1971, to having the entire country covered in fiscal year 1972. Also the job matching will be coming up fast. This exciting system could enable a person to have five jobs matched to his personal qualifications with the job matching machine indicating which it believes to be the best match. At the present there is a pilot project in Madison, Wis., in operation. A tremendous amount of work is being done on this pilot in 13 other areas that have one form or another of job matching system. To clearly illustrate the distribution and impact of MDTA funds, I would like to insert the following figures:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
MANPOWER TRAINING SERVICES PROGRAMS AVAILABLE TO INDIVIDUALS BY AGE

Program	14 to 21 years—Job Corps	14 to 21 years—Neighborhood Youth Corps in school	14 to 21 years—Neighborhood Youth Corps summer	16 to 21 years—Neighborhood Youth Corps out of school	16 years and over—OJT
Program description.....	Provides a residential rehabilitation program for disadvantaged youth from culturally deprived environments.	Provides opportunities to enrollees to earn funds to remain in school while receiving useful work experience through part-time jobs in schools and other public agencies.	Provide funds for poor students of high school age to return to school in the fall through summer employment.	Work experience, training, and supportive services to enable enrollees to return to school or improve their employability.	State-administered training in conjunction with national unions and trade associations.
Type of program.....	Vocational training with basic education, recreation, work experience, and room, board, and clothing.	Work experience with source of income and supportive services.	Work experience and a source of income with supportive services.	Work experience, skill training, and supportive services.	Occupational training with remedial education, trainee allowance, and supportive services.
Eligibility requirements.....	Disadvantaged. School dropouts.	Disadvantaged. Students from low-income families; grades 9 to 12.	Disadvantaged. Students from low-income families, grades 9 to 12.	Disadvantaged. Unemployed. High school dropouts.	Disadvantaged/nondisadvantaged. Unemployed/underemployed. School dropouts.
Obligations:					
1971 appropriations.....	\$156,200,000	\$59,100,000	\$270,700,000	\$127,000,000	\$60,000,000
1972 request.....	196,127,000	69,800,000	165,700,000	127,000,000	60,000,000
Enrollment opportunities:					
1971.....	23,100	94,700	609,300	36,800	60,000
1972.....	26,200	94,700	414,200	36,800	60,000

Program	17 years and over—Institutional training	18 years and over—JOBS	18 years and over—PSC	18 years and over—CEP	22 years and over—Operation Mainstream
Program description.....	Provides occupational training in areas where critical skill shortages exist.	On-the-job training in the private sector with Federal compensation to the employees for hiring and training costs.	Training and permanent employment in the public sector within merit staffing principles.	Coordinates and concentrates various Federal manpower efforts to aid severely unemployed persons in certain target areas.	Provides projects especially in rural areas and small towns which will improve social and physical environment of the community.
Type of program.....	Occupational training with remedial education, trainee allowances, and related supportive services.	Vocational training with health and social services and remedial education.	Occupational training with supportive services.	A system of packaging and delivering manpower services in priority areas having serious unemployment and underemployment problems.	Job creation and work training program augmented by necessary supportive services for chronically unemployed poor adults with permanent employment as objective.
Eligibility requirements.....	Unemployed/underemployed. Head of household. 1 year experience in gainful employment.	Disadvantaged. Unemployed/underemployed. School dropouts. Handicapped.	Disadvantaged. Unemployed/underemployed.	Unemployed/underemployed. Resident of target area. Member of poor family. School dropout. Handicapped.	Chronically unemployed/underemployed. Have annual family income below poverty line. Be unable to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs.
Obligations:					
1971 appropriation.....	\$268,084,000	\$200,000,000	\$126,800,000	\$177,900,000	\$38,800,000
1972 request.....	266,084,000	200,000,000	125,800,000	172,800,000	38,800,000
Enrollment opportunities:					
1971.....	148,600	76,900	66,800	12,100	12,100
1972.....	146,600	76,900	66,800	12,100	12,100

For the Manpower Administration, salaries and expenses, the Department has requested \$63,515,000 from general funds. The committee allowed \$37,568,000 from general funds and \$25,847,000 from the unemployment trust fund for a total allowance of \$63,415,000. The \$100,000 decrease from the request was taken from the planning, evaluation, and research activity. The committee bill is an increase of \$9,050,900 for MA salaries and expenses over fiscal year 1971. This level

of funding will allow for mandatory cost increases and program increases.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in the Manpower Administration asked for and was allowed in committee \$8,150,800, an increase over the 1970 appropriation of \$742,114 due to mandatory items. Our committee has been pleased with the accomplishments of this bureau. At the same time we realize that the need for the number of apprenticeships, particularly in the

minority and veteran communities, is still a crucial problem. This, combined with the fact we are still falling far short of meeting the need for trained people in the apprentice occupations, creates a situation requiring continued and greater accomplishments. At this point I would like to insert figures which, I believe, give a complete picture of the distribution of registered apprentices by industry and occupation.

DISTRIBUTION OF REGISTERED APPRENTICES BY INDUSTRY AND SELECTED OCCUPATIONS¹

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972		1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Construction.....	164,441	181,719	197,580	219,785	228,260	Lithographers.....	3,079	3,601	3,837	4,166	4,327
Brick, stone, and tile workers.....	11,944	13,265	14,423	16,044	16,663	Public utilities and transportation.....	13,294	9,597	10,730	12,059	12,524
Carpenters.....	34,946	37,434	41,492	46,155	47,935	Electrical workers (P. & L.).....	640	991	1,105	1,242	1,290
Electricians.....	34,409	35,435	38,528	42,858	44,511	Linemen.....	3,116	2,422	2,704	3,039	3,156
Ironworkers.....	10,329	11,448	12,448	13,846	14,380	Carmen.....	835	1,321	1,481	1,664	1,728
Plumbers-pipfitters.....	33,247	34,345	37,343	41,539	43,141	Trades, services, and miscellaneous.....	30,923	36,079	59,200	56,405	58,580
Sheetmetal workers.....	17,069	18,172	19,758	21,979	22,826	Auto mechanics.....	10,010	12,458	16,102	16,923	17,574
Manufacturing—Metal.....	58,956	79,109	76,960	72,354	75,144	Auto body builders.....	2,623	3,226	4,144	4,907	5,096
Machinists.....	23,711	28,442	27,706	26,047	27,052	Maintenance mechanic.....	7,729	9,020	14,208	15,060	15,641
Tool and diemakers.....	26,249	31,644	30,784	28,942	30,058	Butcher.....	4,761	5,237	5,979	6,543	6,795
Patternmakers.....	2,886	3,164	3,078	2,894	3,006	Draftsmen.....	3,519	3,935	5,920	6,205	6,444
Manufacturing—Nonmetal.....	18,496	21,184	22,570	24,507	25,452	Mining.....	2,601	2,979	3,330	3,501	3,636
Compositors.....	5,661	5,932	6,320	6,862	7,127						
Pressman.....	4,742	5,296	5,643	6,127	6,363	Total.....	289,000	331,000	370,000	389,000	404,000

¹ Selected occupations are listed under industry in which the majority of apprentices are employed and the figures represent the number of apprentices in training during the year (number at the beginning of the year plus accessions during the year).

An item over which we have no control in the Department is Federal unemployment benefits and allowances. This activity provides for payments to Federal employees, payments to ex-servicemen, and trade adjustment assistance. For fiscal year 1972 the Department has requested and the committee has approved \$274,500,000 for this program. This figure is \$42,568,000 below the appropriation for 1971. However, as has become the rule, the budget estimate is far below the amount currently estimated to be needed for this service in fiscal year 1972. The Department has stated that it may be as much as \$250 million to \$275 million short.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service; administration has requested \$806 million. The committee has allowed this amount an increase over 1971 of \$62,500,000. These funds will again be derived from the employment security account of the unemployment trust fund. The increase is largely mandatory, with an increase of \$29 million in the contingency fund.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Next we have the Labor-Management Services Administration. The request of \$22,798,000 for this activity was approved over last year's appropriation of \$4,809,000. The majority of the increase over last year is for the implementation of the standards-of-conduct provisions of Executive Order 11491 which vests in the Assistant Secretary for Labor-Management very broad responsibilities in the field of Federal labor-management relations.

The committee allowed the full request of \$81,391,000 for the Workplace Standards Administration, an increase over the 1971 level of \$23,170,000. Of the increase approximately \$2.7 million is for mandatory costs; by far the largest part of the increase is approximately \$14.8 million for implementation of the Occupational Safety and Health Act which became effective last April 28. Therefore, 1972 will be the first full year of operation. This \$14.8 million can hardly be considered an optimal level of funding, however, when one considers that this appropriation will provide for a maximum of 1,082 employees, administrative and supervisory as well as compliance officers, and there are 4.1 million workplaces estimated to be covered by the act.

The Department requested \$90 million for Federal workmen's compensation benefits which the committee allowed, however the Department indicated this is another uncontrollable budget item that is seriously underestimated in the budget. The committee was told that an additional \$50 million will quite possibly be required to cover all expenses during fiscal year 1972.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics requested \$37,636,000 an increase of \$9,540,000 above the fiscal year 1971 level. The committee allowed the Bureau \$35,500,000 a reduction of \$2,136,000 below the request and an increase over 1971 of \$7,404,000. The Bureau proposed a budget amendment of \$2,625,000 but gave no specific explanation for the

amendment, therefore, the committee allowed only a small increase included in the bill of \$489,000.

Of the increase for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, \$2,676,000 is for the revision of the Consumer Price Index to bring it up to date with changing buying patterns and other factors to improve its accuracy. Also, the committee will expect the highest priority be given to statistics having to do directly with the construction industry where there is a clear need for more data.

Moving on to the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, the Bureau requested and received from the committee an increase over the 1971 appropriation of \$356,000 for salaries and expenses bringing their 1972 bill to \$1,996,000. The increase is for mandatory salary costs.

The special foreign currency, which comes under the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, requested \$525,000 for fiscal year 1972 an increase over 1971's level of \$450,000. The committee allowed the Bureau for this activity \$100,000 a reduction from the request of \$425,000. The committee was not favorably impressed with regard to the value of activities that were proposed to be funded by the increase. The committee did, however, increase the 1971 appropriation by \$25,000.

The Office of the Solicitor requested \$7,851,000 for fiscal year 1972. The committee bill includes \$7,694,000 from general funds and authorizes a transfer of \$157,000 from the unemployment trust fund, which in essence brings the committee bill to the level requested by the Department. The 1972 bill for this activity is an increase of \$1,295,000 over 1971. The increase is for mandatory expenses and an additional 12 positions in the field offices.

Finally we come to the last section of the Department of Labor, the Office of the Secretary which has requested \$11,082,000, the committee bill allows for \$10,567,000 from general funds and authorizes a transfer from the unemployment trust fund of \$615,000 which brings the total allowance of the committee to \$11,182,000. An increase over the Department's request of \$100,000 and an increase over the 1971 level of \$166,000. The \$100,000 increase is earmarked for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped which is funded in this appropriation.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Under title II of H.R. 10061, we have appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Your committee has tried to fund every worthwhile project here, while keeping the overall budget picture in perspective.

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION MENTAL HEALTH

The \$581,201,000 we have provided for mental health under the health services and mental health administration item is an increase of \$192,629,000 over the comparable 1971 appropriation—a 50-percent increase over last year.

The original budget request was amended by the administration to include \$7 million for programs to combat alcoholism, and \$67 million for the new

drug abuse control initiative, and to this your committee added additional increases amounting to \$81,750,000. These increases I will identify as I discuss the individual mental health items.

MENTAL HEALTH RESEARCH

For mental health research, your committee provided \$120,459,000, the amount of the budget request. This is an increase of \$3,286,000 over the comparable 1971 appropriation.

Of the \$120 plus million for research, \$92,400,000 will go into the grant program, an increase of \$1.8 million over last year.

There are two major types of grants in this program: regular research grants, and hospital improvement grants.

The regular research grants are awarded for behavioral, clinical, psychopharmacology and applied research as well as clinical research centers and areas of special interest such as alcoholism, drug abuse, violence, early child care, minority studies and services development research.

The hospital improvement program provides grants to State mental hospitals for projects which provides immediate improvement in the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of patients.

In both programs, the grants go to investigators affiliated with hospitals, academic and research institutions, and other nonprofit organizations in the United States. Under very special circumstances, grants may be awarded to foreign institutions for research in areas of top priority.

Small grants limited to a maximum of \$6,000 may be awarded for a period of 1 year for pilot studies or for exploration of an unusual research opportunity.

In fiscal year 1971, 1,527 regular research grants and hospital improvement grants were supported with special emphasis given to research into the causes and prevention of alcoholism, narcotic addiction, and drug abuse.

MENTAL HEALTH MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

The budget request for mental health manpower development was \$3,050,000 below the comparable appropriation level for 1971. Reflecting reductions in general practitioner and psychiatry training grants and fellowships.

Your committee, however, disagreed with the administration's proposal to discontinue the psychiatric training program, and restored \$6,750,000 to this budget item, making its total figure \$126,415,000. This is \$4,233,000 more than the comparable 1971 appropriation, and \$6,750,000 more than the budget request.

Although the committee did restore these funds, I personally feel that the administration's arguments have a great deal of merit. The National Institute of Mental Health has provided, for many years, grant support to public and private nonprofit institutions to assist in the establishment, expansion, and improvement of programs to train physicians to be psychiatrists. Grants provide funds to defray teaching costs and supply trainee stipends for residents enrolled in the training programs. Funds were first made available for the training of psychiatrists in 1947 and 22 grants were made, providing for 69 residency sti-

pends. A large number of psychiatric residents not on NIMH stipends have also benefited from the institutional support of the teaching costs included in the residency training grants. Initially all NIMH residency support was for basic residency. As specialized programs in child psychiatry developed, support for this emerging subspecialty was included in the basic grant.

The NIMH also makes grants to medical schools, hospitals, and clinics approved for psychiatric residency training, for support of research training programs designed to increase the number of research psychiatrists. This program, begun in 1959, was intended to develop a greater number of psychiatrist investigators capable of conducting basic and clinical research in biological and psychological spheres which may lead to more effective treatment of mental illness and a better understanding of the underlying factors in mental health.

The 1972 budget's proposed decrease of \$6,700,000 for psychiatric residency training represented what the administration termed "the first step in reforming the present system of Federal support for manpower training efforts." They told us that the wide array of unrelated and narrowly targeted programs would be streamlined to provide Federal grant support in a way that would add greater stability and flexibility to the training effort by providing future support on an institutional capitation basis. Through this effort, they said, the medical community would be able to establish priorities and provide training on the basis of national need.

Psychiatric residency training, we were reminded, is the only federally funded clinical residency program—the only one—and it was initiated to provide an incentive for physicians to enter this field when there were only 3,000 psychiatrists in the country. The goal of the program at that time was 12,000 psychiatrists—today there are 25,000. This is not to say, of course, that these 25,000 completely fill the need, or that it is not necessary to train more. It is to say, however, that we can justifiably ask if this type of residency training can or should any longer uniquely qualify for Federal support.

I think my colleagues might be interested in what Dr. Bertram S. Brown, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, had to say about this during our hearings in April:

Dr. BROWN. Let me give the rationale that has to be dealt with on this issue.

When the program to support psychiatric trainees and residents was first started, we had a situation in this country in which psychiatrists were called "alienists," not even called psychiatrists and there were less than 3,000 of them. We now have 26,000 psychiatrists, well over half of whom received direct Federal assistance.

The question is whether or not this program has seen its time, or whether we have actually trained enough psychiatrists.

Secondly, no other medical specialty receives Federal support for residency training. You do not get this for internists, surgeons, orthopedists. This is the only specialty so favored.

Third is a very important thing which is very much like the question you asked me,

sir, on the construction funds. It is very serious. As more funds become available for general health training, we hope that psychiatry and mental health will get their fair share. Now that they have grown up and are of age, we hope that resources will become available through more generalized institutional support on an enrollment basis.

The last reason given is that we are using Federal funds to train many men who go out into private practice. It is a fair question to ask whether or not Federal funds should be used to train people who then go into the private sector and do quite well financially, as you know. Those are the reasons for the reduction, sir. (Page 134, Part II.)

MENTAL HEALTH STATE AND COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE—COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

The administration's budget request for this item was \$105,100,000 for staffing grants, \$5 million over the comparable 1971 appropriation. However, no funds were requested for construction grants.

Staffing grants are awarded to assist in the establishment and operation of community mental health centers in areas designated by State mental health authorities as "catchment areas"—geographical areas containing between 75,000 and 200,000 people among whom there is to be a coordinated, comprehensive system for providing mental health care. Grants are awarded on a project basis to eligible centers for partial support of staffing costs of professional and technical personnel. They are, at the same time, awarded on a matching basis with the percentage of Federal support varying, depending on whether the catchment area has been designated a "poverty" area.

These grants provide assistance to enable the community to initiate new or improved mental health services and make them available while longer term sources of financial support are being developed. With the 52 new staffing awards made in 1971, the number of funded centers stands at 450, serving an estimated population of 61 million people. Staffing grants are made on an 8-year basis at a decreasing Federal matching percentage with special higher rates for the poverty areas.

During the hearings on this item, the Department outlined their policy of making grants of staffing funds only to those centers that have received Federal funds for construction. This policy is unfair to communities which have constructed facilities with their own funds. In my own State of Illinois, for example, we have gone ahead with construction of community health centers on our own initiative, using non-Federal money, and to restrict staffing grants as the administration proposed would, in effect, penalize our people who have had enough concern to go ahead on their own.

The administration's budget would have provided funds for 42 new staffing grants in 1972, but your committee was advised that there are some 65 centers which have been approved for such grants, and have raised the required matching money at the non-Federal level. Therefore, your committee has included in this bill an increase of \$30,000,000 above the budget for staffing grants, and have specified that we expect

these funds to be made available to all eligible centers without regard to how their construction was financed.

As to construction grants, we were advised by administration spokesmen during the hearings that the policy decision of more than 2 years ago to phase out this program had not changed. Hill-Burton funds for construction are available under title VI of the Public Health Service Act, we were told, and no funds from previous years would carry over into 1972 for the construction grant program, as happened last year. Some 34 new construction awards were made in fiscal 1971 with the \$27.7 million available from 1970.

Your committee, however, decided to keep this program going in fiscal 1972 with an appropriation of \$10,000,000.

MENTAL HEALTH STATE AND COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE—NARCOTIC ADDICTION AND ALCOHOLISM PROGRAMS

For narcotic addiction and alcoholism programs, the committee bill provides \$70,193,000, which is \$25 million over the budget request, and \$48,598,000 over the comparable 1971 appropriation.

These funds go for grants and contracts, for training, development of materials relating to drug abuse, for detoxification services and for support of community treatment facilities. The amount provided will support 16 centers in operation last year and will establish seven new centers. In addition to these funds, of course, is the \$67 million budget amendment for programs to combat drug abuse, which I will discuss in more detail in a moment.

In the budget request, the administration asked for money to fund all aspects of last year's Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse Act except for the formula grant provision. The funds they requested provided a \$21 million increase for alcoholism programs. The committee approved the request, and in addition, provided an extra \$25 million to be used specifically for formula grants.

During the hearings, Dr. Brown, the director of NIMH, provided for our hearing record a statement which I felt did a good job of outlining the Institute's efforts and the impact of the new law. He said:

IMPACT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL ACT (PUBLIC LAW 91-616)

Alcohol abuse and alcoholism are problems of immense and tragic proportions in the U.S. today. It is estimated that there are 9 million alcoholics and problem drinkers in the Nation. A total of 36 million Americans or approximately 1 in every 6 is adversely affected. Alcoholism and alcohol related problems cause more than 85,000 deaths annually. More than 50 percent of persons age 15 and older killed on the highway each year have alcohol in their blood at the time of the accident. One-third of all deaths reported as suicide are known to be alcohol related, and one-half of all homicides are also alcohol related. In conservative economic terms alcoholism costs the Nation over \$15 billion per year, \$10 billion in lost work time; \$2 billion in health and welfare costs; \$3 billion in traffic accident costs.

In response to the enormity of the alcoholism problem in the U.S., Congress passed the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-616),

which established a National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) within the NIMH to deal with alcohol-related problems. For the most part this act incorporates into one legislative authority previously authorized programs. The one exception is part A of title III which authorizes for the first time, formula grants to States. This legislation creates a new national interest and heralds the beginning of a more meaningful Federal effort in the field of alcoholism.

The NIAAA will serve as a focal point for all DHEW activities in the field of alcoholism, pulling together existing programs and combining them with new undertakings into one coordinated effort. The various NIAAA programs and legislative authorities are:

(1) Using the authority of the Community Mental Health Centers Act as amended by P.L. 91-616, the NIAAA will continue to provide Federal support on a matching basis for staffing grants to local communities to develop and expand services for the prevention and treatment of alcoholics. Funds will also be provided for initiation and development grants, and direct grants for special training, field trials, and demonstration projects.

(2) The Public Health Service Act (sec. 301) serves as the basis for the award of research grants in the area of alcoholism. Through these grants, NIAAA seeks answers to a range of questions about the nature of alcoholism and the implementation of these findings in treatment and prevention programs.

(3) The Public Health Service Act (sec. 303) also provides authority for a training grants program under which the NIAAA endeavors to increase the supply of skilled personnel in the field of alcoholism.

(4) The direct operations budget of NIMH provides for the salary and related costs of the staff who administer the programs outlined above, and for contract awards to finance surveys, field trials, and developmental projects aimed at seeking alternatives to the current methods of coping with the problems of alcohol abuse.

(5) In addition to establishing the NIAAA and amending the Community Mental Health Centers Act, the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 authorized a new program of formula grants to States to assist them in planning and establishing programs for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. This new act also authorizes grants and contracts to public and private non-profit agencies to conduct demonstration projects, to provide education and training and to provide programs and services for the treatment of alcoholism in cooperation with schools, courts, penal institutions, and other public agencies.

In terms of impact, the increased alcoholism effort outlined above is intended to improve treatment services for alcoholics in States and communities; treat and rehabilitate employees with drinking problems in Government and private industry; modify public attitudes toward alcoholism through education and public information; train professional personnel; and conduct research on the causes and prevention of alcoholism.

In summary, the Institute's new alcoholism efforts represent a comprehensive, integrated program under various legislative authorities.

MENTAL HEALTH STATE AND COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE—MENTAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN

As is noted in our committee report, the last Congress overwhelmingly passed legislation authorizing a program for child mental health services. In order to initiate this important new effort, we provided an appropriation of \$10 million which we trust will be put to good use during the new fiscal year.

MENTAL HEALTH STATE AND COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE—DIRECT OPERATIONS

This activity supports the staff which administers the alcohol community assistance programs, the community mental health centers program, the hospital improvement and hospital staff development programs, and the Mental Health Study Center. For these purposes, the committee bill provides \$6,459,000, the amount of the budget request, and \$2,981,000 above the 1971 comparable appropriation.

This increase in funds was requested primarily for 45 new positions to administer an expanded alcoholism program, funds for contract awards to finance surveys, field trials, and developmental projects aimed at seeking alternatives to current methods of coping with alcohol abuse.

MENTAL HEALTH STATE AND COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE—DRUG ABUSE INITIATIVE

As part of the program the President announced in his omnibus drug control message, the committee has provided the full budget request of \$67 million for an expanded effort to combat drug abuse.

Basically, the drug abuse initiative would be used as follows:

First, research: \$12 million for research activities concerned with understanding how drugs work in the human system and to develop improved means of treatment, such as long-acting substitutes for narcotics and other kinds of agents that could be used to "block" the effects of narcotics.

Second, manpower development: \$4 million to establish two regional training centers to produce a broad spectrum of people especially equipped to handle problems of drugs and drug addicts. The funds will also be used to develop educational materials for use in these centers and elsewhere.

Third, community assistance: \$50 million to provide a broad variety of narcotic addiction and drug abuse treatment services to meet the general and particular needs of communities across the Nation. Emphasis in the first year would be placed on extending opportunities for treatment and rehabilitation to those drug abusers and addicts, particularly heroin addicts, who have a strong motivation for recovery, but for whom community services are not available. Existing mental health and health delivery systems, such as community mental health centers and general hospitals, would be supplemented to include narcotic and drug abuse facilities where needed, and in the absence of systems which could be supplemented to meet these needs, independent narcotic and drug abuse facilities would be created.

Treatment facilities in all cases would be established with a view toward maintaining maximum flexibility by tailoring the range of services and the methods employed to the carefully assessed needs of the communities to be served. Within this basic framework, there would be, for example, a special effort to provide treatment services in areas where there is a heavy concentration of heroin usage among youth.

Fourth, The balance of \$1 million is for necessary staff related to this effort.

MENTAL HEALTH—REHABILITATION OF DRUG ABUSERS

Here your committee has provided \$21,323,000, the amount of the budget request and \$739,000 over the comparable 1971 figure.

This activity provides support for the NIMH staff who administer the narcotic addiction community assistance grant program and funding for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts under contract arrangements with community agencies and in the clinical research centers at Fort Worth, Tex., and Lexington, Ky.

The increase here is mostly built in—that is, pay costs—along with some adjustment resulting from transfer of the Fort Worth Hospital to the Department of Justice.

MENTAL HEALTH—PROGRAM SUPPORT

This activity includes funds for the National Institute of Mental Health regional staff, and consists entirely of pay and expenses. The committee has provided the full request of \$14,252,000, which is \$792,000 above the comparable 1971 figure.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The committee bill provides for \$23,144,000, the amount requested by the Department. This brings the total obligation for fiscal year 1972 to \$49,709,000, an increase over 1971 of \$4,382,000.

Of the \$4,382,000 increase requested, \$2 million is built in. The other \$2,382,000 is requested for 300 new permanent positions said to be needed for necessary programmatic changes including the initial implementation of the unit system of organization which has been widely adopted by other psychiatric hospitals, and for some equipment replacement.

HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For health services research and development the committee has allowed the request of \$62,070,000, an increase of \$4,322,000 above the amount appropriated for 1971. The request includes an increase of 16 positions, three for management and 13 for increased program effort in the development of community-wide health services data systems.

The bulk of the net requested increase—\$4,392,000—would go for grants and contracts—\$3,600,000—of which \$1,600,000 would be used to support R. & D. leading toward a cooperative Federal-State-Local Health Services Data System to be carried out in cooperation with the National Center for Health Statistics.

This request would also support research and development of up to 24 health maintenance organizations—\$2 million.

Health maintenance organizations concentrate on keeping people healthy through emphasizing preventive medicine, early detection and treatment, and educating the public to apply health maintenance principle. During the hearings, Dr. Sanazaro, Director of the National Center for Health Services Research and Development had this to say about HMO's:

In the administration's commitment to HMO's there are a number of unanswered problems which most people in the field are very much aware of. For example, we are

depending upon the HMO to draw in private capital as a way of energizing the expansion of the HMO movement so that more people will get services. This, therefore, has to be documented to see whether in fact private money will be attracted by the HMO so there will not be continuing dependence upon the public sources.

There is question as to whether HMO's will enroll populations that give them an unfair economic advantage. This has to be monitored over time. There will be the question as to how appropriately one can request information from basically private organizations that will reflect upon the quality of the care they are providing. . . . There are legal and market factors that need to be investigated. The assumptions that have been made about the incentives to the public to join them, public satisfaction, all of these

are matters that require deliberate investigation. That is the reason for our request, (of \$2,000,000 to enable monitoring of up to 24 HMO's.)

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES

The total amount in the bill includes \$312,753,000 and authorization to transfer \$4,519,000 from the social security trust funds. This amount is \$10,000,000 above the budget request for direct appropriations and the same as the budget request with regard to trust fund transfers, an increase of \$61,077,000 above the amount appropriated for 1971.

The committee has specified that \$16 million of this increase shall be for the new venereal disease control program

proposed by the Director of the Center for Disease Control. The committee has included in the bill language, citation to the Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1970—section 317 of the PHS act—so that there will be no doubt that the increase for project grants is within the authorization cited in this paragraph of the bill.

At this time I would like to submit the committee report breakdown for comprehensive health planning and services.

CHPS—PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH—PLANNING GRANTS

There are two kinds of grants under planning grants—formula grants and project grants.

Activity	1971 comparable appropriation	1972 budget estimate	1972 bill	Activity	1971 comparable appropriation	1972 budget estimate	1972 bill			
Comprehensive health planning and services:				2. Migrant health				\$15,062,000	\$18,101,000	\$18,101,000
1. Partnership for health:				3. National Health Service Corps				3,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(a) Grants:				4. Medical care standards and implementation				6,691,000	7,068,000	7,068,000
(1) Planning				5. Program direction and management services				2,395,000	2,471,000	2,471,000
(2) Formula				Total				256,195,000	307,272,000	317,272,000
(3) Project				Less trust fund transfer				-4,519,000	-4,519,000	-4,519,000
Subtotal				Total appropriation				251,676,000	302,753,000	312,753,000
(b) Direct operations										
Subtotal										

¹ Includes \$15,000,000 budget amendment for family health centers, \$15,000,000 budget amendment for rodent control, and \$10,000,000 budget amendment for VD and measles.

² Budget amendment.

PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH FORMULA GRANTS

Partnership for health formula grants are awarded to assist States in establishing and maintaining adequate public health services. The grants provide support for development and expansion of health services to meet the health needs of the citizens of each State in accordance with priorities and goals established by the States.

Grant allocations are based on a State's population and per capita income with the restriction that States make available at least 15 percent of the funds for the support of mental health activities, and at least 70 percent for the provision of health services at the local level. The Federal share ranges from one-third to two-thirds.

I am inserting a table showing what each State would receive in 1972 formula grants.

The committee allowed \$90,000,000 for formula grants, a decrease from the request for this activity of \$10,000,000. This \$10,000,000 decrease was shifted to project grants to be used for the new venereal disease control program.

PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH PROJECT GRANTS

Project grants are awarded to assist public or nonprofit private agencies to identify health needs of an area, inventory resources, establish priorities and goals, and recommend courses of action. Federal funds ordinarily comprise 50 percent of the project with remaining funds coming from the local area. However, Federal funds may go as high as 75 percent if the area is all or partially designated as one of poverty.

During 1970 and 1971, the number of areawide agencies increased from 93 to 137. The number of agencies which have finished organizing and have launched active planning programs has increased

to 36 and was expected to reach 93 by the end of the fiscal year, June 30.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES
ALLOCATIONS OF GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES:

	1970 actual	1971 allocation	1972 estimate
Alabama	\$1,831,500	\$1,787,800	\$1,723,400
Alaska	388,900	388,100	394,100
Arizona	930,900	918,600	933,600
Arkansas	1,179,100	1,143,500	1,111,900
California	6,581,200	6,539,900	6,662,100
Colorado	1,019,800	1,030,300	1,063,300
Connecticut	1,232,600	1,233,000	1,237,600
Delaware	474,200	476,200	477,700
District of Columbia	550,200	543,600	530,700
Florida	2,572,200	2,561,700	2,675,100
Georgia	2,099,300	2,074,400	2,023,400
Hawaii	565,000	569,000	555,100
Idaho	573,800	580,200	572,900
Illinois	3,849,000	3,839,900	3,845,300
Indiana	2,065,300	2,062,300	2,077,000
Iowa	1,270,100	1,278,200	1,284,600
Kansas	1,109,300	1,111,700	1,090,500
Kentucky	1,598,800	1,569,700	1,599,200
Louisiana	1,791,000	1,774,700	1,743,800
Maine	674,100	670,400	670,700
Maryland	1,566,700	1,540,500	1,580,100
Massachusetts	2,104,300	2,081,400	2,139,800
Michigan	3,258,200	3,213,600	3,223,600
Minnesota	1,585,900	1,587,000	1,610,800
Mississippi	1,388,300	1,365,200	1,302,400
Missouri	1,965,300	1,938,500	1,951,800
Montana	559,000	557,000	557,600
Nebraska	809,200	811,400	812,600
Nevada	448,700	446,200	452,600
New Hampshire	549,400	551,900	559,500
New Jersey	2,611,600	2,597,300	2,597,100
New Mexico	703,000	689,600	693,200
New York	6,151,900	6,063,300	6,011,200
North Carolina	2,359,800	2,337,200	2,272,700
North Dakota	547,300	536,900	533,900
Ohio	3,981,300	\$3,949,000	\$3,921,000
Oklahoma	1,266,300	1,263,400	1,264,800
Oregon	1,013,900	1,009,000	1,026,300
Pennsylvania	4,387,300	4,360,800	4,351,000
Rhode Island	611,200	607,300	617,500
South Carolina	1,440,600	1,422,200	1,364,500
South Dakota	554,300	546,900	551,600
Tennessee	1,911,400	1,887,800	1,846,800
Texas	4,430,700	4,389,800	4,376,200
Utah	699,500	698,300	702,500
Vermont	455,600	458,700	461,600
Virginia	2,010,700	1,995,300	1,979,200
Washington	1,389,700	1,428,500	1,442,500
West Virginia	1,041,600	1,042,200	1,017,200
Wisconsin	1,776,700	1,767,800	1,822,700

	1970 actual	1971 allocation	1972 estimate
Wyoming	\$412,400	\$413,300	\$418,700
Guam	324,900	351,500	307,700
Puerto Rico	1,565,500	2,063,300	2,109,500
Virgin Islands	265,700	265,700	265,700
American Samoa	265,700	265,700	265,700
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	320,100	443,300	453,400
Total	89,100,000	89,100,000	89,100,000
Evaluation Amount ²	900,000	900,000	900,000
Grand Total	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000

¹ Allocations are awarded to States based on population and per capita income with a minimum program requirement.

² Authorized by Public Law 91-296.

The committee bill for project grants is \$153,713,000, an increase over the budget request of \$20,000,000. And an increase over the 1971 appropriation of \$44,900,000.

Providing the additional funds requested will mean that there will be approximately 151 areawide agencies with 24 in the organizational stage and 127 fully engaged in planning the organization and delivery of health services in their communities during this fiscal year.

A third type of assistance under this program consists of project grants for training, studies, and demonstrations for health planning. In 1971, grants to public and nonprofit organizations were used to train 388 students in 21 graduate programs to develop health planning skills, and to support 10 continuing education programs aimed at "retreading" individuals already involved in health planning.

In 1972, training grants will support over 400 students in 18 graduate programs, plus 10 education programs reaching 600 individuals in health planning, as well as consumer education programs to reach 1,500 people.

Of the \$20 million increase provided

for project grants, \$16 million is earmarked specifically for the new venereal disease control program designed to prevent or treat a million cases of venereal disease in the next 2 years.

Under this program, it is proposed that:

First. Assistance to be awarded to the States and large cities to provide, for the first time, support for a nationally coordinated gonorrhea control program which will permit utilization of emerging technology in the management of this disease, and enable the States to carry out, at the optimum level, proven measures for the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of syphilis;

Second. Immediate steps to be taken to insure that all federally supported programs providing health care adopt a policy of routine detection and treatment of patients with venereal disease;

Third. States be urged to adopt legislation requiring prenatal examinations for the presence of gonorrhea; and

Fourth. States be urged to implement measures to assure complete reporting of venereal disease by physicians and reporting of reactive tests for venereal disease by laboratories.

Support of an adequately financed venereal disease control program has been strongly advocated by the Association of State & Territorial Health Officers, the American Venereal Disease Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Legion, the National Congress of Parents & Teachers, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The American Social Health Association has long supported increased appropriations for gonorrhea and syphilis control.

I cannot say I am altogether reluctant in taking pride in being so visible year after year in the matter of trying to bring the rate of venereal disease down.

Two years ago, when we marked up our bill, I offered an amendment to add a half million so we could get going on this whole program. Last year we had to put in \$400,000 just to bring it up to what we had in 1970.

So, we have come an awfully long way to get to the point where we can earmark \$16 million for a program of such real value, and we hope to see the Department move quickly to really get this operation moving.

CHPS—MIGRANT HEALTH

The committee allowed the Department's request for migrant health of \$18,101,000, an increase over 1971 of \$3,039,000.

Projects supported under this activity provide family health services to migrant agricultural laborers, seasonal farmworkers and their families. The grants finance a wide range of personal health services.

There are currently 131 ongoing migrant health projects. The \$3 million increase would provide \$2,400,000 for the support of five new projects and \$600,000 for expansion funds for the seven new comprehensive projects funded in 1970.

Completed reports from the last migrant season show an increase in the total number of medical visits over last

year ranging from 18 percent in one region to 56 percent in another with a mean increase of about 30 percent.

CHPS—NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS

The bill includes \$10,000,000 for the National Health Service Corps. This is an increase over the 1971 appropriation of \$7,000,000. The request is for 660 positions to carry out the provisions of the Emergency Health Personnel Act of 1970, Public Law 91-623. This act authorized the assignment of personnel to areas with critical health manpower shortages to provide care as well as to encourage health personnel to practice in areas where shortages of such personnel exist.

CHPS—MEDICAL CARE STANDARDS AND IMPLEMENTATION

The committee bill allows the Department request for medical care standards and implementation of \$7,068,000, an increase over the 1971 level of \$377,000. The increase is requested to cover built-in items.

The Community Health Service serves as the professional health resources of the Social Security Administration in the medicare program and provides the mechanism for defining and applying standards of quality for providers of service under title XVIII of the Social Security Act. These standards are coordinated with title XIX—Medicaid—to assure the programs are consistent.

During 1972, Bureau of Health Insurance and Community Health Service review teams will evaluate State medicare certification operations, and encourage improved techniques for assessing provider performance. A health facility survey improvement program will also be undertaken. Efforts to correct deficiencies in facilities which receive medicare and medicaid reimbursements will continue.

Maternal and child health—formula grants—\$119,650,000: This figure is a \$1.8 million change since 1971. This is what was requested in the budget, and the committee did not change it. These grants will be used to first, reduce infant mortality, and second, treat crippled or handicapped children. One-half of the amount goes to States on a population formula and half is reserved for special project grants. The \$1.8 million increase will be used for treatment of crippled children.

Maternal and child health—project grants—\$90,380,000: This figure is a \$7,030,000 increase since 1971. This is the budget figure. The purpose of this program is to provide comprehensive health care to poor and near-poor mothers and children, and the grants are awarded on a 75-percent Federal, 25-percent matching basis. The increase requested will go largely for maintaining the 56 comprehensive maternity and infant care centers at the 1971 level, and for the "Children and Youth" health care services in low-income areas, as well as to expand services in the dental care program.

Maternal and child health—research and training—\$21,106,000: This is an increase from the 1971 level of \$4,171,000 and is the budget figure. These programs are designed to improve health and medical services to mothers and children through applied research and through

training of personnel involved in providing health care and related services for mothers and children, particularly mentally retarded and multiple-handicapped children.

This is under title V, section 511-512 of the Social Security Act and the primary effort under section 511 has been given to support of training in university-affiliated centers for the mentally retarded.

Through section 512, research grants and contracts are made with public and nonprofit institutions of higher learning and private agencies and research groups.

New funds are requested to initiate training for 150 nurse-midwife pediatric nurses and other physicians' assistants—\$1,500,000. New funds would improve staffing levels for the existing 19 university-affiliated centers.

Maternal and child health—program direction and management: This section includes a committee figure of \$4,477,000, an increase of \$394,000 over 1971. This is the budget figure.

This activity provides staffing resources and operating funds essential to implementing program requirements of the Maternal and Child Health Service.

Of the increase requested, \$199,000 will be used for child health experts to assist in an expanded review and development effort, and \$195,000 is built-in.

As a part of the President's expanded Indian health effort, \$750,000 of the total request—\$4,477,000—will support project contracts for delivery of health services to Indians.

Maternal and child health—family planning services: Most of the increase under maternal and child health is a \$57,763,000 increase for family planning activities. It is expected to fund 131 continuing and expanding projects, compared with 76 last year. It will also support 80 OEO family planning projects to be transferred from that agency, as well as some 127 new project grants, compared with 50 last year.

Approximately 1,560,000 women will be served by all projects funded through 1972 when they are fully operational—this compares with an estimated 700,000 in fiscal 1971.

As part of the President's expanded Indian health effort, the National Center for Family Planning Services will also support project contracts totaling \$625,000 in both 1971 and 1972 for the delivery of family planning services to Indians.

For fiscal year 1972, the \$57-plus million is intended to provide resources for the National Center for Family Planning Services to carry out its expanded responsibilities under the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970. This authority was not in effect for fiscal year 1971.

Of the new moneys: \$11 million will be for continuation of existing projects; \$15 million will be for expansion of well-developed projects; more people can be included; \$10 million reflect transferred projects from OEO; \$17 million for new activities. Remaining is for increased training, education, and services delivery improvement contracts, training grants program, and for new positions.

In summary, the bill includes in total \$326,651,000, for Maternal and Child Health, the amount of the budget request, which is \$64,659,000 above the amount appropriated in 1971.

REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS

The bill includes \$82,771,000, an increase of \$30,000,000 above the request and a reduction of \$28,837,000 below the amount appropriated for 1971. The \$30 million increase recommended by the committee, plus the carryover of funds from 1971, will make \$115,104,000 available for obligation for regional medical programs.

The regional medical program has accomplished a number of things during the last year or two:

First. National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health reports that this program has resulted in a substantial reduction in cigarette smoking by adults from 49 million in 1966 to 44,500,000 in 1970 despite the growth of the population. Continued reductions afford the prospect of reducing the total level of medical care needs which now tax our resources.

Second. Approximately 750,000 people in a 15-county area in western North Carolina now have available to them, in their communities, coordinated programs for comprehensive and continued care of stroke patients.

Third. More than 200 operational projects are for patient-care demonstration projects concerned with coronary and other intensive-care activities, expansion and improvement of ambulatory care in neighborhood health centers, clinics' outpatient departments, and the expansion and improvement in extended- and home-care activities benefiting 240,000 patients.

Fourth. This year an estimated 30,000 physicians, or 10 percent of all practicing physicians in the country, will be involved in regional program medical supported training activities.

Fifth. It is estimated that 1,470 hospitals presently participate in or benefit from regional medical programs. This represents 25 percent of all short-term, non-Federal hospitals.

Sixth. Treatment of kidney diseases has made great progress through the program and is operating in targeted areas to achieve maximum geographic area benefit with the least amount of investment.

In addition to the aforementioned basic regional medical programs, this appropriation funds the activities "Technical Assistance and Disease Control." There was an increase of \$72,000, which was the request.

This program provides assistance in planning, development and operation of the 55 regional medical programs, and supports work in the areas of kidney disease and smoking. Fund for 1972 would be distributed as follows:

Regionalization (+\$33,000)-----	\$2,576,000
Smoking and Health (+17,000)---	2,189,000
Kidney Disease (+22,000)-----	4,118,000

The committee made it imminently clear that it expects the pediatric pulmonary program to be continued in 1972 at not less than the 1971 level.

DISEASE CONTROL

The bill includes \$94,425,000, an increase of \$3,000,000 above the request. This appropriation covers a broad range of activities in connection with the prevention and control of communicable diseases, including the Foreign Service Quarantine Service.

LABORATORY IMPROVEMENT

The committee funded this item at the budget request of \$7,788,000 which provides training, consultation, reference services, et cetera, to upgrade clinical laboratories. Last year the licensure program included some 450 clinical laboratories and it is hoped that an additional 150 laboratories which are engaged in interstate commerce can be included this year.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

The committee allowed \$25,216,000 for this item as requested in the budget.

This program provides research and technical service to reduce the high economic and social costs of workers illness and injury through prevention and control of occupational hazards and disease.

The budget amendment of \$8,435,000 would provide minimal funding for implementation of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, Public Law 91-596. Research grants are awarded to universities and nonprofit institutions on a 95-percent Federal, 5-percent grantee matching basis. Training grants, with no matching requirement, are also awarded.

In 1971 approximately 90,000 underground coal miners received medical examinations by the Public Health Service and its contractors under provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

With funds for 1972, medical examination of the 25,000 surface coal workers will be completed, and final development and refinement of the special supplementary examinations given to 10,000 coal workers will be completed.

RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH

The committee met the budget request of \$11,574,000 for radiological health, an increase of \$1,197,000 over 1971. The main purpose of the program is identification and reduction of unnecessary radiation through standard setting and enforcement, and through research and training programs. The studies include such items as microwave ovens, colored televisions, X-rays, et cetera. Beginning in fiscal year 1973, the program will be transferred to the Food and Drug Administration.

COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

This item totals \$8,875,000. Included in the budget request was a \$2,000,000 item to carry out the provisions of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. The administration intends to implement this Act in fiscal year 1972 through several means.

This amount will be used to make a more concerted effort to define the nature and extent of the national problem of lead-based paint poisoning.

Through contracts with local governments, the Bureau of Community Environmental Management will: conduct screening of a statistically valid sample

of children for lead intoxication, examine dwelling units for lead-base paint and improve medical screening methodologies as well as nondestructive methods for detection of lead-based paint.

A total management effort will be pilot-tested in three communities including: first, education intended to communicate the health hazard among children to parents, educators, and local officials; second, large scale screening of potential victims; third, marshaling of health service resources; fourth, follow-up of identified cases; fifth, detection of lead-based paint on surfaces of dwelling units, and sixth, development of a policy that affords to the extent possible the training and employment of the residents of lead-belt communities.

The Bureau will also carry out the provision of the act under title IV which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in dwellings constructed or rehabilitated with Federal assistance.

The Department will also continue to give support to ongoing projects under existing legislation in Chicago, New York, New Orleans, and Norfolk, totaling approximately \$150,000.

Since the committee recognizes that it is difficult to estimate just what a new and innovative program like this will cost, it appeared to the committee that the Department's estimate was a conservative one and it added another \$3,000,000 to the bill for this program.

MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

The bill provides \$266,704,000 or an increase of \$41,350,000 over 1971 and an increase of \$127,827,000 over the budget request. The committee restored a number of items to 1971 levels though the budget proposed decreased amounts. Distribution of the funds requested for construction grants in the administration's budget would be as follows, compared with the 1971 budget:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971	1972	Sub-com- mittee
Hospitals and public health centers.....	16,400	16,400	16,400
Long-term care facilities.....	20,800	20,800	20,800
Outpatient facilities.....	70,000	70,000	70,000
Rehabilitation facilities.....	15,000	15,000	15,000
Modernization.....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Total.....	172,200	85,000	172,200

The 1972 budget proposed grants for outpatient and rehabilitation facilities because they are first, most critically needed, and second least able to cover construction costs through fees and third-party payments. The 1972 budget request, together with unused funds carried over from 1971, will provide loans to generate \$1 billion worth of hospital construction in 1972. Largely through the guaranteed loan program.

The committee restored a total of \$87,200,000 for hospitals and public health centers, long-term care facilities, and for modernization but exact allocation of these funds among these three programs is left up to the administration.

The committee agreed with the de-

partment that funds for direct loans be maintained at the 1971 level of \$30,000,000. Construction of health care facilities owned by public agencies which are precluded by local laws from borrowing mortgage funds from commercial lenders, is supported by this program.

The Director of Health Care Facilities Service testified during the hearings—part 2, page 59—to the effect that it is appropriate that capital financing of inpatient facilities utilize private investment funds through loans with Federal loan guarantees. Hospitals and other inpatient facilities generate, through user charges and third-party payments, income to be used for operating expenses and capital improvements. Some of these facilities, however, are owned by public agencies which are precluded by State or local laws from borrowing capital funds commercially. In order to provide these institutions with financing supported and subsidized in a manner similar to that available to private nonprofit facilities, loans would be made by HEW in exchange for commitments in the form of bonds or mortgages. Concurrent with the transactions between HEW and the public agency, the bonds would be sold by HEW to the Federal National Mortgage Association and other investors. Proceeds from these sales would be used by HEW to provide funds for the direct loans. No appropriation of Federal funds is required; however, it is necessary that contract authority of \$30 million be authorized.

MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION—INTEREST SUBSIDIES

Under the redirected Hill-Burton program, Federal support for construction of inpatient health facilities such as hospitals and long-term care centers would be available through guaranteed loans with interest subsidies for private, nonprofit hospitals and direct loans for facilities owned by public agencies.

The committee included the request for this item of \$20,300,000, an increase of \$15,300,000 over 1971. The committee feels that if this program gets started, the amount in the bill plus a \$5,000,000 carryover from 1971 will support interest subsidy payments on up to \$1 billion worth of mortgage loans.

MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

The committee also included \$40,627,000 for District of Columbia medical facilities though no request was made for funds in the 1972 budget request. This reflects an increase of \$25,627,000 over the 1971 appropriation.

The District participates in the guaranteed loan and interest subsidy Hill-Burton programs. In view of this and the great need for aid in areas such as California after the earthquake, the administration felt it was not rational to ask for special moneys for a particular area such as the District of Columbia when we had this great balance of demands across the country.

However, as the committee report says on page 17:

The unique problems of the District of Columbia in raising funds for such things as medical facilities are widely recognized. Among them is the lack of industrial growth

that has occurred in most cities the size of Washington and the fact that so many of its people have legal residences elsewhere and make most of their charitable contributions there. There is no doubt of the need for more funds for many of Washington's hospitals. Members of the Committee are personally acquainted with serious problems at Providence, Rogers, Children's and Georgetown U. hospitals. The Committee has added to the bill the full amount of the remaining authorization which will at least partially alleviate these situations.

The District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act authorized the appropriation of \$40,052,000 for grants and \$40,575,000 for loans. The remaining authorization, after deducting appropriations already made, is \$24,052,000 for grants and \$16,575,000 for loans.

PATIENT CARE AND SPECIAL HEALTH SERVICES—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS

Included in the bill is \$71,682,000, the amount of the request, and a reduction of \$14,223,000 below the amount appropriated for 1971. This reduction was based on a proposal to transfer some or all of the hospitals and clinics for other use. This proposal would effect eight hospitals and 30 outpatient clinics.

However, a continuing resolution will permit the hospitals to continue operation in 1972, and a budget amendment of up to \$19.5 million will be transmitted to insure operation until successful transfer of facilities to communities can be effected.

The existing hospitals are serving a declining patient load and a substantial number of military dependents and retired Armed Forces personnel. After hospital transfers, medical care for primary beneficiaries would be maintained through contractual arrangement with local providers of health care.

NATIONAL HEALTH STATISTICS

The committee agreed to the budget request of \$15,900,000 which is an increase of \$5,557,000 above the amount appropriated for 1971.

Of the requested increase, \$446,000 is built in.

\$700,000 is requested to begin field work on the national family growth survey initiated in 1971.

An increase of \$501,000 is asked to make operational the national family planning reporting system currently in the developmental stages.

An increase of \$1,201,000 is requested to provide funds to reduce the existing delays of up to one and a half years in making national vital statistics available to users at local, State, and Federal levels.

RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

The committee is providing an indefinite appropriation of \$23,196,000, an increase of \$3,695,000 over 1971. The increases are built in.

Regarding actual retirement pay, a net increase of 115 officers will result in an estimated total of 1,198 retired officers at the end of fiscal year 1972.

It is estimated that there will be a total of 72 annuitants under the survivors' benefits program as of June 30, 1972.

The dependents' medical care program is designed to provide care to an estimated 118,200 eligible beneficiaries, an increase of 2,800 over 1971. The level of

funding requested will allow delivery of health care to this larger beneficiary population. Currently they are anticipating in contract hospitals an average daily patient load of 261, outpatient claims of 8,690, and handicapped cases of 117.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Unobligated balances from previous year appropriations will be used to complete construction of new facilities, conduct miscellaneous improvements and repairs necessary.

No additional money is being appropriated.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

The \$12,359,000 included in the bill provides for \$467,000 in built-in increases. That amount is the same as the budget request.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The comparable 1971 appropriation base for NIH research is \$1,166,260,000. The administration's budget estimate for 1972 is \$1,291,841,000. The committee bill provides \$1,379,722,000—including \$100,000,000 for the special cancer research initiative. The committee also added \$87,881,000.

The so-called coalition for health figures for 1971 and 1972 were not adjusted for comparability and do not include any of the President's health initiatives.

RESEARCH GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

The committee bill includes \$534,117,000 for research project grants, an increase of \$29,093,000 over the budget request and \$47,456,000 over the 1971 level.

For general research support grants, the bill includes \$47,185,000, an increase of \$6 million over the budget and \$1 million over the 1971 level.

For other special research grant programs, the budget includes \$146,000,000, an increase of \$7 million over the budget request and \$12 million over the 1971 level.

The bill provides \$195,171,000 for research contracts, an increase of \$8,413,000 over the budget request and \$12,178,000 over the 1971 level. These increases are in addition to the \$100 million increase for cancer research which has already been enacted as part of the 1971 Supplemental Appropriation Act.

NIH—DIVISION OF BIOLOGICS STANDARDS

The committee bill provides \$8,956,000 for this Division, the budget figure. This is an increase of \$231,000 over 1971. The Division is responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of quality and safety of all biological products that come within the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service. These products include all vaccines, antitoxins, therapeutic serums, allergenic products, and human blood for transfusion, as well as products prepared from human blood. There are presently 263 biological products licensed, all of which are under constant surveillance and study by the DBS.

The major program objectives of this Division are to keep abreast of the latest research advances and to maintain progress in testing and control techniques. The attainment of these objectives is essential to assure the safety, purity and potency of biological products used for the prevention, diag-

nosis, and/or treatment of human disease.

The control of hepatitis remains a major challenge in medical virology. In the field of biologics, the disease constitutes a serious risk in the administration of blood and blood products. Transfused blood is known to cause more than 30,000 cases of overt hepatitis and 1,500 to 3,000 deaths every year in the United States.

RUBELLA

Rubella virus vaccine became generally available in the United States in June 1969, and by October 1970, approximately 28 million doses had been distributed in this country. Practical experience with the vaccine since licensure supports investigative data pertaining to vaccine safety and effectiveness.

NIH—NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

The committee bill provides \$237,531,000, an increase over the budget of \$3,193,000. This is an increase over 1971 of \$7,069,000.

Included in the 1971 Supplemental Appropriation was an additional \$100 million requested by the President for the Special Cancer Research Initiative, making the total available to the National Cancer Institute in fiscal year 1972 \$337,531,000.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRESS IN RESEARCH—CANCER

Several milestone discoveries of 1970, achieved by scientists working with the aid of National Cancer Institute funds, offer the hope of understanding and eventually controlling cancers in man.

The first complete synthesis of a gene was announced in June 1970 by Dr. H. Gobind Khorana at the University of Wisconsin after 10 years of grant support. If, as many scientists believe, cancer is a disease of cells caused by a faulty gene or genes, Dr. Khorana's findings may eventually permit the replacement or alternation of such genes, thus correcting the genetic error that is cancer.

In September 1970 Dr. Robert J. Huebner of NCI and his colleagues proposed that an inherited cancer gene present even before birth could also be a growth factor in the developing embryo.

In 1969 Dr. Huebner and Dr. George J. Todaro had first presented their theory of the tumor gene, suggesting that an inherited cancer gene is present from conception throughout life, even though inactive as a cancer-causing agent. According to the concept, its genetic activity is somehow "switched off" for cancer at an early age; it lies dormant until it may be "switched on" again by the aging process or environmental agents.

During 1970, research on drug treatment of cancer continued to be a major thrust in the Institute's effort to control cancer.

We were told that 1,000 chemicals and 20 or 30 materials can produce cancers in animals.

Development of new drugs—and of techniques to use established drugs more effectively—were goals actively sought. Almost 14,800 compounds, including 8,500 synthetic chemicals and 6,300 natural products from fermentation, plant and animal sources, were

tested as potential anticancer agents during 1970.

A drug named BCNU has been shown to be useful in the treatment of advanced Hodgkin's disease—a cancer of the lymph system. Some degree of anticancer activity was also reported for BCNU in treating gastrointestinal cancer, melanoma, lung cancer and brain tumors.

Procarbazine, a new drug that is a close chemical relative of a rocket fuel component, has also been found useful in treating advanced Hodgkin's disease.

A promising new approach to cancer therapy is to apply to the skin small quantities of chemicals that produce an inflammatory reaction of the delayed hypersensitivity type. In working with 50 patients for more than 5 years, the immunotherapy resulted in resolution of more than 95 percent of multiple superficial basal cell cancers tested.

It was interesting to learn that 110 different kinds of viruses have been found that cause cancer.

The areas of greatest promise in cancer research are: first, viruses as probable human cancer causative agents; second, chemical agents that induce cancer; and third, treatment of cancer, particularly drug therapy.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, of the 100 or more different kinds of cancer, about 10 have been shown to be curable by means of drugs.

Mr. Chairman, cancer research should not be viewed as an isolated—or isolatable—activity. The most important reason for keeping the cancer conquest program within the family of the National Institutes of Health is that cancer research is inescapably intertwined with various aspects of the research missions of the other Institutes. The complex questions to which biomedical research must address itself and the work that goes into their solution are almost never unique to a particular disease or confined to single scientific disciplines.

The present excitement about the role of viruses in causing cancer—illustrates the way in which progress in one field of research depends on work being done in another. Virologists, who for years have been mainly concerned with unraveling the mysteries of infectious diseases, such as the common cold, for which viruses are thought to be responsible, have provided the leads and are now doing much of the work in viral carcinogenesis.

As for a breakthrough in cancer research, Dr. Marston, Director of the National Institutes of Health, said:

We are probably talking about decades and we are talking about different kinds of cancer. We will make progress in some cancers and we will not make progress at the same rate in other cancers.

At the same time we are improving our ability to diagnose and treat and prevent cancer, we are putting new chemicals out into the environment, many of which undoubtedly will have the ability to cause cancer. We need to be able to identify those hazards.

We propose to add \$100 million to cancer research because cancer is a very major health hazard and because the scientific opportunities to use that money effectively do, indeed, exist. This must not be interpreted, however, as meaning that this field is ready for a moon-shot approach—we are very far from being in the position of the Apollo program of merely having to exploit existing

scientific knowledge for the accomplishment of a difficult and dramatic task. In cancer, as in most of biomedical research, the even more difficult but less dramatic task is to acquire the basic scientific knowledge which will make dramatic clinical achievements possible.

Separating cancer research from other medical research activities—in a way, putting it in competition with other medical research—would, I think, do real damage to all of medical research including cancer research itself. To put it bluntly, from a scientific point of view, it makes no sense.

Dr. Baker, head of the Cancer Institute, said in our hearings:

Although the nature of the cancer problem does not permit even an informed forecast of solutions within a definite time limit, it is altogether reasonable to expect that an intensified effort will move us toward the ultimate goal at an accelerated pace.

I should like to re-emphasize a key point. We should not look too soon for extraordinary results from a suddenly expanded major endeavor to conquer cancer. The time frame of accomplishment in the cancer field is quite different from that associated with the control of poliomyelitis, for instance. Significant research advances or cures in the cancer area cannot be predicted with accuracy, but what we can expect to see is a quickening of pace in the whole cancer area through a larger, carefully coordinated effort.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the following exchange took place between Dr. Baker and me:

Mr. MICHEL. The article I read in yesterday's paper indicates that the distinguished medical scientists around the country representing medical schools are in accord with our making this big push and effort through the established Institutes of Health rather than setting up some independent autonomous unit that would itself take this on.

Dr. BAKER. Yes, sir. I think most of the medical schools and professional societies have gone on record to that effect. Also, the federated professional societies, the basic scientists, have all backed the need for serious and accelerated research in the cancer area and, in many instances, have come out quite strongly against separating the support and administration of cancer research from the support and administration of other areas of research.

OTHER GOVERNMENT RESEARCH ON CANCER

Aside from research going on in the National Institute of Dental Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, there are several other Government agencies supporting limited research on cancer. They are: the Atomic Energy Commission; Regional Medical program, Health Services and Mental Health Administration; the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology; and the Veterans' Administration.

NIH—NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE

The committee bill provides \$211,624,000 for this Institute, which is an increase over the budget figure of \$16,132,000. This is \$19,997,000 over 1971.

This Institute supports research on diseases of the heart, lungs, and vascular systems in its own laboratories and clinics in Bethesda and through grants and contracts to universities, medical schools and other institutions. Three areas of major concern: heart attacks, diseases of the blood, and diseases of the lung. Emphasis is placed on heart attacks because they represent the Nation's No. 1 killer. The Institute also has plans for

studies in the prevention of heart disease through control of high blood pressure.

Research has been going on for possible substitutes for blood. Sickle cell anemia is a very serious disease which is common with Negroes; it rarely occurs elsewhere. An interesting hypothesis about why sickle cell anemia occurs among black people: it has been shown that the presence of a sickle cell trait increases the body's ability to cope with malaria. Certain types of malaria are prevalent in Africa, and it is believed that the persistence of this trait in the black population has been due to a selection for an increased survival of those people with sickle cell anemia, that is, malaria is more likely to kill those people who did not have the trait than those who do, and consequently to increase the fraction of the people who have the trait.

ARTERIOSCLEROSIS

Nearly one-fourth of initial nonfatal heart attacks may not be recognized by the patient or his physician, data from the NHLI Framingham study indicate. However, these "silent" heart attacks appear to pose the same threat of recurrent attacks and death as do those with more dramatic onset.

Of 188 documented first heart attacks occurring in the Framingham study population during 14 years of surveillance, 44 were unrecognized at the time they occurred. The attack was verified only when the unsuspecting victim subsequently reported for his routine biennial examination and ECG.

HYPERTENSION

Norepinephrine, released into the blood from the adrenal glands during exertion or emotional stress, is a powerful heart stimulant and blood vessel constrictor. Dr. William B. Kannel and coworkers of the NHLI Framingham study, report that hypertension appears to be the most common and most potent factor increasing risk of stroke and that control of hypertension appears to be central to stroke prevention.

During the current year new specialized centers of research in four important areas—arteriosclerosis, hypertension, thrombosis, and pulmonary diseases—are being established.

In the past year, with the new attack on lung disease, the Institute has experienced a doubling of the request for research grants in emphysema. They have also implemented a new pulmonary academic award program in order to teach physicians, both in the undergraduate sense and also in the continuing and specialty sense, the problems related to emphysema and other forms of chronic lung disease. Awards will be given for 10 specialized centers of research which will focus on chronic lung disease.

Heart and lung transplants: There have been 171 heart transplants with 168 recipients, and, as of spring 1971, the longest time that a functioning graft had remained viable in support of the life of the recipient was 31 months; 23 surviving. There have been 25 lung transplants with 25 recipients. The longest time that one of those survived was 10 months and, as of spring 1971, no lung transplant was continuing to function.

Because of the rejection factor, research has also been going on to find an artificial heart. So far it has only been tried on animals, and results look promising.

While they are not on the verge of any dramatic breakthroughs, Dr. Cooper says: "I think the opportunity for significant reduction in the number of premature deaths of arteriosclerotic heart disease, hypertension, and thrombosis is at hand. In our promise of detection of chronic lung disease, we may be on the upswing as well."

NIH—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

The committee has provided a figure of \$41,828,000 for this institute, which is an increase over the budget of \$2,999,000. It is an increase over 1971 of \$7,125,000.

The dental institute conducts and supports a broad range of laboratory, clinical, field, and epidemiologic studies directed toward improved therapy, control and ultimate prevention of oral problems through application of advancing and new knowledge.

The area of knowledge where the institute stands closest to the point of application is in tooth decay or dental caries. The most conspicuous research progress made recently involves an adhesive sealant. A 2-year study, in which the grinding surfaces of children's teeth have been painted with a clear plastic, has shown an outstanding degree of protection against decay.

For the first time this year, the institute has begun research in the field of "pain control," a long neglected area of research. They are also studying the administration of anxiety-reducing agents and general anesthesia to the ambulatory dental patient.

Their budget request for 1972 is \$38,829,000, an increase of \$4,126,000 over the 1971 operating level of \$34,703,000. It reflects an increase of \$2,900,000 for the national caries program and \$1,500,000 for dental research institutes.

Largely through the efforts of scientists working in the National Institute of Dental Research as well as grant-supported investigators, they have learned that dental caries is truly an infectious disease and is transmissible.

Their approach to the study of dental caries falls into three general categories. First, protecting the susceptible tooth either through adhesive sealants, by alternative measures of fluoridation application, and by making the tooth substance more resistant to bacteria; second, diet—exploring better sugar substitutes, since sucrose seems to be the principal culprit; third, combating the bacteria themselves.

There are 53 dental schools currently operating. Two will be closing, and six new ones will be opening soon. All of them, to some degree, receive support from the National Institute of Dental Research.

In the area of periodontal disease, the statistics show that over the age of 35 years, approximately two out of three people in this country have one or more teeth lost as a consequence of this disease.

In the area of finding new adhesives,

the institute has even been investigating the lowly barnacle. It is believed that adhesive secretions from barnacles, mussels, and other common marine animals might be effective because they stick to a variety of surfaces under water, and remain adherent for many years.

Preliminary success with a new plastic coating for the tooth's grinding surface has been reported. Treated surfaces of children's teeth remained free of decay for 1 year after the plastic sealant was applied. If clinical tests now underway bear out its initial promise, the coating could take a place beside water fluoridation, which mainly protects the tooth's smooth surfaces, as a preventative of decay on chewing areas.

Dr. Leonard Shulman, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, reports progress in extending the life of dental transplants. Even though transplanted teeth are eventually rejected, Dr. Shulman believes they could be practical replacements if they could be made to last for an average of 8 years instead of the approximate 4-year survival period now expected.

Plastic tooth replicas have also been tested.

Large amounts of phosphates, continuously available in drinking water or food, have protected animal teeth against decay. The work suggests that topical fluoride applications may reduce human cavities further if combined with this phosphate solution.

Dr. H. C. Slavkin has been doing basic research into the oral cancer field and his discoveries should help researchers trying to stop uncontrolled growth in cancer and to initiate growth for regenerating tissues and organs.

NIH—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASES

The committee figure for this Institute is \$148,204,000, which is an increase over the budget of \$12,771,000. This figure is an increase over 1971 of \$13,779,000.

This institute seeks to control disease and promote health through research. Essential to this objective is a broad-scale fundamental scientific approach to the mysteries of health and illness and a marshaling and developing of results for research attacks on specific disease problems. To accomplish this objective the Institute acquires new biomedical information in the main through scientists supported by about 2,000 research grants at some 400 institutions across the country.

Progress against cystic fibrosis—CF is a grave disease of children and young adults caused by an inborn error of metabolism. The basic chemical defect is not yet fully understood, but it is known to be genetically transmitted. In addition to the research being conducted in the Bethesda laboratories, this Institute provides grant support to many cystic fibrosis research projects at medical centers and institutions across the country. Among promising new findings this past year is the demonstration that skin of patients with cystic fibrosis is deficient in a specific enzyme that is linked to salt secretion. This finding should help pinpoint the molecular defect in this metabolic disorder.

Early diagnosis and prompt institution

of therapeutic regimens are of utmost importance both in forestalling and delaying development of such serious complications of cystic fibrosis as irreparable lung damage. Several significant advances in diagnostic and therapeutic techniques have been reported this year.

The Institute has communicated diagnostic and therapeutic developments in CF to practicing physicians and research workers throughout the country. One particularly effective means of communication has been the new comprehensive scientific exhibit on CF presenting the latest findings. This exhibit has been brought to the attention of thousands at medical meetings and conferences this past year.

ARTHRITIS

Over 17 million Americans suffer from arthritis, a group of diseases characterized by inflammation and impairment of the joints. Of the many forms of rheumatic disease, rheumatoid arthritis is the most serious and crippling. It is a major subject of study supported and conducted by the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. Although the primary cause of this disorder is as yet unknown despite an intensive research effort, early diagnosis and proper treatment benefit 9 or 10 such patients, and 7 of 10 are enabled to avoid severe disablement.

As for progress against arthritis, Dr. Whedon has said: "Evidence is accumulating concerning the possibility that a transmissible, infectious agent is involved in rheumatoid arthritis."

While the primary cause of rheumatoid arthritis is still unknown, present research is endeavoring to discover whether an infectious process, or an autoimmune reaction, or possibly a combination of both processes are the mechanisms by which the disease develops. Institute grantees are continuing to gather data on the possible role of microbial organisms and viruses which have recently been recognized as potential pathogens.

Another area of concern of the institute is diabetes. According to the American Diabetes Association, one American in 20 is either an actual or a potential diabetic. A complicated disease, for which there is no known cure, diabetes ranks eighth on the list of diseases causing death in the United States. It has been known for some time to be a hereditary disorder. Continued advances against diabetes depend upon further knowledge of the disease and its complications; of genetic factors; of how insulin is made in the pancreas; how it is transported and how it works. Progress in these areas, now under intensive scrutiny, should contribute substantially toward amelioration of diabetes and its consequences.

One of the areas of research to alleviate diabetes is the possibility of an artificial pancreas. This idea is not to transplant pancreatic tissue but to set up a mechanical pancreas, a mechanical system which could be worn by the patient all the time. The system would involve a sensor in the blood which would electronically indicate what the blood sugar level was and when it got too high, there

would be a means of telling the reservoir of insulin which would be carried by the patient that it should deliver more insulin into the blood.

In the area of gastrointestinal bleeding, a research advance will permit physicians in the future to determine the site of gastrointestinal bleeding in a patient without subjecting him to overly complex and uncomfortable diagnostic procedures.

Also in the area of artificial kidneys, the Institute has now reached the phase in which many improved, lifesaving artificial kidneys are being developed, while others are passing their final clinical tests or will soon be coming off the assembly line.

NIH—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES AND STROKE

The committee bill provides \$108,590,000 for this Institute, which is an increase over the budget figure of \$12,069,000. This is \$9,108,000 over 1971.

This Institute is concerned with a variety of diseases which afflict the brain and sense organs. Disorders such as cerebral palsy, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, parkinsonism, and deafness result in long-term disability, while stroke is the third largest cause of death in this country.

The diseases that this Institute seeks to eliminate are important both because of number of people they kill, stroke being the third most prevalent cause of death, and because these diseases severely handicap their victims often for an entire lifetime. The financial burden to the victims' families and to the community, and the prolonged anguish that these crippling diseases cause, are unusually great.

Parkinson's disease is a vivid example of a long-term neurologic disability. It afflicts more than 1 million of our citizens. A year ago L-dopa had not yet been released to the public. Now that clinical trials have been completed it is available to all who need it. Three of the large treatment centers have reported that over 70 percent of patients with Parkinson's disease are benefited; about 25 percent spectacularly so. Thus if all who are afflicted obtain treatment, about 700,000 sufferers will be able to lead much more normal lives, and of these perhaps 200,000 will appear to be almost completely cured.

Strokes kill over 200,000 people a year in this country; another 2 million are disabled in varying degrees. The Institute has worked for many years with the Veterans' Administration and the regional medical centers of the Health Service and Mental Health Administration. Recently a careful study by the VA dramatically confirmed the suspicion that, if blood pressure is controlled by regular drug therapy in people who are otherwise hypertensive, the chances of their having strokes are decreased.

Head and spinal cord injuries have become a major health problem due to increases in automobile and sporting accidents. Over 70 percent of auto accident victims suffer head injury. Over 100,000 persons in the Nation are paralyzed in the arms, legs, or both, due to spinal cord injury. Therefore, increased research

upon the acute phase of spinal cord injury is urgently needed. During 1971 the Institute funded two research centers for research and treatment of acute spinal cord injury. They are currently reviewing application for six research grants. In 1973, they expect to make two or three of these centers fully operational.

Virus research: The delayed effects of virus infection have been shown in recent years to be responsible for an increasing number of diseases. Possibly multiple sclerosis, parkinsonism, and a variety of degenerative diseases of the nervous system may be caused by slowly acting virus infections.

Since 1957 the Institute's slow virus program has succeeded in transmitting two human neurological diseases to chimpanzees and from them to three species of smaller monkeys, proving without question that we are dealing with an infectious agent. Attempts are now underway to purify and isolate this agent so that means may be found to combat it.

Collaborative perinatal study: The Institute has spent about \$100 million on this program since it was initiated 10 years ago. The goal of this large-scale study was to monitor a group of women during their pregnancy, labor, and delivery and to relate various factors present to the outcome of the pregnancy and the future development of the children, especially concentrating on neurological damage. Sixty thousand pregnancies have been studied and the program is expected to be completed in 1974. The children are monitored until they reach the age of 8.

The study has already shown that certain viruses in the mother, once thought to be harmless, can lead to neurological damage in the newborn; that several drugs when taken during pregnancy can cause congenital malformations and stillbirth; that a lack of oxygen any time during fetal development plays a major role in causing cerebral palsy; and that diabetes in pregnancy is related to the frequency of congenital malformations in the offspring.

The data bank on this project is recognized to be unique in the world by those scientists familiar with its breadth and completeness.

HEARING DISORDERS—NINDS IMPLANTABLE HEARING AID

An experimental model of a permanently implantable hearing aid, designed to last a lifetime, has been tested in animals by Institute grantees at the University of Oregon Medical School. The tiny crystal, less than one-half inch long and ten-thousandths of an inch in diameter, is attached to a small wire probe, and implanted in the middle ear. It picks up sound, in the form of electrical impulses, which causes it to vibrate and send these impulses to the brain.

Research at the Central Institute for the Deaf show exposure to intense noise can indeed cause damage to the inner ear. Their findings indicate that—

Moderately intense sound can gradually destroy, bit by bit, . . . the ability to hear.

NIH—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

The committee's figure on this Institute is \$106,662,000, which is a \$7,320,-

000 increase over the budget and \$8,538,000 over 1971.

This Institute conducts and supports broadly based research on the causes, characteristics, prevention, control, and treatment of diseases believed to be caused by infectious agents, including bacteria, fungi, viruses, and parasites—or by abnormalities in the body's immune mechanisms such as allergies.

This Institute has done considerable research on the effect of the environment on human health, earlier with the living areas and the control of vectors of infectious diseases, and, more recent, with factors that can trigger allergic conditions.

In the area of asthma, use of an experimental drug has helped open up a new approach to treatment of this severe disease.

The Institute is establishing a limited number of allergic disease centers this year where clinical aspects of allergic disorders can be studied in conjunction with existing superior programs in immunologic research. They will be directing their efforts primarily at the diagnosis, prevention and treatment of asthma, hay fever, skin allergies, and food sensitivities.

Organ Transplant Immunologic studies: Institute-supported scientists continue to build on basic immunologic findings related to organ transplantation and the rejection phenomenon.

NIAID is investigating the immune mechanisms of the body with regard to cancer.

NIAID: Prostaglandins are a family of hormone-like chemicals which occur naturally throughout the human body. Their remarkably wide spectrum of biological activity ranges from nasal congestion to induction of uterine contractions. The list of possible therapeutic applications reads like the label on a bottle of old-fashioned patent medicine. It includes control of blood pressure, prevention and treatment of blood clots and of stomach gastric ulcers, correction of male infertility, and control of asthma.

Infections: The "killer" diseases related to this Institute's program are those caused by viruses, bacteria and other micro-organisms. Although the classic epidemic infectious diseases—such as smallpox, bubonic plague and typhoid fever—no longer threaten our country, approximately 100,000 Americans die each year from various infections.

Pneumonia vaccine: Three years ago the Institute began a program to produce a safe bacterial vaccine capable of preventing most pneumonia cases. Compounding the problem is the fact that there are about 14 types of pneumococcus that are the most common causes of pneumonias. As data from trials accumulate, a single combined vaccine will be formulated to protect against the dozen or so predominant types of the pneumococcus bacteria. Although there have been unexpected technical problems, the Institute plans that mass vaccination trials could begin within the next 2 years.

Common cold studies: Almost all colds are believed to be caused by viruses, but only one-half of these illnesses can be blamed on a specific organism. In fact, there are now at least 89 officially recognized rhinoviruses—34 more than were reported last year—and some 23 corona viruses, all demonstrated as causes of the common cold.

Since there are so many viruses that cause the common cold, it is extremely unlikely that scientists could find a vaccine.

One promising area of research, however, is the study of an antiviral substance that the body produces naturally—interferon. New methods are being sought to stimulate, artificially, the body's ability to produce large amounts of interferon when it is needed.

Scientists are also studying factors which affect susceptibility to colds. Using volunteer subjects, the scientists showed that chilling, exposure, or overheating apparently has little effect on the development or seriousness of a cold. If a rhinovirus or coronavirus infects the body, a cold usually develops, and the importance of other factors has not been demonstrated.

NIH—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

The committee's figure for this Institute is \$168,490,000, which is an increase over the budget of \$18,090,000 and an increase over 1972 of \$13,963,000.

Judged to be both urgent and ripe for study at this time is the exciting area of human genetic disease. In summary, there is a very large number of diseases—about 2,000 now tabulated—which are caused chiefly or entirely by errors in the substance or in the transmission of genetic information from parent to offspring.

For over a hundred years, scientists, using peas, flies, molds, bacteria, and viruses, have studied the nature of storage and transmission of genetic information. In no field of science has more rapid progress been made in the past 15 years. Today we are able to study these processes as they occur in mammals by the use of mammalian cells grown outside the body in tissue culture. We know that genetic information is stored in microscopically visible structures of the cell nucleus, chromosomes and more specifically in the molecules of DNA, contained in these chromosomes.

The present status of treatment of these diseases is quite unsatisfactory. For the most part, treatment is limited to the corrections of symptoms as these develop, as in the use of antibiotics to control lung infections encountered in cystic fibrosis. Prevention by genetic counseling has been of limited use, and interuterine diagnosis followed by abortion has to date had only limited application. However, early diagnosis by amniocentesis, which involves drawing off a small amount of fluid surrounding the fetus and culturing the cells for chromosomal and biochemical analysis, has been helpful in diagnosing the presence of Tay-Sachs disease and also cystic fibrosis, as well as a number of other genetic diseases.

The problem of genetics of disease is "ripe" today. This Institute proposes to establish the study of genetics and genetic diseases as a formal program. They are conducting at present a critical and highly professional review of the entire field. Already in fiscal year 1971 they have provided nearly \$30 million in research grant support and \$6 million in training and fellowship support in these areas of medical science. In addition to the all-important continuance of support for the study of basic genetic processes, they propose certain areas for initial targeted concern: first, to stimulate research directed toward the identification of the so-called heterozygote carrier—the apparently well individual who carries in his genetic stock a defective gene which might lead to serious disease in his offspring.

Second, to proceed with the all important but laborious task of "mapping" the human chromosomes. We have barely begun to locate the thousands of known genes in human chromosomes. It has been said that the mapping of the 23 human chromosome pairs, which contain all the necessary information to the structure and function of the body, is surely more challenging and more relevant to human welfare than is the mapping of the moon.

Genetics will be their main thrust in the coming year, but they also have programs in other basic medical sciences: pharmacology-toxicology, trauma, automation of diagnostic laboratory instruments, the clinical subjects of diagnostic radiology and anesthesiology.

Last year this committee increased the Institute's budget request by \$17,696,000. The committee earmarked \$10 million for a special program in genetics.

Approximately 159 awards will be made against the funds which were provided. They are distributed among six Institutes. They all relate to problems of genetics and genetic chemistry. There are 111 awards totaling \$5,632,297 to general medical sciences; 21 awards to allergy and infectious diseases; 10 to arthritis and metabolic diseases; 13 to child health and human development; three to cancer and one to the Neurological Institute.

They are budgeting \$38,828,000 for genetics research and training in 1972.

There are over 1,000 different diseases which are believed to be genetically transmitted or in which genetic mechanisms appear to have a highly significant role.

The Institute continues to provide support for the advancement of the field of biomedical engineering. Its objective is to support the effective introduction of engineering into fundamental and applied biomedical research and quality research training in the area. Its present and planned program represents an effort to improve laboratory functions through specific research grants and contracts in the areas of first, development and automation of new and more reliable analytical tools for the clinical laboratory; second, development of appropriate computer hardware for identification and control; third, development of proper laboratory standards to assure

the validity and uniformity of clinical laboratory's measurements.

Long-range plans include first, the establishment of 10 to 12 genetics research and training centers at major medical schools. Second, the creation of approximately 15 clinical research and demonstration centers in teaching hospitals; third, additional funds for individual research project conducted by qualified investigators in genetics. Fourth, provision of centralized services and resources for use of scientists and clinical investigators. Fifth, development of multidisciplinary attacks on the problems of genetic disease by the provision of additional postdoctoral and special fellowships.

Studies in pediatric pharmacology have revealed: First, nearly all drugs taken by the mother pass to the fetus through the placenta; second, drugs that pass through the placental barrier can be identified in the infant at birth on two or three drops of blood from the umbilical cord; third, certain drugs frequently taken by mothers during pregnancy are highly toxic to the infant.

NIH—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The committee's figure for this Institute is \$109,668,000, an increase of \$6,436,000 over the request and \$15,992,000 over 1971.

This Institute conducts and sponsors research on human biology encompassing the entire lifespan. Program emphasis for 1972 will be in population research and in child health.

Institute-supported investigators have reported that at least one-fifth of all births in the United States between 1960 and 1965 were unwanted. Thus prevention of only unwanted births during those years would have reduced the U.S. population growth by 4.7 million.

For 1972 the President's budget includes \$37,718,000 for the support of population research and training, an increase of \$9,600,000 over the 1971 level.

For the population and reproduction program there are increases of \$6,100,000 under research grants, \$1 million under the laboratory and clinical research, and \$2,500,000 under collaborative research and development.

In 1971 we have \$28.1 million for all population research. For 1972 it is \$37.7 million, an increase of \$9.6 million.

The Institute's plans for 1972 include increasing support for the Center for Population Research. Institute supported studies have shown that in the United States an estimated one out of 5 million women have neither adequate information about nor access to family planning. The Federal Government's policy is that every child should be a wanted child and that every couple has the right to information and services necessary for planning their families. Achieving this policy requires that information, services, and more nearly perfect means of contraception than presently exist be available to all.

During 1972 the contraceptive development program will begin concentrating on new or approved practical approaches and by 1973 it will include many phases of drug development, from syntheses through clinical testing, involving close

cooperation with the pharmaceutical industry.

Center for population research currently supports a number of studies in the area of prostaglandin research. Prostaglandins are hormone-like substances that have a remarkably wide range of effects. At the present time, there are 14 known prostaglandins which are widely distributed in mammalian tissues in very small amounts. These are among the most potent chemicals ever discovered; one-billionth of a gram produces marked effects. On the horizon are many potential medical uses.

In the area of population research, these include induction of labor, therapeutic abortion, contraception and treatment of male sterility. Prostaglandins could be of tremendous use in widespread fertility control.

CONTRACEPTIVE METHODS

No currently available contraceptive method is fully satisfactory and the Institute is directing research efforts to develop new ones. To date, the contraceptive development program at the Institute has consisted primarily of directed fundamental research relevant to the eventual production of new agents useful as contraceptives. During 1972 this program became more product oriented, and by the end of 1972 it will include many phases of drug development from synthesis through clinical testing. Our goal is to develop several new methods of fertility regulation before the end of this decade.

According to a study conducted by the Institute, there are about 8½ million women using the pill, which would make about 20 percent of women in the reproductive age. About 2 million loops are in use.

In the area of population control, preliminary findings would seem to indicate that humanity is midstream in a revolutionary change in its processes of reproduction. This is a transition from wastefully high death and birth rates to a more efficient and humane reproduction with much lower death and birth rates. This "demographic transition" suggests some optimism for the future rates of world population growth.

Research on aging should be intensified, the committee feels. Twenty million people are over the age of 65, but two-thirds of our medical expenditures were for those persons over the age of 65. The Institute continues to support research on aging by scientists at universities, hospitals, and research institutions.

NIH—NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

The figure for this Institute decided on by the committee is \$36,022,000, which is \$3,383,000 over the budget request. It is an increase of \$5,616,000 over 1971.

The National Eye Institute was created in 1968 to conduct and support basic and applied research on disease problems of the eye.

This past year has been marked by significant and exciting advances in research, most notably in the field of diseases of the retina, which accounts for 40 percent of all blindness in the U.S.

Two Institute grantees have shared Nobel prizes for their work in studying the visual system.

Research is also helping to find better ways of treating retinal detachment. NEI grantees have explored the use of cryosurgery, intense cold, in reattaching the retina. Several studies indicate that cryosurgery may enable the treatment of some retinal detachments on an outpatient basis without need for hospitalization.

Research progress on cataracts.—Although cataract surgery has become a safe and satisfactory practice, technical improvements in the procedures are still being achieved. A 5-year evaluation has shown that a suction technique is superior to conventional surgery for removing cataracts in infancy, childhood and adolescence and may also be used successfully in older patients.

The Institute will also support the development of better instruments and techniques for microsurgical repair of eye wounds, such as the laser beam. A further area of emphasis will be on biomedical engineering investigations to develop reading and mobility aids for the blind and near blind.

NIH—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

The committee's figure for this Institute is \$26,436,000, which is an increase of \$1,165,000 over the request and \$6,446,000 over 1971.

This Institute has progressed remarkably during its first 5 years of existence, and many major strides have been made.

The mission of this Institute is to provide a scientific foundation to assist the control agencies in their efforts to resolve environmental health problems. They seek to identify and better understand the chemical, physical and biological factors in the environment which are most likely to affect man's health. For agencies like the newly created Environmental Protection Agency, this knowledge will form the basis for establishing effective control measures.

There are many problems associated with developing chemicals to satisfy the conflicting demands of the American housewife for clean clothes on one hand and the guardians of public health and conservationists who wish to preserve our ecological balance on the other hand. This Institute had a notable part to play in the resolution of this dilemma during the past year.

The detergent industry developed a compound known as NTA in the hope of using it as a substitute for the troublesome phosphates traditionally used. They did tests on NTA and said it would dissolve and would be nontoxic. They envisioned use of more than 1 billion pounds of the chemical by 1975. This Institute was asked by the Water Quality Administration to test it for sure, and found that, while it was nontoxic by itself, when combined with other chemicals usually found in water, it was in fact toxic. The detergent industry then voluntarily modified its plans for immediate use of NTA.

Another problem this Institute has investigated relates to the nitrate-nitrite exposure. In collaboration with their university-based Environmental Health Sciences Centers, they have explored and delineated the extent of diseases from nitrite exposure. Specifically, these investigations indicate that current levels

in baby food in the United States present no health problem.

There are presently six of these Environmental Health Science Centers. Total funding for the centers this next year will be \$3.1 million. They vary in size and program, and range in funding from a quarter of a million dollars to \$900,000.

This Institute is primarily concerned with the effect on human health of environmental pollutants from any sector. They are working closely with EPA.

This will mark the first year that this Institute will have enough research space to permit the establishment of the full range of required laboratory programs. Since the beginning of this Institute in 1966, resources have permitted the initiation of programs in only a few of the

many areas which need investigation. The amounts requested for 1972 will permit extension of investigations into the actual and potential effects on human health brought about by a rapidly changing environment. In addition to the intramural research activities, there is an extramural program which includes grants, fellowships, et cetera.

The Institute awards grants to public and private nonprofit institutions covering a broad range of research activities in the fields of environmental health.

Institute-supported scientists continue to investigate a broad spectrum of known and potential environmental hazards. Pesticides constitute a large segment of this effort. Efforts continue toward the isolation, identification and testing of airborne gases and particulates to deter-

mine the toxic effects of chronic low-level exposure to these contaminants.

NIH—RESEARCH RESOURCES (GENERAL RESEARCH SUPPORT GRANTS)

The committee has provided \$71,948,000 for research resources, which is \$3,879,000 over the budget and \$5,517,000 over 1971. This division also administers the general research support grants, along with their own division, for a grand total of \$127,160,000. The committee's figure for general research support grants is \$55,212,000, which is an increase over the budget of \$6,012,000 and \$1,012,000 over 1971. They receive this \$55,212,000 from other Institutes as shown below.

The following table shows the estimated amounts to be provided by each of the contributing appropriations:

	1971 estimate	1972 estimate	Committee bill		1971 estimate	1972 estimate	Committee bill
National Institutes of Health:				National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	\$3,909,000	\$3,475,000	\$3,980,000
National Cancer Institute	\$5,901,000	\$5,275,000	\$6,052,000	National Eye Institute	1,551,000	1,381,000	1,585,000
National Heart and Lung Institute	8,127,000	7,267,000	8,325,000	National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	485,000	431,000	491,000
National Institute of Dental Research	1,028,000	908,000	1,040,000	Subtotal, NIH	46,173,000	41,173,000	47,185,000
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases	8,123,000	7,243,000	8,301,000	Health Services and Mental Health Administration: National Institute of Mental Health	8,027,000	8,027,000	8,027,000
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke	5,027,000	4,481,000	5,136,000	Total	54,200,000	49,200,000	55,212,000
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	5,044,000	4,494,000	5,149,000				
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	6,978,000	6,218,000	7,126,000				

To a large extent, general research support grants provide funds for the younger investigator, the investigator who needs a small amount of support while he is obtaining baseline data prior to submitting a grant application to the NIH. This, along with the biomedical sciences support grants allow institutions to quickly redress the kinds of imbalances that are likely to develop where relatively well-established investigators get the large amounts of research support. Using general research support money an institution can initiate the upgrading of neglected areas through the purchase of modern equipment and the recruitment of new research personnel. These funds are also valuable in the stabilization of high quality, ongoing research which may be floundering through underfunding.

GENERAL RESEARCH SUPPORT GRANTS

In 1972, these grants will be awarded to approximately 333 institutions—schools of medicine, dentistry, public health, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and nursing, hospitals, nonacademic research institutes, and State and municipal health departments. Over one-half of the funds will be distributed to schools of medicine. With few exceptions these grants may be spent for the direct costs of research and research training at the discretion of the recipient institution. Such costs include salaries, student stipends, research equipment, and supplies and numerous other needs.

In September 1970, in keeping with the expressed intent of this committee, the Division of Research Resources was reorganized out of the Bureau of Health Manpower Education and was established as a free-standing research Division of the NIH. This status will provide a clearer picture of the Division's programs of support of research resources and

general research support and how they complement and undergird much of the research project grant support of the categorical institutes.

The animal resources program is an important part of this Division. Their objectives are to first upgrade institutional laboratory animal medicine research and care; second, maintain specialized animal models; and third, develop the national resources of seven primate research centers that seek to extend studies on primates to the diseases of many by providing sources of healthy primates in the United States and the proper environment needed to undertake such studies.

All major medical research and educational institutions require a comprehensive animal resources program. Over half of the biomedical research effort in NIH grant-eligible institutions is dependent on the use of animals.

Scientists utilizing DRR-supported animal resources are also working actively in the area of child development. A group of specially trained researchers in a primate center have completed a comprehensive study of normal fetal development in monkeys.

This division participates directly and indirectly in the total NOH effort to find a cure for cancer. Also, a significant portion of the funds allocated to the division are utilized for the conduct of research on the causes and cure of heart disease. For example, during the past year, a team of researchers at a general clinical research center developed a new simple method of diagnosing diseased arteries.

A GRS funded pilot project led to the development of a rechargeable nickel cadmium battery for use as an implantable cardiac pacemaker. This rechargeable pacemaker, one-third the size of

conventional models, was cited as one of the 100 most significant inventions of 1970.

NIH—JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES

The committee's figure for this item is \$3,763,000, which is an increase over the request of \$444,000 and over 1971 by \$81,000.

The John E. Fogarty International Center for advanced study in the health sciences is designed to facilitate and expand the continuing effort of the National Institutes of Health and the U.S. Government to broaden the knowledge base of the biomedical sciences. The center serves as the focal point for the international activities of the NIH and is responsible for the administration of the international postdoctoral fellowships program, the Fogarty scholars-in-residence program, the conference and seminars program, International Visitors Center and the special foreign currency program, Public Law 480.

The U.S. contribution for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory was transferred in fiscal 1971 from the appropriation of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases to this appropriation.

This laboratory, located in Panama, provides the highest level of scientific and technical support in: virology, parasitology, malariology, serology, bacteriology, pathology, hematology, and medical entomology. The world problems of today have reemphasized the continuing public health importance of malaria, viral infection, intestinal parasites, and other diseases common to tropical areas. Our contribution to this laboratory is \$500,000, set by law.

This Institute is developing its capacities to emphasize and encourage interaction within the medical and scientific community of the world through several

ongoing programs, such as conferences and seminars and the Fogarty scholars-in-residence. Among other elements of cooperation and advanced study is an organized program of bilateral cooperation and a newly designed effort to obtain useful scientific information from a variety of foreign countries, including Eastern Europe. In addition, they are continuing the administration and management of the international postdoctoral fellowship program, the International Visitors Center and the special foreign currency program, where, as a result of the increased allocation of foreign currencies, they have enlarged research abroad in those selected countries where Public Law 480 funds are available.

NIH—NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The committee's figure for this item is \$22,781,000, which is an increase over the request of \$800,000. It is \$1,271,000 over 1971.

The National Library of Medicine appropriation consists of 12 separate items and activities, many of which are not what one would expect in your ordinary, everyday library—but, then, the National Library of Medicine is anything but an ordinary, everyday library.

The administration recommended \$1 million to fund the library's training grant program for 1972. This program is authorized by the Medical Library Assistance Extension Act of 1970, and is intended to help meet the Nation's need for medical librarians and other medical information specialists. The funds would allow support of 11 such grants for an estimated 100 trainees.

Special scientific project grants are intended to support outstanding scholars in full-time analysis and documentation of major advances in the health sciences, the results to be published as monographs on advances in biomedicine. For 1972, the \$95,000 recommended for this program would provide support for three projects by highly qualified scholars.

A research grants program, to develop methods of processing and making accessible the rapidly growing body of biomedical information, would be funded at \$600,000, permitting the support of 14 noncompeting continuation grants and three new awards in this area.

Library research grants would be funded at \$2,105,000. The purpose of this program is to provide financial assistance and incentive for improving the basic materials, equipment, and services of medical libraries, such as acquisition of books, cataloging, binding, new equipment, and the like. This level of funding will support 165 continuing grants and 241 new ones.

The regional medical libraries grants program is intended to develop a system of regional medical libraries with the scope and depth necessary to supplement significantly the services of local medical libraries in each region. A funding level of \$2,002,000 will allow continuing support of the 10 active regional libraries.

Publications support grants assist in the development of useful, selected publications to help American health professionals digest and utilize the tremen-

dous output of new information in the biomedical sciences. The request of \$290,000 will provide support for 14 projects.

The Lister Hill National Center for biomedical communications provides a mechanism for the transfer of computer and communications technology to improve biomedical research, medical education, and health care delivery. Last year, the center demonstrated the utility of on-line bibliographic access in more than 30 hospitals, libraries, and medical research facilities. The center has experimented with satellite communications for voice, data facsimile, and analog signals and has planned a major experiment with Alaska to test this new communication modality. The requested funding for 1972 of \$1,398,000 will allow this test and the development of the initial portions of a network in Vermont and New Hampshire. It will provide augmented in-house staff for the center to meet the growing demand for managerial and technology transfer functions.

The National Medical Audiovisual Center administers programs to improve the quality and use of biomedical audiovisuals in schools of the health professions and throughout the biomedical community. The proposed funding level of \$2,127,000 will allow expansion of these activities.

An appropriation of \$8,125,000 would provide for continuation of the basic operations of the library itself, and the request of \$1,237,000 for the toxicology information program would allow the library to further develop and refine this information system.

Support for staff review and approval of grants would total \$704,000 in 1972, and \$2,298,000 is provided for program direction, which includes direct operating expenses for the office of the director office of administrative management, the office of public information and publications management, and payment to NIH for centrally furnished services.

The committee increase of \$800,000 is not included in the above amounts, but would be added to the library's extramural programs.

NIH—BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

The committee's figure for this item is \$3,565,000, which is the same amount requested.

Two million dollars of the amount provided by the committee would go for the design of the first phase of permanent facilities at Research Triangle Park, N.C., for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, which is now housed in temporary leased quarters.

Replacement of the incinerator at the Rocky Mountain Laboratory Hamilton, Mont., will take \$325,000 of the funds, and \$1,240,000 is for repair and improvements to the existing NIH plant.

NIH—OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

The committee's figure is \$11,442,000 for this item. It is the same amount as the budget request and \$556,000 over 1971.

This increase is to cover uncontrollable costs such as within-grade salary increases, and to provide two new positions to expand program evaluation activities.

NIH—SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

The committee's figure for this program is \$25,545,000, which is the budget figure. It is \$3,449,000 less than 1971.

The request for 1972 provides for an estimated 75 new projects and additional support for approximately 30 on-going projects. Research in the fields of population and family planning; nutrition; and the organization and delivery of health services, particularly in the area of maternal and child health, will be emphasized. The programs of biomedical research and health communications will be strengthened.

This program is supported entirely by foreign currencies owned by the U.S. which have been determined by the Treasury to be in excess of normal U.S. needs in the countries. Payments are made for necessary expenses for conducting research and other activities, as authorized by law.

WELFARE—SRS—GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. Chairman, the largest single item in this bill is for grants to the States for public assistance. It accounts for 56 percent of the total amount in this bill. Except for \$46 million for child welfare grants and \$687,000 for assistance to repatriated U.S. Nationals, the entire amount represents a computation of the share of State and local expenditures for welfare and medical assistance which the Federal Government will be required to pay in 1972 under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

Members may recall that earlier this year we had a supplemental request on this item of \$1.047 billion. In fiscal year 1970 this amount was in the amount of \$8 billion plus. This past year it was over \$9.6 billion, and matched by some \$7 billion of State money. In this bill we have \$11,411,693,000, and as I said, we will probably expect a supplemental in the neighborhood of \$1 billion. This has to be the fastest growing and most alarming expenditure of not only the Federal Government, but our State governments as well, and signals the real need for reform.

It may be of interest to know that the 1972 programs will provide social services for 14,773,000 persons.

As of May 1971, a total of 9,452,000 persons were on our AFDC rolls. This is indeed a shocking figure. And unfortunately it is a noncontrollable expenditure from our point of view.

If we would have retained in our bill the section 208 that would have limited expenditures in this field this fiscal year to 110 percent of what was spent last year, we could save \$244 million, but unfortunately, the big industrial States that cause us most of the problem, such as my own State of Illinois, would be seriously hurt by this kind of limitation. And I do regret that we could not be in a position of imposing some kind of restraint on this program at this end.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, ASSISTANCE TO REPATRIATED U.S. NATIONALS

The request was for \$687,000, which the committee provided.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE,
MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

The request was for \$3,827,619,000, provided by the committee.

This is \$611,477,000 over 1971.

Federal financial participation in medicaid payments varies from a minimum of 50 percent to a maximum of 83 percent depending upon the per capita income of the State. Federal program requires that eligible recipients include, as a minimum, all persons receiving or eligible to receive maintenance payments under the Social Security Act and eligible children under 21 who are not in families. In addition, States may elect to cover certain medically needy persons who are eligible for help only with their medical bills and hence do not receive maintenance payments for food, clothing, and shelter.

The reorganization of the Medical Services Administration, begun in 1970 and completed in 1971, has expanded the Federal role to provide more health services to eligible recipients. New regulations and guidelines on utilization of hospitals and nursing homes, and new management information systems are being devised to improve the States' ability to manage and control their costs.

Administrative initiatives are being taken to generate savings of \$70 million to be applied to reduce the fiscal year 1971 supplemental budget request. These initiatives consist of a more critical review of the utilization of medical services in order to reduce hospitalization and substitute nursing home or outpatient care for hospitalization. In addition, the requirement for prior authorization for extended stays in hospitals and nursing homes, the establishment of fee schedules for doctors and dentists, and improved surveillance of claims processing will yield additional savings.

SRS—GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE,
SOCIAL SERVICES

The request was for \$838,200,000, which the committee provided.

This is an increase over 1971 of \$81,314,000.

Services are provided to recipients of aid to families with dependent children, and to the adult categories of recipients under old age assistance, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to the blind. Grants are made to States based upon a rate of Federal financial participation of 75 percent for AFDC and either 75 percent or 50 percent for the adult programs.

During 1971, 43 States have separation of services from the determination of eligibility to some extent, including 29 with some experience in all categories, and 14 with some experience in only one category. More than 810,000 families and 2,128,000 children are receiving one or more social services under the AFDC program. Some of the major services with respect to AFDC are homemaker, counseling, family planning, family-life education, assistance in child rearing, home and financial management, day care, in-home child care, help in obtaining and utilizing health services, legal, housing, self-support, education, and programs to maximize the educational and social development of children.

It is expected that adult services will be extended to all States and that the quality of services will be improved. The number of adults being provided protective services is expected to increase from 101,000 to 125,000. The number of clients being provided services in helping them to leave institutions and preventing unnecessary institutionalization by helping them to remain in their own home—"in-home" services—is expected to increase from 65,900 to 115,000. New services will be developed for 50,000 adults living in community-based housing and other social care institutions.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE,
STATE AND LOCAL TRAINING

The budget request for \$43,866,000 was provided by the committee.

This is a decrease from 1971 of \$1,204,000.

Under the 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act, Federal financial participation at the 75-percent rate is available to States for costs of training public assistance staff or persons preparing for employment in public assistance agencies. The 1967 amendments require States to provide for the training and effective use of subprofessionals as community service aides and of volunteers.

This program enables State and local public assistance agencies to provide educational leave for employees, stipends for individuals preparing for employment, agency in-service training programs for employees, and educational and training grants or contracts for services.

WELFARE—SRS—GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC
ASSISTANCE, MAINTENANCE ASSISTANCE

The budget request for this item was \$6,665,321,000, which the committee provided. This is \$1,038,032,000 over 1971.

SRS—GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE
CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

The committee provided the budget figure of \$46 million, which is no change from 1971.

Child welfare services are authorized under title IV-B of the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act. The purpose of this program is to provide essential child welfare services to children in their own homes, or in foster homes or institutions.

Children referred for child welfare services by other welfare agencies, courts, schools, police, and neighbors to public child welfare agencies are not limited to the poor. These services are extended to children in need of such services without regard to financial need, legal residence, race, or religion. Each State receives a uniform grant of \$70,000 and an additional grant which varies directly with child population under 21 and inversely with average per capita income. The basic statute establishes a rate of between 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ to 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent Federal financial participation. However, due to budget constraints, the Federal financial participation was 8 percent of total costs—\$563 million—in 1970 with a projected decrease each year thereafter.

More than 338,000 families and 611,000 children are receiving services under this program. State welfare departments are continuing their efforts to reorganize and coordinate the family and child welfare

services programs as required by the social security amendments of 1967. Most have also started the process of separating the staff functions of determining eligibility for financial and medical assistance from the delivery of social services. During 1971, State and local funds will make up approximately 93 percent of the total funds expended, with Federal financial participation being 7 percent.

WELFARE—SRS—WORK INCENTIVES AND
TRAINING

The committee's figure for this item is \$181,136,000 which is \$16 million below the amount requested. This is \$109,356,000 over 1971.

The 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act authorized a work incentives program designed to encourage and promote the employment, work experience, and training of public assistance recipients receiving support from the aid to families with dependent children program. This training and incentives activity of the program is funded by HEW and administered by the Department of Labor.

The grants go to State agencies to provide individuals with concentrated amounts of manpower and training service essential to insure that they are eventually placed in full-time employment. Grants are made to manpower agencies based upon an 80 to 20 percent matching basis—the Federal share being 80 percent and the State giving 20 percent.

WELFARE—SRS—WORK INCENTIVES—CHILD CARE

The committee's figure is \$78 million which is the amount of the request, and \$51,600,000 over 1971.

The 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act require that child care services be provided to all WIN participants who need such services. These services begin at the time the Employment Service is prepared to enroll the parent, until other satisfactory arrangements can be made.

Child care is provided on a full-time basis for preschool children and on an after-school basis for older children. This is designed to permit WIN participants to take full advantage of the programs offered. Grants are made to States based upon a 75 to 25 percent matching rate—the Federal share being 75 percent and the State giving 25 percent.

WELFARE—SRS—REHABILITATION SERVICES AND
FACILITIES

BASIC STATE GRANTS—SECTION 2

The committee's figure on this item is \$518 million, which is the budget request. It is \$15 million over 1971.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act provides for allotment of Federal funds among the States on the basis of need as measured by a State's population and its per capita income. Federal funds requested for 1972 will match State funds of \$134,683,463.

In 1971 an estimated 130,000 public assistance recipients were provided vocational rehabilitation services and of this number approximately 37,500 were rehabilitated during the year. It is estimated that for each public assistance recipient removed from the welfare rolls, that the resultant annual savings to welfare will amount to approximately \$850, not counting the humanitarian benefits,

productive contribution to society in earnings and finished products, and taxes. Approximately 300,000 persons now on welfare rolls are estimated to have a disability and rehabilitation potential.

In 1972, an estimated 51,000 recipients will be rehabilitated under this program.

In addition to these individuals, basic State grants will provide funds to rehabilitate others in the following categories:

Social security disability insurance beneficiaries	21,200
Correctional rehabilitation	18,700
Alcoholics	16,700
Narcotic addicts	1,200
Mentally ill	83,800
Mentally retarded	40,300
Blind and visually impaired	24,300
Deaf, hard of hearing, and speech impaired	17,500
Heart disease, cancer, and stroke	11,800
Spinal cord injuries	300

WELFARE—SRS—REHABILITATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES

REHABILITATION SERVICE PROJECTS

The committee's figure is \$52,210,000, which is the budget request. It is \$24,560,000 over 1971.

This is a priority initiative to expand the States' capability to rehabilitate welfare recipients, and the increase requested for fiscal year 1972 will support special expansion projects in which States will serve an additional 45,000 public assistance recipients and of this number rehabilitate approximately 14,000 within the first full year.

The 1965 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act authorized the expansion grant program. Federal grants are made to State vocational rehabilitation, other public, or private, nonprofit agencies of up to 90 percent of the cost of projects to expand beyond normal growth the number of disabled persons being rehabilitated.

WELFARE—SRS—REHABILITATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FACILITIES

The committee's figure is \$3,051,000, which was not requested. It is \$1,750,000 on 1971.

Grants are made for the construction of new buildings, acquisition, expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, and for initial equipment. The cost of construction may include the cost of architectural fees and acquisition of land.

These grants are made to public or other nonprofit rehabilitation facilities. The Federal matching rate ranges between 33½ and 66½ percent.

In 1971, one grant will be issued to the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago for the next phase of the project. The total Federal share of this project is estimated to be \$8 million, of which \$3,750,000 has been appropriated through 1971.

WELFARE—SRS—REHABILITATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES

GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED: FORMULA GRANTS

The committee's figure is \$16,215,000, which is \$5 million over the request and an increase of \$5 million over 1971.

This program provides formula grants for planning, provision of services and construction and operations of facilities for persons with developmental disabili-

ties. This new act—Developmental Disability Services and Facilities Construction Amendments of 1970—Public Law 91-517—was being implemented during the last half of fiscal year 1971, and it is expected that in 1972, promulgation of regulations, policies and procedures for full implementation will be completed. Approximately 15 construction projects will be approved.

Because of the late program startup, nearly all of the 1971 funds will be available for program purposes in 1972, providing a program level of about \$22 million.

WELFARE—SRS—REHABILITATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES

GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED: SERVICE PROJECT GRANTS

The committee provided for \$23,575,000, which is no change for either 1971 or 1972.

The highest priority of these programs is to reorient and restructure the patterns of services to be more individualized and therapeutic and to design community oriented approaches to help reduce the dependency of the developmentally disabled.

Projects supported under this activity provide part of the cost to improve care in mental retardation institutions; to initiate and expand community programs; for the habilitation and rehabilitation of the mentally retarded and other handicapped individuals; and for concomitant specialized training.

Initiation of services and projects is facilitated by Federal project grants made to States, public, and other nonprofit agencies and organizations, universities and to local communities. Matching rate varies with different types of grants.

The 1971 program will support 63 new projects and 119 projects previously approved. These projects provide service to 32,476 individuals, and training for 14,220 individuals at a cost of \$8,300,000.

Funds available in 1971 will support 72 new projects and 82 projects previously approved. These projects provide service to 6,660 and training for 389 individuals at a cost of \$5,500,000.

Funds available in 1971 will support continuation of 359 projects previously approved. These projects make possible the provision of services to 93,340 individuals at a cost of \$9,775,000.

The 1972 funding request will support the continuation of 130 projects previously approved providing services to 25,416 retardates and staff training for 9,006 members at a cost of \$6,500,000.

WELFARE—SRS—SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING

The total funding request for this item was \$33,700,000, which the committee provided. It is \$5,850,000 higher than 1971.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING—STATE PLANNING AND SERVICE GRANTS

The request was for \$18,200,000, which the committee provided. This is \$3 million more than in 1971.

This item consists of three programs: First, community programs; second, areawide projects; and third, planning and operations.

The community programs would be

continued in 1972 at the 1971—\$9 million—level. Authorized by title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965, this program allocates funds on a formula basis to States having an approved State plan. Local communities provide 25 percent of the cost the first year, 40 percent the second, and 50 percent for the third and subsequent years. During 1970 and 1971, about 700 community programs were supported, food and nutrition programs are an important part of this activity.

Authorized by the 1969 amendments to title III of the Older Americans Act, the areawide model program is directed toward reduction and elimination of barriers which prevent older people from living independently and participating meaningfully in community life. In 1971, 10 areas were selected for funding for a total of \$2,200,000, the \$5,200,000 requested for 1972 would provide for continuation of these projects and the initiation of several new ones.

Planning and operations funds would remain at the 1971 level—\$4 million.

The budget originally proposed a reduction in funding for the community programs—\$3,650,000—but a budget amendment restored this.

Authorizations: Community programs, \$30 million; planning, \$5 million; and areawide projects, \$10 million.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING—FOSTER GRANDPARENTS

The requested figure is \$10,500,000, which is no change from 1971. The committee provided this amount.

Effective July 1, 1971, this program was transferred to the new action agency.

Authorized by title VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965, this is a project grant program which provides opportunities for low income—\$1,900 for an individual and \$2,500 for a couple—older persons to contribute to their community in the retirement years. The program focus is on a 1-to-1 relationship between a mature adult and a child with special needs.

Foster grandparents serve children in State and private institutions and day-care centers; in general and pediatric hospitals; in institutions for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and emotionally disturbed; and in inner-city day-care, preschool, and school settings.

Foster grandparents receive a stipend of \$1.60 an hour and generally serve 4 hours a day, 5 days a week. Over 80 percent of the total cost of the program is received as direct benefits by the foster grandparents. These benefits include stipends, transportation, meals, medical examinations, workmen's compensation, and social security.

In 1965, the initial year of the program, 21 demonstration projects were funded. There are currently 68 individual programs in 40 States and Puerto Rico. There are 183 participating institutions in which about 4,200 foster grandparents serve over 8,400 children on any given day and over 20,000 children during a year.

The budget originally proposed a 30-percent reduction from 1971, but a budget amendment was submitted to provide funding at the 1971 level for 1972.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING—RETIRED SENIOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

The requested figure is \$5 million, which the committee did not change. It is an increase of \$4,500,000 over 1971.

This program is authorized by title VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, and was created on September 17, 1969, when the 1969 amendments to the Older Americans Act became law.

The RSVP program is authorized at \$15 million, and the \$5 million requested for 1972 will provide opportunities for approximately 29,200 volunteers, compared with 3,000 volunteers in 1971. It would permit the funding of the 10 programs begun in 1971 for their second year of operation and allow for the initiation of 80 new programs.

RSVP structures useful roles for older persons as volunteers providing needed services in or through community agencies. Many of the volunteers are recruited, trained, and assigned in groups to public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations in their own or nearby communities. The primary focus of the services provided is on direct social services to people. However, for those older persons unable or unwilling to engage in this type of activity, other needed services will be developed in the volunteer projects such as sewing, repair of recreation equipment, and so forth, not requiring direct involvement with the beneficiaries.

The social services include visiting with aged, ill, or handicapped persons; assisting ill or aged persons with personal shopping; working as tutors with under-achievers in schools; assisting in providing recreational activities for the aged and the institutionalized of all ages; assisting rehabilitation agencies in activities to rehabilitate the mentally and physically disabled; counseling older persons on good consumer practices; and giving individualized care and attention to hospitalized children. All services rendered will be in addition to, not a duplication, services being performed by employed workers.

WELFARE—SRS—RESEARCH AND TRAINING

The committee's figure is \$92,465,000, which is \$23,315,000 over the budget request. This item includes a budget amendment of \$2,150,000 to maintain the research and training efforts for the aging at the 1971 level. The entire increase over the budget request is to be applied to the rehabilitation and social work training programs, to maintain them at the level of the 1971 appropriation.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING—RESEARCH: SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION PROJECTS

The budget request was for \$24,125,000, the figure provided by the committee.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING—RESEARCH: INCOME MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

The budget request for \$11 million was provided by the committee, unchanged. It is a \$2 million increase over 1971.

This entire amount is requested to fund research projects initiated in prior years. Approximately \$7,200,000 will be used to cover the cost of operations for the Seattle-Denver experiment and \$3,500,000 for the Gary experiment. The remaining \$300,000 will be used to continue

a project with the Urban Institute for the provision of technical assistance and research related to the experiments.

It is currently estimated that the income maintenance projects will be completed in 1974.

HEW money to date:

	Millions
Fiscal year 1970.....	\$8
Fiscal year 1971.....	9
Total	17
Request for fiscal year 1972.....	11

The Gary project is estimated to have a total cost of \$11 or \$12 million. There is no such estimate for the Seattle-Denver project.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING—RESEARCH: SPECIAL CENTERS

The committee provided \$12,375,000, the budget request. This is a cut of \$2,543,000 from 1971.

Funds requested will provide for continuation of the Research and Training Special Centers at the 1971 level, in such research area as "flotation therapy," mental retardation in impoverished areas, outreach programs, drug and alcohol addiction, and so forth.

The decrease of \$2,543,000 results from the nonrecurring construction cost for the National Center for Deaf/Blind, and reduced continuation cost of regional research institutes.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING—TRAINING: REHABILITATION

The committee provided \$33,065,000, which is an increase of \$18,415,000 over the budget request and maintains the 1971 level.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING—TRAINING: COMMUNITY SERVICES

The committee provided \$8,900,000, which is the 1971 figure, and \$4,900,000 over the budget for 1972.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING—TRAINING: AGING

The committee provided \$3 million, no change from 1971.

The original estimate for 1972 for this item was \$1,850,000. However, a budget amendment raised the amount to the 1971 level.

The justification says:

For the Title V training grant program an additional \$1,150,000 will permit the continuation of the 15 aging training programs at current levels of operation. The number of long-term and short-term students supported will remain at approximately 415.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS—SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

The committee provided \$8 million, which is a decrease from the budget request of \$2 million, but an increase over 1971 of \$4 million.

The 1972 increase of \$5,775,000 would provide for an increase of 61 new projects in nine foreign countries in which currencies in excess of the normal requirements of the United States are available. This request will also provide travel funds for an increase of nine American and foreign nationals to participate in the interchange of experts program over the 121 travelers in 1971.

WELFARE—SRS—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The committee provided \$39,537,000, which is an increase over 1971 of \$3,-

655,000. It is \$944,000 below the budget request.

Some of the requested increase is built in, but 100 new positions and \$1,894,000 are requested as a program increase.

Thirty additional positions are requested to strengthen program control efforts over community service programs and to provide better financial control over formula grant programs.

Included in the estimates is \$375,000 for contract support of the increased efforts to reduce the incidence of fraud and incorrect payments in the public assistance caseload.

The 70 additional positions are requested for regional operations to provide greater technical assistance and leadership to the States in improving their control over the community services and medical assistance programs and to provide for better surveillance over these programs to insure that expenditures are necessary for proper and efficient administration of State plans.

SSA—PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

* The total requested was \$2,465,297,000, which the committee provided. This is a reduction from 1971 of \$134,589,000.

The amount of funds required for Federal matching of premiums paid by or for individuals in the voluntary medical insurance program is dependent on the number of persons enrolled in the program and the premium rate which has been promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year for which funds are appropriated.

Appropriation estimates for payments to the trust funds for the cost of hospital insurance for the uninsured, noncontributory military service credits, and retirement benefits for certain uninsured persons aged 72 and over are based on benefits paid or to be paid to individuals protected by these provisions of law and the related administrative and interest costs.

During fiscal year 1971, the average number of enrollees in the supplementary medical insurance program is estimated at 19,500,000. Of these, 9,500,000 are expected to receive reimbursed medical services and over \$2 billion in benefits is expected to be paid. Uninsured persons eligible for hospital insurance benefits will number 1,700,000 during 1971, and benefits for this group are estimated at \$576 million.

Federal fund payments made to the trust funds in 1971 for hospital insurance for the uninsured, military service credits, and retirement benefits for certain uninsured persons helped put the trust funds in the same position they would have been in had these various provisions not been in effect.

The average number of enrollees in the supplementary medical insurance program is expected to grow to 19,800,000. The standard monthly premium rate and the Federal matching payment will be increased from \$5.30 to \$5.60 effective July 1, 1971, essentially for increases in the utilization and cost of covered services. Approximately 9,800,000 individuals will receive reimbursed services and \$2.3 billion in supplementary medical insur-

ance benefits will be paid. In 1972 approximately 1,600,000 uninsured persons—100,000 less than in 1971—will be eligible for hospital insurance and an estimated \$602 million in benefits will be paid for this group.

SSA—PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS
MATCHING PAYMENT FOR SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE—MEDICARE

The budget request was for \$1,376,400,000, which was provided by the committee. This is \$131,118,000 over 1971.

In the voluntary medical insurance plan for those persons 65 and over—medicare—about 95 percent of those eligible have chosen to enroll. This covers the costs of physicians' services, home health services not covered under the hospital insurance program, outpatient services, and certain other medical costs, subject to certain deductible and coinsurance amounts. Medical insurance benefits are financed from payments of monthly premiums by enrollees and by dollar for dollar matching Federal contributions.

The average number of enrollees in the supplementary medical insurance program is expected to grow to 19,800,000 during 1972 from an estimated 19,500,000 during 1971. At a standard premium rate of \$5.60 per month, 1972 premium collections are estimated at \$1,341 million. These must be matched with Federal funds, adjustments for underfinancing of 1971 costs—\$13,500,000—and of 1970 costs—\$15,900,000—make the total of \$1,376,400,000 required for 1972.

The amount of payments to be made derives from the exercise by individuals of their rights under the law and is not subject to administrative control.

SSA—PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS
HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE UNINSURED—MEDICARE

The budget request was for \$503,351,000, which the committee provided. This is \$375,337 less than 1971.

The Social Security Act also provides a hospital insurance plan to pay, for most individuals age 65 and over, the costs of hospital and related post-hospital services subject to certain deductibles and coinsurance requirements. Coverage extends to all persons entitled to social security or railroad retirement benefits and to practically all others age 65 and over not entitled to benefits under those systems.

It is estimated that during fiscal year 1972 the number of uninsured individuals on the hospital benefit rolls will decline to an average of \$1.6 million from the average of \$1.7 million in fiscal year 1971. The resulting decrease in benefit outlays is partially offset by increases in the cost and utilization of covered services.

Funds for this item must be provided by law, and are not subject to administrative control.

SSA—PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS
MILITARY SERVICE CREDITS

The committee provided \$235 million, the budget request. This is \$130 million over 1971.

The Congress provided men in the Armed Forces free wage credits toward

social security before there was a regular social security coverage of the Armed Forces. They were granted \$160 a month credit. At that time no reimbursement was provided for the trust funds. Later, the law was changed so that the trust funds would be made whole. The Social Security Administration is required to estimate how much in equal annual installments it would take to cover the cost in benefits provided, plus interest. For several years this request has been \$105 million. A new estimate is required every 5 years, and one has been made to cover the next 44 years beginning in 1972—\$235 million.

Social security benefits are now higher, and the new estimate has been made for a shorter period than before—44 years instead of 50—so this is why the new annual installments will be higher.

SSA—PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS; RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN UNINSURED PERSONS

The committee provided \$350,546,000, the budget request. This is \$20,370,000 below 1971. Benefits were provided in Public Law 89-368 to afford some protection to certain persons or their surviving dependents, who retired before the enactment of social security legislation or before their occupations were covered by social security. To be eligible an individual must have less than three quarters of coverage and have attained age 72 before 1968. The benefit was first paid in November 1966 and amounted to \$35 a month for an individual plus \$17.50 for an eligible wife. It was increased effective February 1968 to \$40 and \$20, respectively, and again in 1969 to \$46 and \$23, effective January 1970. The number of persons receiving benefits under this provision reached a peak of 734,000 in December 1967, and since then has been gradually decreasing as the size of the aged population meeting the eligibility requirements decreases.

SSA—SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

The committee provided \$644,249,000, for 1972.* On December 30, 1969, the President signed the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, Public Law 91-173. The act established nationwide health and safety standards for the coal mining industry. In addition, title IV provided for the payment of cash, benefits to coal miners who are totally disabled due to coal workers' pneumoconiosis—black lung—and to widows of coal miners who died from this condition. Pneumoconiosis, for the purposes of these benefits, is defined as a chronic dust disease of the lung arising out of employment in the Nation's underground coal mines. Under the act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is

*The 1972 request and recommended appropriation includes \$6,734,000 for payments made in FY 1970 and \$252,900,000 for payments made in 1971. Remainder of \$384,615,000 is for 1972 payments.

responsible for the processing of claims filed prior to January 1, 1973. Most claims filed after December 31, 1972, will be handled by the Department of Labor and the State workmen's compensation agencies.

By the middle of fiscal year 1971, 250,000 claims had been received and about 150,000 determinations had been made of which 90,000 were awards. By the end of fiscal year 1971, an estimated 292,000 had been received and about 284,000 of these will be processed, including 141,000 awards.

Expenditures		
1970 actual	-----	\$10,381,000
1971 estimate	-----	241,194,000
1972 estimate	-----	384,000,000
Total	-----	635,575,000

The expected caseload for 1972 is 37,000 considerably less than previous. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the increases in expenditures will stabilize somewhat now that the backlog has been taken care of. Another indication of this is the reduction in personnel for this activity from 601 in 1971 to 205 in 1972. A decrease of 396 positions.

SSA—SOCIAL SECURITY ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

In fiscal year 1971, the Social Security Administration had no program of research financed with excess foreign currencies. It requests an appropriation for such a program for fiscal year 1972. Comparative research projects abroad will assist in the evaluation of the old-age, survivors, disability, and health insurance provisions of the social security program.

Beneficiaries receiving checks outside the United States: 230,000 to 235,000.

The request was for \$750,000, but the committee did not fund it.

SSA—LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES; TRUST FUND

The budget request was for \$1,134,640,000, which was provided by the committee. This is an increase over 1971 of \$89,932,000. This is part of the total SSA figure.

The request for an annual "limitation on salaries and expenses" is a request for the Social Security Administration to use the social security trust funds to meet its annual administrative expenses in carrying out the social security programs of retirement, survivors, disability, and health insurance.

In fiscal year 1972, the cost of administering old-age and survivors insurance is expected to increase by \$6,159,464; disability insurance by \$23,207,445; hospital insurance by \$13,694,249; and supplementary medical insurance by \$21,870,242; making a total increase in administrative expenses of \$64,931,400.

This adds up to a total obligation figure of \$1,109,640,000. Provision for a \$25,000,000 unobligated contingency reserve brings the total appropriation request to \$1,134,640,000.

SSA—LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION; TRUST FUND

1971 enacted	1972 request	Committee bill	Change from 1971	Change from 1972
(\$2,800,000)	(\$18,194,000)	(\$18,194,000)	(+\$15,394,000)	No change.
(\$20,357,000) ¹	(13,314,000)	(13,314,000)	(-7,043,000)	Do.

¹ Obligation.

Comments: The 1971 appropriation provides \$2,800,000 for the acquisition of sites and the design of district office buildings in 30 selected cities. The 1972 appropriation request for \$18,194,000 in budget authority will provide for the acquisition of sites and the design of buildings to house four of the six payment centers operated by the Social Security Administration. Funds for construction of these facilities will be requested in a subsequent year.

THE OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

For the Office of Child Development, the bill includes \$14,251,000, a reduction of \$2,000,000 from the budget request and an increase of \$4,434,000 over the comparable 1971 appropriation.

As noted in our committee report, the funds requested for the Headstart program, amounting to \$376,817,000 are not included in the bill because the authorization for this program, which is contained in the Economic Opportunity Act has expired and has not yet been extended.

The Office of Child Development was initially established in 1969 to assume responsibility for operating Headstart and to continue those functions of the Children's Bureau as mandated by the act of 1912. Located in the Office of the Secretary, OCD encompasses two Bureaus—the Bureau of Headstart and Child Service Programs, and the Children's Bureau. The Office serves as a focal point for developing and leading DHEW efforts to improve and expand the scope of programs and services designed to improve the quality of life for children and youth throughout the Nation.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT—RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

The administration request for research and demonstrations was \$13,500,000, an increase of \$8,000,000 over the comparable 1971 level.

The purpose of this program is to provide financial support for special research or demonstration projects in the field of child welfare which are of regional or national significance; and special projects for the demonstration of new methods or facilities which show promise of substantial contribution to the advancement of child welfare services. Grants may be made at 95 percent cost to the Federal Government to public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations engaged in research or child welfare activities. Grantees are required to provide at least 5 percent of total direct costs.

Funds provided in 1971 supported the following projects:

- Development of a multimedia course in child care for high school students;
- Design of alternative mechanisms for child advocacy at the local level;
- Demonstrations of methods to bring about change in institutional care of children;
- Demonstration of training programs for foster parents;
- Development of a parent education program for mothers using public pediatric clinics; and
- Development of curriculum and certification procedures for new career child care workers.

For this program for 1972, your committee provided \$11,500,000, which is \$2,000,000 below the budget request, but \$6,000,000 over the comparable level for 1971. This is more than a doubling of funds for this program, and the increase will enable work in areas such as demonstration of different models of day care; impact of television on young children; demonstrations to provide a male identity for fatherless boys; child development programs for children from varied socio-economic backgrounds; and demonstrations to increase the adoption of hard-to-place children.

High priority in 1972 will be placed on demonstration and evaluation of different models for day care.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT—WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

For this budget item, your committee has provided the amount of the budget request—\$304,000—which is \$2,237,000 below the comparable figure for last year.

Once each decade since 1909, the President has convened a White House Conference on Children and Youth. Traditionally, the conference has consisted of a single event for both children and youth, but the 1970 conference was split, with the Children's Conference held in December 1970, and the Conference on Youth held in the spring of this year—1971.

The funds will provide for follow-through on both these conferences and phasing out of the operation.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Salaries and expenses other than those not related to administration of the Headstart program were not considered by the committee. For non-Headstart S. & E. activities, the committee provided the budget request of \$2,447,000, an increase of \$671,000 over the comparable 1971 appropriation.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

The committee bill provides \$10,830,000, the budget request, for the Office for Civil Rights, an increase of \$2,137,000 over the comparable 1971 figure.

The Office for Civil Rights is responsible for administering title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination as to race, color, or national origin in programs and activities which receive Federal financial assistance. Additionally, this office insures compliance with Executive orders on equal employment opportunity at universities, hospitals, and other institutions holding Government contracts.

This appropriation provides funding of salaries and expenses for staff of the Office for Civil Rights, both at headquarters and field.

Compliance enforcement: To date 2,300 colleges and universities receiving Federal assistance have been surveyed; 1,100 have been selected for compliance reviews with 470 such reviews completed. To date 36 State health and social service departments have been reviewed for compliance with onsite visits to approximately 2,650 local agencies and facilities, including about 1,100 hospital and nursing homes. To date, 680 contract compliance reviews have been conducted. It is anticipated that approximately 2,-

103 nonconstruction and 600 construction projects reviews will be completed during fiscal year 1971.

In the area of education, OCR will carry out a stepped-up compliance program emphasizing national origin minority discrimination and investigate compliance status of those districts applying for funds for assistance in desegregation. In the area of health and social services, the Office for Civil Rights plans to complete State agency reviews still outstanding and to continue providing training to State agency staffs responsible for making onsite reviews. OCR plans to complete 5,900 compliance reviews of contractor facilities by the end of fiscal year 1972.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

This budget item includes funds for the following activities of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare: executive direction, public information, community and field services, legal services, financial management, facilities engineering and construction, administrative management, and surplus property utilization.

The budget request for departmental management for fiscal 1972 was \$58,400,000, and the committee bill provides this amount. This represents an increase of \$3,297,000 over the comparable 1971 appropriation figure.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

Turning now to the related agencies, your committee did not consider budget requests for several of them because authorizing legislation for them for fiscal 1972 had not been enacted, or because the requests were included in budget amendments which were received too late for consideration.

These agencies are Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People, Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, Commission on Railroad Retirement, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and Office of Economic Opportunity.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The budget request for this agency was \$48,468,000 and your committee recommends the full amount, which is \$6,641,000 above last year.

The funds are requested to enable the agency to process the anticipated 38,600 unfair labor practice and representation cases to be filed in this fiscal year. This is a total increase of 12 percent in unfair labor practice work, and 5 percent in representation work in 1972. They believe these estimates to be on the conservative side.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

For the National Mediation Board, the committee bill provides \$2,796,000, the amount of the request and \$342,000 over the 1971 level. As stated in the committee report, the major portion of the requested increase is to raise the rate of compensation of neutral members of adjustment boards.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The committee bill includes \$20,757,000, the amount of the request and \$788,000 over last year. As noted in our report, this appropriation is to pay the eighth of 10 yearly installments on the

amount due the railroad retirement account for creditable military service by railroad workers through June 30, 1963.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

This agency would be funded at a level of \$10,289,000, the amount of the request and an increase of \$563,000 over the 1971 level. The increased funds will be used primarily for increased pay costs and for increased travel incidents to training programs for mediators.

U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

The U.S. Soldiers' Home under this bill, would receive a trust fund appropriation of \$11,353,000 for operation and maintenance. This is the amount of the request and \$796,000 over the 1971 appropriation. The bill also includes \$80,000, the amount of the budget request, for capital outlay. This is \$48,000 below last year.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Finally, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission would be provided \$400,000 under this bill—the amount of the request and \$325,000 over last year. The Commission was started this spring and is made up of three members appointed by the President. Its function is the adjudication of occupational safety and health enforcement actions initiated by the Department of Labor which are contested by employers, by employees, or by representatives of employees.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman on the levels of the President's recommendations? I was under the impression the committee disregarded most of them and went over the President's recommendations by over \$100 million.

Mr. MICHEL. That is true. There are changes which are in prospect if we will give them an opportunity to be enacted. We have several pieces of legislation which are currently languishing, but which hopefully will soon be considered by the Congress. Hopefully we would like to see those enacted into legislation so we can see those improvements in this area.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman, before he leaves the text before him, give me again the figures and the years with respect to the increases—from \$3 billion to what was the amount?

Mr. MICHEL. I was saying the Federal Government is getting more and more involved in this whole business of health. Since 1960 when the Federal Government was involved to the extent of \$3.5 billion, to the point where now we see a figure of \$22.2 billion this year in this whole health field. So we have been doing a considerable amount in the past several years particularly.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. DENNIS. What is the anticipated total budgetary deficit for this year at the present time?

Mr. MICHEL. As the gentleman well knows, there was a planned deficit of something like \$11.2 billion. In view of the add-ons to appropriation bills thus far, and revenues not meeting those projected earlier in the year, I would not be surprised to see a deficit in the current fiscal year in excess of that for 1971, so it would have to be in excess of \$22 billion or \$23 billion.

That is why we are making the point here today. Even though we have added \$321 million to the bill we would hope the Members of the Committee of the Whole would stand by our recommendations and not add an additional \$230 million or more that will be proposed in a package amendment.

Mr. DENNIS. I would say to the gentleman I certainly concur. I even wonder whether we ought to add \$321 million or, as the gentleman has pointed out, really \$565 million to the budget, under those circumstances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Does the \$14 million-plus which the gentleman referred to as being on public assistance rolls take into account title IV of the Social Security Amendments of 1971 which recently passed the House?

Mr. MICHEL. You mean the so-called welfare reform?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Yes.

Mr. MICHEL. I am talking about a total figure including old-age assistance, disabled, and those on AFDC.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Will we not have that figure, more than \$14 million, whether or not title IV of the Social Security Amendments of 1971 finally becomes law?

Mr. MICHEL. I am just saying—

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I am talking about the guaranteed annual wage provision described as the family assistance plan of the bill we recently passed here in the House.

Mr. MICHEL. Right. Of course, there was no question but during the course of the debate on this in the first few years we were going to have an additional expenditure, but it seems to me over the long haul, after a 4- or 5-year period of time, if the work incentives portion of that legislation is really effective, we may still have some opportunity for eating into this ever-increasing number of individuals who are simply drawing benefits without working.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn now, if I may, to address myself specifically to those additional views expressed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and several other members of the full committee.

These separate views, as they appear in our report, are fraught with all kinds of discrepancies and misstatements of fact.

The separate views said that "the administration requested trimming activities for the National Institutes of Health

for 1972 to \$1,283 million." The actual request was nearly \$9 million higher, as can be noted in the table appearing on page 66 of our report.

In the \$100 million cancer initiative, if it is included, that amount is almost the same as that enacted last year and not "significantly below last year's budget," as my colleagues state.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I will in just a moment. Let me make a couple of other points, and then the gentleman can ask his questions.

This is not the whole story, for when you look at the appropriation for the research Institutes on a comparable basis, the administration's budget represented a real increase of more than \$25 million over the 1971 level. And, when you look at the NIH research budget on a 2-year basis, the total increase in this bill plus the increases added last year represent a 35 percent bigger NIH research budget over 1970—an additional \$348 million.

My colleagues charge that four Institutes were cut sharply below last year's budget level by the administration. This is simply not the case. Two of them were cut by a total of \$7 million—out of a total budget of \$1.48 billion—and these two were more than restored by our committee. Besides restoring everything to the 1971 level, we added approximately 6 percent for a cost-of-research increase, and approved all the increases recommended by the administration.

With respect to the Cancer Institute, the additional views of the gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues say that "the administration's 1972 budget recommended a further cut in NCI funds below the fiscal year 1971 level." This is simply not true. There was an increase, though quite modest, in addition to the much-heralded \$100 million increase.

Now would the gentleman like me to yield to him at this point?

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman continually turns back to the 1971 level. Does not the gentleman think that we ought to look forward and not backward in looking at our appropriations? Why does the gentleman use a level like 1971 when admittedly the appropriations for health were at a low level. The high point of the NIH appropriations was in 1969. In 1970 and 1971 those fiscal year appropriations were lower than that year generally. Now we are looking at the 1971 budget. The percentages that the gentleman speaks about of increase I do not think confound the points that we made in our separate and dissenting views. The fact is that the increases made by the administration over 1971 were woefully inadequate and the committee did not add significantly to those inadequate levels.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is certainly entitled to his opinion, but I want to go on and point out a few other discrepancies in the remarks of the gentleman, because it is quite obvious that these views were taken in no small part from the so-called coalition for full funding, whatever that is, and a good deal of their information was outdated.

I think I should make the point here that the approved unfunded backlog for the National Cancer Institute is \$21.3 million.

The increase of \$104 million that is being provided in 1972 is more than sufficient to fund this backlog, if this is determined to be the most productive approach. The Director of NIH has repeatedly stated that they would not fund the lowest priority approved research grant applications without additional review and consideration.

Now, if I might turn to the National Heart and Lung Institute, our committee has provided a \$16 million increase over the budget which actually represents a \$20 million increase over the comparable figures for fiscal year 1971. To keep this whole thing in perspective, I should point out and would remind you that in fiscal year 1971 the Heart and Lung Institute received a \$35 million increase over fiscal year 1970.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to make a little announcement about the flight that is in progress?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from California for that purpose.

FLIGHT OF APOLLO 15

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. MILLER of California. I hope I do not destroy the line of thought of the gentleman from Illinois, but I know you are all interested in knowing that the test that was made earlier, around 2 o'clock this afternoon, was very successful and the vehicle is on its way proceeding in a normal fashion toward the moon.

Mr. MICHEL. That is good news, I will say to the gentleman from California.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), my dear friend, and his colleagues charge that "restrictive budgets have compelled the Heart Institute to cut back on a number of its major research projects." And they say that "the famous Framingham study of the causal factors contributing to heart disease has been terminated for lack of funds."

Again, my colleagues are in error. The Framingham study, far from being terminated, is being continued through the combined support of a National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke grant to investigators at Boston University, National Heart and Lung Institute funds and private capital.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Is the gentleman saying that the Framingham report is going to continue on the same high level of funding as it has been in the past, or is it being eliminated?

Mr. MICHEL. It is not being eliminated.

Mr. YATES. Is the gentleman telling the House that the Framingham study is going to be continued?

Mr. MICHEL. It is quite obvious that it has not been terminated at this particular point and will go on in so long as it is effective.

Mr. YATES. Is it not being liquidated?

Mr. MICHEL. Not insofar as I know.

Mr. YATES. It is my information that it is being liquidated because of lack of adequate funding.

Mr. MICHEL. It is being continued through the combined support of the National Institute on Neurological Diseases and Stroke at Boston University. If the gentleman is being told one thing and we are being told another, that is something else.

My colleagues say that "the projected long-term diet-heart study, which has been highly recommended by heart experts, has not been launched because of a lack of funds." Contrary to this statement, a large institutionalized human population is under study right now to ascertain if dietary modification can prevent the occurrence of heart attacks.

Mr. YATES. How large a study?

Mr. MICHEL. I cannot tell the gentleman how much it is in money, but we have to take the word of the people out at the National Heart Institute who do not seem to know what the gentleman is talking about when the gentleman makes that charge. I called them and asked them about this and they wondered what study you had in mind.

Mr. YATES. It is the study that has been underway for some time which has not been funded.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, there are all kinds of people who want all of this Federal money around here coming in with all kinds of requests under the sun. This may be a friend of yours who did not get what he thought he ought to have.

Mr. YATES. Maybe the gentleman and I ought to visit the Heart Institute together and perhaps we would come out with the same understanding.

Mr. MICHEL. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the heart cooperative drug study is currently underway at 53 clinics with 8,300 patients enrolled. Our subcommittee was told that patient recruitment was completed in June of 1969 and the clinical phase of the project will be completed in 1974, by which date all patients will have completed a 5-year period of carefully supervised study. This does not sound as though the study was in any serious trouble, but even so, our committee has provided more than enough funds to keep it on schedule.

My colleagues refer to the cardiovascular research centers, stating that 14 are ready to go into operation, but lack funds. Here they are wrong again. The committee bill and the budget provide \$16.4 million for the cardiovascular centers in 1972. And in fact, the Institute has just announced the establishment of 34 centers in the following areas: arteriosclerosis, 13; chronic lung disease, 11; hypertension, five; thrombosis, five.

Turning to the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, our committee did provide an increase of \$12 million above the budget recommenda-

tion. Mr. YATES and the rest of his group have charged in their views with respect to the collaborative perinatal project that "research will have to be cut back on 50 percent of the children who have been studied. . . ."

Here again my colleagues are in gross error. In the first place, our committee instructed that \$1.5 million be put back specifically in this program and there is more than enough in the overall increase we have provided to restore the full \$2.1 million that showed up as a reduction in the budget.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes in order to conclude my presentation.

Mr. Chairman, it might be well to take just a moment to tell you that this project has been going on now for over 10 years, and has cost over \$100 million so far with 60,000 pregnancies having been studied. The project is a very ambitious one, following these children from conception through 8 years of age. Our data collection is nearing completion, and the last children in the study will reach the age of 8 in 1974. Analysis of a very large volume of data is well underway.

During our hearings we were advised that Secretary Richardson had made a study of the program and had determined that it could take a cut of \$2.1 million and still accomplish its main objectives. Had the cut been sustained, it would simply have stretched the data processing and analyzing time, and would in no way have endangered the basic research effort.

Mr. YATES, and others, contend that the budget as originally sent to us was insufficient for stroke, mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and so forth, but I would simply point out that many HEW programs are directed at these problems, and the budget for any one disease cannot be associated with any one HEW organization. For example, in the area of mental retardation, a number of agencies in HEW deal with the problem from their own special perspective. Not only is the NIH involved, but the Office of Education, the Social and Rehabilitation Service, the Social Security Administration, the Health Service, and the Mental Health Administration. The budget for mental retardation was not reduced for fiscal year 1972, but rather increased by \$27 million.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that in this \$100 million proposed increase for NIH the author of the amendment is thinking of a breakdown that would earmark an additional \$25 million for the Heart and Lung Institute, \$25 million for General Medical Sciences, \$20 million for neurological diseases and stroke, \$18 million for child health and \$12 million for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.

In the latter item, our committee has added nearly \$13 million over the budget, bringing this Institute up to an appropriation level of over \$148 million.

In the Institute of General Medical Sciences your committee added some \$18 million over the budget, bringing that

Institute up to a funding level for fiscal year 1972 of \$168.4 million.

Now, as for the Institute of Child Health and Human Development, in fiscal year 1970 we appropriated \$75.5 million for this Institute. In fiscal year 1971 it was funded at a level of \$93.6 million.

The 1972 budget came to us with a \$10 million increase and our committee added another \$6.4 million to that, bringing us to a total of \$109.6 million. That is a whopping 50 percent increase since 1970.

In the additional views expressed on the subject of alcoholism, our colleagues leave the impression that the administration is not attuned to the gravity of the problem and that our committee was too tight-fisted in providing only \$25 million in formula grants for the Alcoholism Abuse Act.

By way of quick review, in 1970 HEW programs to curb alcoholism were funded at a level of \$30 million.

In 1971 the outlay was almost \$42 million and in this bill for fiscal year 1972 with the additional \$25 million added by our committee, funds for all HEW alcoholism programs will total more than \$94 million. The National Institute of Mental Health alone will be responsible for more than \$60 million of this amount.

I should point out that the formula grant funds provided in the committee bill are in addition to the estimated \$34.5 million requested by the Social and Rehabilitation Service that would be distributed in formula grants for the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

Mr. YATES' amendment proposes to add \$50 million to the Hill-Burton hospital construction. Our committee has more than doubled the budget on this item, bringing it up to \$172.2 million for construction and sufficient funds to guarantee \$1 billion in loans with a 3-percent interest subsidy in the fiscal year 1972. Conceivably these loan guarantees could provide us with 21,000 new beds. I think it is inconceivable to think that we would meet all of our hospital construction requirements in 1 year's time, and it is highly impractical to take the position that hospitals are not going to be built except with Federal grants of so-called free money.

The critical need throughout the country is for outpatient facilities. Many cities actually have an excess of acute care beds. Outpatient facilities have the least capability to repay a construction loan and therefore need grant support. And we do have sufficient funds in this bill to meet this particular need. In fact we are meeting full authorization on this item.

Hospitals receive a facility depreciation allowance as part of their regular payment under Medicare which will exceed \$400 million this year. These funds are available to repay guaranteed loans.

Previous estimates of the backlog in hospital construction—including HEW's—ignore recent and planned changes in the delivery of health services. A hospital is a long-term resource which we should not build on out-dated priorities and approaches to health care delivery.

The President's strategy for health delivery deemphasizes the acute care hospital bed and emphasizes outpatient and preventive care which is better and less expensive: HMO initiative, family health centers, emphasis on production of primary care physicians and physicians' assistants, Medicare, and Medicaid reimbursement for outpatient services.

With respect to the \$30 million in the package for communicable disease, the President's budget request already included: \$33.6 million in the diseases control appropriation for communicable disease programs; \$19.3 million in the comprehensive health planning and services appropriation for rubella immunization and venereal disease project grants; \$10 million budget amendment in the comprehensive health planning and services appropriation for venereal disease and immunization programs.

The committee bill shifts the \$10 million increase from formula grants to project grants and added \$10 million for a total of \$20 million for communicable disease project grants. This \$20 million, that has been added since the President's budget was submitted last January, equals the amount which the Director of the National Center for Disease Control indicated could be effectively utilized in fiscal year 1972 in problems of communicable diseases. Additionally, HEW reprogrammed \$6 million in 1971 funds for the purchase of polio, measles, and measles/rubella vaccines.

On the subject of the \$20 million asked in the package as an addition to maternal and child health, the administration will request \$22 million to support HMO's in rural and center-city areas as soon as the authorizing legislation passes. These are the areas where maternal and child health is the poorest and the infant mortality rate highest.

The budget request and the committee bill under comprehensive health include a \$15 million increase for family health centers to serve rural and center-city areas where maternal and child health is the poorest. This is in addition to \$98 million in ongoing comprehensive health service programs.

The NIH research grant budget includes \$9.4 million for perinatal biology and infant mortality.

As for the \$10 million Mr. YATES and others request for patient care, HEW has told the subcommittee repeatedly that it will request additional funds if and when they are necessary to provide the same high quality care to all its beneficiaries as was provided through PHS hospitals and clinics in 1971. This amendment is premature.

The solution to the problem of lead-based paint poisoning is one that will require considerable support from State and local governments, as well as involvement of interested community groups and voluntary organizations. It is clear that a high level of cooperation and integration of effort is essential.

Efforts to eliminate the source of the problem—the presence of lead-based paint in dwellings—will require an increased level of enforcement of housing codes, dissemination of health informa-

tion to parents and heads of households, and most importantly, bringing the attention to landlords of the dangers of lead-based paint. Limited experience in Philadelphia and Washington, D.C., showed that in a majority of cases the landlord has deleaded his apartments—once informed of the potential dangers to child occupants—without resorting to legal action. To use Federal resources to methodically inspect and delead every one of the 4 million dwellings estimated to have lead-based paint would be enormously expensive.

The level of funding recommended by the committee—\$5 million—will allow the Department: First, to screen approximately 550,000 children; second, provide treatment to those who have been diagnosed as experiencing lead poisoning. In providing treatment on a continuing basis, communities will be encouraged to marshal existing resources, both local and Federal; for example, using neighborhood health care centers. This is in keeping with provisions of title I of the act which requires 25 percent contribution on the part of participating communities; third, provide title II grants to communities for detection of sources of lead in residential housing on surfaces commonly exposed to children. Communities will be encouraged and supported to develop programs of individual self-help, neighborhood organizations for voluntary action, community action in the development and enforcement of housing codes in attacking the problem of residential deleading; fourth, to evaluate the results of its new method of testing for lead poisoning, "microdot" blood testing which only requires a fingerprick sample. This new technology needs to be assessed carefully before it is employed on an expanded basis; fifth, to support a total management effort in 8 to 10 communities. As of July 1971, 13 States and cities—not 50, as contended by Mr. YATES, and others—have actually submitted proposals to the Department. We believe that communities should assume a greater part of the initiative and a major role in developing programs suited to their local needs; sixth, carry out the provision of the act under title IV which prohibits the use of lead based paint in dwellings constructed or rehabilitated with Federal assistance. The Department is developing a set of rules and guidelines to implement this provision. In the meantime, informal communication has been made with local and State officials to make them aware of this provision. Further, other Federal agencies have been alerted to the impact this provision will have on their responsibilities.

HEW's strategy to implement this act takes into account the need to establish close working relationships with various groups, governments, and organizations; allow us time to learn from experience to devise the most effective method of attacking this problem; and recognizes that the development of such an approach must be done within available Federal resources.

I would certainly hope that when the Members of this body vote on the increases which will be proposed on the

floor today that they will bear in mind these facts that I have cited.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman has made a very eloquent presentation of the increases in the appropriations that have been made by the administration, and by the committee.

Yet, I refer the gentleman to the hearings of the committee on page 572, to the interrogation by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), who asked Dr. Marston to put in the record a list of the projects that have been approved and have not been funded.

The committee went over the administration's budget by \$83 million for all the Institutes of Health. The number of projects, according to the table that appears on page 573—the number of approved projects for all the Institutes—is \$143 million and so the committee is \$60 million at the very least—\$60 million shy of taking care of the needs of all the Institutes.

Mr. MICHEL. It is the gentleman's view that every application we receive ought to be just automatically funded?

Mr. YATES. It is the gentleman's views that if you have a very able committee reviewing projects and deciding they ought to be funded, yes—they ought to be funded.

Mr. MICHEL. If they have not been funded within a year or two, I suppose you say they ought to be at the same level of priority depending on medical advances, of course?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Is it the gentleman's view that they should be overseen and should be surveyed and examined every year? I would assume, if a project is not looked at every year or two, some committee will decide whether or not a project ought to be continued and so far as I know this list that has been put into the RECORD at the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) is certainly up to date.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my friend at the microphone why it is with all the generosity of the committee that the committee has failed to increase the appropriation under social and rehabilitation services insofar as it relates to child welfare services. This sum has been \$46 million for the past 3 years. It relates to the most disadvantaged children in America and, yet, the committee has not seen fit to increase that amount despite the fact that this administration promised to increase it and your committee also has promised to increase it, but it still stays stagnant at the figure of \$46 million.

Mr. MICHEL. I do not know that merely adding Federal dollars to some of these particular programs is going to be the entire answer. You know that in this thing the local communities are put-

ting up 93 percent of the money and there is only 7 percent of Federal money here.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. That is what I am getting at. Why should the Federal Government discriminate against the most disadvantaged children in America and contribute 75 to 83 percent to children under the AFDC program and then only contribute 7 percent toward the upkeep of these children who have no parents, no guardians, and who are the wards of the State and who are being sent out to rural areas to work in the fields and on the farms. This amount has only been \$46 million, when the House Committee on Ways and Means 3 years ago increased the authorization up to \$110 million a year, which would bring the Federal Government's contribution up to approximately 19 or 20 percent. Why has the committee and why has this administration failed to keep their word and the promise it has made in the past 2 years that they would increase this sum at least up to the authorized figure?

Mr. MICHEL. Actually, the social security—and, of course, the gentleman serves on the Committee on Ways and Means—actually, the amendments of 1967 on the Social Security Act have for the first time included child welfare services along with aid to families with dependent children.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. But these are the facts.

Mr. MICHEL. I would like to answer the gentleman's question, if I may.

Let me make several points:

First, H.R. 1 contains a provision which would authorize a special program of foster care and adoptions. It would authorize \$150 million in 1972 for this purpose. This would be requested in a later supplemental appropriation, after H.R. 1 is passed.

Second, another aspect of child welfare services—day care—is adequately covered by other initiatives in the budget and legislative programs. For example, child care under WIN would reach \$78 million under the committee bill, an increase of \$51.6 million over 1971. Day care services would be substantially expanded under H.R. 1.

Third, child welfare services are essentially State and local programs. There is little evidence to show that an increased Federal appropriation would actually result in an increased level of services. More than likely, Federal funds would simply be substituted for State funds.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. The Committee on Ways and Means increased the authorization to \$110 million. But your committee has kept the sum frozen at \$46 million.

Mr. MICHEL. We go on the basis of the kind of testimony we get before our particular committee.

The gentleman, of course, has made this eloquent case year after year. He is exceptionally bugged about it. But we do not seem to be getting the same kind of

reaction around the country. I do not recall having received one letter from the people back home telling me that they are being shortchanged on this subject.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Three of the largest child welfare agencies in the country—the Jewish philanthropic group, the Protestant group and the Catholic group—have written to every Member of the Congress year in and year out. The facts are that these children have no political muscle. They have no political muscle and there is no voice being raised about their problem. There is a failure on the part of this administration and this committee to recognize these poor, disadvantaged children who have no voice in this Government. I say there is a moral responsibility on the part of the Congress to recognize this scandalous condition that exists in America where young children are being raised and sent into society with no education, very poor nutrition, and under the worst conditions imaginable, living as badly as they do in Bangkok and India. Yes, that is how badly they live.

If any Member can go home tonight and put his head on his pillow and go to sleep with a clear conscience knowing that these youngsters, 650,000 of them in America, over 300,000 of them black, are living in these conditions, maybe we might be able to do something about it. I do not know. But I say we have a responsibility to these children. They are the future citizens of America. This administration has not kept their word as they gave it to me that they would put in these funds, and I am going to offer an amendment to do so. I hope the gentleman will support it.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman talks about "this administration." Were these the 1967 Social Security Amendments?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. How much was put in by the administration in 1967?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. The last administration was just as lame as this one on this matter.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Very well.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Most of the political leaders on both sides of the aisle have been very lame in this matter because these children are the voiceless children of America.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman is saying that the Democratic administration was negligent in this area and it has not been corrected by the present administration.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I am saying both administrations and the Committee on Appropriations have been negligent in this matter. They have ignored the plight of these children because the children have no political power.

Mr. MICHEL. If I may make a further observation before I conclude, on the strength of the gentleman's very eloquent presentation here today, certainly we will have to take this record into account when we come up this coming year in the hearings to get more specific in-

formation that might either corroborate or dispute what the gentleman has said. We are funding here today what we think is reasonable in this area, and to say that we are completely ignoring the poor groups in this country by what we are appropriating in this bill is an erroneous impression to leave with Members of this House.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I intend to offer today contains three basic features:

First, it would increase from \$518 to \$575 million funds available under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the basic State-Federal formula grant program. As a corollary of this increased appropriation, the amendment would also change the allotment base—a formula used for distribution, but not itself an appropriation—from \$530 to \$600 million. In this section, I have also specifically earmarked funds for rehabilitation facility improvement and have increased those funds by \$5 million.

Second, this amendment would increase from \$16.2 to \$30 million the State-Federal formula grant funds necessary to implement the Developmental Disabilities Services and Construction Act passed by the Congress in 1970.

Finally, this amendment would restore to fiscal year 1971 levels the funds for research and development in rehabilitation, increasing the \$24 million recommended to \$31 million.

The total cost of these proposals would be \$82.5 million, but those familiar with rehabilitation programs know that the total savings are far greater.

First, a report of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee in February 1970 showed that vocational rehabilitation had a cost-effectiveness ratio more than twice that of any other program in the general manpower or manpower-related fields.

Second, a study published in 1969 showed that disabled persons rehabilitated in a year through the State-Federal program had dramatically increased lifetime earnings, a conservative estimate showing \$8 increased earnings for each dollar of the social cost of the rehabilitation services. Taxpayers obviously share in this kind of successful program, not only through increased taxes paid by rehabilitants but also in the reduction in tax supported maintenance payments. Rehabilitation Services Administrator Dr. Edward Newman, in testifying before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee—point 4, page 14—noted that:

The most important savings stem from sustaining individuals as productive and tax-paying members of society instead of dependent on public support, from the preventive role of rehabilitation in keeping people off the welfare rolls and lessening entry into publicly supported institutions.

Third, as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) pointed out in those hearings, some States will receive less money in fiscal year 1972 than they did in fiscal year 1971. It was noted that the appropriation necessary just to main-

tain current efforts in all States—that is to assure that no State would receive less than it had in 1971—is \$552 million, in contrast to the \$518 million in the bill and the \$575 million my amendment proposes.

Fourth, as was further noted in the hearings, the people well served under the program are still a small fraction of those who could profitably use rehabilitation programs. Dr. Newman said his guess was that between 6 and 8½ million people could use such services, while less than a million will do so next year. As Mr. Shriver said, "we have a long way to go."

Fifth, the States are quite capable of meeting and are willing to meet increased formula commitments from the Federal Government, sensing perhaps, as many Members of this House have, that this is a self-help, dependency-fighting program. In its budget justification—hearings, part 4, page 295—the administration states that:

Estimates of state funds available by fiscal year 1972 reflect the enthusiastic support being given by the states to vocational rehabilitation and to the possibilities for program expansion and improvement of services available under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Sixth, my amendment proposes to specifically earmark funds for rehabilitation facility improvement—now part of the budget but not of the bill—and to increase those funds by \$5 million, by way of beginning to render more livable and pleasant the facilities within which rehabilitation programs take place.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that some \$23 million placed in this bill for rehabilitation of public assistance recipients is innovative funding, but in no way compensates for de facto cuts in rehabilitation programs supporting other handicapped people.

Public assistance recipients have, in fact, been rehabilitated in the past under the existing, proven, State-Federal program. In fiscal year 1969 there were 24,475 persons receiving public assistance at the time of their acceptance into rehabilitation programs, at an annual cost of \$36 million. At the time these individual cases were evaluated, 14,032 persons were still receiving public assistance, at an annual rate of \$19 million—a reduction of \$17 million in welfare payments, which should, for proper evaluation, be added to the \$53 million in improved earnings those individuals had in their first year after rehabilitation.

In sum, rehabilitation for public assistance recipients is fine, and is even done well under the current program. While the \$23 million in project grants proposed by the administration in conjunction with H.R. 1 is innovative, it does not substitute for ongoing rehabilitation programs.

DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Last year Congress enacted the developmental disabilities services and facilities construction amendments. In this move, Congress expanded the former

Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act in three ways: First, the scope of the former program was broadened to include not only the mentally retarded but also persons suffering from other handicaps originating in childhood, such as cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and other neurological diseases. Second, the program was expanded to include support for a full array of service programs as well as construction of community facilities. Finally, States were granted greatly increased responsibility for planning and implementing a comprehensive network of services under a new formula grant program.

While the fiscal year 1972 authorization level for these programs is \$105 million, \$11.2 million was requested in the budget. The Labor-HEW Subcommittee and the Full Appropriations Committee, recognizing the inadequacy of that figure, has added \$5 million to the budget for developmental disabilities programs, and I wish to compliment the committee on that action. The \$16.2 million called for in the committee bill, however, still falls far short of the amount needed to mount an effective formula grant program. In addition, the figure recommended by the committee is less than that amount appropriated by Congress for construction of community facilities alone in fiscal year 1968.

In other words, Congress has increased sharply the number of persons potentially eligible for assistance and also has broadened the program to include support for services as well as construction, and yet is considering appropriating less funds in 1972 than in 1968.

In asking whether or not there is a need for such funds, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) received the following response from Dr. Newman:

There is no question on the first assessment that we are going to find there are an awful lot of unmet needs and that there are going to be some bonafide proposals which will be coming into the State planning agencies in order to have these needs taken care of.

Dr. Newman further elaborated in noting that:

The administration has felt because of fiscal constraints that this is all the money that might be available at this time, but in answer to your question about the state capabilities for expending moneys for the purposes for which they were intended, I would say that the states will have a thoughtful list of projects to which they could address these resources. (pg. 253, 254).

Further evidence to the need for increased funding for developmental disability programs lies in this budget justification narrative—page 311:

Almost all public institutions are overcrowded, many seriously understaffed, and administered under outdated theories. Yet, nearly every state has a long list of individuals waiting for admission to such residential facilities.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, there are known needs and working programs to meet those needs in the field of developmental disabilities. A modest funding increase, still not approaching that \$105 million authorized, will demonstrate congressional intent to help the disabled help

themselves, perhaps even more convincingly than the unanimous votes by which this legislation was passed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposes to hold the line on research and development expenditures in the field of rehabilitation—restoring projected cuts to the fiscal year 1971 level. No justification for the \$7 million cut planned has been presented, although the obvious result is that few, if any, new research or demonstration programs would be approved in fiscal year 1972. We have seen the result of such cuts in other expensive health fields—innovation stops, research teams disband, false economies are made. It would take years to recover from such an event in rehabilitation, and mere restoration of fiscal year 1971 funds will help avoid that.

(Mrs. GRASSO, at the request of Mr. GIAMMO, was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, insufficient, inadequate and generally unreliable health care are widespread realities in our land.

We are a nation of wealth and technology. At this moment, we are transporting three men through the void of space to the moon. Yet, our system of transporting patients and delivering health services is in shambles.

Our Nation has the highest standard of living and per capita income in the world. Yet, we rank the 13th in infant mortality, and countless numbers of families are financially ruined by health catastrophes every year.

Our Nation leads the world in medical technology and surgical techniques. Still, we have been unwilling to provide adequate funds to save and rebuild lives as we can and must.

The action of the committee in regard to funding, while commendable in some respects, is inadequate. Funds have been added, but are not sufficient. The committee's actions do little more than restore previous cuts, and are a far cry from promoting solutions to our health crisis.

The amendments before us today begin to reorder priorities. They at least recognize that this Nation faces a health crisis and not a minor problem.

The amendments offered by my distinguished colleague from Connecticut would add a total of \$82.4 million to provide services for the handicapped. These rehabilitation services are desperately needed, and we must act now. Even with this amendment, the appropriation is below the amount authorized; but the amendment at least provides the minimum funding necessary to carry on a viable rehabilitation program.

The amendment offered by the gentlemen from Massachusetts and Illinois would provide funds for seven programs presently in need of more money. The amendment would add \$30 million for communicable disease control, a program the administration has chosen to ignore; \$50 million would be added to Hill-Burton grants to help meet the crying need for more health facilities. In total, the

amendment adds \$230 million to the committee recommendation. This amendment is the first step toward improving our deteriorating health care system.

The amendment offered by my distinguished colleagues from New York and Hawaii would add \$15 million for training of personnel in the field of mental retardation as well as funds for the construction and operation of new university affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded, another area neglected by the committee bill.

The amendments offered today would increase funds for the National Institutes of Health, patient care, maternal and child care, alcoholism programs, vocational rehabilitation, personnel training and other purposes. It has been argued by some that to increase funding in this area would be inflationary. Yet, strangely, farm subsidies for the rich, and needless defense appropriations, are not considered inflationary by many of the same people. The money these amendments would appropriate are minimal in relation to total Federal appropriations. If we do nothing extra, and let the health care situation deteriorate further, even more money will be needed in the future. The time is now if we seriously intend to attack this problem.

In a nation where entire areas of States are without doctors, where the handicapped are denied dignity and training, where even the wealthy cannot find treatment—not to take action when we have the ability is a crime with few historical precedents. I urge adoption of these amendments, not as a solution to the health crisis, but to demonstrate our determination to attack and conquer this monstrous problem.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I support the recommendations of this subcommittee. Of course, all of us would like to have more money to fund all the programs that are carried in this bill. I know the subcommittee worked long and hard on the bill. There are hundreds and hundreds of pages of testimony taken in the many hours of hearings on all these programs.

I believe that in substance and in general the committee came out with a fair bill. Last year I offered the package

amendment to this bill. It amounted to \$360,500,000. We did not prevail. I am not buying the package this year. Mr. Chairman, I am not buying the package because the committee in its recommendations for the various programs that we attempted to more fully fund last year has funded them to an extent greater than the amount of funding provided in the package amendment which was offered last year. I think this committee has dealt fairly with these programs. We would all like to see more money appropriated for them. But this subcommittee under the chairmanship of Mr. FLOOD and ably assisted by the ranking minority member, Mr. MICHEL and the other members of the committee have done a good job in bringing this bill to the floor. As on all appropriation bills, there must be some reliance on the work and the judgment of those who have heard the witnesses—departmental and otherwise—who seek to justify the amounts for specific programs funded in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the bill as it relates to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommends a total of \$18,959,690,000. This amount is \$350,930,000 above the amount recommended in the budget. It is \$3,024,429,000 over the 1971 enacted bill. I need not remind the members of the committee that these figures will not be the same when this legislation comes back from the Senate. All of us know that there will be substantial increases and the final recommendations will have to be worked out in conference.

But I do say, Mr. Chairman, that this subcommittee has not skimmed on this budget and we ought to be grateful for what it has done. Experienced and dedicated people across the field of health and welfare are all interested and concerned—and rightfully so—about dollars allocated to their particular activities. No one blames them for seeking every penny they sincerely believe necessary to carry out the responsibilities and activities that this bill funds. But there is a corresponding responsibility of the Congress to insure that the funds are adequately and wisely spent. This, I submit, is what this subcommittee has done. This, too, is the responsibility that all of us carry in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I include, at this point, a table indicating the action of the subcommittee with reference to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

	1971 enacted to date	1972 estimates	1972 bill	1972 bill compared with—	
				1971 enacted	1972 estimates
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:					
Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....	1,501,669,000	1,620,279,000	1,872,856,000	+371,187,000	+252,577,000
National Institutes of Health.....	1,257,670,000	1,358,374,000	1,447,055,000	+189,385,000	+88,681,000
NIH Research Institutes.....	(1,191,800,000)	1 (1,291,841,000)	1 (1,379,722,000)	(+187,922,000)	(+87,881,000)
Social and Rehabilitation Service.....	10,518,595,000	12,445,160,000	12,457,582,000	+1,938,987,000	+12,422,000
Social Security Administration.....	2,599,886,000	3,110,296,000	3,109,546,000	+509,660,000	-750,000
Office of Child Development.....	7,992,000	16,251,000	14,251,000	+6,259,000	-2,000,000
Departmental management.....	49,449,000	58,400,000	58,400,000	+8,951,000	
Total HEW.....	15,935,261,000	18,608,760,000	18,959,690,000	+3,024,429,000	+350,930,000

¹ Includes \$100,000,000 advance appropriation for fiscal year 1972 for the National Cancer Institute contained in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1971 (Public Law 92-18).

I am particularly interested in the program to which the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMMO) will offer an amendment. He will seek to amend that section of the bill dealing with rehabilitation services and facilities. I intend to support his amendment when the bill is read. It is one of the few items in the bill with which I am not in agreement with the committee recommendation. It deals with vocational rehabilitation and is one of the major and useful activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Chairman, the programs under this activity produce payoffs that are incalculable in dollars, to say nothing of the tremendous benefits that inure physically, socially, and morally to those who are the beneficiaries of these vocational rehabilitation programs.

As so many Members of this House know, Mr. Chairman, the late, beloved, great Member of this House and chairman for so many years of this particular Appropriations Subcommittee, the Honorable John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island, nursed and guided this program in giant strides to achieve the great success that it now enjoys.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW and its chairman, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, for the legislation now before us.

This appropriations bill recognizes the country's needs in the field of health—needs that now approach the point of desperation.

I have talked to Chairman FLOOD about many of the health programs in this bill. And we agree wholly on their urgency.

DRUG ABUSE

I want to talk first today about drug abuse—a problem that has taken on all dimensions of an epidemic.

The committee seeks heartening new increases in many of the drug control programs scattered throughout HEW.

What is particularly promising, however, is the \$67 million appropriation for programs created by the new Drug Control Act.

The need for ample funding of such legislation hardly merits mention here.

Even a cursory glance at the statistics make it plain.

One study shows that more than 50 percent of our young people—yes, more than 50 percent—have experimented with drugs.

Marihuana has spread everywhere in our society.

And hard drugs like heroin and cocaine, once confined to the ghetto, are not far behind.

Addiction rates creep upward year by year, enslaving millions of Americans.

Like everyone else in this Chamber today, I am happy that the Congress is beginning to answer this threat.

ALCOHOLISM

Alcoholism poses a comparable threat. Indeed, it is probably the singlemost crippling drug problem in the United States today.

Directly or indirectly alcoholism darkens the lives of more than 36 million Americans.

It is responsible for countless traffic deaths, countless hours of lost production, countless broken homes, countless ruined lives.

The Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse Act, the legislation that would help prevent alcoholism and help salvage the millions already addicted, authorizes a \$100 million budget for fiscal 1972.

More than half of this budget—60 percent, in fact—is meant for formula grants to the States.

The administration did not request funds for this vital grant program—recommending no funds whatsoever for it.

The committee is asking for \$25 million to put this program into action.

VENEREAL DISEASE

Venereal disease is still another special problem that demands major new congressional action.

Like drug abuse and alcoholism, it has defied solution for too long now.

VD rates are almost exploding among the country's young people, reaching levels that even the most cheerless observer could not have envisioned a generation ago.

Gonorrhea and syphilis—the two major venereal diseases—are astonishingly commonplace.

Estimates of the increase in VD rates over the past few years range as high as 100 percent.

The Director of the Disease Control Center, warning that VD's growing virulence may soon make it resistant to treatment, asked for a \$16 million increase in the VD control program this year.

This increase, I want to emphasize, was considered merely adequate.

Yielding to outcries from the medical community, the administration submitted a budget amendment calling for a \$10 million increase.

The committee doubled this to \$20 million.

LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING

Chairman FLOOD's committee more than doubled the budget for lead poisoning programs.

Ghetto children, already the principal victims of our tainted environment, are most vulnerable to this disorder.

Chronically malnourished, they eat the paint they find flaking and peeling on the walls around them.

The paint is often lead based, an obsolete kind found chiefly in the old and rotting tenements of city ghettos.

It even tastes good, something like lemon drops.

But even a tiny dose of such lead is toxic, attacking the central nervous system in much the same way as mercury.

Larger doses can be lethal. Hundreds of children die each year.

Thousands more are left blind, retarded, even paralyzed.

Yet the administration sought only \$2 million for the lead-based Paint Poisoning Act—a comprehensive program aimed at treating lead poisoning and eliminating its sources.

The committee, I am happy to report, suggests \$5 million for this program.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

On still another front, the committee is trying to hasten the administration's

laggardly pace in promoting mental health.

The community mental health centers program has been a striking success ever since it was established in 1963.

It offered psychiatric services to millions of Americans, giving them an alternative to the prohibitively high cost of private treatment and to the grim State hospitals that are often little more than human warehouses.

In the last 2 years, however, the administration has approached this problem timidly.

Indeed, the administration has all but abandoned it.

The fiscal 1971 and 1972 budgets sought no funds for construction of new centers.

And, just as alarmingly, it adopted the regulation prohibiting any staffing grants to centers constructed without Federal funds.

This arbitrary regulation threatens scores of centers built largely through community initiative.

The committee has redressed these injustices, calling for \$10 million in new construction funds and \$135 million in staffing grants for all centers.

The administration has also shunned the children's mental health program enacted by the last Congress.

In fiscal 1971, and again in this fiscal year, the administration wordlessly pushed this program aside, requesting not even a token appropriation.

There is a clear need—in fact, a conspicuous need—for treating the mental disorders of children.

The committee has recognized it, proposing \$10 million to get this program started.

The psychiatric training budget is still another case in point.

The budget suggested just \$113 million for training grants, an alarming \$4 million decrease from the fiscal 1971 level, and called for a total phasing out of the psychiatric residency program.

This comes at a time when the need for more mental health personnel, urgent for more than a decade, has reached its peak.

The committee proposes an increase of almost \$7 million to restore this program to its fiscal 1971 level.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about cancer—the Nation's second leading killer and its most dreaded killer.

The committee recommends \$237.5 million for the National Cancer Institute, more than \$3 million above the amount requested.

This sum—when added to the \$100 million appropriation made in the second supplemental bill earlier this year—will give the institute about \$104 million more than it had last year.

Medical and scientific leaders, citing promising new breakthroughs in cancer research, have convinced the committee of the need for a dramatically expanded cancer program.

I, too, am convinced.

The new research programs sought here today may ultimately control cancer.

Mr. Chairman, I briefly mentioned what this bill seeks to do about the shocking growth of alcoholism and its

devastating effects upon the Nation and our people. It is not a matter that can be dealt with solely and simply by Federal officials and Federal dollars alone. Dedicated people interested in the commonweal have joined in many areas of this country to join the fight against the constant and continuing rise in alcoholism.

I noted and place in the RECORD an article from today's New York Times, July 27, 1971. R. Brinkley Smithers of New York City has contributed \$10 million to fight alcoholism. I congratulate him and I know the Members of this House join me in expressing the gratitude of this Nation for his generosity. For years, Mr. Smithers has been deeply concerned and interested in the problem of alcoholism. For years, he has been doing something about it. He climaxes those efforts with today's announcement. I commend it to the attention of every Member of this House:

\$10 MILLION GIVEN TO AID ALCOHOLICS—WALL STREET BANKER DONATES FUND TO ROOSEVELT HOSPITAL

(By Edward C. Burks)

Roosevelt Hospital has received a gift of \$10-million for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics, H. Whitfield Carhart, the president of the West Side institution announced yesterday.

The gift was made by R. Brinkley Smithers, a special partner in a Wall Street investment banking house and a philanthropist who for years has been especially interested in combating alcoholism.

The hospital described Mr. Smithers's gift as the largest single grant ever made by any individual or agency, including the Federal Government, to fight alcoholism.

The money is to be used to establish the Smithers Alcoholism Treatment and Training Center as an "integral part" of the hospital, providing detoxification, rehabilitation and professional training.

In a statement accompanying the announcement of the gift, Mr. Smithers said alcoholism ranked among the nation's major health problems, along with cancer and heart disease.

"In spite of the staggering toll taken by this disease in terms of human lives and resources, relatively little is being done to combat it because of public and professional misunderstanding," he said.

Earlier this year the New York Council on Alcoholism reported that "alcoholism is four times as widespread as other forms of addiction and results in six times as many deaths."

The council's report said a large number of alcoholics also used other addictive drugs. It cited a special survey showing that 60 per cent of the alcoholics tested were also using barbiturates and amphetamines and that 35 per cent were using heroin and opium.

MORTALITY RATE CITED

Underscoring the seriousness of alcoholism as a major health problem here, the Health Services Administration has reported a steady rise in the mortality rate from cirrhosis of the liver—from less than 1,500 in 1949 to more than 3,400 in 1969.

Mr. Smithers, who is 63 years old and a son of one of the founders of the International Business Machines Corporation, is also president of the Christopher D. Smithers Foundation, named for his father. In the last 15 years the foundation has made grants totaling \$5-million to treat alcoholism.

Since 1968, when Roosevelt Hospital started an alcoholism service described as the only such program in a private non-profit hospital in Manhattan, Mr. Smithers has been giving \$60,000 a year to the inpatient and outpatient programs of that service.

VAST EXPANSION SEEN

Dr. LeClair Bissell, an internist and an attending physician at the hospital with dual appointments in medicine and psychiatry has been coordinator of that service.

A hospital spokesman said that Dr. Bissell could be expected to coordinate the vastly expanded program that will be made possible by the new gift from Mr. Smithers.

There were no details announced yesterday on exactly how the money would be spent, although a spokesman said additional facilities through lease, purchase or construction would be necessary.

Mr. Smithers said the success of the existing alcoholism program at Roosevelt "prompted him to make the \$10-million grant. He noted that more than 100 patients were admitted to the hospital and about 325 outpatients were treated last year, but, he added, "What impresses me most, is that an additional 4,000 patients who were admitted for other reasons were found to have alcoholism."

Mr. Smithers, a resident of Locust Valley, L.I., was actively connected with I.B.M. and Wall Street investment banking houses prior to 1952, when he decided to devote his time to charity while remaining as a special partner in the family's brokerage firm, F. S. Smithers and Company.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I had a very interesting interchange with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) a few moments ago on what the administration had done in terms of advancing the cause of medical research in the National Institutes of Health. He said I was wrong. I say he is wrong. The best testimony in support of my position is stated by the committee itself in its report on page 19. I read from that page:

Official testimony on the estimates for the Institutes and research Divisions of NIH represented the budget as marking the beginning of a new and more vigorous phase in Federal support for medical research and expressed the hope that it will re-establish lost momentum in the research area. Even a cursory inspection of the budget justifications quickly dispels this optimistic view.

If that is not an answer to the statements by the gentleman from Illinois, I do not know what is. The testimony brought out by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) which appears in the hearings for the National Institutes of Health, is proof too that even the committee did not go far enough in providing funds for the various Institutes of Health.

Mr. Chairman, I will offer an amendment later with the sponsorship of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) to provide an additional approximately \$200 million appropriations for the various activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I think it is essential that we provide the funds that are necessary

to keep this Nation moving toward better health for the people of this country.

Six years ago, in 1965, the Appropriations Committee celebrated its centennial year. The distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), inserted in the RECORD a statement which is well worth remembering as we consider the amendment which I will offer today. The chairman quoted a noted man who wrote in the 19th century that—

If our Republic were blotted from the earth and from the memory of mankind, and if no record of its history survived, except a copy of our revenue laws and our appropriation bills for a single year, the political philosopher would be able from these materials alone to reconstruct a large part of our history, and sketch with considerable accuracy the character and spirit of our institutions.

Surely, that century-old statement is as relevant today as it was at the time it was spoken. There are few more accurate measures of our national character than the way this Congress chooses to spend funds from the public's treasury.

I noticed a study the other day, Mr. Chairman, of what the costs of the war in Vietnam will approximate, going into the next century. A professor from the University of Idaho estimated that the costs will exceed \$400 billion, including veterans' benefits. The record of those appropriations has been written. But what will history record about this Congress? What will it say about our record in the field of health? What are we doing to make our people healthier and to make the people of the world healthier?

I think that the administration's record in allocating funds for health care has been very dismal. As a result of retrenchment by the administration in this field the morale of the researchers has fallen, concern and worry has arisen, the institutions cannot plan rationally for the future.

The graduate students and postdoctoral fellows have become alarmed. Those who contemplate entering fields of research wonder whether their future careers will be sustained by adequate appropriations to permit them to research into the cause and cure of the killers of mankind, the diseases that are still present among us.

The committee recommendation for NIH, though an improvement over the budget, represents at best a standpat approach to medical research that looks backward to last year's funding rather than forward to next year's progress in combating disease.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill we are considering today for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare represents the largest funding bill for fiscal 1972. When the General Treasury funds and the trust funds in this bill are added up, the total is more than \$78 billion. Taken together with the education ap-

proportions enacted earlier by the Congress, the total appropriations for human resources programs under the jurisdiction of our subcommittee is in excess of \$83 billion. This is about \$7 billion more than has been requested for national defense.

In addition to this enormous sum, our subcommittee will later consider budget requests for \$3.5 billion for programs which were not authorized when hearings were held on this bill. Included is the \$1 billion for the New Emergency Employment Act for which hearings have been scheduled tomorrow. I intend to support early and full funding for this much needed program.

Also in addition, as pointed out in the committee report, substantial amounts will be necessary in later supplemental appropriations for many of the mandatory programs because of statutory requirements.

As a part of reducing the requirements for national defense and the reduced requirements for Southeast Asia, and the reordering of priorities, our committee believes that a major portion of such reductions and shifts should be channeled into programs to improve the health of the Nation.

This attempt is probably best demonstrated in the recommendations for the National Institutes of Health. The committee has included funds for all increases for NIH requested by the administration. In addition, we have calculated and recommended increases for each of the institute's research and training activities to insure that none would be funded at less than the fiscal 1971 operating level. This is the necessary first step toward future expansion of these efforts.

All of us are now well aware of the promising leads which have appeared in cancer research. Congress earlier appropriated an extra \$100 million for the President's cancer conquest program, and \$237.5 million is in this bill for the regular 1972 National Cancer Institute appropriation.

At the same time, we were impressed during the lengthy hearings at the significant advances being made by the other institutes, and we have included selective program increases to further these efforts.

Heart attacks continue to be our Nation's No. 1 killer. The bill appropriates \$212 million for the National Heart and Lung Institute, an increase of \$16 million over the budget request and nearly \$17 million over the 1971 funding level. We expect that continued progress will be made in determining better prevention and treatment methods for heart and pulmonary diseases.

The National Institute of Dental Research is pursuing a vigorous effort to eliminate dental cavities completely during this decade. The committee is encouraging the Institute to expand its activities in the field of pain prevention and control.

Several new leads are being followed in the treatment and cure of arthritis, cystic fibrosis and kidney disease by the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. The committee has recommended \$148 million, an increase of

\$13 million over the budget, to stimulate concentrated research in these areas.

Many other advances were described during the hearings in the areas of multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, allergies, asthma, hay fever, pneumonia, genetic disorders and others. It is important to point out that these research activities are progressing—that we are receiving valuable returns on these NIH expenditures. The committee will continue to investigate any such breakthroughs and to redirect appropriations accordingly.

Of course, these research advances are meaningless until they are made available to the public at large.

Primary Federal responsibility for this task rests with the health services and mental health administration.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,873 million for health delivery activities—an increase of \$253 million above the budget and \$371 million over 1971. A major part of the increase is for medical facilities construction.

The committee has included \$87.2 million for the construction and modernization of health facilities, the same amount as appropriated in 1971. This has been a very successful and very popular program around the country, and the committee insists that it be continued. This amount plus what we have put in for the District of Columbia brings the amount to an increase of \$127,827,000.

Substantial increases are also proposed for the increasingly effective regional medical programs and comprehensive health planning and services. These are key Federal efforts in the field of health care delivery, and they have received enthusiastic support on the part of the medical profession and laymen alike. Together with carryover funds and trust fund transfers, the bill includes \$432 million for these programs.

The committee is recommending an increase of \$192 million over last year for mental health programs. We heard extensive testimony, including that from representatives of the community mental health centers in my home city of Wichita, Kans., concerning the need for additional staffing funds for such centers.

At a time when Congress has declared as a national priority more effective treatment of mental health in children and adults, it makes no sense to cut back the services of these community centers. In addition, certain communities, including Wichita, were actually being penalized for taking the initiative in providing mental health facilities without the help of the Federal Government.

The committee has ordered a halt to this discrimination and has called for a \$40 million increase for the construction and staffing of these centers.

Additional funds are also included to prevent and treat alcoholism and to initiate the President's omnibus drug abuse control program.

By far, the largest amount of money in this bill is for the social and rehabilitation service—\$12.5 billion. This is an increase of nearly \$2 billion over last year, most of which is for welfare payments. Fifty-six percent of the money in this bill is for these welfare payments.

This reflects the increase of nearly 2 million persons who will receive assistance this year. Under present law, the increase is mandatory.

In one effort to try to control such increases in welfare payments, the bill includes \$259 million for an expanded work incentives program. Of equal importance, \$11 million is directed to further research into income maintenance—or guaranteed income—experiments. The results from similar experiments in the past have been mixed, with no conclusive determinations obtained. In my opinion, this question of whether guaranteed income encourages or discourages work needs to be looked into much deeper before Congress sets up any massive welfare reform program based on the concept.

The bill includes \$613 million for rehabilitation services and facilities, an increase of \$43 million over the 1971 appropriation. These are longstanding and successful manpower programs in our country. It has been shown that the returns, both economic and in human terms, from these vocational rehabilitation programs are the highest of any Federal investment in human resources. State, local, and private participation continues to be enthusiastic.

We have included \$16.2 million for the initial implementation of the Developmental Disabilities Act for the treatment of the mentally retarded, and persons with epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and other neurological conditions. This has been a neglected area, and much more needs to be done for these handicapped people. We expect that in future years, this amount will grow with the program.

Mr. Chairman, as our time is limited, I have covered only a few of the highlights of this bill. Our subcommittee held hearings over a period of 4 months, with time out for the education appropriations.

These hearings compiled almost 6,000 pages of testimony. The House, and indeed the country, owes a debt of gratitude to our very fair and able chairman, DAN FLOOD, the ranking minority member, BOB MICHEL, and in fact to the entire subcommittee and its capable staff for the extensive yet expeditious way which this bill has been handled. It may be that changes will be made here or in the other body later. However, after hearing almost all of the testimony presented during these hearings, I am convinced that we have reported out a good bill.

Huge sums are involved here, and we must be especially watchful that these funds are effectively used.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of a few questions to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the debate last June on the supplemental appropriation there was a discussion concerning the supplemental appropriation request for alcoholism research and treatment. The chairman at that time recommended that the supplemental appropriation not be approved because he pointed out that the appropriation for this fiscal year was coming up soon and that he anticipated there

would be an amount of at least \$70 million in the appropriation bill for alcoholism. I find that the committee report does not clearly tabulate the total amount that would be appropriated for alcoholism. I wonder if the chairman would clarify this point.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. Mr. Chairman, that is a perfectly proper question.

I direct your attention to page 501 of part 1 of the hearings where you will find a reference to programs against alcoholism. The total request that came to us in the January budget was \$62,185,000 as shown on that page. Since this was printed the President sent up a budget amendment in the amount of \$7 million. To this, as you heard me say in my earlier remarks, the committee added \$25 million. So the total of the bill is \$94,185,000.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I certainly commend the committee for this very substantial increase having to do with a problem which has been with us for a long time without the amount of attention it should have received.

Secondly, I would like to ask the chairman if he could clarify the total amount that is being appropriated for drug abuse, because the committee report refers to an increase of \$67 million over the January budget but does not give the total amount of the drug abuse control program.

Mr. FLOOD. This is also a perfectly proper question. I direct the gentleman's attention to page 474 of part 1 of the subcommittee hearings where the gentleman will find the original request was for \$76,140,000. The budget amendment was for \$67 million. The total, therefore, is \$143,140,000.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman very much. Would the chairman yield for one further question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I notice that the amount of \$25 million is appropriated for operations under the New Occupational Health and Safety Act. This is the same as the administration requested?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. And I assume that the committee feels this is an adequate amount, but because of the importance of this program to people who are engaged in hazardous occupations, and that includes a great many in my own district, I wonder if the chairman would confirm that the committee does feel that the appropriation request by the administration is adequate.

Mr. FLOOD. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that coming from where I come, the coal fields of Pennsylvania, no one appreciates more the merits of occupational health and safety. We believe this will be adequate for the time being but that it will surely be increased in the future. We are satisfied with this figure for the present. However, we were deeply concerned about the problem and I know of no one who is a stronger advocate of support for this program than I.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) for an inquiry.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-HEW of the House Appropriations Committee (Mr. FLOOD) and the distinguished members of that subcommittee for their work in bringing before the House H.R. 10061, the fiscal year 1972 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. I know personally that they have labored long and hard to bring out this bill, and it is a credit to their work.

H.R. 10061 appropriates \$20.4 billion in total. Of this amount, \$1.3 billion is provided for the Department of Labor and \$18.9 billion for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Everyone of the programs funded by H.R. 10061 is desperately needed. This bill addresses the human needs of our country—needs which are continually short changed.

H.R. 10061 does not adequately answer all of these needs. That is clear. But it does move in the right direction. And because of that, H.R. 10061 must be supported. But, because it does not move far enough, I intend to support the omnibus amendment to be offered later today which will increase health funding by \$230 million, as well as the other amendments to be offered to increase funding.

I do want to particularly direct attention to one item in this bill. By doing so I do not mean to thereby discount all the other items therein. As I said, they represent the funding of essential programs. However, because of the efforts I have expended to obtain funding for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695, I want to particularly stress the appropriation for this act.

Before addressing the funding of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, however, I want to briefly note some of the programs funded by H.R. 10061.

This bill includes an increase for psychiatric training of \$6,750,000 over the administration budget to restore this program to the 1971 level. It is indeed unfortunate that the administration has sought to gut this program. Rather, it should have sought a vast expansion. Because of its negative posture, this program winds up being only sustained at last year's level. This is clearly the least that could be done. In fact, much, much more must be done.

The administration budget request asked no funds for "Title IV—Mental Health of Children." This title is contained in Public Law 91-211. Fortunately, the committee has reported out a bill containing \$10 million to initiate this program.

The administration sought to reduce the funding of rehabilitation and social work training to \$21.65 million—more than \$23 million below last year's funding. H.R. 10061 raises funding to \$44.965 million.

The administration originally requested no funds for the rat control program. Due to strenuous efforts on the part of many of us, we succeeded in inducing the administration to submit a budget amendment for \$15 million. This \$15 million is included in the bill before us today.

H.R. 10061 includes \$16 million over the original budget and \$9 million over the amended budget to initiate a concerted effort to control venereal disease, a massive national problem.

I would also note that the bill includes an increase of \$30 million over the budget to fund all approvable applications for the staffing of community mental health centers.

Another program which the administration sought to completely short-change, and which the committee, despite this resistance, responded to, is alcoholism control. The bill provides \$25 million.

In addition, the committee acted to add to the administration budget request more than \$87 million for the National Institutes of Health institutes and divisions. This still only brings funding up to last year's level for all research and training grant and contract programs. Again, administration resistance was a stumbling block, deterring the large increases over 1971 funding which we should have.

I do want to particularly call attention to the \$67 million provided in H.R. 10061 for drug abuse control. This is a belated assault on a massive and disastrous peril. I expect an amendment to be offered later today to add an additional \$40 million for this assault, and I intend to strongly support that measure.

I also want to call particular attention to the committee concern—which I share—regarding unemployment among veterans. I want to quote from the committee report—House Report 92-374—at page 5, and add my second to that statement:

(T)here is something drastically wrong when there is a higher percentage of veterans unemployed than the percentage of unemployed non-veterans in the same age groups. The Committee will expect the Department (of Labor) to make a much stronger attack on this problem. No problem with which the Department deals should have higher priority.

I would note, also, that H.R. 10061 provides \$748,799,000 for manpower training services. I think much more is needed. I also think that much more is needed in terms of quality administration of the manpower programs. The great promise they have held out has not been met. In many respects, they have not produced anywhere near the results they should have. Thus, not only is ample funding essential, so, too, is good administration.

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING

I want to now turn to one particular item in the bill before us today. This is the funding for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695. The bill provides \$5 million. This is just one-fifth of the authorization.

I commend the committee for responding to the problem of childhood lead poisoning, which Public Law 91-695 attacks. It has done so in the face of administration obduracy and resistance with which I am all too familiar—being the author of this legislation and consequently—having followed daily the twists and turns of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in its attempts to consign this program to the backroom.

However, while I commend the committee, which has provided funding 150 percent in excess of the administration request of \$2 million—a request, I would note, which came in the form of a belated amendment to the original fiscal year 1972 budget request and a request which, I am told by officials within HEW, was a direct response to my testifying last April before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of full funding—it is clear that \$5 million can do little more than open the door to fighting childhood lead poisoning.

Later today, an omnibus amendment will be offered by our distinguished colleagues from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE). Together with them, I have arranged for the inclusion in that omnibus amendment of an additional \$5 million to fund the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695. This will produce, if passed, a total of \$10 million.

Whether or not that amendment succeeds, it is clear that the other body must provide the full funding, so that a larger amount will be provided in the bill eventually sent to the President. I have already testified twice in the last 3 months before the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare of the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of funding of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. I know the Senate subcommittee appreciates the problem and I hope the subcommittee will convert this understanding into dollars—\$25 million.

This past April, I first appeared before the Senate subcommittee in support of funding for the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act for fiscal year 1971. I was very much gratified that the Senate Appropriations Committee subsequently reported out, in the Second Supplemental Appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971—H.R. 8190—an appropriation of \$5 million.

Unfortunately, that funding was deleted in conference, and thus the act received no funding for fiscal year 1971. However, the fact that the distinguished Senate subcommittee, and the full Senate committee, perceived this problem as sufficiently severe to warrant funding of \$5 million for just the last two months of the past fiscal year encourages me to hope that for the full fiscal year of 1972, of which more than 11 months still remain, the full \$25 million will be provided.

In this regard, I would quote the Senate Report—Senate Report 92-107—on the Second Supplemental Appropriation bill, at page 34:

Thousands of small children throughout the Nation today are victims of lead-based paint poisoning. The effects of the disease

are devastating—mental retardation, cerebral palsy, convulsive seizures, blindness, learning defects, behavior disorders, kidney diseases, and even death. The actual number of children poisoned is impossible to know; there are few adequate screening programs in communities and most communities are currently unaware of the full nature and extent of the problem. Even so, the limited surveillance programs to date indicate that 225,000 children between the ages of one and six are victims of lead-based paint poisoning.

Yet the striking fact is that this disease—which Congressional testimony has revealed is more disastrous to children than either rubella or polio before the advent of modern vaccines—is completely preventable. . . .

There is much that I want to say about childhood lead poisoning. The points which I would particularly stress are these:

Childhood lead poisoning is a disease whose victims number in the thousands every year, and almost all of them are children under the age of 7.

Childhood lead poisoning is preventable. We know what to do and we know how to do it, to end thiscrippler and killer.

Childhood lead poisoning can be ended, provided we have the funds. You have the ability to provide these funds.

Let me briefly run through the statistics. Numbers often serve more to obscure than to enlighten, but I am sure that we can all appreciate that each number represents a small child. This past May, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued its report entitled "Toward a Comprehensive Policy for the 1970's: A White Paper." This report gives the hard, cold numbers of tragedy:

Paint with lead in it poisons about 400,000 children (predominantly poor) annually. It is estimated that 16,000 of these children require treatment, 3,200 incur moderate to severe brain damage, and 800 are so severely brain damaged that they require care for the rest of their lives . . . (page 30)

The report omits mentioning the 200 children for whom there is no future—even the vegetable-like existences of an institution for the hopelessly brain damaged. These 200 children will die. Two hundred each year.

These are the figures which mark childhood lead poisoning's toll—a toll taken by means of blindness, cerebral palsy, kidney impairment, brain damage, and death. So, that is a point I want to stress. Childhood lead poisoning is not some rare malady. It is, and here I quote the language of the implementation plan prepared by the Bureau of Community Environmental Management, the division within HEW designated to implement Public Law 91-695:

More prevalent than the polio problem before the advent of the Salk vaccine . . . (and it) leaves more children permanently impaired than did German measles prior to the extensive measles vaccination programs. (Page 1)

This disease is not the exclusive blight of New York City. Nor is it even confined just to the cities of the Northeast. Childhood lead poisoning is a national problem, and I know no better way of emphasizing this point than to list some of the cities which already have made preliminary application requests to the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for grants under Public Law 91-695: Bangor, Maine; Cincinnati, Ohio; Denver, Colo.; Evanston, Ill.; Kansas City, Mo.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Nashville, Tenn.; New Orleans, La.; Omaha, Nebr.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Saginaw, Mich.; San Antonio, Tex.; San Francisco, Calif.; Toledo, Ohio.

There are many more requests. And there will be still more, once the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act is funded.

So, a second fact that I want to stress is this: Childhood lead poisoning is a national plague.

How does this disease arise? Its genesis lies in the congruence of two factors. The first is the high incidence among small children of pica—an appetite for nonfood items such as dirt, paper, paint, and plaster. The second is the presence of lead-based paint on the walls and ceilings of older dwellings. As the sweet-tasting lead-tainted paint and plaster chips fall within the reach of the children living in these dilapidated dwellings, they are picked up and eaten. Gradually, the child ingests lead into his system. It has been estimated by Dr. Julian Chisolm of Baltimore, a leading expert, that the ingestion of a few small leaded paint chips a day, no longer than the size of an adult's thumbnail for about 3 months or longer can produce clinical symptoms of lead poisoning.

So we have a man-made disease, of enormous proportions and of a national scope, which goes largely unabated. This is unconscionable, because this disease is preventable. Let me quote Dr. Jane S. Lin-Fu, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who has written in an article entitled "Childhood Lead Poisoning—An Eradicable Disease," which has been reprinted for public distribution by the Department:

In the history of modern medicine, few childhood diseases occupy a position as unique as lead poisoning. It is a preventable disease. The etiology, pathogenesis, epidemiology, and symptomatology have all been well defined. Methods for screening, diagnosis, and treatment have long been available. In the past three decades, concerted efforts to conquer infectious disease have resulted in the development of vaccines for such viral diseases as polio and measles, the discovery of many antibiotics for bacterial and other infections, and the systematic application of these therapeutic agents, but little has been done to eradicate lead poisoning. Yet this man-made disease exists in epidemic proportions in many cities.

I should like to repeat two of these sentences written by Dr. Lin-Fu. The first is "It is a preventable disease." And, second, "this man-made disease exists in epidemic proportions in many cities."

I think the basic facts are clear. Childhood lead poisoning is a disease of massive proportions. It is a disease which is preventable. The Congress recognized these facts by passage of the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. It recognized the need to enact a specific law to mount a focused, coherent federally assisted assault on childhood lead poisoning, with specific Federal funds authorized for this assault, rather

than leaving childhood lead poisoning as the possible stepchild of general grant programs.

The act, signed into law by the President on January 13, 1971, contains five titles. Title I authorizes grants by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to units of general local government to assist in developing and carrying out detection and treatment programs. Title II authorizes grants for developing and carrying out programs to identify high-risk areas, and then to develop and carry out elimination programs. Title III authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a demonstration and research program to determine the nature and extent of the problem, and the methods by which lead-based paint can be most effectively removed.

By virtue of title V, funds authorized but not appropriated for fiscal year 1971 are available to be appropriated for fiscal year 1972. Consequently, the authorized funding for these HEW grant programs totals \$25 million for fiscal year 1972.

The issue remaining is that of funding the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. The President submitted no request for funds for fiscal year 1972. In cognizance of this omission, 45 members on April 23 wrote to Secretary Richardson, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, urging that his Department request funds to implement the Act. Secretary Richardson responded to our letter on May 28, informing us that the President would transmit an amendment to the 1972 budget requesting \$2 million. Specifically, Secretary Richardson's letter reads:

(T)he budget transmitted on January 29 did not include any new funds for implementing the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act.

Since the current fiscal year is nearly over, we will not request a 1971 supplemental. However, the President will shortly transmit an amendment to the 1972 budget requesting \$2 million to expand out program to attack the problem of lead-based paint. We would use the additional funds to make a more concerted effort to define the extent of the problem and support model demonstration projects in three communities.

Let me be blunt and say that much, much more is needed. Moreover, the stated intended use for the \$2 million to be requested—three demonstration projects for defining the problem—is also unacceptable.

Let me take these two points in reverse order. First, the matter of demonstration projects. The fact is that there is no need for such projects. As I noted earlier, Secretary Richardson's own employee—Dr. Lin-Fu—has made very clear the point that, and I quote again:

The etiology, pathogenesis, epidemiology, and symptomatology have all been well defined. Methods for screening, diagnosis, and treatment have long been available.

I would also point to the October 12, 1970, report by the Surgeon General, another official within the HEW structure. In this report, entitled "Medical Aspects of Lead Poisoning," the Surgeon General sets national guidelines for attacking childhood lead poisoning. Again, I think

this demonstrates that the problem is well identified.

In addition, I want to refer to an internal HEW document which I have received, which I think equally as well demolishes any argument that demonstration projects are needed at this point. This document is entitled "Implementation Plan to Carry Out the DHEW Responsibilities Under the 'Lead Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1971'—Public Law 91-695." It was prepared in March of this year by the Bureau of Community Environmental Management, the division of HEW which was delegated responsibility for implementation of the Act by the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on March 5.

I would like to quote from pages 3-4 of this document, which is the work product of the professional experts within HEW designated to implement the childhood lead poisoning program. It makes very clear that we are long past the state of demonstration projects:

The problem of lead poisoning is completely controllable with existing technology. Techniques for the control of the problem are developed and tested. Program activities have generated a widespread awareness of the problem and an eagerness to initiate or expand local lead control efforts with minimum "seed money" from Federal sources.

The Public Health Service through the Bureau of Community Environmental Management had done much to define the problem, bring the problem to professional and public attention, and to facilitate and encourage local control programs. An intradepartmental committee prepared an HEW policy statement defining levels of lead poisoning and recommending treatment and control techniques. On October 12, 1970, the Surgeon General issued his policy statement on "The Control of Lead Poisoning in Children." Procedural guidelines for assisting communities in carrying out lead control programs have been developed by B.C.E.M. and distributed widely. The application and effectiveness of these guidelines have been demonstrated in Norfolk, Virginia.

Simple, inexpensive and rapid methodologies for the determination of blood lead levels have been developed and are being tested by B.C.E.M. in the cities of New Orleans and New York. These micro-techniques require only one-hundredth the amount of blood, and cost one-fourth as much as former methods. Thus, it is now practical and economically feasible for communities to carry out the massive screening programs recommended by the Surgeon General. There is a minimal need for further research.

The necessary information to eliminate the problem is known. The time for action is now and now is the time for effective action programs at the community level.

This is not political rhetoric. These are the conclusions of trained professionals. Let me, for emphasis, quote again these words:

There is a minimal need for further research. The necessary information to eliminate the problem is known. The time for action is now and now is the time for effective action programs at the community level.

I think it is clear: the problem has been identified. What we need now are action programs.

Finally, as one last point, I would stress that some local programs do exist now, and that fact rebuts any contention that we need demonstration projects to ascer-

tain how to run a program. Baltimore has had a program since 1935; Chicago since 1966; New Haven since 1968; Rochester, N.Y., since 1969. Currently New York City also has a program.

Now let me turn to the other matter at issue, aside from whether just three demonstration programs are the appropriate answer to a disease more prevalent than was polio prior to the advent of the Salk vaccine. I know of no organization save the higher echelon at HEW which believes that anything but many millions of dollars are needed. Within HEW itself, the professionals are calling for full funding. Thus, in the Bureau of Community Environmental Management Implementation Plan, it is stated:

Inaction on this problem would be an economic and human disaster. . . . Based on the extent of the valid need evidenced to date—based on pilot screening programs already undertaken—the Bureau is convinced that the full funding authorized under the law for 1971 can be effectively utilized in the current fiscal year to carry out the types of community programs as outlined above. . . . In FY 1972 a budget amendment is requested to continue and expand these important activities.

There is no question that all the funding authorized can be used. Prior to hearings on the authorizing act, the Bureau had received requests from 38 communities for technical and financial assistance in conducting local lead control programs. The dollar volume of these requests was over \$30 million. Currently, the Bureau—that is, HEW—has requests from at least more than 50 States and communities, including the following:

Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Baltimore, Md.; Bangor, Maine; Binghamton, N.Y.; Boston, Mass.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Chester, Pa.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio.

Cleveland, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; State of Delaware; Denver, Colo.; Detroit, Mich.; East St. Louis, Ill.; Evanston, Ill.; State of Illinois; Kansas City, Mo.

Los Angeles, Calif.; Louisville, Ky.; State of Maryland; State of Massachusetts; Milwaukee, Wis.; Mobile, Ala.; Nashville, Tenn.; New Haven, Conn.; New Orleans, La.; New Rochelle, N.Y.

New York, N.Y.; State of New York; Newark, N.J.; Norfolk, Va.; Omaha, Nebr.; Orange, N.J.; Paterson, N.J.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Plainfield, N.J.; Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

Providence, R.I.; Puerto Rico; Rochester, N.Y.; Sacramento, Calif.; Saginaw, Mich.; St. Louis, Mo.; San Antonio, Tex.; San Francisco, Calif.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Toledo, Ohio; and Washington, D.C.

More applications will no doubt be forthcoming.

I would also like to mention some of the organizations which recognize the need and are supporting large funding of the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. They include:

American Association on Mental Deficiency, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine, American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, American Association of Dental Schools.

American Dental Association, American Heart Association, Inc., American Nurses Association, American Optomet-

ric Association, American Public Health Association.

Association of American Medical Colleges, Association of Schools of the Allied Health Professions, Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry, Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, Association of Teachers of Preventive Medicine.

Association of University Program in Hospital Administration, Committee of Hospitals of Brooklyn to Eradicate Lead Poisoning, Environmental Action, Friends of the Earth, National Association for Retarded Children.

National Committee Against Mental Illness, National Council of Community Mental Health Centers, National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc., National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association, Planned Parenthood—World Population, Sierra Club.

The issue is, as it so often ends up, one of funds. This Nation has many needs, and all of these needs must in some way be balanced. But, if we must talk strictly in money terms—and I have no brief to deal with children's lives in such callous terms—then the conclusion still remains inescapable: the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act must be funded.

Let me run through the figures. Each moderate case of brain damage requires approximately 10 years of special instructions and other care, averaging \$1,750 per child annually. So, each year, the 3,200 children who do suffer moderate to severe damage produce costs for care alone of \$5.6 million. The 800 children who annually experience severe brain damage require lifetime institutionalization, at a cost of \$4,000 per year each, or \$3.2 million annually. Thus, the current annual cost for the damage to these small children totals \$8.8 million. Add to that the medical and other expenses for the 200 small children who die annually. Add to that the incalculable millions for loss of productive lives. Add to that the incalculable amounts for grief and suffering.

The figures are devastatingly damning. They are also economically dispositive. So long as we fail to spend money to end the blight of childhood lead poisoning, we will continue to expend far more money patching up the sins which have been committed against our children by allowing them to fall victim to this manmade, yet preventable, disease.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee have recognized the problem, and the bill before us (H.R. 10061) provides the sum of \$5 million to combat childhood lead poisoning, which is commendable in view of the fact that the administration itself refused at first to ask for any money but then finally submitted a belated request for \$2 million.

Unfortunately, however, the \$5 million recommended in the bill is only one-fifth of the authorization. I would hope that this action is only a beginning. I hope that the Senate, as it did in the fiscal year 1971 supplemental, will increase the funding, so that the fully au-

thorized amount may be available to combat this dreadful disease.

Mr. FLOOD. I might say this, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from New York appeared before the committee and testified on this matter and, on the weight and value and knowledge of his testimony, we did take this action.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I would like to compliment the gentleman and his committee for the monumental task that it has undertaken and for the fine job that it has done.

I would just like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if in this proposed measure there are funds for the Galludet College, whether such funds for that school are included?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me state that those funds are in the education bill, which is a separate bill, and which was recently signed by the President. I might add that there were no objections and no quarrels with the funds included in that bill.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor-HEW Appropriations, once again I want to pay my respects to my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL). Under their leadership, our subcommittee has worked diligently in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, we are advised that the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID) has been named to a great national commission by the President, and has been confirmed by the Senate. The gentlewoman can be assured that her years of service in our committee have greatly helped to contribute to its efficiency, and I am sure that I can speak for the other members of the committee and state that I am sure they can show the gentlewoman how they feel by applauding the gentlewoman from Illinois with their hands, but that also a little bit of their heart goes with it also.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us today—H.R. 10061—includes appropriations totaling \$20.3 billion for all program activities of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and various related agencies—with the exception of the Office of Education which was covered in a separate bill. As

the six volumes containing over 5,700 pages of printed hearings indicate, our subcommittee conducted a very thorough investigation and review of the budget requests and individual views brought before us. Representatives from the executive agencies, as well as those outside of the Federal Government, made excellent presentations—and, of course, I welcome the great interest that has been expressed in the form of letters and other communications. I am sure all of us are aware not only of the growing needs in the field of health manpower, disease control, social and rehabilitation services, and welfare activities, but also the necessity to place these needs in a realistic framework of priorities in view of budgetary limitations.

It has been pointed out that this is the largest of the appropriation bills excluding defense. However, when we take into consideration the funds carried in other bills for health, education, welfare, and services to individual Americans, the spending in fiscal 1972 for human resources will again exceed defense expenditures for the second straight year.

Naturally, in an appropriation bill of this size—and dealing with matters which are related so closely and directly to people—there are bound to be honest differences of opinion regarding specific amounts for various programs. I certainly have great sympathy for the needs in health care and have found much of the testimony regarding research in the causes and cures of some of the dreaded diseases to be encouraging. In this regard, we have given priority in the allocation of our limited resources to those areas which show the greatest promise for results and where additional funds could be spent effectively. As a result of our hearings and deliberations—as well as the unusual amount of interest expressed about a number of programs since the 1972 budget was released—we have recommended increases totaling \$321.7 million over-the-budget estimates.

The major items in the bill have been covered thoroughly by the chairman (Mr. FLOOD) and the ranking minority member (Mr. MICHEL), but there are several matters of particular interest to me and many others on which I would like to comment briefly.

For mental health, the bill includes \$581.2 million—an increase of \$81.7 million above the budget request. There has been much concern expressed about the proposed reduction in funds for psychiatric training grants and I am pleased that the committee restored this program to the 1971 level. In the hearings we received voluminous testimony from both administration and public witnesses as to the disastrous impact of alcoholism upon our society. As a result, we have included \$25 million for formula grants to the States to close the gap in a comprehensive program to attack this problem. We also approved the full increase of \$67 million included in the budget amendment of the President for drug abuse control. In addition, the committee provided an additional \$30 million above the budget for staffing

grants for community mental health centers.

While cancer is the second leading killer, it is our No. 1 national health concern because it is the disease most dreaded by the majority of Americans. The bill, as reported, includes a total of \$237.5 million for cancer research. With the extra \$100 million funded in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1971, the National Cancer Institute will have \$104.4 million more available in 1972 than it had in 1971. The proposal for a greatly expanded cancer research program is based on the expert advice of a large number of scientific and medical leaders who presented convincing evidence that recent research advances and leads are sufficiently promising to merit a major national commitment to a cancer conquest program. In my opinion, the investment of substantial funds in this effort is very worthwhile and is certain to meet with wide public approval.

Heart attacks continue to be the Nation's No. 1 killer and in view of the critical need for more research in this area—particularly in regard to prevention—the committee has increased appropriations by \$16.1 million over the request to a total of \$211.6 million for the National Heart and Lung Institute. We received impressive testimony about new research regarding the effectiveness of diet and drugs in preventing heart attacks but much more study needs to be done in this whole area.

There has been much concern expressed, also, about the continuation of the medical facilities construction program. I have long felt that this is one of the most successful Federal-State programs in existence, but the goal of increasing hospital beds and public health centers is even more critical today than it was when the program was instituted. Therefore, our committee gave this matter top priority by recommending an appropriation of \$266.7 million—an increase of \$127.8 million above the request. These funds will include money also for long-term care facilities and modernization of existing facilities.

In my judgment, one of the most important programs funded by this bill is vocational rehabilitation—the restoration of persons who have been disabled in one way or another to useful lives. For this purpose we have recommended \$613 million, an increase of \$8 million over the budget request and \$42.6 million over the appropriation for 1971. It is estimated that 980,000 disabled persons will be served by the State-Federal programs in 1972 and 288,000 will be rehabilitated. The committee has also added \$5 million over the budget request—making a total of \$16.2 million—for the Developmental Disabilities Act. This is a new program, enacted in the last Congress, providing for the treatment of the mentally retarded, and persons with epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and other neurological conditions.

Since this is a new program, it is somewhat difficult to ascertain how much money could be spent effectively at this time. However, I was impressed with the testimony which showed the great need for improved services and facilities for

these people and hope the Department will move swiftly in putting the program into effect.

It is obvious that I have mentioned only a small percentage of the items in this bill. But I do feel it is important that our taxpaying citizens know that much is being accomplished in these important fields. It has been said that health is real wealth. Not only is health more important than economic wealth, it is also its foundation—and our entire society has a direct stake in the health of each and every person.

In my opinion, H.R. 10061, the bill before the House, is a good compromise in that we have made every attempt to establish priorities among those programs which have proven their worthiness for the health and welfare of our people. Our committee's task was not easy because of our limited budget resources and the great needs that exist—and I am hopeful that the Committee of the Whole House will reject amendments which will add millions of dollars to the bill and will approve our committee's recommendations which were reached after intensive hearings and after considering each item with much concern and compassion.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, in assuming my position on the Labor-HEW Subcommittee this year, I was forced to relinquish a combined total of 24 years of seniority on two other appropriations subcommittees: Treasury-Postal Service and Foreign Operations. Because of the vital programs that the subcommittee deals with however, I was not only willing but eager to pay this price.

I would like at this time to commend the hardworking chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD). And the conscientious ranking minority members, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) for their efforts on this bill. The courtesy and assistance extended by them, as well as by my other colleagues on the subcommittee, were most appreciated.

Funds for many important programs were reduced in the budget request for this year and the committee is to be congratulated for restoring some of these cuts.

I was particularly gratified that the bill includes an increase of \$6.7 million over the budget to restore the National Institute of Mental Health's psychiatric residency training program to the 1971 level. Psychiatric manpower needs in this country are enormous and programs in the community mental health centers, in alcoholism, in drug abuse, in the Indian service, and in the Bureau of Prisons require large numbers of competently trained psychiatrists. The committee's action will help to meet this requirement.

I also applaud the committee's recommendation to restore the budget for rehabilitation and social work training to last year's level of \$44.9 million. The proposed budget cuts for this activity would have seriously affected the ability of institutions devoted to social work

education to prepare properly qualified persons in sufficient numbers to provide essential services for the aged, the ill, the unemployed, the disabled, and the mentally ill.

In total, the committee increased the budget request for these and other programs operated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by \$350.9 million.

It is to be commended for this action, but, to my mind, this simply is not enough if we are to make a conscientious attempt to achieve the goal of making our Nation the healthiest in the world. There can be no question that we are faced with a health crisis of alarming proportions.

Consider these sobering statistics: The United States ranks 13th among industrialized nations in infant mortality, 11th in life expectancy for women, and 18th in life expectancy for men. Moreover about 150 counties in the Nation are without a single doctor, and another 150 have but one physician.

Twice as many black infants die in the first year of life as whites. The poor suffer four times as many heart conditions and six times as much mental illness, arthritis, and high blood pressure as their more affluent neighbors. Across the country, there is a shortage of 50,000 physicians, 150,000 medical technicians, and 300,000 nurses.

These figures demonstrate the very clear need, I believe, for expanding our commitment at the Federal level to improve both the quality of our health care and the methods of providing that care. In many instances, the committee recommendations constitute little more than restorations of budget cuts below the fiscal 1971 levels, with an addition of approximately 6 percent to allow for inflation. This is clearly inadequate if we are to make a realistic attempt to move America's health programs forward.

At the appropriate time, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and I will offer an amendment to increase the total appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by \$200 million. The details of that amendment will be elaborated upon then.

I would like, before closing at this time, to discuss one program for which that amendment would provide increased funds. Last year Congress unanimously passed and the President signed into law the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention Act. The legislation authorized \$300 million over a 3-year period for formula grants to the States and project grants in the field of research, training, and education to finance a major offensive against the problem of alcoholism—one of the most widespread, destructive, and costly health problems facing our country today. This disease adversely affects the lives of some 36 million Americans, or one out of every six persons in the United States. Nine million persons are alcoholics and their ranks swell by another 200,000 persons each year. An annual death toll of 87,000 is caused by alcohol related problems. Furthermore, alcoholism accounts for a \$15 billion

yearly drain upon our economy. This includes \$10 billion in lost worktime of employed alcoholics, \$2 billion in health and welfare costs incurred by them and their families, and \$3 billion in property damage and other costs associated with traffic accidents.

To counteract this devastating problem, I offered an amendment to the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971 on May 11, which would have provided an initial \$10 million to get this program off the ground. Unfortunately I was unsuccessful then. Now the committee is allotting only \$25 million despite the fact that preliminary applications from the States far exceed the \$60 million that is authorized for formula grants in 1972. Our amendment would increase this allotment to a minimally acceptable level of \$40 million.

We have been warned by the American Psychiatric Association that if we do not begin an adequately funded program for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism now, we will have 12 million alcoholics to contend with by the end of the decade.

Later today I will discuss other items in the bill that I believe are deficient and outline what additional increases are needed to meet the health crisis which is now hard upon us. Suffice it now to point out that the right to good health care is as fundamental as the right to an education, an adequate diet, and decent housing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again I wish to commend the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the committee for doing a commendable job on the bill. It is a good bill. But when this House, only a few hours ago, passed an agriculture bill which was \$1.2 billion over the budget, and passed it by a substantial majority, giving \$3.5 billion to farmers across this land for subsidies, I think the House can afford \$200 million extra for the health care of our citizens.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there are 9 million of our citizens whose destiny is particularly related to a portion of the bill now before us. An additional 36 million of their family members have a vital interest in the legislation. I am speaking of persons who suffer the tragic problems of alcoholism in our country; problems which exact massive and inexcusable human loss, create a \$15-billion annual loss to our economy, and are related to at least 87,000 deaths annually. Our present inadequate treatment facilities are overwhelmed by almost 1,000 new cases of alcoholism daily. We will have 12 million alcoholics to contend with by the end of the present decade if a program of prevention and treatment of alcoholism is not undertaken immediately. I will not take the time for a further repetition of the sad and depressing statistics which describe the magnitude and scope of alcohol abuse and alcoholism problems. The plain fact before us now is that positive action by the Congress is required if our Nation is to become capable of reducing the tragedy of this national blight.

The New York Times announced this

morning that a gift of \$10 million has been made by R. Brinkley Smithers, a special partner in a Wall Street investment banking house, to the Roosevelt Hospital in New York for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics. Mr. Smithers' gift is the largest single grant ever made by any individual or agency, including the Federal Government, to fight alcoholism.

Yet Congress enacted legislation last year which authorized substantial sums of money to be appropriated for this purpose. The Comprehensive Alcohol and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, Public Law 91-616, authorized \$300 million over a 3-year period for formula and project grants for the support of research, training, and public education in the area of alcoholism. Several weeks ago I appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee to request \$40 million to carry out the provisions of this act. The administration budget request did not even recognize the enactment of this important public law.

I am aware that existing programs currently administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are somewhat related to the purposes of this new act. These programs are important, especially those which are to be administered by the new National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. But the funds which have been requested are not adequate, nor do they pursue directly the directives of our new legislation. The provisions of Public Law 91-616 are directly responsive to the challenge of providing prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, and they should be implemented with appropriations which are adequate to meet the goals and objectives of the enlightened national policy which has been set by this new legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the appropriation of adequate funds to make our national policy something more than words and to enable our Government to launch the programs necessary to reduce the human suffering and other serious consequences of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. We cannot brush this problem under the table any longer.

Even though I consider the \$25 million appropriated today as a less-than-adequate response to this most urgent problem, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the able chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. FLOOD) for his most sympathetic and sincere response. I certainly understand the political realities with which the distinguished chairman must contend.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my longstanding view of the vital importance of basic biomedical research.

As I have emphasized on many occasions in this body, the entire structure of America's health care is based upon the strength of our basic biomedical research programs. If we do not achieve our full potential here, all applied medicine will suffer and suffer grievously.

The Congress must acknowledge the necessity of continued support for basic biomedical research. We in the Congress

have a special responsibility through the appropriations process for the future progress of science in America.

Our leadership in medicine and the physical sciences is inseparable from our investment in scientific research. Our investment in this pure research is not an investment in a luxury but in an absolute essential to our continued growth and development.

The increased attention to the problems caused by environmental pollution further emphasize the need for increased attention to basic research.

Technological protection against the hostile environment, heat against cold, light against darkness, pesticides for crop protection, preservatives for food, drugs to combat disease, all in their turn create their own problems.

For man's survival it becomes now increasingly important to know all that there is to know about his reactions to the environment and to manmade environmental hazards. Biomedical science continues to take on new significance for the survival of man.

It is most essential that this country avoid any discontinuity in the support of knowledge-building through biomedical research and in the development of both clinical and research manpower.

The two most recent appropriations bills for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare were not finally enacted into law until more than half of the fiscal year had passed by. This kind of delay is particularly harmful to programs of biomedical research that rely as they do on the development and maintenance of research teams and for continuity in their support. I hope enactment of this bill comes much more promptly this year.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to relate to you and my colleagues the sad story of one small program funded under one small section of this very large bill. Although the program is small, it has accomplished a great deal to improve the health care of the 1,850,000 residents of central New York. Its story illustrates the meaning of impounded funds for the average man on the street in the cities and rural areas of our Nation, and points to the special responsibility of the Congress to strive to improve health care in our Nation.

The program I speak of is the central New York regional medical program. The program, founded in 1967, serves 17 counties in central New York and northern Pennsylvania. It is funded by the regional medical programs service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The central New York program has been funded for \$729,091 in direct costs for the period October 1, 1970, to September 30, 1971. This does not seem to be an unreasonable sum for an organization which is engaged in 19 separate projects serving a 17,000 square mile area.

In addition, the program was operating a mobile stroke rehabilitation unit which had provided training to over 5,500 doctors, nurses, and relatives of stroke victims in techniques for rehabilitation of stroke victims. The mobile unit had conducted instruction sessions at

over 140 health care facilities in the 17 county area. The mobile unit, as well as teaching badly needed skills, was highly visible and played an important part in the processing of gaining the confidence and support of local health care personnel. This contribution should not be underestimated, for without the confidence of local health vendors the regional medical program cannot effectively serve the residents of the area. The total cost of the unit, which employed physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, and a brace-maker, was just under \$200,000 a year.

For fiscal 1971 Congress appropriated \$104,798,000 for the operation of the regional medical program service. The administration impounded \$34,500,000 of these funds, one-third of the total appropriation. The Appropriations Committee was amazed by this action. The committee report states that:

In order that there would be no mistake with regard to the feelings of Congress in this matter, the Congress appropriated an additional \$10,000,000—in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1971.

The administration callously added these funds to its reserves.

Following the first impoundments in March 1971, the regional medical programs service informed the central New York program that it would have to cut \$59,507 from its existing \$729,000 operating budget and that it would have to terminate the stroke mobile program, effective March 31. The central New York program made the cuts, including 40 percent of the funds to train nurses and patients in the use of dialysis machines, which clean the blood of patients with chronic kidney failure, and 40 percent of the funds from a learning resources center which provided videotapes, films, audiotapes and projection equipment for use by health care personnel in the 17 county area.

The Federal Government achieved the magnificent saving of \$95,000 in fiscal 1971 by cutting off funds for the stroke mobile. Mrs. Ruth Jamison, legislative chairman of the State University Hospital Auxiliary of Syracuse, N.Y., commented on the loss of the stroke mobile:

At a time when health care needs are urgent and ever-increasing, when dedicated professional personnel are in great demand and when cooperation between national, regional, and local agencies is essential—indeed, the announced objective of the present administration—the elimination of this particularly vital program of patient rehabilitation is incomprehensible.

Alas, the sad story of the central New York regional medical program was not over. In late April, after the administration impounded the \$10 million from the second supplemental appropriation, the regional medical programs service directed the central New York program to make \$24,000 in additional cuts from the fiscal 1971 budget. This was accomplished, although it meant a 7-percent reduction in a program to provide inservice training for licensed practical and registered nurses and a 15-percent cut in a program of inservice training for physicians engaged in family practice.

The total budget reductions saved the administration \$178,000; but they cost the people of central New York dearly in terms of badly needed health services which could not be provided in local hospitals in many of the rural counties served by the program. Furthermore, the reductions cost those engaged in providing health care to the residents of central New York valuable experience in regional cooperation. By working together, health care professionals in central New York can provide care far superior to that presently being offered. To do this they must form effective professional relationships and gain confidence in each other. This confidence is one of the most important products of the central New York regional medical program.

Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Duval, last week held out hope for health maintenance organizations as an improved method for delivery of health services in rural areas. However, the administration persists in robbing funds from regional medical programs which will have to be the vital lifelines among health maintenance organizations.

The hatchet wielders in the Office of Management and Budget do not seem to realize that the health-care crisis is here and now and that it is not going to subside if they continue to impound the funds appropriated for every imaginative and innovative program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in economy in Government. We as Representatives have no greater responsibility than to make sure that our constituent's tax dollar is wisely used. If we are to carry out this responsibility, we must understand what the figures on the budget sheets mean to the people living in this great country. In my opinion, when we take time to see what the cuts in the budget of the regional medical programs service mean to the people of central New York, we will realize that the full appropriation would have been funds wisely used. That is why I support the appropriation of the full \$82,771,000 recommended by the committee. These funds, together with the funds impounded last year, will provide \$115,104,000 in obligational authority for regional medical programs in fiscal 1972. I sincerely hope that none of these funds are impounded.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, chaired by our beloved and respected colleague, Congressman FLOOD, Dr. Harold Margulies, director of the regional medical programs service, said that the purpose of the program was—

To improve the availability of and access to high quality health care to all Americans.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, few programs have purposes more worthy of our support.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, my colleague from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and the able and dedicated chairman of the Labor and HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD, along with the esteemed members of the committee, for including in this ap-

propriations bill funds for the continued operation of the Public Health Service hospitals.

The legislation as reported by the committee includes \$71,682,000 for patient care and special health services for fiscal year 1972. While this amount is admittedly not sufficient to cover expenses for the Public Health Service facilities for the entire year, I note that the appropriations committee, on page 18 of its report, has assured the Congress that a supplemental appropriation to cover other expenses will be considered at a later date.

The Public Health Service hospitals around the country provide valuable and essential medical services to thousands of people. The largest of these is located in Galveston, Tex., in my congressional district. The absence of this facility would impose a severe hardship upon the residents of my district and an intolerable strain upon other medical facilities located in the area. It would be a tragic mistake to close these hospitals.

The Federal Government has a legal and moral obligation, not only to keep these hospitals in operation, but to make certain that they provide the best health care possible. Instead of attempting to close these vital facilities, we should be modernizing and improving them, and supplying them with the most up-to-date equipment. I would hope that the Congress will leave no doubt that it wants these hospitals to remain in operation and to be remodeled, rehabilitated, and expanded in order that they can continue to provide the finest medical services available.

I commend the committee for its favorable action on this provision and urge the Congress to endorse these funds along with the promise of additional funds when needed.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend Chairman FLOOD for bringing to the floor a realistic appropriation for health care. He has augmented the budget about 11 percent.

In particular, I commend the committee for the supplemental funds—\$30 million for regional medical programs and the supplemental funds for animal research.

I personally would support a further very substantial program of health research and expenditure that would rather radically reorient American priorities.

I support the amendments of Mr. YATES and Mr. GIAMMO, and others, therefore, to increase the health budget another 11 percent.

I do not believe in general revenue sharing. I do believe in specific program assistance. Our retarded facilities, nationwide, are a disgrace. There are specific good exceptions.

In my home district we have the Valjeo-Benicia Council for Retarded Children doing good work, but our teachers need the training only the amendments to this bill can provide.

I urge the support, therefore, of all amendments to enlarge the scope of this bill.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a few moments this afternoon to speak on a subject of critical im-

portance—health. As a member of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, I have deplored the callousness of the Nixon administration in making cutbacks in vital health programs. But that is just part of the story.

We have lived through a miraculous era in medical research. What was once the horrible fear of contracting polio simply does not exist today. Diphtheria, typhoid fever, whooping cough, and rheumatic fever are no longer among the common risks of life. Indeed, we have come a long way.

But, there are miles to go before we can rest easily. The two leading killers: heart disease and cancer are like modern plagues on our House. Cancer will take the lives of 335,000 Americans this year while heart disease will account for three times that many deaths.

Once considered to be under control, venereal disease has roared back in epidemic proportions. Similarly, some estimate that as many as 50 percent of the residents of some inner city neighborhoods have tuberculosis.

Hippocrates once said:

Healing is a matter of time but it is sometimes also a matter of opportunity.

There is a vaccine for German measles and yet thousands of pregnant women bear deformed children as a result of this dreaded disease. Even though we have made great strides in curbing infectious disease with antibiotics, venereal disease and tuberculosis are very much a part of American life. Plainly enough, the health of the American people is lagging behind the great advances of medical science.

Medical programs must advance on two levels. We have to make greater strides to eliminate disease through medical research and, at the same time, extend the medical breakthroughs of yesterday to all of the American people today. Good health is the greatest of all blessings.

This can be the Congress that brings a new era of medical progress to all of our citizens. Why not make the 92d Congress the health Congress?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I support the bill before the House, the Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971. I commend the committee for its excellent work in reporting out a bill which restores many of the budget cuts requested by the administration. But the health crisis facing this Nation is so severe that I must also support the series of health improvement amendments which will be offered to this bill.

Half a year after he was inaugurated, President Nixon stated that—

We face a massive crisis in—the health—area and unless action is taken, both administratively and legislatively, to meet that crisis within the next 2 to 3 years, we will have a breakdown in our medical care system, which could have consequences affecting millions of people throughout this country.

That "massive crisis" is already upon us. Nationwide, there is a shortage of 50,000 doctors, 150,000 medical technicians, and 200,000 nurses. Although we are the richest Nation in the world and

pride ourselves on being the most advanced, we rank 13 among the industrialized nations in infant mortality, 11 in life expectancy for women, and 18 in life expectancy for men. There are 150 counties in America without a single doctor in residence and 150 more with only one physician.

The frontier of American health research lies in the collection of organizations known as the National Institutes of Health. The real and ultimate hope for improving the health prospects of this Nation rests in the continued advance of the biomedical sciences which has been spearheaded by the National Institutes. Official testimony on this year's budget for the Institutes and their research divisions heralded this year's budget as "marking the beginning of a new and more vigorous phase in Federal support for medical research." As the committee report indicates—

Even a cursory inspection of the budget justifications quickly dispels this optimistic view.

It is true that the National Cancer Institute is receiving an additional \$100 million, largely as a result of congressional support for the Conquest of Cancer Act, of which I am proud to have been a cosponsor.

The administration's requested appropriation for the other nine Institutes and the three research divisions is an increase of only \$21.7 million over last year—a growth of 2.3 percent. Four institutes—neurological diseases and stroke, allergy and infectious diseases, arthritic and metabolic diseases, and general medical sciences, are cut below last year's levels. The National Heart and Lung Institute, which concentrates on research on heart attacks—the Nation's No. 1 killer—received no increase over last year's appropriation. This, despite the fact that the Office of Science and Technology estimates that the cost of medical research rises 15 percent each year because of new and more sophisticated technology, increased personnel costs, and so forth.

Because of the importance of the Institutes in improving American health, the committee has added funds to each of the Institutes' appropriations request so as to bring the amount available this fiscal year up to the amounts available in the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1971. In addition, the committee has added a cost-of-living increase of approximately 6 percent to each of the Institutes. Yet the committee action is not enough to utilize the medical knowledge which we now have or are on the threshold of development. For this reason I am supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and Illinois (Mr. YATES) to add \$100 million to the budget of the Institutes. This amendment, being offered by members of the Appropriations Committee itself, is supported by 20 major health organizations.

To better appreciate the need for this increased funding, it is worth looking at some of the activities of the various Institutes.

The National Cancer Institute deals with probably the most dreaded disease

in the world and the second largest annual killer of Americans. Under the committee action and the amendment, research on this disease will be able to expand significantly. This is important because a large number of scientific and medical leaders have testified that recent advances and research clues are sufficiently promising to justify a major national commitment to a cancer conquest program. There are now over 100 viruses which are known to cause cancer. It is probable that when these viruses are identified and grown in the laboratory, it will be possible to develop preventive medicines for the control of these forms of cancer.

The Institute also needs to—and plans to—place increased emphasis on cancers caused by chemicals. Each year there are approximately 500 new chemicals entering our environment. In the past, we have found that some chemicals are very carcinogenic—cancer-causing. It is vital that more of the chemicals which we are constantly in contact with be tested and evaluated for cancer-causing properties.

The National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases needs additional funds to take advantage of recent medical developments in this area. These disorders afflict some 71 million Americans a year, at an estimated cost to the economy in lost work, et cetera, of \$4 billion annually. But recently, the search for the cause of rheumatoid arthritis has found that it is possibly a transmitted disease. "This demonstration provides a promising clue to the infectious and/or immunologic basis of rheumatoid arthritis" and brings us closer to finding a cure.

The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases needs additional funds to provide research on the allergies which afflict some 31 million Americans. In addition, private research should continue—and be expanded—on a number of basic infectious diseases. It is generally thought that pneumonia is no longer a major problem, yet it has just moved from sixth to fifth place as the leading disease killer of Americans. Pneumonia, despite the antibiotics we have today, killed 70,000 people in the United States last year.

The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences is designed to identify the environmental factors that adversely affect man, find out what diseases these pollutants cause, and develop cures for them. As the committee report states—

It is obviously impossible to wage an effective national campaign on pollution without a full knowledge of the composition and chemistry of the pollutants which are its cause.

Increased efforts are needed in this area.

The amendment which I am supporting will help all these Institutes to undertake the research so necessary to the health of all of us.

The health amendment will also provide an extra \$50 million for Hill-Burton hospital construction assistance. HEW has indicated that the present time we need 91,000 new hospital beds and the modernization of 227,000 others. The amount of hospital obsolescence grows

each year and is now estimated at \$15 billion nationwide. Despite this fact, no more money is being provided in fiscal year 1972 than was provided in the last fiscal year. If our medical plant continues to deteriorate at the present level, it will be next to impossible to avoid an accelerating breakdown in health services. Even the extra money provided by the amendment is inadequate, but it is a step in the right direction.

The health amendment will also provide badly needed funds to improve the communicable disease control program—a program designed to eliminate such diseases as German measles which when contracted by a pregnant mother, often results in death or deformity to the child. Programs to provide alcoholism treatment centers, to meet the problem of death and mental retardation caused by lead paint poisoning, and other important health needs will all be helped by the passage of the health package amendment.

Finally, in the area of the Department of Labor appropriation, I am disappointed that the committee deleted all funds for summer employment for next year. The committee report states that—

If conditions which prompted the supplemental appropriation for this purpose in 1971 still exist next Spring, it is quite possible that there will again be a supplemental appropriation for this purpose.

Summer employment for youth is a constant problem that is always with us. We always treat it as a crisis problem, with the result that the program is usually late in getting started, inadequate numbers of youths are employed, and the services which they provide to local governments and parks delayed. I recently surveyed the results of the Federal Government's youth hiring efforts in Cleveland for this summer. The results were shocking. In this year of unconscionable unemployment when it is almost impossible for youth and needy college students to find employment, the Federal Government has hired fewer young people than in any year since the summer program has been in effect. An appropriation should have been provided now so that planning could begin now to provide a good program next summer.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972 would allocate \$20.4 billion. This sum exceeds the President's budget request by \$322 million and is \$2.9 billion above last year's appropriation.

Despite these overall increases and the adequate funding of numerous worthwhile programs, the legislation still falls woefully short in many important areas, particularly with reference to vital health care and assistance programs.

Therefore, I shall support the amendments to be offered today by Mr. CONTE and Mr. YATES and by Mr. GIALMO. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The Conte-Yates amendment would add a total of \$230 million to the committee bill for the following seven health programs: National Institutes of Health, patient care, communicable disease control, Hill-Burton grants, alcoholism State formula grants, lead-based paint

poisoning prevention, and maternal and child care grants.

The Gialmo amendment would add \$82.4 million to the committee's recommendation for the following rehabilitation services programs: State-Federal vocational rehabilitation services, rehabilitation facility improvement, research and demonstration, and developmental disabilities.

These "package" amendments, for the most part, simply restore cuts which were made by the administration from fiscal year 1971 spending levels. The Conte-Yates amendment is strongly supported by the coalition for health funding—an organization made up of more than 20 health groups including the Association of American Medical Colleges, the National Council of Community Mental Health Centers, and the American Public Health Association. Among the supporters of the Gialmo amendment are the National Easter Seal Society, the National Rehabilitation Association, and Goodwill Industries.

On two issues of particular concern to me, I am disappointed that the committee has seen fit to include only \$5 million for lead paint poisoning elimination. Even if the Conte-Yates amendment prevails, funds for this vital program will still amount to less than half the fiscal 1972 authorization. A recent article from the Elizabeth Daily Journal, which follows my remarks, outlines the pressing need for adequate funds to end the scourge of lead paint poisoning.

On the other hand, I was gratified that the full amount has been approved for rat control. Originally, the administration had requested no funds for this program. However, this position was revised and \$15 million, the amount contained in the committee bill, was requested. Discontinuance of the rat control program at this stage would have represented a sharp setback to our cities' efforts to improve the quality of life for their people.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation is in the midst of a health-care crisis. We are the richest country in the world, yet we are failing to provide all our citizens with adequate health care. One small step on the path to better health for all Americans would be realized through the passage of an appropriations bill which truly reflects a commitment by the Congress to respond affirmatively to our Nation's health needs.

I include the following:

(From the Daily Journal, Elizabeth, N.J., July 8, 1971)

LEAD-POISONING FIGHT WAGED—PEELING WALLS DEAL DEATH

(By Stephen Franklin)

One morning last summer as N. Peter Garcia walked into Newark's Martland Hospital on his way to work, he saw a small child stretched out on a large table—dead of lead poisoning.

Three hundred youngsters were treated last year in Newark for lead poisoning, but it was the first time that Garcia, a social worker in the pediatric service, had ever seen a child killed by it.

In Plainfield, where the overcrowding and rundown housing problems are much less severe than Newark, it was a shock when a

17-month old child died of lead poisoning last year at Muhlenberg Hospital.

Since then, John Kunze, Plainfield's health officer, realized the need for a program to find all of those homes with children where lead-based paint is peeling from cracked or worn walls.

Like most persons involved in the fight against lead poisoning, he knows that it is a killer that could be eliminated easily but claims more children's lives annually because of the public's lack of awareness.

"We simply don't have the staff to survey homes for cracked or peeling walls," Kunze explained, adding that prevention programs would probably greatly reduce the chances of children's lead poisoning.

For some time Kunze hoped that Plainfield would qualify for a \$5,000 grant to purchase a lead paint detection machine under the federal Lead Based Poisoning Prevention Act.

In the mail recently, however, he received a letter from Washington explaining that although the President signed the bill Jan. 14, Congress has not appropriated any money for it.

For the program's first two years, there was supposed to be \$30 million spent, but Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Elliot Richardson never requested the money. After Congress killed a \$5 million proposal initiated by several of its members, Richardson submitted a \$2 million program in May. It has not yet been voted on.

"It's clear that we are concerned about this problem," claimed a HEW spokesman in Washington, who admitted that his office was not sure how far the \$2 million would go.

"There's no real good reason for allocating such smaller funds, except that when revenue sharing starts there will probably be more funds for screening and home correction," said Dr. Roger Challop of the Public Health Service in Cincinnati.

But the number of children whose lives are touched annually by lead poisoning is not a small figure. Last year in the nation 400,000 children received treatment, 3,200 suffered permanent brain damage, 800 went blind or required hospitalization and 200 died because of lead poisoning.

Health officials can identify lead poisoning victims by vomiting, fatigue and loss of weight, he explained, but added that "We really have no idea about the number of children who eat lead paint and show no symptoms."

The detection odds for these children, Dr. Challop remarked are poor since there are few lead-detection programs in the nation and communities the size of Plainfield cannot afford the cost of their own programs. Government figures also are not exact since only seven major cities in the nation require all reporting of lead poisoning cases, he claimed.

"It's quite likely many of the problem children in the nation's classrooms are suffering from lead poisoning," Dr. Challop continued. "If there's no screening of homes or housing program, then you might as well forget these children."

Of the first seven cities that applied for the non-existent funds of the Lead Based Poison Prevention Act, their requests totalled more than four times the proposed \$2 million allocation, according to a spokesman for Rep. William Flitts Ryan of New York.

"The money the administration has requested is hardly enough for postage stamps. It simply means that 200 children will die this year because they are waiting for revenue sharing which will never come to life," said the spokesman for Rep. Ryan, who sponsored the bill with Sen. Edward Kennedy.

With three children's deaths recorded in New Jersey last year from lead poisoning, Democratic Assemblyman Jern F. Fay Jr. of Colonia said that he was "upset" over the

political "dealing" it took in Trenton to have a bill approved.

Not long after Fay submitted legislation banning lead paint from any furniture or goods that might come in contact with children and giving local health officers the power to force repairs by landlords. Republican Sens. Farleigh Dickinson and James H. Wallwork presented an almost identical bill.

Even though the GOP-sponsored bill passed both houses and now awaits the governor's signature, Fay says that he will remain skeptical until he sees local officials begin its enforcement.

For John N. Surmay, Elizabeth's director of health, welfare and housing, the lead poisoning prevention problem has been kept at a minimum since housing inspectors and public health nurses have concentrated on warning people of this dangers.

Just after the GOP-sponsored bill passed both houses, however, Garcia wrote to several legislators, asking why no funds were proposed to enforce the law.

"Unless this bill is backed up with muscle in terms of dollars," he warned, "this law will have little effect on the problem."

To help the Trenton lawmakers gain a feeling for the problem, Garcia invited them to look over the admission record of his hospital which shows that 105 children were brought in between January and May for lead poisoning.

Each admission for lead poisoning treatment, he went on, means 60 injections stretched out over a five-day period at a cost of about \$500, which the state usually pays.

Once a child completes the treatment, there's no guarantee that he will not return to the same apartment to pick at the still peeling chips of lead paint, Garcia added.

Each time a 1- or 2-year-old returns to the hospital social workers there witness the child's slow, painful progression towards mental retardation, which occurs in a third of all lead poisoning cases, he said.

Last summer Garcia decided that he had to write to state legislators and do all he could to beat the killer that can be stopped with only a little more concern and some dollars.

If several legislators came to Martland Hospital to see what lead poisoning does to children, Garcia thinks they might spend the dollars needed to keep children alive.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with our consideration today of legislation providing fiscal 1972 appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, I rise to call particular attention to funds included in H.R. 10061 which are of critical importance in the fight against cancer.

The horrifying dimensions of this terrible disease in the United States certainly need no additional delineation and the commitment to do everything possible to combat cancer is unquestionably shared by all of us.

In my judgment, however, the House Appropriations Committee is to be especially commended for the strong commitment which it has made to the fight against cancer by providing an additional \$3,193,000 in funds over the amount requested for the National Cancer Institute. With these additional funds the total amount provided for the National Cancer Institute in H.R. 10061 is \$237,531,000. As the committee report on H.R. 10061 points out, furthermore, with the \$100 million cancer funding already appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1971, the National Cancer Institute will have

\$104,371,000 more available in fiscal 1972 than it had in 1971.

I am particularly gratified by the recognition evidenced in the committee's report on H.R. 10061 of the need for a major cancer research center in the Southeastern part of the United States. On page 23 of this report the committee noted the major role which cancer research centers, supported by the National Cancer Institute, have played "in the conduct of intensive, highly specialized and coordinated clinical and laboratory research relating to the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of cancer in man."

In the same paragraph the report contains the statement that—

The committee was particularly impressed with testimony concerning the lack of any such center in the entire Southeastern part of the country, and was pleased to be informed of the planning that is now being done for such a center. It will be expected that the development of this center be given high priority under the 1972 budget.

The critical need for a cancer research center to serve the Southeast and the extensive planning toward such a center already underway at the University of Alabama in Birmingham was brought out in subcommittee hearings on this legislation by the Alabama congressional delegation and by Dr. John R. Durant, professor of medicine, cancer planning director and director of the cancer research and training program at the University of Alabama in Birmingham.

During the subcommittee hearings we pointed to the widely recognized value of regional cancer research, training, and treatment centers and the fact that with the nearest such cancer institutes over 700 miles away, the State of Alabama and the Southeast are largely without these vital services.

We also indicated our strong conviction that the University of Alabama in Birmingham represents the most logical and beneficial location for the development of a regional cancer center to serve the Southeastern United States. The university already possesses what are generally recognized to be the requirements for the operation of a first-rate cancer program. Such a program requires the availability of a broad range of resources including laboratory sciences, basic research sciences, and the spectrum of the clinical sciences. The already well-developed plans for the proposed Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Hospital and Tumor Institute provide for the integration of a statewide cancer program and its facilities into the other outstanding programs of education, research, and service activities of the University of Alabama in Birmingham.

The citizens of Alabama are justifiably proud of the outstanding medical programs and facilities of the University of Alabama in Birmingham and its medical center. The advances in medical technology there have received worldwide acclaim, and with the center's rapid expansion—both physically and educationally—it promises to become one of the Nation's most outstanding medical com-

plexes. As I indicated in my testimony to the subcommittee on this matter, furthermore, the University of Alabama Medical Center was cited in the October 30, 1967, issue of the American Medical Association Journal as the "fastest-rising medical center" among southern medical schools.

These fine qualifications are also true of the university's work in the field of cancer. For a number of years the university's medical center has gradually been recruiting a nucleus of physicians and scientists with special interest in the various problems of cancer. This has resulted in the development of an informal cancer program at the medical center, with an increasing number of cancer patients being referred to the center each year.

In early 1969 the Alabama Comprehensive Health Planning Agency, the Alabama regional medical program, and the Alabama Division of the American Cancer Society formally approved a plan for a statewide cancer program calling for a major cancer center located in the University of Alabama's medical center with cooperating cancer management facilities located throughout the State.

The cancer program at the University of Alabama in Birmingham has also been visited by representatives of the National Cancer Institute and has received a planning grant of approximately \$225,000 for the purpose of developing a regional cancer research, training, and treatment center. Accomplishments to date toward the establishment of this center include the recruitment of outstanding professional personnel in the cancer field, the beginning of a network of radiation therapy centers and a telephonic consultation service, the development of a formal tumor program, the enlargement of the medical center's experimental clinical programs, plans for a building to house the cancer program, and the development of details for the projects of the cancer program.

The fine people of my State have also indicated their strong commitment to the development of a major cancer center in Birmingham by contributing nearly \$5 million to it in the largest public fund drive in the State's history.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely gratified by the committee's approval of over \$3 million in additional cancer funds and its expression of support for the development of a major cancer center in Southeastern United States. I urge my colleagues in the House to uphold the committee's action in this regard and profoundly share the committee's expressed hope that the development of this center will be given high priority in the National Cancer Institute's fiscal 1972 budget.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, this is, I believe, the first time I have voted against the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I would not normally do so in view of the many important, desirable, and ongoing programs which are included in this measure.

Our country, however, is in a very precarious situation. It is anticipated that the budgetary deficit for the fiscal year

1972 will run in the neighborhood of \$25 billion, and some predictions make it more likely \$35 billion. If we continue the course we follow here today these predictions seem likely to be realized.

Inflation is still spiraling upward in this country. Strikes and ever-increasing wage settlements beset us. The news of the day includes information that reserves of all kinds behind our currency are at an all time low, and that the price of gold is being bid upward in London and other world markets, due in substantial part to international views as to the weakness of the dollar. Knowledgeable economists are mentioning possible devaluation.

In this situation the committee brings in a bill which is \$321,750,000 above the President's budget and \$2,800,000,000 over last year's appropriation without counting some \$244 million of added expense which will be incurred by repealing the provision in the budget presentation which limited grants to the States for "services, staff training, and administrative expenses" in connection with public assistance to 110 percent of the grants for fiscal year 1971. Consequently we are really talking about a bill that comes in here at \$565,750,000 over the budget.

In addition, the Giaimo and Rogers amendments add \$83 million and \$14 million, respectively, for an additional \$97 million, so that with these amendments we have a bill carrying \$418,750,000 above the budget request; or, taking account—as we should—of the \$244 million added by repealing or omitting the limitation on public assistance grants to the States, we have a bill appropriating \$662 million more than the budget request.

Earlier today, in adopting the conference report on the Agriculture and Independent Agencies appropriations, we exceeded the budget by \$1.172 billion, and topped that bill, as passed by this House—and which I supported—by over \$853 million.

By our actions today, therefore, we add some \$1,834 million to the budget—a budget already in the red by around 25 billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeated this measure today would all these good programs, which are covered in this bill, fall by the way? Of course not.

Defeat of this measure would simply mean that the Committee on Appropriations would come back into the House with a bill which, while still generous in amount, would pay more realistic heed to the by no means niggardly budget requests of the administration which has to carry out the provisions of the bill. We would still have an appropriation—in the strictly controllable appropriated items—of around \$20 billion for the various programs and objectives of this bill, and of course the "uncontrollable" items, such as social security payments, which are appropriated through the mechanism of this bill, are obligations of the Government which have to be, and would be, provided for in any case.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to vote against the type of desirable program represented by many of the things funded by this measure. I have voted for these appropriations in the past; I would

vote for reasonable, and even for generous, appropriations for many or most of these objectives today. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is our duty, as responsible representatives of the people and in the circumstances in which we now find ourselves, to exercise some restraint.

I do not believe, that under these circumstances, we should decide to spend something like half a billion dollars more than the Government itself says that it needs in order to carry out the programs provided for in this bill.

We know, too, that no matter at what level we start, the U.S. Senate—star-studded with popularity-seeking presidential aspirants as it is—will add millions of additional dollars to whatever sum we here may appropriate. This is but one more reason for us to set what can only be the initial figure at a somewhat realistic and reasonable level.

Many of the programs included in this bill and which we all wish to continue, under a prosperous Government which will remain financially able to continue them, are most worthwhile and desirable programs.

But as our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) says, "Where is the money coming from?"

The answer, of course, is that it is going to come out of taxes earned by the sweat of the brow of Americans you and I represent—and, I fear, also out of the sweat of the brows of their descendants, including those yet unborn.

I fear also that it may come at the expense of a solid national financial structure and a sound national currency.

Mr. Speaker, when our day's work is done, I walk out of this historic building, and I see our flag flying high. By that sight I am always sobered and impressed. It is my hope that my service here, and the votes I may cast here, will not contribute to the financial instability of our Government, and to the misery of our people, which such instability will, in the end, inevitably exact. It is in that spirit that I cast my vote against this bill today.

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

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

Mr. YATES. 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. 206]

Abernethy	Foley	Martin
Abourezk	Ford,	Montgomery
Anderson,	William D.	Morse
Tenn.	Garmatz	Nelsen
Ashley	Goldwater	Pickle
Baring	Goodling	Poage
Blackburn	Gray	Rees
Blatnik	Griffiths	Rosenthal
Burlison, Mo.	Gubser	Roybal
Carter	Fanna	St Germain
Celler	H'bert	Saylor
Clark	Hosmer	Seiberling
Clay	Hungate	Sisk
Conyers	Jones, Tenn.	Stubblefield
Culver	Keith	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Koch	Van Deerlin
Donohue	Kyros	Vigorito
Dorn	Long, La.	Whitehurst
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Yatron
Esch	McEwen	
Evins, Tenn.	McKinney	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, 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. 10061, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 374 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. At the time the quorum was called, all time had been expended. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health and, except as otherwise provided, the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681, et seq.), the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-616), and the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-793), \$581,201,000, of which \$55,193,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1973, for grants pursuant to parts A, C, and D of the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 9, strike lines 5 through 15 and insert in lieu thereof, the following paragraph:

"For carrying out the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health and, except as otherwise provided, the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681, et seq.), the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-616), and the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-793), \$596,201,000, of which \$55,193,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1973, for grants pursuant to parts A, C, and D of the Community Mental Health Centers Act; for carrying out, except as otherwise provided, sections 301, 311, and title X of the Public Health Service Act and title V of the Social Security Act, \$346,651,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to section 503(2) or 504(2) of such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of section 506 of such Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State; to carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, sections 301, 308, 311, 315, 317, 322(e), 325, 328, and 353 to 369 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the prevention and suppression of communicable and preventable diseases (including the introduction from foreign countries and the interstate transmission and spread thereof), occupational safety and health, community environmental sanitation, and control of radiation hazards to health; the functions of the Secretary, except title IV under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (Public Law 91-695) except section 301; and sections 6-8 and 18-27 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; including care and treatment of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322(e) of the Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the Public Health Service are not available; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by the law of such countries; licensing of laboratories; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;

\$129,425,000; to carry out title VI of the Public Health Service Act, and, except as otherwise provided, for administrative and technical services under parts B and C of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act (42 U.S.C. 2661-2677), the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457), and the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681-2687), \$316,704,000; of which \$222,200,000 shall be available until June 30, 1974 for grants pursuant to section 601 of the Public Health Service Act for the construction or modernization of medical facilities; \$50,300,000 shall be for deposit in the fund established under section 626, and shall be available without fiscal year limitation for the purposes of that section of the Act, of which \$30,000,000 shall be available for direct loans pursuant to section 627 of the Act; \$24,052,000 shall be for grants and \$16,575,000 shall be for loans for nonprofit private facilities pursuant to the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457): *Provided*, That there are authorized to be deposited in the fund established under section 626(a)(1) of the Act amounts received by the Secretary and derived by him from his operations under part B of title VI of the Act which shall be available for the purposes of section 626(a)(1): *Provided further*, That sums received by the Secretary from the sale of loans made pursuant to section 627 of the Act shall be available to him for the purposes of that section; for carrying out, except as otherwise provided, the Act of August 8, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 7901), and under sections 301, 311, 321, 324, 326, 328, 331, 332, 502, and 504 of the Public Health Service Act, section 1010 of the Act of July 1, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 763c) and section 1 of the Act of July 19, 1963 (42 U.S.C. 253a), \$81,682,000, of which \$1,200,000 shall be available only for payments to the State of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when the Health Services and Mental Health Administration establishes or operates a health service program for any department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made by way of reimbursement or in advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation; for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out title IV, part B, of the Public Health Service Act, \$236,624,000; for expenses necessary to carry out title IV, part D, of the Public Health Service Act with respect to arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$160,204,000; for expenses necessary to carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, title IV, part D of the Public Health Service Act with respect to neurology and stroke, \$128,590,000; for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out title IV, part E of the Public Health Service Act with respect to general medical sciences, including grants of therapeutic and chemical substances for demonstrations and research, \$193,490,000; to carry out, except as otherwise provided, title IV, part E, and title X of the Public Health Service Act with respect to child health and human development, \$127,668,000."

Mr. YATES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

I have furnished copies of the amendment to both the majority and minority sides of the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an

amendment to the paragraph just read, that is, the paragraph on lines 5 through 15 on page 9, as a simple substitute to several paragraphs of the pending bill, and I hereby give notice that if the amendment is agreed to I will offer a motion to strike out the several paragraphs appearing as follows: the paragraph on page 10, lines 18 through 26; the paragraph on page 11, lines 5 through 25; the paragraph beginning on line 1 of page 12 and extending through line 2 on page 13; the paragraph on page 13, lines 3 through 17; the paragraph on page 14, lines 16 through 19; the paragraph on page 15, lines 1 through 5; the paragraph on page 15, lines 6 through 11; the paragraph on page 15, lines 17 through 22; and the paragraph on page 16, lines 1 through 6.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which is sponsored by Mr. CONTE and me, proposes to correct the deficiencies in the appropriation bill. Progress in the Nation's health requires that additional moneys be made available for certain HEW programs.

Two years ago, on July 10, 1969, President Nixon walked into the rose garden and held a press conference in which he said:

I realized when the administration came in, in January, that we had a major problem with regard to health care, that the problem was primarily one of enough doctors, the quality of the doctors, enough hospital beds to take care of the massively increasing demands in this field.

The President continued:

The report that I have received from Secretary Finch and Dr. Egeberg indicates that the problem is much greater than I had realized. We face a massive crisis in this area and unless action is taken, both administratively and legislatively, to meet that crisis within the next 2 to 3 years, we will have a breakdown in our medical care system which could have consequences affecting millions of people throughout this country.

And the President concluded:

I don't think I am overstating the case.

Mr. Chairman, these are resounding words that the President uttered. It is unfortunate that the President did not follow through on what seemed to be a commitment to do something about the massive health crisis by providing adequate funding for the purpose.

The budgets he presented for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 and for this year 1972 were most inadequate to meet the massive health crisis, with the lone exception of the \$100 million the President has allocated for the drive against cancer. The allocation of this amount, however, does not mean that research upon the great number of other health problems must stop. The fight against other diseases that cripple and kill mankind must go on.

I have offered, Mr. Chairman, a composite amendment which will include the following items.

For the National Institutes of Health there is a composite sum of \$70 million for all the institutes. I have reduced this amount from the amount I had stated we had prepared in our minority views by \$30 million, to make it accord with the hearings before this subcommittee and with the testimony that was brought out

by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH). If Members will look at page 572 of the hearings, of part 3, Members will note that in response to a question by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), Dr. Marston stated that there were \$143 million of approved requests, of research requests, that were above the budget that had been submitted by the President.

This committee did not grant the \$143 million Dr. Marston said was needed. This committee granted \$83 million above the budget. My amendment proposes to take care of the difference.

The amendment also includes \$10 million for patient care to take care of the public health service hospitals throughout the country which are threatened with closing by the administration.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the amendment also includes \$30 million for the control of communicable diseases, to take care of the growing problem of venereal disease, or the fight against rubella, of the suddenly rising threat of tuberculosis. All of these diseases are once again becoming dangerous.

The amendment also includes \$50 million for Hill-Burton grants, \$15 million for alcoholism, \$5 million for lead poisoning, \$20 million for maternal and child care grants; a total of \$200 million.

I should like to call your attention—time does not permit me to address myself to each of these items, but I want only to point out with respect to one item, the item with respect to the Hill-Burton program, that the committee's allocation has again been most deficient. Emphasis is placed by the committee on providing subsidies for interest so that hospitals can modernize themselves with a 3 percent subsidy by the Federal Government; but with a rate of interest that is at least 8 or 9 percent in most places in the country hospitals will not undertake the financial burden necessary in order to meet their modernization requirements. Moreover, guidelines have not been approved. Hear this—not one application for a loan has been approved by HEW for hospital modernization in the last 18 months.

There is an inadequate amount presented here for grants as well for the construction of hospitals. The amount of \$50 million is, in my judgment, a very minimal amount to take care of this program.

There is a \$16 billion obsolescence factor in the hospitals of this Nation, and this committee has not given the subject the attention that it deserves.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we believe that in order to advance the health care of this Nation we must approve of the amounts in this amendment. As a noted historian, Will Durant, once observed from a vantage point of 40 years of study of the history of the Nation:

The health of the nation is more important than the wealth of the nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of my amendment.

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

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates-Conte amendment which contains an increase in the funding for the lead-based paint elimination program from \$5 million in the pending bill to \$10 million. The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1971 of which I was the author would provide grant assistance to local communities to assist them in eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning and would provide assistance to local public health agencies in treating children who have ingested lead paint. Two hundred children a year are dying of this dreaded manmade disease. We have an opportunity here to provide much needed funds to a program which will go a long way to eliminate this disease which is plaguing most of our large central cities. The whole problem of lead-based paint poisoning in children has been widely discussed both here in the Congress and in the cities over the past year. I will not at this point go into a long discussion concerning this childhood disease.

I would like to compliment my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, DANIEL FLOOD, who is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare, and who, through sheer persistence, managed to convince the administration to finally fund this program. The administration originally requested no funds for the lead-based paint poisoning prevention program and only after the distinguished subcommittee chairman persisted did they then request a meager \$2 million. I was pleased that the committee increased this figure to \$5 million although it still is far too little to begin to meet the problems that lead-based paint poisoning is inflicting to our children in our large central cities. My own city of Philadelphia could use the total \$5 million that is appropriated in this bill alone. The Yates-Conte amendment increases the appropriation to \$10 million, which is only a first step.

The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act authorized a total of \$30 million over a 2-year period. I believe that Congress should appropriate the full amount, but knowing the realities of the situation, I am supporting a \$10 million appropriation figure.

Mr. Chairman, this problem is too important to be put off for another year. We in Congress must see that we take the steps to attack this dread disease now.

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

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. Year after year. Ai-yai-yai! Of all people, I find myself standing here in the well of this House opposing another large, what we have come to call, package amendment.

Of course, you in your good judgment have usually supported the committee and undoubtedly will again, but it seems that no matter how much your commit-

tee recommends we are bound to face an attempt and a bona fide one—be sure about that—to raise it. These people are not frauds. This is bona fide which makes it worse.

Now, I am very uncomfortable in this role. I have played some good roles in my time—and bad ones. I would never have tried out for this one.

Now, I am not considered and I do not consider myself to be one who is opposed to increased Federal appropriations for such things as the control of alcoholism, medical research, the control of communicable diseases, maternal and child health, and so on and so on and so on. And, neither are you.

Now, it would be much, much easier for me to be a knight in shining armor riding forth to battle for truth and beauty in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Instead, I have to sit through 6 months of the hearings on hundreds and hundreds of programs—you know that—funded in this bill, trying, from our hearts, as I am sure it is true with you, to reach a judgment as to the level for each program, in a fair and reasonable manner.

This is the appropriations process. You know that. We went through this on the education bill. The President, thank goodness, signed the bill. We are doing precisely the same thing at this time.

Now, this bill is \$560,572,000 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1971 for health programs, and \$341,258,000 over the budget request. Is there something the matter with that? We do not think so. I do not think that any reasonable person—and this is no reflection upon anyone—none—any reasonable person who reads our report carefully could possibly come away with the conclusion that this committee has been insensitive to the health needs of this Nation.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FLOOD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FLOOD. I might not use all of that time, but I probably will.

Let me repeat for the purpose of emphasis that this bill—now, hear this—this bill provides an increase of over one-half billion dollars over last year's level—one-half billion dollars for the health programs, and an increase of \$340 million over the budget request. And, these figures, by the way, exclude medic-aid about which you know and medicare, which amount to over \$12 billion. You have not heard that mentioned. Well, here it is.

Now, with reference to NIH. No one is more concerned about NIH than this committee; no one, and never will be. We have approved every increase contained in the budget and on top of that we have added to the budget for every institute without exception. For the research institutes the total 1972 funding level would be \$1,379,722,000 which is \$188,000,000 above the 1971 level and \$88,000,000 more than the budget request.

For control of communicable diseases, we have provided some \$20,000,000 over

the original budget request of which \$16,-000,000 is earmarked for control of venereal disease.

For Hill-Burton grants, we added \$87,-200,000 over the budget to maintain the 1971 level. The bill also includes \$30,000,-000 for direct loans and \$20,300,000 for interest subsidies which should finance \$500,000,000 worth of construction.

For alcoholism, we added, in addition to the very substantial amounts already included in the budget, \$25,000,000 for formula grants to States.

For lead poisoning, we included \$5,-000,000 in the bill which is \$3,000,000 over the budget request.

For maternal and child health, the bill includes \$326,651,000 which is an increase of \$64,659,000 over last year.

The amendment also includes \$10,-000,000 for the operation of the Public Health Service hospitals. We did not think it necessary to put these funds into the bill in view of the assurances which have been given to Congress that these hospitals will not be closed without further discussion with interested members and committees of Congress. As we state in the report, we know that a supplemental appropriation will be necessary for the hospitals for fiscal year 1972, and we expect to deal with it a later date.

Mr. Chairman, no Member of this House needs to think that he must vote in favor of this amendment in order to demonstrate his concern for the Nation's health. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conte-Yates health amendment which provides \$200 million to the Labor-HEW appropriations for fiscal year 1972. These funds are recommended for seven health programs, all vital. I would like to single out one of the programs for special comment because of my familiarity with it; namely, the maternal and child care grants. The Conte-Yates amendment will increase the appropriation for this program and its various components under title V of the Social Security Act by \$20 million.

Even with this proposed increase, the appropriation for these maternal and infant care and children and youth health programs falls far short of the level needed to maintain adequate funding. Certainly, our colleagues should support the Conte-Yates amendment since it is the best appropriation we have in the House for these critically needed funds. Hopefully, the amount will be increased by the Senate.

Fiscal year 1972, is the last scheduled funding year for project grants for children and youth and maternal and infant care projects. I have introduced legislation which provides Federal funding to continue these project grants for an additional 5 years. These programs serve over one-half million children across the country of lower socioeconomic groups delivering comprehensive health care to children in central cities and rural areas. These projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in compre-

hensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country.

The bill, H.R. 7657, as amended, has at this time 87 cosponsors in the House and 17 in the Senate. To give our colleagues an insight into these programs, I am including information from the Association of Children and Youth Directors.

I also want to add my voice in support of the other increases requested. The amounts provided for treating alcoholism, communicable diseases including stopping the spread of venereal disease, and attempting to eradicate lead poisoning which affects our children living in slum tenements in the great cities of this country are far too meager, but at least this amendment will provide some additional and indispensable funds for these vital programs.

The special material provided by the directors of the children and youth programs follows:

THE NATIONWIDE CHILDREN AND YOUTH HEALTH PROGRAM

A nation is only healthy if its young has been given the appropriate nurturing from birth. The concern about the quality of the health care and the extent of the health care for children and youth of this country has been present for some time. However, it was the report of the Ways and Means Committee in the mid-sixties which led to the introduction of legislation, that provided grants for the organization of health programs for children and youth. For the first time programs were to be funded which were mandated to deal with the total health of the child rather than the continuance of acute episodic care. It was the recognition of the fact that the maintenance of a state of well-being, not merely the treatment of disease, determines the health of the individual and the nation.

The Comprehensive Health Services was established in 1965 under P.L. 89-97, the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act. The pertinent new provision was section 532 of Title V, Part 4 of the Social Security Act and reads in part as follows:

"In order to promote the health of children and youth of school or pre-school age, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income families . . ." grants may be approved ". . . to pay not to exceed 75 percent of the costs of projects of a comprehensive nature for health care and services for children and youth of school age for pre-school children (to help them prepare to start school). No project shall be eligible for a grant under this section unless it provides (1) for the coordination of health care and services provided under it with, and utilization (to the extent feasible) of, other State, or local health, welfare and education programs for such children, (2) for payment of reasonable cost (as determined in accordance with standards approved by the secretary) of inpatient hospital services provided under the project, and (3) that any treatment, correction of defects or aftercare . . . is available only to children who would not otherwise receive it because they are from low-income families or for other reasons beyond their control; and no such project for children and youth of school age shall be considered . . . of a comprehensive nature . . . unless it includes . . . at least such screening, diagnosis, preventive services, treatment, correction of defects, and aftercare, both medical and dental, as may be provided for in regulations of the Secretary." The purpose of the Federal grant is to increase the availability and to improve the quality of health care services, not to replace or reduce State or local community funds.

So specified the legislation as to what these grants should do in trying to improve

the health care for children and youth. Cognizant of the intent of the legislation the guidelines that were established for the application for and administration of these programs include the following:

To increase the quantity of needed services and make them more readily available to the population being served;

To better coordinate and more efficiently administer the health care given to low-income children of the areas;

To guide families to community resources which are appropriate to the need of their children;

To reduce preventable illness and disability among children in the project area and to ameliorate chronic conditions amenable to treatment;

To offer an opportunity to develop, test and apply new methods of providing care to children.

Over the nation there are now 67 projects. The grantee agencies include an existing health department, medical school or teaching institution. The third major force along with the federal government and provider institution is the community. The government, as sponsor of the program, designates the broad limits; provision of free comprehensive care to children and youth. The resources it offers comes in the form of grants to certain provider institutions which in turn impose their own limitations due to their unique organization and method of operation. Institutional resources come in many forms, including matching funds and services, and types of personnel available. The community imposes its particular limitations due to demographic characteristics, specifically, its size, population density, socio-economic character and health status. At the same time the community holds various resources which can be utilized, including possible personnel, decision-making activities based on community experience and the resources available from other sites of health provisions located in the area.

The limitations imposed and resources available from these three major forces combine to become the specified context for each Children and Youth project.

With the development of such comprehensive care programs, it was important to have some consistent method of collecting data so that the vast amount of experience which would accrue could be logically and objectively examined. Therefore, the Systems Development Project of the University of Minnesota the research and reporting arm of the Children and Youth Program, formulated a quarterly reporting system which exacted similar information from each project in a standardized or uniform reporting method and also allowed for the individuality of each project in its non-uniform reporting. The total concept of comprehensive care then had to be broken down into component parts and the accompanying diagram shows diagrammatically what is called the comprehensive care cycle. By understanding the cycle of care one can follow the course of the child as he enters the program. The program in turn can look at its data and understand where difficulties might lie in putting a child through the complete cycle. The philosophy is that a child is never lost to care and the provider assumes the responsibility of not only care but knowing who and where the population of children are at any given time. One of the crucial differences that existed between the usual method of encounter care or episodic care and comprehensive care was the concept of a planned and supervised flow of services.

As noted there are 67 projects throughout the nation varying in size range from one block to 6373 square miles, size will depend upon population density and resources available. The hospital project serves a median area of 2 square miles, and health department serves a median area of 18 square miles.

The largest ethnic group among project geographic area populations is white and the second largest is black. However, the position of these groups is reversed in registrant population. The other ethnic groups, American Indian, Spanish-speaking, Oriental and other show less difference between their proportion of representation in the geographic and registrant populations.

The outcomes to date have been very interesting and contribute strongly to the need for these programs to be continued under the present authorization status.

These programs have become for the areas in which they are located, the service programs of care. They are no longer demonstrations, models, etc. they are the health services which are available to that low-income population which they serve. Moreover, because of the effectiveness of these programs in the educational aspect of helping families understand the need for health supervision, the expectations of the community residents for care is much different than it was prior to the Children and Youth Program.

Since one of the mandates of the Children and Youth programs was to furnish the health care for the family and to coordinate with other agencies if their involvement is needed, the families using Children and Youth services now expect that health care will include not only attention to their medical needs but also to their environmental and social health wants, and that if the program itself does not do this, the program will coordinate with another agency to have this need attended to. For the first time Health programs have taken the complete responsibility for health care which is consistent with the recommendation made in the editorial in the American Medical Association News entitled "Healthy Babies", which said "The physician must be given control of the social conditions."

For the first time in many instances there was the real experience of team care where professionals and non-professionals represented in the various programs the new health careers people who are being trained in increasing numbers and whose incorporation into the health system makes for more effective health care delivery. Very often these workers are from their respective communities and represent a group who understand the culture and mores of that particular area and population. The involvement of team care also caused a re-examination of the professionals in regard to their responsibilities so that medicine, nursing and social work had need to re-examine their functions in light of appropriateness and best utilization of skills.

These programs attracted over the country highly motivated personnel who were willing to grapple with the objective of improvement of health care delivery and innovation of new methods. There is now over the country a group of people who have accumulated experience and knowledge over the past few years; it takes a while for programs to tool up and work through many of the problems that exist both within program and within the community. To discontinue support of these programs now would be to dissipate all that experience and knowhow that has been assembled only to have to resurrect it sometime in the future. The Children and Youth programs do represent a nucleus upon which a broader health care delivery system could be developed in the future if some of the national thinking about health care is to materialize.

The data collected shows that in many programs there is an increasing number of well children under health supervision indicating that early detection of disease and preventive application of health care has resulted in a healthier population under supervision. In other programs there has been a decreasing infant mortality rate for that particular area. Programs located in some of

the larger urban areas have either instituted or cooperated with the city health department in large surveys for detection of lead poisoning. Programs have added components to their projects which are particularly relevant to their community needs. These include programs to work with drug addicts, special considerations for the teenage members of their programs, particularly the unwed teenage mother. Programs have either started or work closely with the day care centers in their community. Some programs have extensive outreach health education program in the community which include the incorporation of a health component in the training programs of the school for family or teaching assistants.

Because of the total health family orientation of the Children and Youth programs, the schools in the areas where these programs are located have for the first time been able to have a referral source which attends to total needs and in this way many school suspension have been averted because of the mutual planning of the school and health agencies. Recognition that early cognitive stimulation is important for a healthy functioning achieving child, has caused some of the programs to promote special activities for cognitive stimulation for infants and mothers.

The high identification of the patients with their Children and Youth programs has been demonstrated through several interview surveys done by some of the programs. There is no longer the former anonymity of the patient who attended a clinic; there is a warm, personal relationship between the family and the health program, with a high degree of identification by name of the particular personnel responsible for the care of a child and family. There is a growing trust between the program and the community. For some of the programs, their operation began when there was great tension in the community between the members of the community and the public institutions including schools and hospitals. In most cases there has been meaningful exchange and the Children and Youth program has become part of that community. Community input in Children and Youth programs has taken different forms depending upon the nature of the community and program, for most there has been community input. Part of this acceptance has been the recognition that the Children and Youth program is the way that the community wishes to have its health care provided for its children.

Curtailment of federal authorization at this time would be the end of Children and Youth programs in most communities. Restrictive budgets in most cities and states, precarious financial situations of most hospitals would make it impossible for these programs to survive. Once again hundreds of thousands of children would be returned to episodic care if any.

The Children and Youth programs are the prototypes of health care delivery which must be envisioned for all Americans young and old in this country.

Dr. Mildred Moorehead stated in a paper "Comparison Between OEO Neighborhood Health Centers and Other Health Care Providers of Ratings of the Quality of Health Care," presented at the American Public Association in Houston, Texas 1970, "Children's Bureau Children and Youth programs received a total rating for pediatric care that was 60 percent higher than the average of the hospital out-patient departments. Their ratings were considerably higher than the average of the hospital out-patient departments. Their ratings were considerably higher in all areas than those of the other programs reviewed. The OEO centers, the well-baby clinics of the health departments and the group practices received ratings above that of the hospitals but the differences were not as marked."

In its final report to the President, the

National Advisory Committee on Health Facilities, appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson on October 6, 1967, emphasized the need for a thorough reappraisal of the existing patterns of health care delivery in the United States. "The Nation must concentrate upon organizing health facilities and other health resources into effective, efficient, and economical community systems of comprehensive health care available to all." Their assessment of the existing health care system, including a survey of the evaluation of national health policy during the past three decades, led the Commission to conclude that: "Health activities in the United States have progressed to a point that the Nation can realistically work toward developing systems of comprehensive health care-systems of high quality that emphasize both initial and continuing care, and systems which are accessible and available to the entire population."

Above all else Children and Youth Programs across the nation have fulfilled the needs of availability, acceptability and accessibility.

The Federal government had the foresight to recognize the need for the establishment of such programs. It can only be hoped that the accomplishments will not wither because of failure to continue the authorization for such programs. The goal for each child should be achievement not merely survival, adequate health care supervision is a vital must if achievement is to be realized for the children of the nation who grow up to be its leaders.

SUMMARY IMPACTS OF THE CHILDREN & YOUTH PROGRAM

(By Vernon E. Weckwerth, Ph.D.)

The Children and Youth program is unique by legislative design and has demonstrated its effectiveness in organizational impacts on care delivery, effective implementation of planned, continuous, complete care which by a certain number of measures have produced healthier children. The program is also characterized by the existence of having an information system which not only can measure performance and costs of care on an on-going basis but predict these as well.

For the program as a whole, the 69 service delivery projects have over 490,000 registered children and youth out of a maximum residing in these geographical service areas of 3.4 million children and youth. These children are from the least well, lowest income, most health-service deprived populations across the nation.

MAJOR IMPACTS

1. For the first time, health departments, teaching hospitals and medical schools became directly involved, as both grantees and deliverers, in both preventive and curative services for large populations of children. As a result medical school curricula were changed and additionally, organizational capacities to deliver care created for the first time in most grantees.

2. The disease distribution of presenting conditions were changed as children move from encounter care services to supervised care. Conditions believed to be preventable have in most cases dropped in prevalence among the registrants. Most dramatic are the rising rates of "well children" upon subsequent assessment for those who have been under planned service programs.

3. By reorganizing and experimenting critical interchange and substitution of lower cost, local health workers can do the job in lieu of non-available and higher cost personnel.

4. Service linkages to the polyplot of other purveyors have been established, and a coordinated service system is now operational in many projects with good progress being made in most others.

5. Because of its management information

system, the C & Y Program is the only health program that can give quarter by quarter data on measures of continuity, completeness and costs of care as well as future trend data on delivery and costs. Such measures as backlogs of services, terminations, retention, changes in health status, hospitalization and cost measures provide a self-correcting data base for administrative decision making.

SELECTED FINDINGS

1. Rates of hospitalization have fallen to about one-third of what they were three years ago.

2. Costs of care per child year have dropped by over 30% during the last 2½ years—in spite of national trend of nearly the reverse magnitude. The numbers reflect actual dollar costs, unadjusted for inflation, but including all federal and matching funds.

3. All services, not just medical and hospital care but full dental services, nursing, nutrition, speech and hearing, social service, physical and occupational therapy are included for all children who need them. Many of these services are provided on a family basis because individual case care would not solve the problem. Even with these complete and continuous services, the costs per child year range from a regional high average of about \$375 per child per year to a national average of \$130 per child per year. As compared to the national average of some \$350 per man, woman and child in the nation, these projects are performing at unanticipated low costs—particularly considering that these children are drawn from the least healthy areas in the nation.

CONCLUSION

Without doubt, not all of the answers are available to all questions, but more is known for decision- and policy-making purposes about the C & Y program, and more results are demonstrated for this program than for any other federally sponsored health care program. These projects are living evidence of 69 unique ways of demonstrating that care can be delivered effectively to the most deprived parts of our populace on a complete, continuous, planned, quality basis, and yet at a cost which this nation not only can afford, but more importantly, cannot afford not to continue. This evidence of diversity in delivery to match local idiosyncracies yet with national review and assessment is critically important as a policy consideration as well—lest we once again make the mistake and produce one uniform program which on the average fits the nation as a whole, but individually fits nowhere within the country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Time is limited so I will briefly discuss some of the items that are included in the increase we are proposing. I have already discussed the additional funds that are needed for the fight against alcoholism.

Turning to the National Institutes of Health, I would first point out that our ultimate hope for modifying the health prospects of the Nation lies in the continued advance of the biomedical sciences. This program, in turn, is dependent upon the level and direction of support for research and training provided through the programs of the NIH.

Over the past 4 years, there has been no real increase in the funds for the research and training activities of the various institutes. Furthermore, the Office of Science and Technology estimated several years ago that the cost of medical research rises 15 percent each year because of new and more sophisticated technology, increased costs for person-

nel, and other data. Thus by these standards, research and training funds have not merely been standing still but indeed have regressed at an intolerable rate.

In 1971 alone, research and training projects amounting to \$163 million were approved by the institutes. But unfortunately a lack of funds prevented their implementation.

When we examine the actual figures, we find that the bill would make approximately \$1.38 billion available for the research institutes in 1972, including the \$100 million special cancer research funds that were contained in the 1971 supplemental. However, if these special funds are excluded, the increase over last year amounts to only \$113 million. Thus the committee increase, commendable as it is, falls short of what is desperately needed in this area. Our amendment would help meet this need by providing \$100 million for the research and training programs of the institutes.

For patient care and special health services, our amendment would allocate an increase of \$10 million. Despite the fact that health care costs have increased dramatically over the past several years, the bill recommends only \$71.6 million—a slash of more than \$14 million from last year's appropriation. The \$10 million increase will permit the public health service to continue to meet the health needs of its beneficiaries in 1972 and would insure the continued operation of PHS hospitals in Baltimore, Boston, Galveston, New Orleans, Norfolk, San Francisco, Seattle, and Staten Island.

We are urging a \$30 million increase for the control of communicable diseases. Since the vaccination assistance act expired in 1968, the rate of immunizations against polio, measles, and diphtheria has declined markedly and there are definite indications of a resurgence of these preventable diseases. Likewise, because of inadequate funding, the campaign against rubella is disappointingly short of expectations, with less than 50 percent of the target populations vaccinated. And the reported cases of measles in 1970-71 will probably exceed the number of cases reported in any year since the drive to eliminate measles began in 1966. The funds that would be added by our amendment would go far toward reversing this alarming trend.

Turning to the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, we are advocating an increase of \$50 million. Despite the fact that we face a backlog of \$15 billion in needed construction and modernization of hospital facilities, the bill recommends only \$266.7 million for this program. This sum, if allowed to stand, would freeze the hospital construction and modernization grant program at the lowest point in the past decade. Clearly a more realistic sum is required to reduce this huge backlog and also to manifest the solid support that Congress has shown for this program by renewing it last year at a level close to \$3 billion.

To assist local communities in their efforts to eradicate childhood lead poisoning, we are urging an additional \$5 million. This preventable disease affects 400,000 children annually, 90 percent of whom are under 3 years of age. Each year

4,000 children suffer permanent brain damage and another 200 die from this menacing disease. The economics of this issue are no less compelling than the humanitarian aspects. This Nation is currently paying approximately a quarter-million dollars to treat and provide lifelong care to each severely brain-damaged child. How wiser it would be to invest a portion of this cost into prevention. Our amendment would allot a total of \$10 million for the program which has a 1972 authorization level of \$20 million.

Finally, for maternal and child health care, we are advocating an increase of \$20 million which would be divided into \$10 million in formula grants and \$10 million in project grants to permit States to reach a greater number of mothers, infants, and crippled children. Some States have reported that their funds for these programs were exhausted as early as March of this year. This has resulted in a cutback or total elimination of vitally needed services.

To cite one example of the work that is carried on under this activity, the worst German measles epidemic in U.S. history—1963-65—resulted in more than 20,000 babies born with birth defects. The children affected by this epidemic are now of school age and some are exhibiting signs of brain damage and have learning problems. The crippled children's program is providing follow-up care for a large number of these handicapped children. The added funds we are proposing would permit this invaluable care to continue.

To conclude, I will readily concede that our amendment represents a large sum of money. But I will not concede this point: It is as impossible to provide a Nation proper health care with inadequate funding as it is impossible to fund a cure for cancer with inadequate research. The time has come for this Nation to realize that support of health care is not an economic burden. Rather it is a measure of social advance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHEUER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHEUER to the amendment offered by Mr. YATES:

In the matter proposed to be inserted on Page 9, strike out "\$596,201,000" and insert "\$636,201,000."

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add \$40 million to the \$84.3 million appropriation for parts D and E of the Community Mental Health Centers Act as amended, administered by the National Institute of Mental Health. It would increase by 47 percent the Institute's funds to develop and conduct comprehensive treatment, rehabilitation, education, addiction treatment manpower training programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse.

These programs were initially authorized on October 15, 1968, when Congress enacted the alcoholic and narcotic addict amendments to the Community Mental Health Centers Act. They were amended by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of

1970 and the Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1970.

These programs are the bulwark of the Federal Government's effort to treat the causes and effects of drug abuse. The Community Mental Health Centers Act provides for \$30 million in fiscal year 1972 for special project grants to public and nonprofit private agencies to meet part of the costs for detoxification services, or institutional services—including medical, psychological, educational or counseling services—and community based aftercare services. Awards made under this program are for a period of 8 years and are on a matching basis with declining Federal support. This program was funded at only \$5 million last year, even though over \$26 million in applications were received. The funds provided in this amendment would be used for full funding of the \$30 million authorization for these programs.

The act also authorizes \$12 million in fiscal year 1972 for drug abuse educational programs to develop materials and curricula, to train professionals and others to work in this field, to coordinate all Federal programs dealing with the health aspects of drug abuse education, and generally to serve as the focal point for dissemination of information about drug abuse. My amendment would increase the funds available under this section.

Finally, my amendment would also increase the funds available for training drug treatment and rehabilitation personnel, and for establishing programs that utilize new or relatively effective treatment and rehabilitative methods.

Mr. Chairman, these are all vital programs. There can be no doubt that the country is facing an epidemic of drug abuse. As the President has said:

The problem has now assumed the dimensions of a national emergency.

The Federal Government must meet its responsibilities and provide sufficient funds for the programs which we have enacted over the years to fund drug education, treatment and rehabilitation programs.

The Committee on Appropriations has approved the total fiscal year 1972 budget request for drug abuse control programs, including a \$67 million increase requested by the President on June 21. But the gross inadequacy of the current funding is apparent. The stark fact is that there are no treatment or rehabilitation slots of any kind for well over 90 percent of the Nation's hard drug addict population.

The fiscal year 1972 budget contains some \$381 million in funds for drug abuse programs distributed among some 14 Federal agencies. About \$176 million of these funds are for treatment, rehabilitation, education, and training. This is a commendable increase over last year's level of funding, but it is still far from meeting the crying need for these programs all over the country.

The New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission has testified before congressional committees to the effect that it alone could easily utilize \$50 million in new Federal funds this year and still not reach every addict in the State. New York State clearly has the

most severe drug abuse problem in the country, but it is making a greater effort than any other State, and, in many cases, greater than the Federal Government. As a result, they have not received the Federal funds they could clearly use in combating drug abuse.

This is not to imply that only New York can use additional funds. Dozens of communities across the country from Los Angeles to Boston, from Atlanta to Chicago, are starving for resources to fight this pandemic. Yet the proposed increase in the NIMH budget we are considering today will be used primarily to fund only 10 new narcotic treatment centers. My amendment, though modest, will allow the Federal Government to reach out to a far larger number of communities which are struggling to cope with an ever-increasing rise in drug addiction.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the subcommittee for approving the full budget request for drug abuse programs. The bill before us today demonstrates the understanding and concern of every subcommittee member for mounting a broad scale attack on the problems of drug abuse. However, the administration has dragged its feet in responding to this crisis. The President did not submit his amendment, increasing the Federal budget for drug abuse control programs until the subcommittee had concluded its hearings on the fiscal year 1972 Labor-HEW appropriation bill, thus denying the subcommittee a chance for careful evaluation of the adequacy of the President's proposals.

It is quite evident that additional hundreds of millions of dollars could be efficiently spent in fiscal year 1972 by the Federal Government to control drug abuse. Every dollar spent is repaid many times by reducing human suffering, and cutting back the billions of dollars lost each year in narcotic related crimes that are spreading pervasive fear and terror in our cities.

The \$40 million this amendment adds to NIMH's treatment, rehabilitation, and education programs can be effectively spent. I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of opposing the amendment. I repeat again what I said a few minutes ago and a few hours ago. What my friend from New York has just said about the subject I could not possibly have said better myself. To try would be gilding the lily. But that is all.

These are the figures concerning funds to combat drug addiction in the appropriation for the National Institutes of Health: for 1970, \$38,833,000; for 1971, \$64,068,000; in the original 1972 budget it was \$72,167,000, and then a budget amendment was sent to Congress to add another \$67 million.

Mr. Chairman, the total for this ugly thing in the 1972 budget for the Institute is \$139,167,000. This bill includes the whole amount of the \$139,167,000. This is \$75 million more than last year. It will be over twice as much as last year. It is over 3½ times the amount appropriated for 1970.

The amendment to the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I might point out, as I did earlier in the session this afternoon, that the Yates-Conte amendment does include an additional \$5 million for the antilead poisoning program.

I support the omnibus amendment offered by our distinguished colleagues from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE). I do so not because I do not believe that the Subcommittee on Labor-HEW of the House Appropriations Committee, chaired by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), has done a commendable job. In many respects, the subcommittee—which is responsible for H.R. 10061—has acted very well, I believe. Faced with a budget request from the administration which clearly short-changed urgently needed domestic programs, the committee has exceeded that request by \$322 million. It has done this in the face of expectable administration opposition.

However, in some respects the bill which the committee has reported out is very severely inadequate, and in others there is much room for improvement. Consequently, I support the omnibus amendment now being considered.

The amendment provides a total of \$230 million for seven health programs:

National Institutes of Health—up \$100 million, from \$1.4 billion to \$1.5 billion;

Patient care—up \$10 million, from \$71.7 million to \$81.7 million;

Communicable disease control—up \$30 million, from \$16 million to \$46 million;

Hill-Burton grants—up \$50 million, from \$87.2 million to \$137.2 million;

Alcoholism State formula grants—up \$15 million, from \$25 million to \$40 million;

Maternal and child care grants—up \$20 million, from \$326.6 million to \$346.6 million; and

Lead poisoning prevention—up \$5 million, from \$5 million to \$10 million.

I want to point out the irony, at the outset, of the fact that we must so vigorously debate the merits of this omnibus amendment. Yesterday, we launched a ship to the moon. The total cost of that one effort—the Apollo 15—comes to \$445 million. That is \$445 million to send three men to the moon, while here in our own country millions of people are in desperate need of health services; medical research is underfunded; and disastrous diseases plague us.

I will not dwell long on this amendment. My position is clear. I would just like to briefly explain some of the programs which it funds.

An increase of \$30 million is provided for communicable disease control. In 1970 the Congress passed the Communicable Disease Control Act, authorizing \$75 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$90 million for fiscal year 1972 for control programs to halt the spread of communicable diseases such as polio, measles, German measles, diphtheria, and tetanus.

The administration has refused to request any funds under the act, urging that the immunization activities authorized should compete with other health

programs for funds under the Partnership for Health Act. Thereby, these important programs would have to establish their priorities within a multitude of competing health efforts on the State level. This spells disaster, as demonstrated by the fact that since the expiration of the Vaccination Assistance Act in 1968, the rate of immunizations against polio, measles, and diphtheria has declined markedly. The campaign against rubella, or German measles, is inadequate. Measles is on the rise. Funding to fight tuberculosis has declined.

Consequently, it is essential that the Communicable Disease Control Act be funded, as it is under the omnibus amendment before us. Even with this funding, there is still an appropriation-authorization gap of \$44 million. So it is clear that more could be done. The \$30 million added by the amendment is the least that should be done.

The Yates-Conte amendment also provides an additional \$50 million for Hill-Burton grants. These grants are used for hospital construction; to explain their purpose is virtually to explain the merits of added funding. Recent figures released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicate a requirement for the construction of 91,000 new hospital beds and the modernization of 227,000 beds. We desperately need hospital construction, and the amendment before us supports that.

The amendment provides an additional \$15 million for alcoholism State formula grants. Last year the Congress unanimously passed the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970. Yet, despite the urgent need to begin a long overdue federal effort aimed at alcoholism, the administration has seen in this new law another candidate for rejection. The committee has resisted that by providing \$25 million. This is only barely enough, and the amendment before us provides an additional \$15 million, making a total of \$40 million, to fight a health problem which Dr. Vernon Wilson, Administrator of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, has described as "one of the most widespread, destructive and costly health problems facing our country."

The omnibus amendment—which I should note is supported by at least some 21 major health organizations—also provides an additional \$20 million for maternal and child care grants. The importance of these grants can be demonstrated, I believe, by looking at the child and youth project—No. 645—conducted through Roosevelt Hospital, in New York City, and which serves a portion of the district which I represent.

Since 1968, this program has been attempting to meet the health needs of the children and youth of the west midtown area of Manhattan. In 3 years, total visits have increased from 18,336 in 1968, to 30,986 in 1969, to 37,654 in 1970. It is predicted that in 1971 visits will be in excess of 50,000. While these are numbers, and numbers sometimes become just abstractions, I think it clear that this record indicates a tremendous outreach service which is providing desperately needed

care for the children and youth of Manhattan. I strongly support the \$20 million embodied in the amendment before us, and would only have wished that this amount of increase were far, far more.

Finally, I want to direct attention to the fact that \$5 million additional is incorporated in the Yates-Conte amendment to increase funding of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695, making a total of \$10 million for fiscal year 1972. Last week, I worked closely with the sponsors of the amendment to assure inclusion of added funds for this act. We all well recognize that even an additional \$5 million is insufficient, and were the administration less obdurate, far more would be included.

However, in assessing the situation in the House today, it was concluded reluctantly, to limit the additional amount for fighting childhood lead poisoning—the target of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act—to the \$5 million. I fully hope that the Senate will provide full funding, so that the bill which finally reaches the President's desk for signature, and which expresses the will of both Houses of the Congress, will contain much increased funding over the \$5 million provided in the bill reported out by the House committee and presently being considered for amendment.

I am not going to review the problem of childhood lead poisoning, or of our efforts to force the administration into action, or of our efforts to obtain funds within the Congress after it became all too clear that the administration has no desire or commitment to mount a meaningful assault on this terrible, yet preventable disease. I have already done this earlier today, during general debate on H.R. 10061. I would only say this. There simply is no excuse—absolutely none—for the outrage which this Nation continues to perpetrate on the children of its inner cities. These children are the victims of lead-based paint poisoning. Every one of them who develops this disease—and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself estimates the annual count at 400,000 annually—is a witness to the war being waged upon them by an unconcerned, uncaring society. I for one have been fighting to end that war for a good long time. I claim no credit for that, because there is no credit due. When one sees an outrage, one is compelled to oppose it.

But I do say now to every mother and every father of a lead poisoned child, and to every child—"You are owed a debt." And I do say to them and to their child, "You must demand that that debt be paid." Today, we have the opportunity to make a down payment—a bare, minimal down payment—on that debt. We had better make that payment. Why else do we serve in this Chamber?

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) which would add an additional \$230,000,000 to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for health programs.

The health of our Nation is steadily declining. We are witnessing one of the

most unfortunate incongruities in our country's history of health care. On the one hand, the space age technology has brought forth new firsts in solving health problems to the point where we are transplanting human hearts. Yet, on the human level, our health delivery system is still in the horse and buggy era with little of these technological miracles reaching the people who need it most.

Heart disease is still the Nation's No. 1 killer. Cancer still threatens the lives of millions of Americans. Arthritis, brain diseases and poor child health development are common occurrences.

The first part of the amendment offered would provide an additional \$100 million for the National Institutes of Health so that these and other serious health problems can be solved and put to work helping people get well.

Additionally, this Nation is facing one of its most serious crises in the delivery of health care. Hospitals have become a richman's health spa. Health insurance premiums, while skyrocketing, are covering less of the costs of serious illnesses.

Congress has wisely authorized many substantive programs to help improve the health delivery system and correct special social health problems like alcoholism and lead based paint poisoning.

Yet once again this body is shown as a paper tiger—all words and no funds to back up the promises. The second part of this amendment will appropriate funds for the control of communicable diseases, for improved patient-care programs, for additional Hill-Burton grants for the construction of sorely needed new hospitals, for alcoholism treatment and prevention programs, for control of lead based paint poisoning and for maternal and child health programs.

What good is a nation that can boast of the strongest defense establishment, the greatest space achievements, the most advanced technological feats; but looks inward to find a populace sick with disease and unable to cure itself. This amendment deserves approval.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) to H.R. 10061, the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. This amendment proposes to add a badly needed \$40 million to the appropriation for NIMH drug research, education, treatment and rehabilitation programs.

The addict population in this country is now conservatively estimated to be 250,000, over half of them in New York City. Due to the epidemic of drug abuse in Vietnam, another tragic consequence of that wasteful and futile war, the number will be substantially increased by the end of fiscal year 1972. We must have facilities immediately available to treat these men.

Although the administration has recognized the critical nature of the drug abuse problem, and has taken steps to consolidate and enlarge the Federal drug control effort, it has not followed through with adequate funding to implement desperately needed programs for treatment and rehabilitation of addicts. The Presi-

dent amended his original budget request to include an additional \$67 million for drug abuse control. However, this would increase NIMH treatment funds to a mere \$21 million; New York City alone could use \$50 million.

Although the additional funding the amendment provides does not meet the full need for drug treatment programs, it would enable many addicts throughout the country to find help in overcoming their addiction.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, last year Congress gleefully overrode a presidential veto of the Hill-Burton program.

A lot of people made grand speeches about the need for more modern hospitals. Now we have a chance to see how many of those speeches were just so much wind.

The administration this year asked for not one dime for Hill-Burton grants for the construction of long-term care facilities and for modernization. The committee restored the grant fund to the 1971 levels, but this is still \$230.3 million less than the amount so many in the House were calling for in our veto override action of last year. House voted 279-98 to override.

The committee will tell you that we do not need these funds any more because of the new guaranteed loan program. If any of you really believe that, check back home in your own districts.

The problem is that State Hill-Burton agencies report that 140,000 general hospital beds and 48,000 long-term care facility beds need to be built or modernized in the next 2 fiscal years, in addition to 317 outpatient facilities, 113 rehabilitation facilities and 162 public health centers. The estimated cost of constructing these is \$9.3 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I do not apologize for trying to add \$50 million for this program. I only apologize because the amount we are trying to add is so small.

The amendment would also add \$30 million for communicable disease control, recognizing that the rate of immunization against polio, measles and diphtheria has declined markedly since the expiration of the Vaccination Assistance Act in 1968.

Reported cases of measles increased 46 percent from 1968 to 1970. This year they are up 56 percent more and it is estimated—based on the experience of the first 4 months of 1971—that 83,000 cases will be reported this year. The total of 439 cases of diphtheria reported last year was the highest for any year since 1962. In 1964 more than 87 percent of the children in this Nation age one to four had been protected against polio, but as of last year the immunization level for children in this age group had fallen to 65.9 percent.

These immunization levels have dropped to epidemic thresholds especially among the urban and rural poor. Let us do something about it.

The amendment would also add \$15 million to cope with what many consider our costliest and most extensive disease—alcoholism. The budget request included no funds for formula grants to States for comprehensive planning and start-up for

services to alcoholics. While the committee has recommended \$25 million to close what it calls an important gap, this amendment would close it further.

Mr. Chairman, there are few people in this House who do not expect some substantial revamping of our health care delivery system in the next 5 years.

We can either try to prepare ourselves for that prospect by developing enough manpower and enough facilities to meet the coming demand or we can try to minimize it by boosting funds for disease prevention—or we can continue a business-as-usual health care budget and find ourselves 5 years from now wondering how we let ourselves get into such a mess.

The trouble with this bill and even with the amendment is that it will hardly give us a start. I urge your support of the amendment.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues, Mr. YATES and Mr. CONTE, to increase health funding for the fiscal year 1972.

The shortcomings of America's health-care system have been detailed by so many, upon such numerous occasions, that I hesitate to indulge in further criticism for fear of inducing a narcotic lull. We have become inured to indignity—few rage at the indecency of the remark by a former editor of the AMA Journal, that—

Our infant mortality rate is nothing to be crying about.

We rank 13th, Norway is first. Our infant mortality rate for nonwhite babies is twice that for white babies.

But unfortunately, the 80,000 parents of children who would not have died, had they lived in Norway, do cry.

The time has long since come to halt our efforts to balance the budget at the expense of our health. To this end, the Coalition for Health Funding has been formed. It is composed of 18 major health groups, among them medical college associations, the American Public Health, Dental, Nurses, and Heart Associations, the National Committee Against Mental Illness, and Planned Parenthood-World Population. The AMA is not a member. The coalition seeks to increase the President's appropriation for the National Institutes of Health and the Health Services and Mental Health Administration by \$632,500,000. In doing this, they speak for the powerless Americans who are regularly victimized by an unfeeling Congress.

The mentally ill are unorganized. They have no lobbies to exert pressure for them in Washington. Their spokesmen do not show up on the chic late night talk shows. They are largely faceless, hidden away, and nobody seems to want to know their names. Congress regularly treats them with deference—then casts them aside. Yet despite their near invisibility, the mentally ill are not few and scattered. Fully 10 percent of our population is suffering from some form of mental or emotional disease, right now.

The history of mental health programs has shown cycles of reform and decay, of promises made and expectations unfulfilled. Yet the community mental health centers program, funded

through the National Institute of Mental Health, has been able to generate a diversity of clinical services, community activities, and complex administrative arrangements with general hospitals, health agencies, and social welfare programs. In 1969, for the first time in history, admissions to community mental health centers exceeded first admissions to State hospitals. In fiscal 1970, the largest annual drop in the number of patients confined in State hospitals, 32,000, was achieved. The overall total has been reduced by almost a quarter of a million over the past 15 years—totally apart from the alleviation of human suffering and the mending of broken lives, this reduction has enabled the public mental hospital system to save billions of dollars in construction and operation costs—the local centers not only keep patients out of the State hospitals, but they also hold in the community countless numbers of patients who have been discharged from State hospitals and would be forced to return to them but for the availability of treatment in their home areas.

Now all of this is threatened. Despite their record of achievement, for the second simultaneous year, the administration has refused to authorize any money for the construction of new mental health centers. The legislative authorization for construction of mental health centers is \$90 million. A recent survey of State mental health centers has disclosed a backlog of more than \$50 million in this area. The Appropriations Committee has put in \$10 million for this construction. This is \$10 million short of what the coalition had asked for, and this additional money is crucially needed.

The staffing needs of these centers are even more critical. The administration has arbitrarily limited staffing moneys to those centers which have received previous Federal construction funding. This is a direct "slap in the face" to those communities which have used their own resources to construct centers. Coming from an administration whose rhetoric readily proclaims, "turn the power back from Washington and return it to the people," this action is indeed shocking. The National Institute of Mental Health estimates that by June 30, 1972, there will be a shortage of \$44.3 million necessary to meet the Federal contributions for approved, but unfunded, staffing grants. Simply put, 88 centers, around the country, will not open their doors.

The mentally ill of this Nation do not need buildings constructed as monuments to their leaders' concern; they desperately need the help, treatment, and care that has been promised them. It is obscene to give people hope, to erect these centers, and then have them stand unstaffed, targets for the pigeons. As Jung noted:

... Where power predominates, love is lacking.

An increase of \$50 million in the administration's request of \$105.1 million is the smallest possible sum which can meet the needs for new staffing and for the expanded mission Congress has decreed—the development of mental health centers in the inner city and in poverty

areas, and services for emotionally disturbed children.

Finally, and perhaps most baffling, is the administration's appropriation for the training activities of the National Institute of Mental Health. The budget, as amended, includes \$113.3 million for training grants, a reduction of \$3,050,000 from the 1971 level of funding. Despite the desperate shortage of psychiatrists in our mental hospitals and mental health centers, the administration has planned a \$6.7 million cut in training programs for psychiatrists and intends to phase out the psychiatric residency program. This will result in the loss of approximately one-third of the medical students now being trained in psychiatry. In fiscal 1972 alone, this cut would result in 140,000 patients going untreated, most of them in low-income areas. The Appropriation Committee's report would restore \$6.75 million to this program, returning it to the 1971 level of funding.

While I support this move, I hope that more funds will be appropriated to provide for a small amount of money designed to train neighborhood mental health workers and other kinds of sub-professionals and to cover cost-of-living expenses for other mental health professions.

In fiscal year 1971 we appropriated \$338,104,000 for the National Institute of Mental Health. For fiscal year 1972, the Coalition for Health Funding recommended an appropriation of \$629,451,000. The administration requested an appropriation of \$499,451,000. This bill, for which I will vote, increases that appropriation to \$581,201,000.

An additional \$48,250,000 would be, in our vast Federal budget, a small amount; but, instead, it is Congress which today is so small. We must change our perception, our way of thinking about the mentally ill. We must stop treating their presence as shameful and spiriting them away. In a world where "normal" men have killed perhaps 100 million "normal" men in the past 50 years, any sense of superiority must appear laughable. We must try to reach the mentally ill with love and understanding and never forget that none of us is immune.

Rock bottom funding for desperately needed programs is not the answer.

Some may wonder why I have not introduced legislation to increase mental health funding. It is because I am convinced that such legislation would not stand a chance of passage in this body. The House, as presently constituted, lacks the compassion to actually institute a humane program of mental health care. I have little hope that this situation will be remedied in the future, but I intend to continue raising my voice. In the words of R. D. Laing:

If I could turn you on, if I could drive you out of your wretched mind, if I could tell you I would let you know.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by Congressmen CONTE and YATES to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972 which recommends an additional \$100 million for the National Institutes of Health, \$10 million for patient care, \$30 million for com-

municable disease control, \$50 million for Hill-Burton grants, \$15 million for alcoholism State formula grants, \$5 million for lead-poisoning prevention and \$20 million for maternal and child care grants.

I also support the amendment offered by Congressman RYAN and Congresswomen ABZUG and MINK which recommends an additional \$15 million to train personnel working with the mentally retarded and the amendment offered by Congressman GIAIMO which will result in the rehabilitation of an additional 25,000 handicapped individuals in 1972.

This issue of expenditure of funds is not one of money, but of priorities. Failure to provide funds now will mean tremendous expenditures for rehabilitation projects in the future. Each project has great merit and is most worthy of the expenditure of the funds requested.

The problem of lead-based paint poisoning is so grave in the 9th Congressional District of Massachusetts, which I represent, I urge the passage of the amendment to add additional funds to the detection and treatment of this disease. It is well known that children are its cruellest victims. Lead-based paint has a deceptively sweet taste and children eat the peeling paint which is found on walls of old buildings located in tenement housing. Lead-based paint poisoning inflicts permanent brain damage on thousands of children in America annually and often results in death.

Increased technology has produced a blood testing program that enables doctors to detect the disease simply and inexpensively. A report prepared by HEW professionals stated that—

Inaction of the lead-based paint poisoning problem would be an economic and human disaster.

The time for action is now.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to strongly urge the adoption of this amendment to increase funding for our Nation's health programs. Particular commendation is due my distinguished colleagues, SIDNEY YATES and SILVIO CONTE, for having the foresight to propose this vital amendment. Mr. Chairman, at a time when the country is becoming increasingly aware of the monumental problems in our health care services, it seems inconceivable to me that the national administration would want to cut expenditures in this field. The committee took a step in the right direction by returning the funds to their 1971 level but I am firmly convinced that health is one area where we must increase our support to insure the continuation of progress in our fight to foster a healthy America. Those who criticize the increase as inflationary lose sight of the fact that the moneys we spend to prevent Rubella in expectant mothers and lead-paint poisoning in our young is far less than that needed to rehabilitate the victims of these tragic illnesses. The resulting mental retardation caused in these infants often costs large amounts in terms of State-supported treatment. But, far more important is the battle to prevent the personal, human tragedy that strikes these youngsters and their families. An increase of \$230 mil-

lion in a budget of over \$200 billion seems a reasonable price to pay for such urgently needed programs.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will provide for increases in seven important programs. The programs already initiated in our urban areas with these funds desperately need to be continued and expanded. The appropriations for communicable disease control must be increased in light of the recent decline in immunizations against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and measles. This decline in immunizations is most pronounced in the urban poverty areas where the vaccination level is roughly only 50 percent. Further difficulties are presented by the rapidly increasing epidemic of venereal disease. How can we relax in our efforts when the rate of syphilis increased by 18 percent over the past year? The point is, these diseases are preventable and we would be grossly remiss in our duty if we failed to fund the programs that are capable of having a marked effect in controlling them.

One program that has proved effective in our large cities is the maternal and child care grants. In my city of Chicago, the infant mortality rate has declined significantly since the inception of this program. Here again is an opportunity to support initiatives that are having a considerable effect. Our commitment to these efforts to promote infant care pays dividends in terms of a healthier population, able to share more fully and contribute more productively to our society.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to look with concern at the health problems of our constituents; look with compassion at the diseased, the alcoholic, the poisoned infant—and find fit to vote for this amendment. It will not be a magic cure for these ailments in our society, but it will enable us to continue and improve our efforts to provide a better, healthier life for all Americans.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the health of the American people in both the present and the future demands passage of the Yates amendment and the Giaimo rehabilitation amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill—H.R. 10061. Failure to accept these proposals can only lead to a further deterioration of our already ailing health care system.

Although President Nixon warned in July, 1969 that administrative and legislative neglect of America's medical system would invariably precipitate a breakdown in this system, he has not chosen to exert the leadership needed to avert this type of a catastrophe. Thus, the President's budgetary request for health care for fiscal year 1972 is inadequate. This executive request is concrete evidence that this administration's commitment to remedying the health care crisis is decidedly weak.

The fundamental reason which the administration has given for its substandard budget request is that increased funding would exacerbate the inflationary problems of the economy. In my opinion, this argument is unacceptable on a monetary as well as a social basis. With hospital construction costs rising at an 11 percent rate annually,

expenditures now for Hill-Burton grants would result in an ultimate savings. In addition, adequate expenditures for disease research, prevention, and rehabilitation programs would keep many citizens from becoming tax burdens and enable many currently handicapped individuals to become fully productive members of society.

The social aspects of this issue, however, supersede the economic considerations in importance. Americans must recognize that health care advances bolster rather than drain the strength of our society.

The Committee on Appropriations is to be commended for the foresight which it showed in recommending an increase of \$322 million over the President's budget request for the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. The increased spending in the field of medical care which would result from acceptance of the Yates and Giaimo amendments would assist this committee in its desire to improve our health system.

The Yates amendment which would add a total of \$230 million to the committee's recommendations and the Giaimo rehabilitation amendment which would increase the appropriation for rehabilitation programs by \$82.4 million represent realistic assessments of America's health condition. Because of the seriousness of our current health problems and the prospect for easing these problems that is offered by the proposals, I urge passage of these amendments.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been asked today, "How can we vote for the Conte-Yates amendment—which adds \$230 million to the Appropriations Committee's recommendations for health programs—when to do so would add to inflation in the country?"

It is a question that deserves an accurate answer. And the answer is that it is the vote against this amendment that would contribute to inflation, not the vote for it.

With hospital construction costs going up 11 percent annually, it is the further delay in meeting the Nation's health crisis that would be inflationary.

It is the money we will have to spend on rehabilitation tomorrow that adds to inflation, not the money we spend today to prevent disease. Looked at from sound economics alone—aside from the human suffering involved—the health research that enables the ill or potentially ill to become productive taxpayers instead of handicapped tax burdens can hardly be defamed as inflationary. Indeed, we have indisputable evidence that the Federal Government has gained far more in taxes from persons whose lives have been prolonged by better health knowledge than it has appropriated for all the research leading to this better knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the facts:

Fact: The combined income of the 554,000 wage-earners whose lives were prolonged in 1967 as a result of modern biomedical research was \$13.8 billion, out of which they paid \$1.7 billion in income and excise taxes. The Federal appropriation for all of the National Institutes of Health, for that same year, was below this tax total—only \$1.4 billion.

Fact: Six million people are afflicted with mental retardation. Seventy-five to eighty-five percent of these people are capable of becoming self-supporting, independent citizens both economically and socially if they receive adequate services and early medical diagnosis and treatment. While we are currently spending only \$38.8 million for research to find answers to mental retardation, mental retardation costs the Nation some \$14.2 billion a year in maintenance and construction of public facilities and special programs for the mentally retarded.

Fact: Blindness costs the Nation \$2.7 billion a year in wages lost because of inability to work and in direct aid to the blind. Yet a relatively small investment in research could eliminate much of this cost. For example, a \$50,000 investment in a study supported by the National Institute of neurological diseases and stroke has eliminated retrolental fibroplasia, a disease that used to afflict nearly 2,000 persons each year. The saving in lifetime support of these victims, which are prevented early, is approximately \$121 million.

Fact: The direct cost to the Nation for the education, management and compensation of victims of hearing impairment is \$410.5 million a year. Yet we know that many thousands of cases of hearing impairment could have been eliminated or reduced if there were greater effort to identify victims early, reduce prenatal virus infection—including German measles, and provide obstetrical techniques to help prevent children from receiving injuries at birth which will lead to hearing handicaps. The fact is, we spent a paltry \$9.7 million last year to support the programs for prevention and control of hearing loss.

Fact: The Nation now spends about \$683 per cancer death annually, or \$227 per case under treatment; but only \$4.19 per American now alive who will have cancer unless cures or preventive measures are found. Looked at another way, if all of the working victims of cancer who died in 1967 had been able to work even 1 additional year, they could have earned over \$406 million and paid taxes to the Federal Government on this income totaling over \$48 million. Contrast this to the estimated \$15 billion it cost the Nation by 1969 resulting from direct care and treatment of cancer victims plus the indirect costs represented by their loss of earning power and productivity.

Fact: Mental illness cost the Nation approximately \$21 billion in 1968, of which over \$9 billion was borne by the public. This \$9 billion includes additional taxes in order to offset the reduction in tax revenues caused by the decline of income among the mentally ill and to provide them with maintenance and treatment. Alcoholism alone costs industry \$2 billion annually. Compare these figures with our annual research investment to combat this toll: less than 1 percent of this cost, and only 8 percent of the yearly maintenance costs of our State and county mental hospitals.

Fact: 1.2 million Americans died of infectious diseases in 1968—which include influenza and pneumonia; bronchitis, emphysema, asthma; kidney infections; tuberculosis; and meningitis. If

those of working age had lived just one extra, healthy year they could have earned \$215 million in that 1 year alone. And the Federal Government could have gained at least \$25 million in income tax revenue on those earnings. Infectious diseases caused more than 50 percent of all days lost from work due to acute illness, for a total loss in income in 1968 of nearly \$4 billion. Add to this the \$1.6 billion that year for medical treatment of diseases, and we see how tragically deficient is the \$79.9 million spent in 1968 for research in infectious and allergic diseases.

Fact: the digestive diseases—including disorders of the stomach, intestines, biliary passages (gall bladder) liver and pancreas—are the leading cause of inability to work due to illness. The latest figures available are that the economic loss to the Nation from these diseases was \$8 million yearly, as of 1963. Yet we are spending less this year for research under the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases than was spent 5 years ago—\$12,408,000.

Mr. Chairman, I think the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, earlier this session we voted \$100 million in special cancer research funds. I supported that bill. But I know that some of that money will go to waste: It is impossible to run a \$100 million crash research program without some waste somewhere. At the very least, we will wind up funding people with only peripheral expertise in the cancer problem because there are not enough cancer specialists around to soak up that kind of money.

But a little waste is not the ultimate crime. As long as they get the job done. That appropriation made sense: If it was part of a broad-gage commitment to improve the State of medical knowledge and our ability to deliver health care to the American people. If we choose to expand our whole medical research effort, then \$100 million this year is not too much for cancer.

But it is clear from the ludicrous budget for the National Institutes of Health submitted to us by the President that he has no intention of mounting a serious health-research effort. Discounting for inflation, the 1972 requests represent a net cutback for everything except cancer. Instead of launching this Nation on a new round of health-science advances, the administration has apparently chose to score cheap political points from the American people's justifiable dread of cancer, while weakening the rest of our medical research program. Even for this administration, even for this President, this surely represents a new low in raw cynicism and emotional manipulation.

The Appropriations Subcommittee, under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), has rejected the policy of the Scrooge-Marley administration, and written a substantially better bill, one which is reasonable where the other is absurd, adequate where the other is grossly inadequate. They propose a 6 percent increase across-the-board to allow maintenance of present program outlays.

But even 6 percent is a very conservative estimate of research inflation: The soaring cost of instrumentation makes 15 percent a more accurate figure.

Certainly the committee's proposals will not bring our other research programs into line with our expanded war against cancer.

The minority package includes an additional \$100.7 million for the national institutes of health. This money can be usefully expended, in many cases on currently funded programs which would be cut otherwise, like the collaborative perinatal project.

It should not be supposed that the amendment would give truly generous support to health research. No one proposes to provide our medical scientists with the sort of open-ended, fat-ridden budget we routinely approve for the military. All this amendment would provide is a small increase in the present research effort. NIH has spent its money well; it can use more.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 7657, which would extend the authorization for the children and youth and maternal and infant care projects under title V of the Social Security Act, I wish to make particular mention of this line in the appropriation. These 56 projects in 35 States are providing comprehensive community-based care to poor people in the cities and in rural America. The preventive approach emphasized in these projects has been a singular success, improving both the ability of people in the target areas to obtain health care and the quality of the care provided.

The bill before us leaves a \$90 million shortfall from the amount authorized.

The \$20 million in additional funds provided for in the amendment before us is not fully adequate, but it is an improvement. It is time for us to stop starving our successful programs.

I urge a vote for the amendment. Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which would increase funding for the Public Health Service hospitals and outpatient clinics to \$81.7 million.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the administration has suggested the closing of the eight Public Health Service hospitals and 30 outpatient clinics. Last year, Congress rejected the administration's attempt to close the facilities and appropriated \$87.8 million for their continuation. Again this year, the administration has suggested the phasing out of the Public Health Service hospitals and clinics.

Mr. Chairman, I am appalled at any suggestion to close down the hospital and clinic program, especially at a time when the health care service in the United States is at a critical low. Such proposals are incongruous in light of the increasing workloads which hospitals and clinics are bearing, the ever-escalating costs for doctors, drugs, and hospital care, and the critical need for such services in many areas.

Instead of curtailing services, every effort should be made to augment and expand health services and take positive steps toward providing meaningful, com-

prehensive, and professional health care for all citizens.

I protest the plans to close any of the existing Public Health Service hospitals or clinics. The PHS hospital system was established in 1798 as a means to provide medical care for merchant seamen. This system not only provides medical care for seamen but it protects our Nation against disease catastrophes. Further, it has introduced and maintained a public service concept that benefits the medical profession, and our Nation, as well as the seamen and other recipients of such hospital and medical care. The proposal to terminate this public service concept of medical care is shocking.

It is even more incomprehensible when we consider the total service which the Public Health Service hospitals provide. At one time there were 30 PHS hospitals. Today, there are eight PHS hospitals along with 30 clinics—one of the clinics is located in my district in San Pedro, Calif. These facilities provide care to merchant seamen, Coast Guardsmen and their dependents, and active and retired military personnel and their families.

The contributions which these hospitals make are truly of great magnitude. Each facility is an integral part of the health-care system of the community in which it exists and is helping to meet the rising demand for quality health care. It serves as part of the training forum for badly needed medical personnel. There are 500,000 beneficiaries of the Public Health Service program. In short, the PHS hospital system provides much-needed service and should be expanded—not eroded.

For example, in the Public Health Service clinic in San Pedro, Calif., in a 3-month period—July–September, fiscal year 1970—there were 26,777 outpatient visits. This workload average, of over 8,500 outpatient visits a month, was handled by a staff of 54 people.

As a matter of fact, the Comptroller General of the United States, Elmer Staats, on February 25, 1971, rendered a legal opinion indicating that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not have the authority to close the Nation's Public Health hospitals. At that time, I thought that the Comptroller's opinion would put an end to the doubts and anxieties concerning the future of these invaluable health facilities.

I have mentioned the need to expand our Public Health Service facilities. Congress overwhelmingly passed the Emergency Health Personnel Act of 1971, which was signed into law by the President last New Year's Eve. Under this act, the role of the Public Health Service is expanded beyond its present beneficiary group to help meet health needs in urban and rural poverty areas that are presently underserved. Why would the administration approve a law to expand services, and, then, with the other hand, advocate the closing of the hospitals and clinics?

To rely on the Veterans' Administration hospitals to take over the PHS caseload, as suggested by Secretary Richardson, appears not to be properly accounting for the already overburdened

condition of these facilities. The Veterans' Administration cannot handle PHS beneficiaries in addition to the VA's own patients.

Mr. Chairman, as a supporter and cosponsor of the House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to continue these hospitals and clinics; as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which has conducted hearings on this matter; as a person concerned with the escalating costs for doctors, drugs, and hospital care that now cost Americans some \$70 billion a year—a 16-percent rise last year, far greater than our general inflationary trend in the United States; as an American concerned about the poor state of the Nation's health, I appeal to all concerned persons to help in our efforts to expand and modernize our existing health care facilities and not erode or eliminate the Public Health Service.

Even with this amendment which appropriates \$81.7 million for the Public Health Service hospitals and clinics, I feel that we are far short of the \$100 million which is necessary for the PHS to operate at full efficiency. Thus, I am anxious for the committee to present us with a supplemental appropriation to fully fund these hospitals and clinics in the very near future.

I urge that all efforts be made toward building, and not destroying, the Public Health Service hospital system.

Mr. FRASER, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my support for the Conte-Yates amendment to H.R. 10061.

The appropriations measure before us today provides for the expansion of several key health and welfare efforts. I feel, however, that the bill as approved by the committee falls short of meeting our Nation's ever-increasing health needs.

The \$230 million Conte-Yates amendment, if approved by this body, will represent a more adequate response by Congress to the current health crisis.

I would like to draw attention to several of the more significant provisions in the amendment.

One hundred million dollars for the National Institutes of Health. This amount will only enable NIH to maintain its present level of activity. NIH should lead our country in its attack upon illness and disease.

Thirty million dollars for the communicable disease control program. Prevention of disease saves millions of dollars in health care, wage losses, disability payments and death. Our much heralded program against polio is now dangerously sliding downhill. Last year only 66 percent of the children between the ages 1 to 4 were vaccinated. After mass immunization against measles in 1966, 22,231 cases were reported in 1968. Last year there were over 47,000 cases. Estimates for this year are reaching past 70,000. Last year the number of diphtheria cases doubled. Investing a total of \$46 million is not too much.

Fifteen million dollars for alcoholism prevention. Alcoholism in this country is responsible for the death of 87,000 Americans, it drains \$15 billion yearly from our economy. It has been estimated that

36 million people are adversely affected by alcoholics. Secretary Richardson has testified that half of all traffic fatalities are associated with alcohol. Certainly this problem demands more than just our attention. It needs the funds for treatment cure, and prevention.

Twenty million dollars for material and child care grants. The States are in desperate need for continuance of all programs under material and child health including children and youth projects and the crippled children services. These additional funds will allow for little more than just maintaining them at their present levels. At this time I would like to submit for the RECORD a statement by Arnold S. Leonard, M.D., Ph. D., associate professor of surgery, head, pediatric surgery, University Hospitals, Minneapolis, Minn., citing the need for expanding the material and child health program:

EXPANDING THE MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH PROGRAM

(By Arnold S. Leonard, M.D.)

I am speaking for the budget for Maternal and Child Health Services of the Health Service and Mental Health Administration of the Public Health Service. There is a critical need for emergency funding through the Maternal and Child Health Services for regional facilities in the United States to decrease infant mortality, especially in the rural and outlying communities.

Statistics from the Public Health Service in 1967, demonstrate we are 14th in the world in infant mortality under one year of age (Chart 1: At 20.7 deaths per 1,000 live births). These statistics were compiled by the Statistics Bureau of Health, Education, and Welfare, and represent collections by the World Health Organization.

Although one may question, especially in the number of countries which we do not have control of, the method of collection of statistics, we should take cognizance of the problem in our own country. We are not doing the best job. It is more important, therefore, to consider the problem in any given state, city, or region, where statistics are significant. The outlying regions, or poor indigent areas within cities, carry mortalities of 30 and 35 per 1,000 in contrast to regional areas where most modern standards of care are available; the mortality has decreased to 12–15 per 1,000. Funds are necessary to establish centers, therefore, where transportation, communication, and excellent intensive care facilities can be instituted in order to handle this problem.

Certainly infant mortality is reflected also by prenatal care and maternal delivery standards. However, once the infant is conceived and born, the problem exists, and therefore one must deal with the situation at hand in the most efficient manner. Multiple congenital abnormalities, prematurity, and irreparable cardiac defects account for a portion of mortality which in many instances cannot be salvaged. However, there is an important treatable, critical, factor that has led to significant life gain, and that is the prevention of the deterioration phase of that infant from the time it is born with a salvagable condition to the time it reaches a regional facility for proper care. The hypothermia or low temperature, shock, respiratory distress, that progresses in inadequate, small, understaffed facilities can be treated in a majority of instances today if proper care is instituted within the first seventy-two hours of life.

To study this problem, in the last three years at the University of Minnesota we have instituted a transportation communication system and a computerized intensive care facility for the five-state region. We have

extended an arm to the border areas and outlying communities and rural areas where the physician cannot handle the newborn infant with special problems. It is the lack of oxygen in the newborn, the untreated shock from the shift of fluids that occurs; for example, during blockage of the intestine from various abnormalities, and infections in the breathing system, that cause the main problems. We have found after the transfer of over 200 infants, from rural and outlying communities, in the last year and one-half, that those individuals who are transferred immediately had the best chance for survival and complete cure. Where disintegration of the condition occurred after a 72-hour period, when the infant's system became acidotic and was severely damaged, then the salvage was poor. Early communication with the local physician and transportation thus were instrumental in preventing deterioration. Our system is programmed so that a physician may call from the outlying area and within 30 minutes a plane with an intern and special equipment is sent to the region. The intern accompanies the physician to the local hospital where special preparation of intravenous catheters, intestinal suction, etc. are instituted before flight. Then the infant is flown back to our specialized care unit. This service is extended in our area to North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Montana, Minnesota, and portions of Iowa. The transportation portion is available to the entire area for acute pediatric emergencies at no cost to the family. This system is funded in the most part by private resources which, as has happened elsewhere, is dwindling. Help, therefore, is requested from the Government.

It is interesting as a side note, that recently a so-called "Haste" transportation system was funded by the Government for \$200,000. Twenty or so patients were handled by this system and this amounted to approximately \$10,000 per patient. Inefficiency was the key. Our emergency services can be handled on the basis of a charter service with a plane that is not actually hired full time by the Government, as was the latter system. We can go to the border of other states for less than \$200 per patient. In other words, in one year to handle the emergencies in our entire region, we could get along nicely on \$30,000 to \$40,000. If one figures the salvage rate per year and the work years (70-80) for these infants, this certainly justifies the cost on this basis.

Besides the transportation system itself, another very critical problem again is the funding for these very sick infants in intensive care. Infant intensive care costs approximately \$300 per day. Because of the specialized nursing paramedical personnel, the amount of equipment, and tests that are necessary on a minute-to-minute basis for salvage of these tiny infants, this treatment process becomes the most expensive medical care today. Yet we are dealing for 70 to 80 years of life with these babies so we feel that it is well worthwhile.

We have a computerized system for measuring output of the heart, cardiograms, regulation of respirations, temperature, and microchemistry systems where small quantities of blood can measure vital chemistries in the body. These intensive care systems like the transportation-communications program, have been expensive but have been instrumental in salvage of these infants. The cost of the computer hardware and software has been funded by Health Care Technology as a pilot project at a cost of \$250,000.

There is, however, only \$450,000 appropriation for the entire country for intensive care facilities for the next year's budget to include all of the modalities mentioned. I feel this should be increased on the basis of the demonstration of this regional program for several regional projects in the country. This

is not a large budget, for it takes care of only a few intensive care units in the country. Judging the way money is spent on other projects, I feel that more money should be placed in this type of appropriation for salvage of these infants for this integrated approach. We should remember we are not salvaging just sick infants, we are actually curing many of these infants by this regional emergency health delivery system for special care problems so that they may become good citizens.

Financially, there is another important problem. The Crippled Children's Services have alerted the physicians in our area to our project. However, we all know that our Crippled Children's money usually runs out in January, so that only emergency services for only the very critical can be paid for on the present allocation. The large cost of extended care of this nature attests to the financial problem. It is not uncommon for infants with severe respiratory distress, cardiac, or severe congenital abnormalities to have bills in the range of \$20,000 to \$40,000. Funding however, is also necessary to maintain children with non-emergency conditions such as elective cardiac, orthopedic, cleft lips and palates, etc. These children must wait their turn every year while deterioration physically and psychologically occurs. More appropriations must be allocated for a smooth and integrated approach.

In summary, it takes an integration of several services to fund operations for both the critically ill and the crippled children smoothly throughout an entire year. We feel that we have demonstrated in the past three years a better infant salvage rate of the 200 infants we have transported from the region with critical problems, so that regional areas can and should be set up and funded in order to gain significant man years for our population.

The alternative is leaving sick infants in their local communities deteriorating and susceptible to hypoxia or decreased oxygen to the brain of these individuals. They end up then in mental institutions unfit for work in the community and for citizenship and a significant financial burden.

In closing, we would ask for:

1. Transportation-communication system funding
2. Intensive care facility funding
3. Increased allocations for Crippled Children's Services
4. Patient funding for critical special problems

I would like to extend my thanks to the Armed Forces, especially to the Air Force, who when the weather systems were severe, came with their jets to help transfer these infants.

I am pleased to note that the committee has restored funds cut from several key programs and has added funds in other areas. The budget, as submitted, did not take into consideration the demand for more mental health personnel. Across this country there is an increase in the use of drugs and alcohol. Yet the administration advocated a \$3 million reduction in training grants. Also, the administration proposed a three-step phaseout of the psychiatric residency training program by reducing this program by \$6.7 million. The committee restored this program to its 1971 level.

The committee also added \$30 million to the request for regional medical programs. Last year the administration impounded \$34,500,000 of the funds. They did this not by clearing any deadwood from the program if it needed it, but by applying the meat-ax across the board on all projects. With the carry over of

these impounded funds, the total amount available this year will be \$115 million. The administration must regard this appropriation as Congress' intent to have these programs continue their necessary work on an expanded basis.

I also want to lend my support to the effort by Mr. GAIAMO to increase the rehabilitation services appropriation by \$82.4 million. Dr. Newman, commissioner of rehabilitation services administration states that the total increase in lifetime earnings of rehabilitated individuals is from six to 20 times the dollars spent for their rehabilitation. The Social Security Administration estimates that during the last 4 fiscal years over \$45.2 million has been saved because of the rehabilitation of 25,045 beneficiaries.

The Gaiamo amendment increasing funds from \$518 million to \$575 million in the basic State grants will enable 25,000 more people to be included in this program.

One of the intangible, but most important results of this rehabilitation is the return of the self-worth and esteem of the individual who can again become a productive member of our society. Many people who would have had to rely on others are now able to become independent and self-sustaining individuals. They have more control of their lives, something we all reach out for. To deny additional funds to this program will directly result in less people being able to become a real part of our world.

Gov. Wendell Anderson of Minnesota and the president of the Minnesota Association for Retarded Children, Inc., Dr. Thomas Swallen, have both expressed their support for this amendment. I would like to submit these statements for the RECORD at this point:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
St. Paul, Minn., July 23, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: It is my understanding that the House will be debating the Gaiamo amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriation bill next Tuesday, July 27.

Our Vocational Rehabilitation Program would be seriously curtailed without the increased funding.

I urge your support of this amendment.

Sincerely,

WENDELL R. ANDERSON.

MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION FOR
RETARDED CHILDREN, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., July 26, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: I highly recommend that you support Representative Gaiamo's amendment to the HEW Appropriations Bill. It would aid our programs for retarded persons considerably.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS O. SWALLEN, M.D.,
President, Minnesota ARC.

I commend the committee for recommending the increases in health funds to meet the growth of our population. I believe, though, that the Government has a responsibility for a greater commitment to health. What we do will either hasten our social progress or hinder and disintegrate the progress that

has been made thus far. Today as we cheer our astronauts on to further heights in man's conquest of space surely we should try to conquer the unknown in disease, illness, and death with a level of support that will spur these searches on to further heights. Surely, too, our health system should be delivered with space-age equipment, methods, and training. To market health with horses and buggies while man travels to such extraordinary summits in space, is placing our responsibilities on the wrong rungs of the ladder of progress.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. CONTE and Mr. YATES to increase the total appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by \$230 million.

Despite the enormous wealth of our country, we simply are not providing adequate health care for our people. Statistically, we rank 13th among the world's industrialized nations in infant mortality. In life expectancy, we rank 11th for women and 18th for men. The picture is even more appalling when we consider that the poorer members of our society generally suffer far higher incidences of illness than our affluent citizens. We must face the fact that we are not providing all our citizens the quality of health care commensurate with our resources.

I was very hopeful that the present administration would meet this challenge. There were signs that it would. A little more than 2 years ago, the President held a press conference on the state of the Nation's health. He said, and I quote—

We face a massive crisis in this area and unless action is taken, both administratively and legislatively, to meet that crisis within the next two to three years, we will have a breakdown in our medical care system which could have consequences affecting millions of people throughout this country.

The President concluded—

I don't think I am overstating the case.

Unfortunately, the administration's budget requests have not reflected this sense of urgency. Thus, it is incumbent upon the Congress to meet the crisis and expand the Federal commitment to health care.

While the Appropriations Committee has acted commendably by increasing the fiscal year 1972 budget request in several key areas, I cannot accept these increases alone as an adequate Federal commitment. In many instances, the committee's increases constitute little more than restorations of budget cuts below the fiscal 1971 levels, with an addition of approximately 6 percent to allow for inflation. The chief sponsors of the amendment before us have stated that this is clearly inadequate if we are to make a realistic attempt to move America's health programs forward. I am in complete agreement.

The progress of medical science depends in large part on the support we in Congress give the research and training programs of the National Institutes of Health. Thus, it is imperative that the

budget request for the research institutes be subjected to the most careful scrutiny. The Appropriations Committee did so and concluded the following in its report on H.R. 10061:

Official testimony on the estimates for the Institutes and Research Divisions of NIH represented the budget as marking the beginning of a new and more vigorous phase in Federal support for medical research and expressed the hope that it will re-establish lost momentum in the research area. Even a cursory inspection of the budget justifications quickly dispels this optimistic view. Of the total budget increase of \$125.6 million for the research programs of NIH, \$103.9 million is for the National Cancer Institute and this amount includes the \$100 million for the new Cancer Conquest Program which was included in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act approved May 24, 1971. The requested increases for the other nine Institutes and the three research Divisions therefore total only \$21.7 million, or 2.3 percent higher than estimated obligations in 1971. This falls far short of offsetting even the lowest estimates of the effects of inflation on the cost of doing research. The budget is thus a step backward for research on all the diseases and disabilities that afflict man, except cancer.

Not one of my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber is more committed to the conquest of cancer than I. Yet, I don't believe that the resources we allocate to conquer cancer must be at the expense of research on other health problems. The Appropriations Committee shared this viewpoint and added approximately \$59 million to the NIH appropriations. The amendment before us will add an additional \$100 million for the research and training programs of the Institutes.

Another budget item that is of particular concern to me is the appropriation for combating lead poisoning. HEW's own white paper issued in May 1971, revealed with shocking statistics the magnitude of the problem of childhood lead poisoning:

Paint with lead in it poisons about 400,000 children (predominantly poor) annually. It is estimated that 16,000 of these children require treatment, 3,200 incur moderate to severe brain damage and 800 are so severely brain damaged that they require care for the rest of their lives.

My own community of Rochester has pioneered in the identification and treatment of lead-based paint poisoning in children. One of our most active citizen groups involved in this effort is the School-Parent Advisors of the Neighborhood (SPAN), led by Mr. David Anderson.

Groups trained by and under the general coordination of the medical school's department of preventive medicine and community health and SPAN have been checking homes in the inner city. Their results are being confirmed by a special team of inspectors supervised by Mr. Willis Smith of the department of buildings and property conservation. The department of buildings follows this confirmation with an emergency order requiring the landlord to begin correcting the violation in 5 days. Of the nearly 400 dwellings surveyed, about 37 percent contain leaded paint, putty, or plaster in a peeling, cracking, flaking condition. In every fifth such dwelling, there are

one or more preschool children. These families have been referred to medical facilities expressing a capability for testing children suspected of lead poisoning.

Those engaged in this door-to-door effort include SPAN workers, Lewis Street center volunteers, a high school science teacher, three high school students, five medical students, community education center workers, youth workers, a registered nurse, and so forth.

The results of the blood tests on children are slow in coming in—based on our limited access to the laboratory services; however, within the month of May, three children have already been hospitalized for acute lead poisoning.

The Congress expressed its intent that antilead poisoning programs be undertaken by passage of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, which authorized \$10 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$20 million for fiscal year 1972. The administration, however, requested only \$2 million for fiscal year 1972. The Appropriations Committee has raised that figure to \$5 million, but this simply is not enough if we are to make a conscientious attempt to eventually eliminate childhood lead poisoning. The additional \$5 million contained in the amendment will significantly increase the number of States and cities which can receive Federal help.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time to delineate all the critical increases in appropriations offered in the package amendment we are deliberating. Mr. CONTE and Mr. YATES have made a compelling case for each of the additions and I want to express my personal gratitude to these gentlemen for the leadership they have provided us today.

We have before us an opportunity to begin, in earnest, a more vigorous phase in Federal support for health care, and I urge in the strongest terms that the Conte-Yates amendment be met with our full support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER), to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers MESSRS. YATES, FLOOD, CONTE, and MICHEL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 169, noes 215, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]
[Recorded Teller Vote]
AYES—169

Abourezk	Ford,	Mosher
Abzug	William D.	Moss
Adams	Fraser	Murphy, III.
Addabbo	Fulton, Pa.	Nedzi
Alexander	Fulton, Tenn.	Nix
Anderson,	Gallifanakis	Obey
Calif.	Gallagher	O'Hara
Andrews,	Gaydos	O'Konski
N. Dak.	Glaimo	Pepper
Annunzio	Gibbons	Petkins
Aspin	Gonzalez	Podell
Badillo	Grasso	Preyer, N.C.
Barrett	Gray	Price, Ill.
Begich	Green, Oreg.	Pryor, Ark.
Bergland	Green, Pa.	Pucinski
Biaggi	Gude	Randall
Blester	Halpern	Rangel
Bingham	Hamilton	Rees
Blanton	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Harrington	Reuss
Bolling	Harsha	Riegle
Brademas	Harvey	Roberts
Brasco	Hastings	Rodino
Brinkley	Hathaway	Roe
Broomfield	Hawkins	Rogers
Buchanan	Hébert	Roncalio
Burke, Mass.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Burton	Heckler, Mass.	Rostenkowski
Byrne, Pa.	Helstoski	Roush
Byron	Hicks, Mass.	Roy
Caffery	Horton	Ryan
Carey, N.Y.	Howard	St Germain
Carney	Jacobs	Sarbanes
Celler	Karth	Scheuer
Chisholm	Kastenmeier	Scheiberling
Clark	Kazen	Shipley
Clay	Kluczynski	Stanton,
Cleveland	Koch	James V.
Collins, Ill.	Leggett	Stokes
Conte	Lent	Stratton
Corman	Link	Stuckey
Cotter	Long, Md.	Sullivan
Coughlin	McCormack	Symington
Daniels, N.J.	McDonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	Mich.	Tiernan
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald,	Udall
Davis, S.C.	Mass.	Ullman
Dellums	Madden	Vanik
Dingell	Matsunaga	Waldie
Dow	Mazzoli	Watts
Drinan	Meeds	Whalen
Dulski	Melcher	Wilson,
du Pont	Metcalfe	Charles H.
Eckhardt	Mikva	Wolff
Edmondson	Minish	Wright
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Wylder
Ellberg	Mitchell	Yates
Fascell	Mollohan	Zablocki
Foley	Moorhead	

NOES—215

Abbit	Crane	Haley
Anderson, III.	Daniel, Va.	Hammer-
Andrews, Ala.	Davis, Wis.	schmidt
Archer	de la Garza	Hansen, Idaho
Arends	Delaney	Hansen, Wash.
Ashbrook	Dellenback	Hays
Aspinall	Denholm	Henderson
Baker	Dennis	Hicks, Wash.
Belcher	Derwinski	Hogan
Bell	Devine	Holifield
Bennett	Dickinson	Hull
Betts	Dorn	Hunt
Bevill	Dowdy	Hutchinson
Boggs	Downing	Jarman
Boland	Duncan	Johnson, Calif.
Bow	Dwyer	Johnson, Pa.
Bray	Edwards, Ala.	Jonas
Brotzman	Erlenborn	Jones, Ala.
Brown, Mich.	Eshleman	Jones, N.C.
Brown, Ohio	Evans, Colo.	Keating
Broyhill, N.C.	Evins, Tenn.	Kee
Broyhill, Va.	Findley	Keith
Burke, Fla.	Fish	Kemp
Burleson, Tex.	Fisher	King
Byrnes, Wis.	Flood	Kyl
Cabell	Flowers	Landgrebe
Camp	Flynt	Landrum
Casey, Tex.	Ford, Gerald R.	Latta
Cederberg	Forsythe	Lennon
Chamberlain	Fountain	Lloyd
Chappell	Frelinghuysen	Lujan
Clancy	Frenzel	McClory
Clausen,	Frey	McCloskey
Don H.	Fuqua	McClure
Clawson, Del.	Gettys	McCollister
Collier	Griffin	McDade
Collins, Tex.	Gross	McEwen
Colmer	Grover	McFall
Conable	Hagan	McKay

McKevitt	Quie	Stanton,
McKinney	Quillen	J. William
McMillan	Rallsback	Steed
Mahon	Rarick	Steele
Mailliard	Reid, Ill.	Steiger, Ariz.
Mann	Rhodes	Steiger, Wis.
Martin	Robinson, Va.	Stephens
Mathias, Calif.	Robison, N.Y.	Talcott
Mathis, Ga.	Rooney, N.Y.	Taylor
Mayne	Rooney, Pa.	Terry
Michel	Rousselot	Thompson, Ga.
Miller, Calif.	Runnels	Thomson, Wis.
Miller, Ohio	Ruppe	Thone
Mills, Ark.	Ruth	Vander Jagt
Mills, Md.	Sandman	Veysey
Minshall	Satterfield	Waggonner
Mizell	Scherle	Wampler
Monagan	Schmitz	Ware
Morse	Schneebell	Whalley
Myers	Schwengel	White
Natcher	Scott	Whitten
Nichols	Sebelius	Widnall
O'Neill	Shoup	Wiggins
Passman	Shriver	Williams
Patman	Sikes	Wilson, Bob
Patten	Skubitz	Winn
Pelly	Slack	Wyatt
Pettis	Smith, Calif.	Wyllie
Peysner	Smith, Iowa	Wyman
Pike	Snyder	Young, Fla.
Pirnie	Spence	Young, Tex.
Poff	Springer	Zion
Powell	Stafford	Zwach
Price, Tex.	Staggers	

NOT VOTING—50

Abernethy	Goldwater	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson,	Goodling	Nelsen
Tenn.	Griffiths	Pickle
Ashley	Gubser	Poage
Baring	Hall	Purcell
Blackburn	Hanna	Roybal
Brooks	Hillis	Saylor
Burlison, Mo.	Hosmer	Sisk
Carter	Hungate	Smith, N.Y.
Conyers	Ichord	Stubblefield
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Teague, Calif.
Dent	Kuykendall	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Kyros	Van Deerlin
Donohue	Long, La.	Vigorito
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Whitehurst
Esch	Montgomery	Yatron
Garmatz	Morgan	

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that under the precedents and rules of the House any Member that is in the Chamber after the 12 minutes has expired is allowed to vote, if he is attempting to vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BOW. If a Member comes in from the lobby into the well of the House, is that Member permitted to vote after the time has expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry that the Chair would have to hear the individual request.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I voted the green card in error thinking I was voting in the negative. I intended to vote in the negative. Is it permissible for me to change my vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be allowed to correct his vote.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, can I record my vote as "no," having just walked in and not having time to vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Texas that according to the precedents the gentleman was not in the Chamber at the time the time limit had expired.

So the amendment was rejected.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given leave to revise and extend their remarks on the so-called Yates-Conte amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

To carry out title VI of the Public Health Service Act, and, except as otherwise provided, for administrative and technical services under parts B and C of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act (42 U.S.C. 2661-2677), the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457), and the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681-2687), \$266,704,000; of which \$172,200,000 shall be available until June 30, 1974 for grants pursuant to section 601 of the Public Health Service Act for the construction or modernization of medical facilities; \$50,300,000 shall be for deposit in the fund established under section 626, and shall be available without fiscal year limitation for the purposes of that section of the Act, of which \$30,000,000 shall be available for direct loans pursuant to section 627 of the Act; \$24,052,000 shall be for grants and \$16,575,000 shall be for loans for nonprofit private facilities pursuant to the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457); *Provided*, That there are authorized to be deposited in the fund established under section 626(a)(1) of the Act amounts received by the Secretary and derived by him from his operations under part B of title VI of the Act which shall be available for the purposes of section 626(a)(1): *Provided further*, That sums received by the Secretary from the sale of loans made pursuant to section 627 of the Act shall be available to him for the purposes of that section.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ABZUG

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ABZUG:
Page 12, line 9: delete "\$266,704,000", insert "\$281,704,000".

Page 12, line 20: after "90-457", add "; \$5,000,000 shall be available without fiscal year limitation for grants for construction of public and other nonprofit facilities for persons with developmental disabilities which are associated with a college or university, pursuant to section 121 of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act (42 U.S.C. 2661); \$10,000,000 shall be available for grants to cover costs of administering and operating demonstration facilities and interdisciplinary training programs for personnel needed to render specialized services to persons with developmental disabilities, pursuant to section 122 of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Contribution Act (42 U.S.C. 2661a)".

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, mental retardation is one of the most shamefully neglected of our national health problems. This bill, as reported from the committee, omits funding for an important program in this area and, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), I am offering an amendment to correct this omission.

This amendment has two purposes. First, it would provide \$5 million for the construction of new university-affiliated facilities, as the existing 19 facilities are not enough; second, it will provide \$10 million for interdisciplinary training programs and expansion of training at the university-affiliated facilities.

The existing law authorizes Federal aid to various types of facilities for the developmentally disabled, including State facilities, community facilities, and university-affiliated facilities. All three of these facilities provide clinical services, but only the university-affiliated facilities, which are covered by part B of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act—to which this amendment is addressed—are offering teaching facilities.

The bill before us today provides funds for the construction of only State and community facilities; it does not provide anything for the construction of the university-affiliated teaching clinics, which are essential for training personnel to work with 6 million Americans afflicted by mental retardation.

The more severely retarded require intensive and expensive care; yet with the proper techniques, they can often be trained and educated to take care of themselves and to assume a productive role in society. Doing this requires various types of specially trained personnel. That there is a severe shortage of such personnel was attested to by various witnesses before the committee.

The committee, in providing appropriations for State and community mental retardation programs, has not made provision to secure properly trained manpower for these programs. To carry out a balanced attack on the problems of mental retardation, and to make these local programs more effective, we need the training and demonstration programs for which the amendment would provide.

The programs of the university-affiliated facilities have taken very serious cognizance of the need to reduce costs of services to the mentally retarded. These programs emphasize training of less expensive personnel, including paraprofessionals, parents, community workers, and so on, to take on some of the responsibility and to free professionals to use their time in the most efficient possible way. They also train professionals from various disciplines in dealing with the very special problems of the developmentally disabled. Their emphasis is on training people to work in teams, to allow for effective differentiation of functions.

They are presently developing a number of new and more efficient strategies for helping the retarded. At the University of Kansas, for example, a group is developing a program called Achievement Place. Teaching-parents are trained to serve as house parents of delinquent, retarded children who have done poorly in school, who have gotten into serious trouble with the law, and who have been referred by the juvenile courts. The parents are not highly trained graduate students, but interested and stable people who are learning to manage

homes which can help delinquents move back to school, family, and the community.

It is financially wise for us to see to it that modern techniques are used in working with the retarded, so that as many as possible can be made self-sufficient.

University affiliated facilities are in painfully short supply, and even the existing ones are understaffed, under-equipped and unable to move ahead with full-scale training programs. Money to do the job absolutely is just not available from other sources.

I urge the Members of this body to support this amendment so that mental retardation programs may be operated with fully trained staff and with maximum effectiveness, and so that as many as possible of the retarded can take their places as productive and contributing members of society.

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

Mr. Chairman, as of this moment chivalry is dead. I must oppose the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

Now there is already a substantial amount of money in the bill for the mentally retarded.

We are providing in this bill \$16,215,000 for formula grants to the States under the developmental disability act which together with the funds carried over from the fiscal year 1971 will provide a total of \$27 million for the programs for the mentally retarded and other disabled persons. Under the law, the States may use up to 50 percent of these funds for construction.

The bill includes \$13,400,000 for staffing grants and training in the 19 university-affiliated centers for the mentally retarded that have already been established with Federal funds, and four new ones have just been opened. This is an increase of \$2,300,000 over the 1971 amendment.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Is it not correct that the \$13 million to which you referred provided for health and health-associated disciplines but not for the nonmedical disciplines which participate in the program?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know if that is so, but let me tell you this, Mr. Chairman. This subcommittee has fostered, nurtured, and instigated the great university programs in paramedics. This subcommittee believes unanimously in the tremendous importance of what we call paramedics. This bill provides \$13 million for staffing grants and training in the institutions that I mentioned.

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

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

Mr. MYERS. It is my understanding that there are four States that have mental retardation training centers already constructed. They are Alabama, Kansas, Washington State, and Indiana.

Mr. FLOOD. There will be more.

Mr. MYERS. I am familiar with Indiana University. The facility has been

completed about 3 years. Would we be safe to draw the conclusion or make the assumption that those four States will be the four that are cited here as additional to the 19 already established?

Mr. FLOOD. This is an appropriation bill. We do not grant by individual project. That kind of detail would rest entirely with the Department.

Mr. MYERS. If the gentleman would yield further, I fully recognize that at Indiana University the physical plant is already there, but the staffing money has not been there. I have read the language that the gentleman referred to which States there will be four additional sites provided.

Mr. FLOOD. You can be sure that what I said was so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know and we all know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is always chivalrous indeed. I support the amendment because I believe the gentlewoman from New York addressed herself to a very important problem.

The amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from New York (Mrs. ABZUG), and of which I am a cosponsor, provides \$15 million—\$10 million for administration and operation and \$5 million for construction—of new university affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded. Few problems in America command such urgent and immediate attention of all of us as does the devastating problem of mental retardation.

Today, some 275,000 people live in the Nation's public and private residential facilities for the mentally retarded. Thousands more are on waiting lists to enter these facilities. Thousands more live with their families, friends, or alone. So much must be done in the face of the awesome numbers of mentally retarded children and men and women.

First, we must assess the causes. Some of them we know. Then, we must determine how to avert mental retardation. Some of the answers we already know. We must continue to expand research to find more answers and more methods of helping those afflicted. And we must devise training and jobs for the mentally retarded so that they, blighted by tragedy, may live with dignity and fulfillment. Likewise, we must expand training for those who work with the mentally retarded. Above all, we must make the public aware that mental retardation, while a tragedy, is not a matter of shame. It is an affliction, yes. But most of the people whom it afflicts can live meaningful and rewarding lives. Even those hopelessly retarded are individuals, to whom no shame or stigma can be attached.

Too many Americans still fail to realize these facts.

The amendment before us today offers steps in the right direction. I therefore gladly have cosponsored it. But there are other steps which must be taken as well. For example, we know that malnutrition and undernutrition are major causes of impaired human mental development.

The 1970 Report of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation makes this very clear. Yet, today, in America, more than 25 million people live on incomes of less than \$3,300 a year for a family of four, and half of these—including some 5 million children—live in households having an income of \$2,200 or less. Clearly, for them, adequate nutrition is a desperate need—and a need which is beyond their grasp to fulfill themselves.

Lead-based paint poisoning accounts for 6,000 to 8,000 cases of mental retardation annually. Yet, the administration still resists mounting a Federal assault on this devastating, yet preventable, disease.

Prenatal disorders account for many cases of mental retardation. Some of these disorders can be averted. For this, research and medical care, once the answer is found, are necessary. For example, research has made it possible to prevent nervous system damage in the Rh positive child of an Rh negative mother. Besides the well-known exchange blood transfusion technique, there has been developed an immunization that prevents the build-up in the mother's system of sensitizing antibodies that react on the child. It is clear that medical research does produce results. Thus, research must be expanded.

Employment is another devastating problem facing the mentally retarded. The fact is that mentally retarded individuals can be trained and educated to perform useful and meaningful work in our society. The problem is that too few facilities are provided for training, and too few employers are willing to employ the mentally retarded.

Still another massive problem facing the mentally retarded and their families lies in the educational system in this country, which simply does not cope adequately with mentally retarded children. An enormously disturbing element of this problem is the fact that so many school systems now program education training for children solely on the basis of so-called intelligence quotient tests, and other supposedly tangible factors which label the child who, once labeled, is consigned to inadequate training and help.

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., former Commissioner of Education, has very pointedly stated the problem:

We know that many children living in ghetto neighborhoods would score low on intelligence tests, but we doubt that all such low scores reflect retarded intellectual ability.

Recent definitions of mental retardation do not seem to imply so much a continuing but something more like a case of pneumonia, suggesting that a diagnosis is valid only at the time and under the circumstances existing when it is made.

It is possible that the term (mental retardation) is no longer of any value to an educator? Do we need to find a new concept of education for children with special needs—one which does not carry with it surplus meaning which is threatening to parents and detrimental to children.

In sum, mental retardation, one of the truly devastating problems of this nation, is a problem which indeed can be considerably relieved with adequate funding, which in turn will be used for research, training, and education.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment for several reasons.

Through fiscal year 1971, 19 university-affiliated centers for the mentally retarded have been established. The Department provides operational funds for these centers from the appropriation for maternal and child health in the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, even though construction funds were provided from the appropriation for rehabilitation services and facilities in the Social and Rehabilitation Service.

In 1972, \$13.4 million was budgeted by the Department and approved by our committee for staffing grants and training activities in the 19 existing centers. This is an increase of \$2.3 million over 1971. The major factor in this increase is the fact that four new centers will become operational this fiscal year.

The budget does not request any funds specifically earmarked for the construction of university-affiliated retardation facilities. The formula grants for carrying out the Developmental Disabilities Act are for preparing and implementing comprehensive State plans for programs for the developmentally disabled. Insofar as university-affiliated facilities fit into such a State plan, they would be supported. The funds available can be used for both construction and operations. The important factor here is that the decision to construct a new university affiliated facility will rest with the State.

The committee bill provides \$16.2 million in formula grants for developmental disabilities, an increase of \$5 million over the President's budget request. In addition, the \$11.2 million appropriated in 1971 have not yet been obligated by the States and will be available to support programs in 1972 as well. This would make \$27 million available to the States in fiscal year 1972. This should be adequate to support meritorious proposals for new university-affiliated facilities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, mental retardation is one of the most serious, and unfortunately, most neglected problem facing this Nation today. Of the some 6 million retarded children and adults in the United States, only a handful are receiving the medical, educational, and rehabilitation services they need. Much of the reason for this is the critical shortage of trained personnel who can educate these children to take care of themselves and to assume a productive and contributing role in society, and the lack of adequate facilities to train this personnel.

The care and treatment of the developmentally disadvantaged, requires the training of highly competent individuals in a number of disciplines, including pediatrics, neurology, social service, psychology, speech and hearing, nutrition, special education, physical and occupational therapy, and vocational rehabilitation, to mention but a few. The prevention, amelioration, and eradication of the multidimensional causes and conditions of mental retardation, moreover, will demand a corps of professionals and paraprofessionals prepared to assume

positions of responsibility in schools, community and residential agencies, clinics and hospitals.

The need for such manpower cannot be denied. Without it, the treatment which we propose to provide and the hope which we offer to the mentally retarded can never be fulfilled. To help meet the need for trained personnel and adequate facilities to train them, my distinguished colleague from New York, Congresswomen ABZUG, has offered an amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill before us now, which would provide \$10 million for the operation and \$5 million for the construction of university affiliated facilities. I enthusiastically support this amendment.

The university affiliated facilities program was authorized by Congress in 1963 to help provide settings which would train professionals in the variety of disciplines necessary for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded. These university affiliated facilities, of which there are now 20, are designed to develop and implement improved, interdisciplinary approaches to the problems of the mentally retarded, integrating all aspects of necessary services and disciplines. New and innovative approaches to the training of professionals and paraprofessionals, and to educating and supporting the handicapped, at lower costs to society, are being developed at these facilities, and the 91st Congress, recognizing their contribution recently extended funding for the construction of these facilities, for training and demonstration programs, and for operation funds, to 1973. Thirty-seven million dollars, moreover, was actually authorized for fiscal year 1972.

Despite the authorization, no funds for the construction and operation of new facilities were included in the Labor-HEW appropriations bill reported to the House. While \$13.4 million of the funds appropriated for maternal and child health will be available for the university program, these moneys can only be used to support the medical aspects of existing programs. It does not support the operation of the nonmedical disciplines that participate in the interdisciplinary program, such as the special service in vocational rehabilitation, or the operation of new facilities.

Over the years, we have recognized the pressing need to provide services to the mentally retarded and their families. We have recognized the need to improve our approaches to the problems of mental retardation. And we have recognized the need for continuing Federal support of community mental health programs. We have also, I am sure, recognized the critical need for trained manpower and adequate training facilities if these services are truly to be provided.

And yet, while the university-affiliated facilities have developed exciting and highly valuable strategies to meet the need for a large group of better-trained personnel able to provide more effective services, Congress has failed to appropriate funds for the construction of desperately needed new facilities since 1963. If this program is not supported, however, the progress which has been made to date

is apt to be lost, and we may well see a return to the apathy which once before greeted the plight of the disabled. I hope the House will take the steps necessary to help prevent this, and approve the amendment before it.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague (Mrs. ABZUG) to appropriate \$15 million to train personnel working with the mentally retarded. H.R. 10061, as reported by the committee, omits funding for one of the most important national health programs. There are 6 million retarded children and adults in the United States.

In 1963, the university-affiliated facilities program was authorized under Public Law 88-164 and was continued under the Developmental Disabilities Act, Public Law 91-517, to furnish trained professionals in various disciplines to meet the technical and professional manpower shortages in the field of teaching the mentally retarded. Part B of the Developmental Disabilities Act provides a framework for university-affiliated clinical facilities that would carry on interdisciplinary training of professionals and paraprofessionals; \$37 million was authorized under the act for the construction and operation of these facilities. However, the committee has joined the administration in eliminating the appropriations for these programs. May I urge you to appropriate at least \$15 million of the \$37 million authorized.

I do not deny the fact that retarded children pose perplexing problems to all of us. But we must not shirk our responsibilities in facing this problem; \$15 million will aid us in training the personnel needed to help many of these children to take care of themselves and to assume a contributing role in society.

This goal requires highly competent and specially trained personnel in an interdisciplinary approach including pediatrics, neurology, psychiatry, social service, psychology, speech and hearing, nutrition, nursing special education, physical and occupational therapy, and vocational education to mention a few. Presently there is a severe shortage of the needed personnel to serve in special schools, community clinics, hospitals, and institutions.

Although the committee has provided appropriations for State-based and community programs for mental retardation, it is questionable whether properly trained personnel will be available to implement these programs. It is imperative to supply the trained personnel so that these local programs can be more effective and balanced.

The university-affiliated facilities are acutely aware of the need to put emphasis on the training of personnel including paraprofessional, community workers and so on, while at the same time encouraging them to work as teams. This would relieve some of the duties of the professionals so that optimal usage of their time could be achieved.

University-affiliated facilities exist in 20 States. These programs are encouraging, however, the deplorable shortage of personnel prevents them from forging ahead with full-scale training programs,

despite the fact that they have assiduously sought various sources of funding.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, so that all those who are mentally retarded will be given the chance to be productive members of society.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment and to points of order at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the bill?

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GIAIMO

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The portion of the bill to which the amendments related is as follows:

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles I, IV, X, XI, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$11,411,693,000, of which \$46,000,000 shall be for child welfare services under part B of title IV *Provided*, That such amounts as may be necessary for locating parents, as authorized in section 410 of the Social Security Act, may be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury.

For making, after June 15 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX, respectively, of the Social Security Act, for any period during the last fifteen days of the current fiscal year (except with respect to activities included in the appropriation for "Work incentives"); and for making, after April 30 of the current fiscal year, payments for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year; such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the subsequent appropriations therefor for the current or succeeding fiscal year.

In the administration of title I, IV (other than Part C thereof), X, XIV, XVI, and XIX, respectively, of the Social Security Act, payments to a State under any such titles for any quarter in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June 30, of the current year, may be made with respect to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan was submitted for approval.

Such amounts as may be necessary from this appropriation shall be available for grants to States for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

WORK INCENTIVES

For carrying out a work incentive program, as authorized by part C of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for related child care services, as authorized by part A of title IV of the Act, including transfer to the Secretary of Labor, as authorized by section 431 of the Act, \$259,136,000.

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, sections 301 and 303 of the Public Health Service Act, and parts C and D of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, \$613,051,000; of which \$518,000,000 shall be for grants under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; \$38,660,000 for section 4(a)(2)(A), to remain available through June 30, 1973; \$3,051,000 for construction grants under section 12, and \$16,215,000 for grants under part C of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, to remain available until June 30, 1974: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from the appropriation, "Mental health" an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustment made by the Secretary pursuant to section 202(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31, of the current fiscal year, grants to States under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING

To carry out, except as otherwise provided, the Older Americans Act of 1965, \$33,700,000.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, sections 4, 7, and 16, of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, sections 426, 707, 1110, and 1115 of the Social Security Act, titles IV and V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and the International Health Research Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 364), \$92,465,000.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION, AND SOCIAL SECURITY ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, and the Social Security Administration, in connection with activities related to research and training by the Social and Rehabilitation Service, and the Social Security Administration, as authorized by law, \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations to such Service and Administration for payments in the foregoing currencies.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for the Social and Rehabilitation Service, \$39,537,000, together with not to exceed \$400,000 to be transferred from the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, as provided in Section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the Federal Disability Insurance, the Federal Hospital Insurance

and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 217(g), 228(g), 229(b), and 1844 of the Social Security Act, and sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, \$2,465,297,000.

SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

For carrying out title IV of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, including necessary travel incident to medical examinations, reconsideration interviews, or hearings for verifying disabilities or for review of disability determination, \$644,249,000: *Provided*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Postal Service shall be used for payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter by States in connection with the administration of said Act.

Benefit payments after April 30: For making after April 30 of the current fiscal year, payments to entitled beneficiaries under title IV of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, for the last two months of the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations and expenditures therefor to be charged to the appropriation for the succeeding fiscal year.

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not more than \$1,134,640,000 may be expended as authorized by section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein: *Provided*, That such amounts as are required shall be available to pay the cost of necessary travel incident to medical examinations, reconsideration interviews or hearings for verifying disabilities or for review of disability determinations, of individuals who file applications for disability determinations under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$25,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), only to the extent necessary to process workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates and to meet mandatory increases in costs of agencies or organizations with which agreements have been made to participate in the administration of title XVIII and section 221 of title II of the Social Security Act, and after maximum absorption of such costs within the remainder of the existing limitation has been achieved: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the United States Postal Service shall be used for payment, in such manner as said organizations may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of the social security program by States participating in the program.

LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION

For construction, alterations, and equipment of facilities, including acquisition of sites, and planning, architectural, and engineering services, and for provision of necessary off-site parking facilities during construction, \$18,194,000 to be expended as authorized by section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein, and to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, section 426 of the Social Security Act and the Act of April 9, 1912 (42 U.S.C. 191) including partial support of a White House Conference on Children and Youth, \$14,251,000.

DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, \$10,830,000, together with not to exceed \$1,049,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for departmental management, including \$100,000 for the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, \$47,570,000, together with not to exceed \$5,926,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein; and not to exceed \$29,000 to be transferred from "Revolving fund for certification and other services," Food and Drug Administration.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The Working Capital Fund of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall hereafter be available for expenses necessary for common personnel support services in the Washington area.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Social and Rehabilitation Service for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to make such transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices, without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying out the operations of the Department.

SEC. 203. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost of such project.

SEC. 204. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used for any activity the purpose of which is to require any recipient of any project grant for research, training, or demonstration made by any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay to the United States any portion of any interest or other income earned on payments of such grant made before July 1, 1964; nor shall any of the funds, contained in this Act be used for any activity the purpose of which is to require payment to the United States of any portion of any interest or other income earned on payments made before July 1, 1964, to the American Printing House for the Blind.

SEC. 205. Expenditures from funds appropriated under this title to the American Printing House for the Blind, Howard University, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and Gallaudet College shall be subject to audit by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 206. None of the funds contained in this title shall be available for additional permanent Federal positions in the Washington area if the proportion of additional positions in the Washington area in relation to the total new positions is allowed to exceed the proportion existing at the close of fiscal year 1966.

SEC. 207. Appropriations in this Act for the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and Departmental Management shall be available for expenses for active commissioned officers in the Public Health Service Reserve Corps and for not to exceed two thousand eight hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps; expenses incident to the dissemination of health information in foreign countries through exhibits and other appropriate means; advances of funds for compensation, travel, and subsistence expenses (or per diem in lieu thereof) for persons coming from abroad to participate in health or scientific activities of the Department pursuant to law; expenses of primary and secondary schooling of dependents, in foreign countries, of Public Health Service commissioned officers stationed in foreign countries, at costs for any given area not in excess of those of the Department of Defense for the same area, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents between such schools and their places of residence when the schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation; rental or lease of living quarters (for periods not exceeding 5 years), and provision of heat, fuel, and light, and maintenance, improvement and repair of such quarters, and advance payments therefor, for civilian officers and employees of the Public Health Service who are United States citizens and who have a permanent station in a foreign country; not to exceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; purchase, erection, and maintenance of temporary or portable structures; and for the payment of compensation to consultants or individual scientists appointed for limited periods of time pursuant to section 207(f) or section 207(g) of the Public Health Service Act, at rates established by the Surgeon General, or the Secretary where such action is required by statute, not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18.

SEC. 208. None of the funds contained in this title may be used for any expenses, whatsoever, incident to making allotments to States for the current fiscal year, under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, on a basis in excess of a total of \$530,000,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIAIMO:

On page 21, line 22, strike out "\$613,051,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$688,836,000";

On page 21, line 22, strike out "\$518,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$575,000,000";

On page 21, line 25, after the semicolon insert "\$15,000,000 for rehabilitation facility improvement under section 13";

On page 22, line 1, strike out "\$16,215,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,000,000";

On page 23, line 3, strike out "\$92,465,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$99,163,000"; and

On page 31, line 5, strike out "\$530,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600,000,000."

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals purely and simply with vocational rehabilitation. There are many programs in the United States de-

signed to cure many of the social ills which affect us as a people, but I will submit that of the many programs dealing with drugs, dealing with poverty, dealing with sickness, dealing with education, and dealing with the whole gamut of social afflictions facing us an urban people, there is no program in my opinion and in the opinion of many of my colleagues which has the unenviable record of success that the social and rehabilitation service has in the United States and that vocational rehabilitation has performed throughout the years.

This is a tried and true and demonstrated program of success. It has taken people who have been handicapped, who have had one affliction or another, who have needed rehabilitation, and it has in fact rehabilitated them and has returned them to the work force of the United States and in fact, by all the estimates and all the statistics and by all the measures, has had a favorable benefit to cost ratio, in that these people, by having been rehabilitated, have been enabled to go back to gainful employment and have made contributions both by their work and by the taxes which they have paid to this Nation, instead of continuing on the unemployment rolls and on the afflicted rolls and instead of continuing consequently to derive additional stipends and payment from the many welfare programs we have to help people who have for one reason or another been unable to work.

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I want to commend very warmly the able gentleman from Connecticut for having offered this very significant amendment and I want to go on record as supporting his amendment to increase funds for vocational rehabilitation. Everyone who has studied the vocational rehabilitation program concludes that it is the most effective program we have designed to help physically and mentally handicapped individuals become employable. The program is uniformly regarded as one of the most effective illustrations of State-Federal cooperation in working toward achievement of a national goal. In this case, the goal is to seek to assure that physically and mentally handicapped people have as nearly as possible equality of opportunity with others. This year, several of us who serve on the Committee on Education and Labor have introduced legislation to further improve and expand vocational rehabilitation services in the United States. The subcommittee which I have the honor to chair will conduct the hearings on this legislation. We have, however, been delayed in getting underway because the administration has not presented its own proposals for the future of the vocational rehabilitation program. The program authorization expires on June 30 of this coming year.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all members of the House Committee on Education and Labor will be looking for ways to make it possible for the vocational rehabilitation program at both State and Federal levels to make an even greater

contribution to meeting the needs of severely handicapped individuals. Contrary to what many people think, the total number of seriously disabled people is increasing from year to year.

Mr. Chairman, although we are learning how to save lives, we have not been equally adept in preventing disability. Thus, the cardiac whose life is saved is likely to become a cardiac cripple. The victim of an automobile accident, who once would have died, now lives, but with a broken back. Clearly we must intensify our efforts to prevent accidents and diseases, but we must also do far more than we have done to meet the needs of those who have become disabled.

The vocational rehabilitation agency is the principal agency in the country to serve the needs of handicapped adults. I might here observe, Mr. Chairman, that our Select Education Subcommittee has recently reported unanimously and favorably this comprehensive child development bill, which would provide significant improvement in the way in which services for children are provided in our country. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the agencies serving children under the child development bill and the agencies providing vocational rehabilitation services for adults under vocational rehabilitation legislation should be regarded as companions in providing services to handicapped youths and adults.

The amount recommended in Mr. Giaimo's amendment is by no means too much. I hope the amendment passes.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it can be easiest thing in the world to come down here into the well and to suggest an increase in moneys for many of these programs in the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill. But we must be prudent—we must respect the judgment of a distinguished subcommittee, we must be careful in suggesting these increases, in view of the budgetary restraints upon us. We cannot go wild; we must act with restraint.

I submit that this amendment of mine today is no wild—it is not a spendthrift amendment. This is what it portends and does in fact do.

There is a basic program of Federal-State rehabilitation grants for rehabilitation services, 80 percent Federal money and 20 percent State money. There are great rehabilitation centers, such as the one which I have in my hometown and which many Members have in their hometowns throughout America.

We are saying, "Increase the basic grants to the States from the committee amount of \$518 million to \$575 million."

One may ask me, Why that figure? It is because of the testimony of the Department itself, as shown on page 245 of the hearings. The Department testified that in order for the rehabilitation program, the basic State-Federal program, to stay at last year's level we have to give them \$552 million. The \$518 million which the committee gave is not sufficient even to stay at last year's level, bearing in mind the inflationary escalation of costs and prices of 6 percent. We must bear in mind the natural desires

of all of us, since this is an excellent program, to expand it, so that it can have a modest expansion and take in more people than it has in the past. Normal growth plus escalation implies some more moneys than it had to stay at last year's level.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GIAIMO was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, there is \$57 million additional for that, to bring it to \$575 million.

Then we are asking \$5 million additional for rehabilitation facilities. This is for additional training service grants to support rehabilitation facilities, to improve their operations, and to expand technical assistance to rehabilitation facilities.

We are asking for an additional \$7 million for research and development. Why another \$7 million? It is merely to bring it to the level for research and development of the year before. The present bill does not even have enough money in it to keep it at the level at which research and development was conducted the year before.

One other item is included in this amendment—the developmental disabilities program. We are increasing that to \$30 million from the \$16 million, which the committee gave in the bill. Whereas the administration asked for \$13 million, the committee recommended \$16 million. I say let us go to \$30 million. Why? This is a new program that Congress passed last year. The authorization is over \$100 million. With the amount asked for by the administration for the mentally retarded and for the epileptics and for those affected with neurological diseases, the amount in the administration bill of \$13 million, even with the additions put in by the committee, would come to roughly \$100,000 per State on the average. That is hardly enough, hardly enough to get a decent mental retardation program in operation.

There has been delay in getting this program into operation. I know that Congress by an overwhelming vote voted for the developmental disabilities legislation. I know that the mandate was to get this program in operation. I think \$30 million as opposed to \$16 million is a modest amount which will do an effective job in starting this program of curing our mentally retarded people. I think we cannot afford to delay it any longer.

The total of all these amendments as enumerated comes to \$82 million. I think this is money well spent. The testimony of the administration's witnesses bears out that the main reason why they did not put more money into the developmental disabilities portion of this legislation was because of fiscal constraints. The testimony also indicates that the department did in fact ask for more money but that they were turned down, as are so many departments, by the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, this is money well spent, and I urge your favorable consideration of this amendment.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in

support of the amendment and to commend the author, my colleague from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) not simply for the advocacy of a noble and humane cause but for taking a very moderate approach and for the persuasive arguments that he has made. In my own judgment, there can be no greater cause than this.

The addition of \$82.4 million to the committee recommendations for four rehabilitation services programs is a bare minimum. Our mental institutions today are no better than the facilities provided in the 1800's. They are living graveyards for those whom we as a society wish removed from our midst.

Likewise, our concern for the physically disabled in most cases ends with a "Tsk, Tsk" or "how unfortunate." We let the handicapped live dependent on others for basic needs.

The saddest aspect of this national shame is that many of those in mental institutions can be rehabilitated and trained to lead productive lives. Similarly many who have physical handicaps can be shown how to live independently.

What is needed is the commitment of funds for authorized programs—a commitment that will pay dividends in returning people to society as useful members and in the knowledge that we have helped fellow human beings realize a greater respect for themselves.

This amendment would first provide increased funds for the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which in terms of cost-benefit ratios has been twice as successful as any other program seeking to accomplish similar goals. It has given a new lease on life to countless millions of disabled Americans.

To compliment this program, additional funds are included in this amendment for research and development and facilities improvement—necessary programs if we are to further expand our services to the disabled.

A fourth section would increase funds for the Developmental Disabilities and Construction Act. Here, too, promises have been many but results few. This additional funding will mean—many new facilities and expansion of old ones to better serve the needs of the disabled American.

While I would favor additional appropriations for the university-affiliated facilities section of this act, I am hopeful that some of the grant funds allocated the States under this section will be channeled into university-affiliated programs.

Improved vocational rehabilitation programs for the mentally and physically disabled are urgently needed. By helping these dependent Americans become independent, we are at the same time building a better America. By giving to these people pride of accomplishment and self-esteem, we are developing a stronger society. These programs should and must be expanded and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Connecticut, Congressman ROBERT N. GIAIMO. His amendment holds out new hope for thousands of

handicapped and disabled Americans, giving them an opportunity for meaningful lives. It calls for major budget increases in three programs vital to the needs of the handicapped and disabled.

First, it would add \$58 million in new funds to section II of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, bringing fiscal 1972's budget for this section up to a full \$575 million.

Within the same field, Mr. Chairman, the amendment would expand the program's allotment base from \$530 million to \$600 million.

And, in still another effort to shore up this program's lagging budget, the amendment explicitly earmarks funds for improvement of rehabilitation facilities and makes \$5 million more available for such improvement.

Second, Mr. Chairman, it would almost double the budget for the new Developmental Disabilities Services and Construction Act, increasing the budget from \$16.2 million to \$30 million.

Third, it would add \$7 million to the budget for research and development in rehabilitation work, restoring it to the fiscal 1971 level of \$31 million.

The need for such increases is more than obvious.

Scores of thousands of the handicapped now lead bleak and desolate lives, shut up in their homes or forgotten in institutions.

The cost in lost production alone is staggering.

The cost in human suffering alone is beyond calculation.

These people can be helped. They can be put to work. And, they do go back to work.

New techniques in rehabilitation—and newer techniques still that might stem from the Giaimo amendment—promise to make most of the handicapped happy and productive members of our society.

The cost is small. Indeed, it is trifling compared to the enormous benefits that will flow from adequate funding of these rehabilitation services and facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the Giaimo amendment.

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

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

The bill already includes \$518 million for basic vocational rehabilitation grants to States. Did you hear that? This is a group of niggardly people with whom I am associated? No, no. This will provide for services to 980,000 handicapped or disabled persons, which is 8,000 more than were served by last year's appropriation. This committee made sure of that. Ten times we made sure of it.

In addition to the basic grants to the States the bill includes \$38 million for what is known as expansion grants. That is an increase of \$23,500,000 over last year. It will be used to rehabilitate disabled persons who are on the welfare rolls. You have heard about that. We wanted to be sure that that was so. It is so. This increase will also go to the States and will be used to rehabilitate an additional 45,000 welfare recipients over and above those that would be reached through the basic grant program.

This bill also includes \$16,215,000 for formula grants to the States for the developmentally disabled. This is an increase of \$5 million over the budget request and the 1971 appropriation.

This committee is for it 1,000 percent—for this new program. This is going to be a great program. This is going to go on to become one of the great programs in this entire field.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FLOOD was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think that we have adequately funded the rehabilitation programs, since the bill provides an increase of approximately \$43 million over the 1971 level. We felt this was proper. We feel under the circumstances that we know this is adequate, or this committee would have added more.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, BOB GIAIMO, on the leadership he has taken in recognizing the need of additional funding for the Social and Rehabilitation Services above the amounts requested by the administration or recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

We talk about tightening our belt in the Congress. We talk about reducing Federal spending. Some of my colleagues are saying that we have to hold the line somewhere. I would ask my colleagues, then, "Why not hold Federal spending in areas where it is proved that we do not get a return for our tax dollars? Why not hold the line in those so-called rat-hole areas where the more money poured in the larger the hole gets?" Why hold the line on programs which more than repay to society the meager appropriations we give them? Why hold the line on programs which transform members of our society from public charges to self-sufficient productive citizens?

Mr. GIAIMO's amendment today is not asking us as Members of this body to fritter away any of the taxpayers' money. He asks for an investment—an investment toward rehabilitating people who are capable of being contributory taxpayers.

Additionally, I would like to point out that this same Congress just last year passed the Developmental Disabilities Services and Construction Act to replace the old Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act. And, in so doing the Congress authorized \$105 million to carry out the new act's programs.

I wonder, has the need which was recognized by this Congress less than a year ago diminished? Or, has the state of our economy become so disastrously critical in 1 year that we can now justify appropriating \$68.3 million less than we authorized? Or have we just lost sight of the fact that the development disabilities program is serving 3 million more people than the program it replaced was serving.

Can we really believe that it is realistic to appropriate only \$16.2 million to be divided among the 50 States to serve the needs of over 9 million people in our country? I think not, Mr. Speaker, and

it is for this reason that I intend to vote in favor of Mr. GIAIMO's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. Thirty million dollars is still a far cry from the authorized \$105 million, but at least it is more realistic than the recommendation of \$16.2 million which we have been offered.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to voice my support for the Giaimo amendment to H.R. 10061. The vital needs of the handicapped, and particularly the mentally retarded, neglected shamefully in the past, cannot even be minimally served without this amendment which unfortunately does little more than maintain programs at existing levels.

I am particularly concerned because I know of a project in Manhattan which provides sorely needed dental care for the mentally retarded. Drs. Vincent Maz-zoe and Murray Ross of Columbus Hospital are providing a program of comprehensive dental care to mental retardates in New York City, and they are operating on severely limited funds. This is one of the few programs of its kind in the country. It is especially important that it be continued and indeed expanded due to the number of patients who have never had treatment before and are in dire need of dental care.

Without the amendment, this program, limited as it is, and many others like it across the Nation will be restricted by a lack of funds, at a time when real progress is just beginning to be made in this area of need.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Giaimo amendment to increase appropriations for vocational rehabilitation and developmental disabilities. I am proud of the fact that the vocational rehabilitation legislation of 1965 bears my name. It was an enlightening experience to me in 1965 and since to participate in hearings, become acquainted with many handicapped individuals as well as with the professional workers in rehabilitation, and to gain insights into how the vocational rehabilitation program works and the effect it has in the lives of handicapped individuals.

My conclusion is that I do not believe we have any better human service program than vocational rehabilitation. It simply would not do to have this program, which Congress has supported loyally throughout the years, come to a standstill at this time, when the need for vocational rehabilitation services is greater than it has ever been. I have always been a supporter of new efforts and new initiatives proposed by this administration and previous administrations to relieve human need. In so doing, however, it has never been my intent that such programs would in any way be a substitute for the tried and true programs which have provided effective service to needy people. Particularly is this true in vocational rehabilitation, which has shown itself to be extremely flexible in adjusting its services to changing conditions and has made a magnificent contribution in the development and application of new approaches to solving old problems.

I am well acquainted with the voca-

tional rehabilitation program in my home State. Vocational rehabilitation has been, indeed, a pioneering program in New Jersey. It has found a way to work effectively with all other State agencies which share its responsibilities for meeting human needs and with the voluntary agencies which play a most significant role in providing rehabilitation and related services. So far as I know, there has never been any criticism of the administration of this program.

In New Jersey, vocational rehabilitation is administered by the Department of Labor and Industry. As such, it has come to be an integral component in a total manpower program, a leader and an inspiration to other agencies and their programs. The ability of this agency, under broad and comprehensive legislation, to provide almost any kind of service that will result in enabling a handicapped individual to become employable has enabled the agency to fill many important gaps in existing services, as well as to provide total services to many individuals.

The accomplishments of handicapped people have been truly great, and many of these handicapped individuals owe their opportunities to vocational rehabilitation. The policy of Congress has been to encourage the expansion of this program to the point that it may be able to serve the total annual increment of handicapped people by 1975. The increase in funds provided by this amendment will make possible an orderly expansion of services designed to meet this goal. Anything less than this would be tragic in this time of great need. I repeat, we must provide the resources needed to enable vocational rehabilitation to perform its mission. I appreciate the fact that our colleague, Mr. GIAIMO, has called this to our attention by introducing this amendment.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks following the comments of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) on the pending amendments.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I am sure that a good many of our colleagues may be persuaded in part by the vigorous arguments of the proponents of this particular amendment, let me give you a few other facts and figures to supplement what our good chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) has said.

Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that this basic grants to the States item was increased by \$15 million from a level of \$503 million in 1971 to \$518 million this year. The amount of each State's grants is determined by a formula based on population weighted by per capita income. The Federal share being 80 percent and the States' share 20 percent.

While the gentleman's home State of Connecticut is not in any way adversely affected by the level of funds carried in the bill this year, there are 12 States that would receive a very small reduction in 1972 because of changes in their per capita income and population, but not as a result of the level of appropriation request.

In fact, in order to restore the level of these 12 States, all other States would have to receive more than their fiscal year 1971 level under the application of the formula. In other words, in order to help 12 States which, because of changes in population and income, are really not entitled to such help, \$2.4 million could be used conceivably. But under the formula those States can only receive that \$2.4 million if we increase the appropriation by \$57 million.

Secondly, I would like to make the point that rehabilitation of public assistance recipients has been given first priority. In order to target rehabilitation activities toward this population, there has been a substantial increase from \$27.7 million to \$52.2 million requested for rehabilitation service projects. Most of this increase is for expansion grants which is being used to reflect this high priority. The appropriation, therefore, has provided a substantial increase of \$24.5 million in expansion grants, rather than adding more money to basic State grants. But the same recipients will benefit—although not by formula distribution, and this will permit the highest priority needs to be met.

It may be of interest to know that in fiscal 1971, an estimated 130,000 public assistance recipients were provided vocational rehabilitation services and of this number, approximately 37,500 were rehabilitated during the year. It has been estimated that for each public assistance recipient removed from the welfare rolls, the resultant annual savings to welfare will amount to approximately \$850, not counting the humanitarian benefits, productive contribution to society in earnings, finished products and taxes. Moreover, there are approximately 300,000 persons now on welfare rolls who have a potential for rehabilitation, and we estimate that better than 51,000 will actually be rehabilitated under the program.

Now, in addition to these individuals, the basic state grants will provide funds to rehabilitate many others, as follows:

Social Security disability insurance beneficiaries	21,200
Correctional rehabilitation	18,700
Alcoholics	16,700
Narcotics addicts	1,200
Mentally ill	83,800
Mental retardation	40,300
Blind and visually impaired	24,300
Deaf, hard of hearing and speech impaired	17,500
Heart disease, cancer, and stroke	11,800
Spinal cord injuries	300

Now, Mr. Chairman, as for adding additional money for developmental disabilities, there has been a delay in getting this program started and the delay is the result of problems in getting regulations promulgated and State plans approved.

The full 1971 appropriation of \$11.2 million and the House allowance of \$16.2

million will be available for expenditure in 1972. In other words, we're going to have a program level of \$27.4 million, and it would be absolutely ridiculous for us to pile on more money until we have some good evidence of how effectively the dollars are actually going to be spent.

Now, as for the item having to do with the proposed increase in research and demonstration funds, our bill restores the budget's proposed decreases in training. This is the area of major concern to the schools of social work and the other welfare R. & D. clientele.

HEW has for the past year been engaged in a rigorous review of its welfare research—its objectives, methodology and the individual projects. HEW is convinced that a pruning job is called for and that the 1972 budget is sufficient to fund all ongoing projects which merits continued support. Furthermore, there will be a substantial amount left over for new projects which should be funded and which will permit some new and innovative work to be undertaken. If the money in the amendment is added, it could prevent a much needed pause for some toughminded evaluation, and—unless the money is withheld from obligation—lead to the funding of some pretty low priority research.

I urge you to vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. MICHEL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 236, noes 153, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—236

Abourezk	Byrne, Pa.	Dwyer
Abzug	Byron	Eckhardt
Adams	Caffery	Edmondson
Addabbo	Carey, N.Y.	Edwards, Calif.
Albert	Carney	Ellberg
Alexander	Celler	Fascell
Anderson, Calif.	Chappell	Foley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Chisholm	Ford,
Annunzio	Clausen,	William D.
Ashley	Don H.	Fountain
Aspin	Clay	Fraser
Badillo	Cleveland	Frenzel
Barrett	Collins, Ill.	Frey
Begich	Corman	Fulton, Pa.
Bell	Cotter	Fulton, Tenn.
Bergland	Coughlin	Fuqua
Biaggi	Culver	Galfanakis
Blester	Daniel, Va.	Gallagher
Bingham	Daniel, N.J.	Gaydos
Blatnik	Danielson	Gettys
Boggs	Davis, Ga.	Giaimo
Boland	Davis, S.C.	Gibbons
Bolling	de la Garza	Gonzalez
Brademas	Dellums	Grasso
Brasco	Dent	Green, Oreg.
Brinkley	Dingell	Green, Pa.
Broomfield	Dorn	Gude
Brotzman	Dow	Hagan
Broyhill, N.C.	Downing	Hamilton
Buchanan	Drinan	Hammer-
Burke, Mass.	Dulski	schmidt
Burton	Duncan	Hanley
	du Pont	Hanna

Hansen, Wash.	Mikva
Harrington	Miller, Calif.
Harsha	Mills, Ark.
Harvey	Minish
Hathaway	Mink
Hawkins	Mitchell
Hays	Mizell
Hechler, W. Va.	Mollohan
Heckler, Mass.	Monagan
Helstoski	Moorhead
Hicks, Mass.	Mosher
Hicks, Wash.	Moss
Horton	Murphy, Ill.
Howard	Murphy, N.Y.
Ichord	Nedzi
Jacobs	Nix
Jones, N.C.	Obey
Karth	O'Hara
Kastenmeier	O'Konski
Kazen	O'Neill
Keating	Patman
Kee	Patten
Kemp	Pelly
Kluczynski	Pepper
Koch	Perkins
Leggett	Pettis
Link	Peyster
Long, Md.	Pike
Lujan	Podell
McCloskey	Preyer, N.C.
McCollister	Price, Ill.
McCormack	Pryor, Ark.
McDade	Pucinski
McDonald,	Purcell
Mich.	Quile
McFall	Quillen
McKevitt	Railsback
McKinney	Randall
McMillan	Rangel
Maconald,	Rarick
Mass.	Rees
Madden	Reid, N.Y.
Mathis, Ga.	Reuss
Matsunaga	Riegle
Mazzoli	Roberts
Meads	Rodino
Melcher	Roe
Metcalfe	Rogers

NOES—153

Abbitt	Ford, Gerald R.
Abernethy	Forsythe
Anderson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling
Archer	Griffin
Arends	Gross
Ashbrook	Grover
Aspinall	Gubser
Baker	Haley
Belcher	Hall
Bennett	Hansen, Idaho
Betts	Henderson
Bevill	Hogan
Bow	Hollifield
Bray	Hull
Brooks	Hunt
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson
Brown, Ohio	Jarman
Broyhill, Va.	Johnson, Calif.
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Pa.
Burleson, Tex.	Jonas
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.
Cabell	Keith
Camp	King
Casey, Tex.	Kyl
Cederberg	Landgrebe
Chamberlain	Latta
Clancy	Lent
Clawson, Del.	Lloyd
Collier	McClory
Collins, Tex.	McClure
Colmer	McEwen
Conable	McKay
Crane	Mahon
Davis, Wis.	Mailliard
Delaney	Mann
Dellenback	Martin
Dennis	Mathias, Calif.
Derwinski	Mayne
Devine	Michel
Dickinson	Miller, Ohio
Edwards, Ala.	Mills, Md.
Erlenborn	Minshall
Eshleman	Morgan
Evans, Colo.	Myers
Evins, Tenn.	Natcher
Findley	Nichols
Fish	Passman
Fisher	Pirnie
Flood	Poff
Flowers	Powell
Flynt	Price, Tex.

Roncalio
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Runnels
Ryan
St Germain
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Selberling
Shipley
Spence
Stafford
Stanton,
James V.
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thone
Tierman
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Veysey
Waldie
Wampler
Whalen
White
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wylder
Yates
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

NOT VOTING—45

Anderson,	Goldwater	Morse
Tenn.	Griffiths	Nelsen
Baring	Halpern	Pickle
Blackburn	Hastings	Poage
Blanton	Hébert	Roybal
Burlison, Mo.	Hillis	Saylor
Carter	Hosmer	Sisk
Clark	Hungate	Staggers
Conte	Jones, Tenn.	Teague, Calif.
Conyers	Kuykendall	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Kyros	Van Deerlin
Donohue	Landrum	Vigorito
Dowdy	Lennon	Whitehurst
Edwards, La.	Long, La.	Yatron
Esch	McCulloch	
Garmatz	Montgomery	

So the amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS

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

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

PATIENT CARE AND SPECIAL HEALTH SERVICES

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, the Act of August 8, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 7901), and under sections 301, 311, 321, 322, 324, 326, 328, 331, 332, 502, and 504 of the Public Health Service Act, section 1010 of the Act of July 1, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 763c) and section 1 of the Act of July 19, 1963 (42 U.S.C. 253a), \$71,682,000 of which \$1,200,000 shall be available only for payments to the State of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when the Health Services and Mental Health Administration establishes or operates a health service program for any department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made by way of reimbursement or in advance of deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS:

On page 13, line 9, strike the figure "\$71,682,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$85,700,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment. This section of the bill has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order comes too late, in view of the fact that the bill has been considered read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I recall my request, I very distinctly said, "the remainder of the bill." That is why I made the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is informed that this part of the bill had not been read when the gentleman made his request as to the remainder of the bill.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if I may have your attention for just 1 minute, I will make this very quick.

This amendment will simply restore a cut of \$14 million to the Public Health Service hospitals and clinics all over this country. We are not asking in this amendment that you add anything to what was appropriated last year but simply that you restore the cut to what was appropriated last year.

The intent of this reduction is to begin to phase out these hospitals and clinics all over this Nation. Right now the order

has already gone to Fort Worth, Tex., where they treat narcotic addicts, only one of two such facilities in the Nation, that they are to accept no more narcotic addicts for treatment, just at a time when we are trying to mount a campaign against drug abuse.

All of you know that there was no money for these facilities in the budget at first—they were just going to close them down—but when the Subcommittee on Public Health started looking into it they said, "We will change our mind and keep them open and try to transfer them to various communities." Now they come in with some more money but reduced the budget level of 1971 by \$14 million. They do not want to do even what they did last year. So the process of trying to close these facilities down has already started.

They will tell you that they will come back in with a supplemental, but that will be in December and it will be too late. The Public Health Subcommittee has already passed a resolution saying that they want these hospitals kept open. We hope this House will have this legislation before it next week. The Senate has already passed a similar resolution. The appropriations committee report itself says this:

It is therefore obvious that the amount in the budget and in the bill is going to be insufficient to maintain an adequate level of service during fiscal year 1972.

Then it goes on and says that hopefully a supplemental will come in.

This amendment will only restore \$14 million to keep the Public Health Service hospitals open in this country and to keep the drug addict clinic going. We need your support.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to support the gentleman's amendment wholeheartedly. I think it will leave the entire section of the country in which this important hospital is located without the kind of care that it affords for addicts. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman will be adopted. If the President really intends to conduct a war on narcotics as public enemy No. 1, then it is a definite mistake to close this facility.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for a very fine and strong statement in support of his amendment. This is not the time to cut back, but instead we should be increasing our support of the Public Health Service hospitals and clinics. I strongly support the gentleman's amend-

ment and urge all Members to do the same.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman.

The Nixon administration wants to wash its hands of some of its direct health care business by transferring its control of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics to the communities in which they are operated.

So the budget proposed by the administration for fiscal 1972 substantially reduces funds and personnel for the PHS—Public Health Service hospital system—and relates funds to the phasing out and conversion of these hospitals and clinics, arguing that these hospitals are underutilized, badly in need of renovation, but too costly to modernize.

Currently HEW is conducting a survey to see what the possibilities of such a conversion or transference are. If the survey shows that they are neither transferable nor convertible, then the executive branch will do what it can to close them down.

But are the hospitals underutilized? Such is not the case in the Galveston unit. The Galveston Public Health Hospital, serving all the ports of the vast Texas gulf coast with its many merchant seamen and Federal employees, also provides health care to patients in underserved areas of its community. It admits an average of 2,550 patients annually and serves about 47,000 outpatients a year. The associated outpatient clinics in Houston and Port Arthur serve approximately 32,000 patients yearly. The occupancy rate is 80 percent.

Secretary Richardson has suggested that beneficiaries be transferred on a contract basis to private and Veterans' Administration hospitals should the PHS facilities be abandoned. If the Government does not have enough money, as Secretary Richardson says, to enlarge and modernize our PHS facilities, where is the money coming from to send PHS beneficiaries to private hospitals? A private hospital demands \$100 a day per patient. This \$100 figure does not include doctors' fees, X-rays, laboratory work, or drugs while the \$47-a-day-per-patient cost, at which the Galveston hospital operates, includes all of the above mentioned.

As to transfer to the veterans hospitals the hard fact is that our VA hospitals are already shockingly overcrowded and overburdened. Mr. Leo Brissette, Chief of Medical Administration at Houston's VA hospital, advised me of the crowded conditions at that hospital and confirmed that it could not handle any additional patients. It presently operates at an occupancy rate of 93 percent, and it is well known that no hospital can properly and efficiently operate completely full. While over 100 patients apply per normal workday for hospitalization at the VA hospital, only 48 percent of these applications can be accepted. The day I spoke with Mr. Bris-

sette, 375 patients were on the waiting list, some having waited for some 3 months. I am advised that at the Galveston Hospital no applicant is turned away.

On June 30, 1971, the Senate passed a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that these PHS facilities should be kept open through fiscal year 1972 during which time an investigation of how these facilities can best be used will be made.

On July 21, I supported a similar resolution in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House Concurrent Resolution 370, which also expresses the need to have the drug treatment centers in Fort Worth and Lexington maintained for use in the treatment of civilian drug addicts. The amendment was passed in committee and is ready for House floor action. (The administration wishes to have these latter transferred to the Bureau of Prisons for use in the treatment of criminal drug addicts.)

In a health care crisis, the last thing that our Government should do is to ignore those in need by not providing them decent medical care.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida and congratulate him on offering it.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) is completely correct. Surely this is no time to close hospitals which treat drug addiction. The Department ironically seems intent on closing the only U.S. Public Health Service hospital anywhere west of the Mississippi River. This hospital has a trained staff and the capacity to treat at least 750 narcotic victims simultaneously. It has in fact treated as many as 1,100 at one time during World War II. In view of the current drug epidemic, it would be folly to close this institution, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman from Texas has said.

I may say I have the authorization of another gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to say that he also supports this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has mentioned the study of the Public Health Subcommittee, on which I serve. We visited these installations. We heard the agonies of the communities they serve or could serve. And we heard hospital administrators testify particularly with respect to what could be done concerning drugs and drug abuse in the Public Health Service hospitals. We heard enough to know they should not be closed.

I congratulate the gentleman, and support his amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, on Friday afternoon I visited the Mental Health Drug Rehabilitation Center at Lexington, Ky., and found 350 empty beds, if you can believe that over one-half of the available beds are unused. On Friday morning I visited Fort Worth, Tex., the Maximum Security Mental Health Rehabilitation Center and I only found 140 beds filled out of a possible 600 beds available. At the Public Health Service Hospital on Staten Island there are 250 empty beds and the utilization rate is a low 60 percent.

Mr. Chairman, with the hundreds of thousands of addicts, heroin addicts, and other varieties in this country, I think we must support this amendment if we are going to have any kind of Federal expertise in the programs designed to rehabilitate them.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to amendment.

Now, this committee knows about these public service hospitals. We have forgotten more about them than some of you will ever know. We have been dealing with this same type of problem since Mrs. Hobby was Secretary. We did not like it then and we do not like it now. And, something funny happened on the way to the forum downtown. They got the message from us; they really got the message. They are reexamining their proposal. Do you think there is not going to be a supplemental request for these hospitals? Of course there is, and that is why we did not put a little more money in this bill. We would like to get the request and study it and come up with a better figure than we can here this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment at this time under these circumstances is not the way to meet this problem.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I, like the gentleman from Florida, have visited the Fort Worth hospital and I have visited the Staten Island hospital.

A number of other members of our committee have visited other hospitals. We have talked with the people who operate these hospitals. We realize that if these hospitals are not adequately funded that their health care teams are going to be disbanded and they cannot be easily reassembled. We are asking about \$14 million to raise this appropriation to the level of support of the hospitals the past year. We are told by the gentleman from the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. FLOOD, that this can wait, it can wait for certain reexamina-

tions. We agree that the mission of these hospitals should be reevaluated, but we do not feel that this mission should be reevaluated in this brief time, but in an adequate manner, and for this reason our subcommittee, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) has stated, voted for a reevaluation of these facilities over a period of the next year. But as I just said, if we do deny them the appropriation at this time then the health care teams in these hospitals will be disbanded, and it will be impossible to put them back together again.

These hospitals, as I am sure the members of the committee know, are in San Francisco, New Orleans, Baltimore, Boston, Staten Island, Galveston, Norfolk, Seattle, and Fort Worth.

Some of the public health hospitals and clinics have already been closed over the past 20 years. These are the best of the hospitals and the best of the clinics that remain open. To attack them in this circuitous manner when hospitals are so badly needed, is both unfair and unwise.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY) in his remarks, as well as the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. Chairman, I happen to represent a district that is less than 300 miles from the Fort Worth Hospital, and I can tell you that we have had a situation with respect to the drug addiction problem, and that we have a vital need for this hospital, and to maintain this hospital.

Again I compliment the gentleman for his determination in this matter today.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding, and I wish to state that in my district we have a Public Health hospital facility there, and I have had all types of calls recently from those who would buy the hospital, and the Boston newspapers have been carrying stories about this, and that the hospital is going to close.

Just this last Sunday I saw an extremely interesting program that showed a private clinic in a community of Boston which is black, and they said that because there were no Government funds public subscription was asked. It showed people being inoculated, that is, the black people were being inoculated for a disease called sickle-cell anemia. The television announcer said that President Nixon had asked for \$5 million, and that there was no money in the bill for a program of this type, and that there were no facilities available.

Mr. Chairman, we have a growing black population in the city of Boston. It seems to me that there is a clear cut and vital need for this hospital to remain open. It could handle programs as this.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania,

the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. FLOOD) whether there is any money in the bill for sickle cell anemia.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, there is money in the bill for this. We know about this problem, I can say to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts. We know how bad it is. We know that it affects many black people. We know that it afflicts as many as 1,000 babies a year, but you do not take care of this with mere dollars, but we are aware of the problem, and there are funds in this bill to work on it.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I cannot accept the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I agree with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY), and will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, there is \$6 million in this bill for research on sickle cell anemia, and it is set forth in our hearings; there is no question about it. This is a fivefold increase over the amount available for this purpose in 1971.

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

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I wish, along with the gentleman in the well, that I could share the fine confidence which the manager of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) has, that the money will be restored for these hospitals. But as recently as last week Secretary Richardson was writing to the Members of this House advising them that, as of October 1, this one hospital, the only U.S. public health hospital west of the Mississippi River that treats drug addicts, would be closed. Surely the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) can be supported in this amendment he has offered to simply put in an amount that will take care of this situation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee for reporting a bill which renews our commitment to improve the health of the American people.

At the same time, however, I must deplore the nearsighted economizing which has characterized the administration's contribution to this effort.

In the recent past, we have been told that we face a "massive crisis" in health care, and this is true.

Yet, despite the resounding rhetoric of its press releases, when the day of reckoning came—when the time arrived to submit its budget requests—this administration chose to turn its back on the health needs of our people.

In category after category, the administration's budget requests failed even to include cost of living increases. Programs which have suffered cutbacks in past fiscal years are being permitted to

with. Valuable research momentum is being lost. Highly skilled and carefully recruited research personnel at the National Institutes of Health are being dispersed.

At a time when all available resources should be applied to meet our health needs, the administration proposes to maintain the status quo, to cut back existing programs, or even worse, to do nothing at all.

The committee report speaks volumes about this administration's concern for the health of our people:

At a time when the mental health professions are suffering from a critically short supply of personnel, the administration proposes that we fund psychiatric training programs at substantially below the 1971 level. The committee added \$6,750,000 to restore the program to the 1971 level.

At a time when community mental health centers are needed throughout our country, the administration requests no funds to continue their construction and little to staff them. The committee included \$10 million to continue the construction of community mental health centers and another \$30 million to staff them.

At a time when alcoholism has become one of the most serious health problems confronting our people, the administration requested no funds for formula grants to States. The committee has wisely included \$25 million.

At a time when a hospital bed shortage is a crisis already upon us, the administration budget included no funds for construction grants for hospitals and public health centers. Fortunately, the committee has included \$87,200,000 to build hospitals.

At a time when childhood lead poisoning afflicts an estimated 400,000 youngsters, the administration first requested no funds at all to carry out the provisions of the Lead-Based Poisoning Prevention Act. Later, a budget amendment of \$2 million to fund this vital program was submitted. The committee has recommended \$5 million to get this important program off the ground.

Mr. Chairman, the reduction of funds for the patient care and the special health services represents another backward step on the part of the administration and the Office of Management and Budget. They have proposed to turn their backs on statutory responsibility to provide services to more than a half million Americans.

The eight public health hospitals, two addict treatment centers, and 30 outpatient clinics gave services to more than 500,000 people last year. These people are guaranteed health service by law.

But the proposed cut of \$14 million is an obvious step in reducing this care and the efficiency of these hospitals and clinics. The administration now is trying to give these facilities away. In the face of alarming inflation in the area of health services, we find a philosophy developing that would have us abandon these facilities and contract out the patients to hospitals which on the whole are probably 20 to 30 percent more expensive.

Mr. Chairman, because of the concern of the Congress toward this ruinous philosophy, the Senate has passed and I hope the House will soon pass, a resolution stating that the sense of the Congress is that these facilities should remain open and under the control of the Public Health Service. I hope this legislation will reach the House floor before the recess.

We should not be moving backward in this very important area. We should be moving forward. By cutting the authorization and, indeed, reducing the level of funding below last year's, we are sanctioning this backward slide and condoning this giveaway program.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, am reluctant to take a position contrary to the chairman and some of the members of this distinguished subcommittee. But this is a matter about which I have some rather personal knowledge. I know that the subcommittee has done a magnificent job under very trying conditions. In a whole series of needed programs, the subcommittee has had to increase the recommendations of the Office of Management and Budget and the suggestions of the administration in order to keep alive our health programs and our community mental health centers, our hospital construction programs, and our program against alcoholism and so forth.

But there are involved here eight hospitals, 30 clinics, outpatient clinics, and the only two hospitals that are maintained by the Federal Government dealing with narcotics addiction.

For years I was chairman of a subcommittee dealing with narcotics addiction. I went to Fort Worth, Tex., and to Lexington, Ky. I saw those facilities. They may not be the best in the world but they are the only ones we have. The idea of closing down the Fort Worth installation to me makes no sense whatsoever, when the President goes out and brings a special man in here from Illinois to carry on the antinarcotics program. Nor does it make any sense to close down eight Public Health Service hospitals, when the Committee on Ways and Means will soon be busily engaged on a whole program of health programs.

These hospitals have performed a unique service for well over 100 years in this country.

I was told that the Public Health Service hospital in New Orleans might be consolidated with the Veterans' Administration hospital. Well, there is not a bed empty in the Veterans' Administration hospital and there are 500 beds in the Public Health Service hospital.

In addition to that, the Government has gone to the expense of buying property to build a new facility. Just as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) a moment ago said that he was unable to get any satisfaction out of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have had the same experience. I think the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) has had the same experience. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) has had the same experience, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) has had the same experience.

So I would just say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, that to operate

these hospitals on \$15 million less than they got in 1971, with the current rate of inflation, particularly in hospital costs, would be absolutely impossible. It seems to me that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is trying to do by indirection what it cannot do by direction; namely, to close these hospitals down and take the patients out and then say the hospitals are old and antiquated and there is no use for them.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is it not true that one of the reasons why it is important for us to act here today is because the Public Health Service hospitals are losing their staffs very rapidly, and if we do not move fast the hospitals are not going to be able to function no matter how much money is made available later on.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. These are trained doctors, many of whom have made a career in the Public Health Service. Under the present conditions, they do not know whether they are going to be there for 1 month, 5 months, 6 months, or what the future holds for them.

I hope the Members will adopt this amendment which will cost \$14 million—a relatively small sum of money—but which will make the difference as to whether or not these institutions remain open.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURKE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE
GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles I, IV, X, XI, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$11,411,693,000, of which \$46,000,000 shall be for child welfare services under part B of title IV: *Provided*, That such amounts as may be necessary for locating parents, as authorized in section 410 of the Social Security Act, may be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts: Page 20, lines 6 and 7, strike out "\$46,000,000" on line 6 and insert "\$110,000,000".

On line 6 strike out "\$11,411,693,000" and insert "\$11,539,693,000".

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It merely asks for an increase in the appropriation for Child Welfare Services, which has lain stagnant for the past 4 years in the amount of \$46 million, and raise it up to the authorized sum of \$110 million.

I would like to tell you a little story. One day prior to 1967 I was standing in the chamber at the Cherokee Strip talking to a former colleague of ours, the

late John E. Fogarty. We heard thousands of words of praise and eulogy for this great man.

The amendment that I am offering today is a John E. Fogarty amendment. John Fogarty asked me to get the authorizing funds through the House Ways and Means Committee to improve the lot of children in America who are deprived. He pointed out the dire conditions that then existed. He said they were the most scandalous conditions in the country.

He said:

Jim, do you know who we are dealing with? We are dealing with thousands of youngsters who are in the institutions throughout the nation, little kids with big noses or big ears, blemished skins, youngsters who are deformed, that no one will adopt and that the State must take care of until they reach maturity.

On looking into the problem I found that the Federal Government with all of its expenditures overseas, with its expenditures for the Penn-Central Railroad, and with an appropriation coming up here for Lockheed, has not increased the appropriation for child welfare 1 penny in the last 3 years. Not 1 penny. And I have had commitments from the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Johnson administration that they would get the additional funds. Yes, I have had commitments and promises from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of this administration that they would get additional funds. And on the floor of the House, in this Chamber, just 1 year ago the Appropriations Committee committed itself to securing additional funds.

Those children are voiceless. They have no political muscle—none whatsoever. But they are the most disadvantaged children in America. I cannot see how the U.S. Government, the executive department, or the Members of this Congress can go home at night, put their heads on their pillows and go to sleep realizing that this great magnanimous Government of ours is contributing less than 70 cents a week to the upkeep of these children.

I hope that my amendment is adopted today.

I recall a meeting we had in the Cannon Building when almost every member of the New York delegation appeared at the meeting with representatives of the various welfare societies of the State of New York, and Republicans and Democrats all got up and pledged their full and complete support for an increase in this appropriation. So this is what the amendment is about today.

If you respect the memory of John E. Fogarty—and I am looking at his good friends that he told me he had—Ed BOLAND, DAN FLOOD, on this committee giving him support—that they could get this type of appropriation if we could get the authorization through. The authorization has been through for almost 4 years, and now the time has come to vote. I hope the House has the courage and the integrity, the moral integrity, to give these children the money they deserve. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I com-

mend my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) for his long interest in the program. We went through this last year.

The child welfare program has been funded at the level of \$46 million for several years, and we did not increase it this year. Let me tell the Members why.

There are large amounts of money in other programs in this bill which are specifically directed at the health and welfare of the children. We go through these items very carefully year after year.

For instance, this bill includes—now hear this—\$326,651,000 for maternal and child health. That is an increase of \$64,659,000 over last year's appropriation for that purpose. The bill includes \$14,251,000 for the Office of Child Development. What do Members think that deals with? That is an increase of \$6,259,000 over last year.

This bill also includes \$109,668,000 for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. That is an increase of \$14,908,000 over last year. Under the work incentives program, about which the Members have heard so much, we provide \$78 million for child care. That is an increase of \$51,600,000 for child care over last year's appropriation.

Under public assistance, the bill includes \$3,700 million for aid to families with dependent children, and it also provides \$838 million for social services, of which a substantial amount will go to the care of children. Furthermore, this committee added \$10 million over the budget for the National Institute of Mental Health for a brand new program relating to mental health of children.

I should mention an addition—I left this out of the bill, and the gentleman knows why—because it is not yet authorized. It will be authorized. It will probably be in the Senate bill, and there is no doubt in my mind that we will accept it. That is \$376 million for the Headstart program, which we know will be appropriated. Those are the figures, those are the facts on some of the things this bill provides for children.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I want to pay my respects to the chairman of the subcommittee for the illustrative generosity stated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has just gone down the list to indicate how in each case they have increased the funds for child development, for maternal and child health, for aid to dependent children.

I am in accord with the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, because what this points up is that they have taken care of all the classes of children except those poor, distressed children who are in State institutions.

Maternal and child health does not go to those children. The Child Development Act does not relate to those children. The day care for mothers does not relate to those children. Those are children at home.

The class of children to which the amendment is addressed, to which the Burke amendment is addressed, is the class of children who are in distress in

State institutions, who get no help from families and who get no help from outside. These are the most neglected children.

That is exactly why these children should be moved ahead at the same pace as other children are supported in the bill. That is why I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I believe the best case for this amendment was made by the chairman of the subcommittee, who pointed out how many other ways other children are helped.

Why should we not help these children in State institutions, who have not been adopted, who have no friends unless we become their friends?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his support. I do not believe there is a more informed Member of the House on this problem.

The whole confusion in the Committee on Appropriations is that they do not recognize child welfare. These children are under the care of the State. This is a revenue-sharing amendment I offer today. The States pay 93 percent of the support for these children and the Federal Government picks up only 7 percent.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

For the past 4 years, the appropriation for child welfare services has remained at \$46 million. We are spending 10 times that amount on one trip to the moon. Can we really expect to assist the 611,000 children and the 338,000 families who receive child welfare services on this pittance? This is like giving a cookie to a starving child.

Let me also point out that the statute which originally authorized child welfare services established a rate between 33½ percent and 66½ percent for Federal financial participation. In 1970, the Federal participation was 8 percent. This year it will be only 7 percent unless this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, out of an abundance of caution, I demand a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLOOD) there were—ayes 162, noes 148.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers MESSRS. BURKE of Massachusetts, FLOOD, CAREY of New York, and MICHEL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 185, noes 201, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]
[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—185

Abourezk	Edwards, Calif.	Moss
Abzug	Ellberg	Murphy, Ill.
Adams	Fascell	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Foley	Nedzi
Albert	Ford	Nix
Alexander	William D.	Obey
Anderson,	Fraser	O'Hara
Calif.	Fulton, Pa.	O'Konski
Anderson,	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Neill
Tenn.	Galifianakis	Patman
Andrews,	Gallagher	Pepper
N. Dak.	Gaydos	Perkins
Annunzio	Gliamo	Pike
Ashley	Gibbons	Podell
Aspin	Gonzalez	Preyer, N.C.
Badillo	Grasso	Price, Ill.
Baring	Gray	Pryor, Ark.
Begich	Green, Oreg.	Pucinski
Bennett	Green, Pa.	Randall
Bergland	Gude	Rangel
Blaggi	Halpern	Rees
Blester	Hamilton	Reid, N.Y.
Bingham	Hanley	Reuss
Blanton	Hanna	Riegle
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Roberts
Boggs	Harrington	Rodino
Boland	Hathaway	Roe
Bolling	Hawkins	Rogers
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Roncalio
Brasco	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Brinkley	Helstoski	Rostenkowski
Burke, Fla.	Hicks, Mass.	Roush
Burke, Mass.	Hicks, Wash.	Roy
Burton	Horton	Runnels
Byrne, Pa.	Howard	Ryan
Cabell	Jacobs	St Germain
Caffery	Johnson, Calif.	Sarbanes
Carey, N.Y.	Jones, N.C.	Scheuer
Carney	Karh	Selberling
Celler	Kastenmeier	Smith, Iowa
Chisholm	Kazen	Stanton
Clausen,	Kee	James V.
Don H.	Kluczynski	Stokes
Clay	Koch	Stratton
Collins, Ill.	Leggett	Stuckey
Conte	Link	Sullivan
Corman	McCormack	Symington
Cotter	McKay	Thompson, N.J.
Culver	Macdonald,	Tiernan
Daniels, N.J.	Mass.	Udall
Danielson	Madden	Ullman
Davis, Ga.	Matsunaga	Vanik
Davis, S.C.	Mazzoli	Waldie
de la Garza	Meeds	Watts
Delaney	Melcher	White
Dellums	Metcalfe	Wilson,
Denholm	Mikva	Charles H.
Dent	Miller, Calif.	Wolf
Dingell	Mills, Ark.	Wright
Dorn	Minish	Wyder
Dow	Mink	Yates
Drinan	Mitchell	Young, Tex.
Dulski	Mollohan	Zablocki
Eckhardt	Moorhead	
Edmondson	Morgan	

NOES—201

Abbitt	Collier	Goodling
Abernethy	Collins, Tex.	Griffin
Anderson, Ill.	Colmer	Gross
Andrews, Ala.	Conable	Grover
Archer	Coughlin	Gubser
Arends	Crane	Hagan
Ashbrook	Daniel, Va.	Haley
Aspinall	Davis, Wis.	Hall
Baker	Dellenback	Hammer-
Belcher	Dennis	schmidt
Bell	Derwinski	Hansen, Idaho
Betts	Devine	Harsha
Bevill	Dickinson	Harvey
Bow	Downing	Hays
Bray	Duncan	Henderson
Brooks	du Pont	Hogan
Broomfield	Dwyer	Hollifield
Brotzman	Edwards, Ala.	Hull
Brown, Mich.	Erlenborn	Hunt
Brown, Ohio	Eshleman	Hutchinson
Broyhill, N.C.	Evans, Colo.	Jarman
Broyhill, Va.	Findley	Johnson, Pa.
Buchanan	Fish	Jonas
Burleson, Tex.	Fisher	Jones, Ala.
Byrnes, Wis.	Flood	Keating
Byron	Flowers	Keith
Camp	Flynt	Kemp
Casey, Tex.	Ford, Gerald R.	King
Cederberg	Forsythe	Kyl
Chamberlain	Fountain	Landgrebe
Chappell	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Clancy	Frenzel	Lennon
Clawson, Del	Frey	Lent
Cleveland	Fuqua	Lloyd

Long, Md.	Poff	Spence
Lujan	Powell	Springer
McClary	Price, Tex.	Stafford
McCloskey	Purcell	Stanton,
McClure	Quie	J. William
McCollister	Quillen	Steed
McDade	Rallsback	Steele
McEwen	Rarick	Steiger, Ariz.
McFall	Reid, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
McKevitt	Rhodes	Stubblefield
McKinney	Robinson, Va.	Talcott
McMillan	Robison, N.Y.	Taylor
Mahon	Rooney, N.Y.	Terry
Malliard	Rooney, Pa.	Thompson, Ga.
Mann	Rousselot	Thomson, Wis.
Martin	Ruppe	Thone
Mathias, Calif.	Ruth	Veysey
Mathis, Ga.	Sandman	Waggonner
Mayne	Satterfield	Wampler
Michel	Scherie	Ware
Miller, Ohio	Schmitz	Whalen
Mills, Md.	Schneebell	Whalley
Minshall	Schwengel	Widnall
Mizell	Scott	Wiggins
Monagan	Sebellius	Williams
Mosher	Shipley	Wilson, Bob
Myers	Shoup	Winn
Natcher	Shriver	Wyatt
Nichols	Sikes	Wylle
Passman	Skubitz	Wyman
Patten	Slack	Young, Fla.
Pelly	Smith, Calif.	Zion
Pettis	Smith, N.Y.	Zwach
Pirnle	Snyder	

NOT VOTING—48

Barrett	Hébert	Pickle
Blackburn	Hillis	Poage
Burlison, Mo.	Hosmer	Roybal
Carter	Hungate	Saylor
Clark	Ichord	Sisk
Conyers	Jones, Tenn.	Staggers
Diggs	Kuykendall	Stephens
Donohue	Kyros	Teague, Calif.
Dowdy	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, La.	Long, La.	Van Deerlin
Esch	McCulloch	Vander Jagt
Evins, Tenn.	McDonald,	Vigorito
Garmatz	Mich.	Whitehurst
Gettys	Montgomery	Whitten
Goldwater	Morse	Yatron
Griffiths	Nelsen	
Hastings	Peysner	

So the amendment was rejected.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I voted "nay" by mistake. I want to be recorded as voting "aye," and ask unanimous consent that my vote be corrected accordingly.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?
There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, \$10,830,000, together with not to exceed \$1,049,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:
On page 26, line 25, strike \$10,830,000 and strike \$1,049,000 and substitute in lieu thereof \$8,581,000 and \$947,000 respectively.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of removing from the bill that portion of the appropriations for the Office of Civil Rights which on page 640, volume 4 of the printed committee hearings, J. Stanley Pottinger said would be used in effect to implement the Swann decision of the Supreme Court.

This returns the budget for the Office of Civil Rights back to what it was last year.

For those of you who have not been as interested in the Swann decision as have I, that was the Charlotte-Mecklenburg County decision by which the Supreme Court OK'd busing in order to achieve racial balance within school districts.

We in the South have had a tremendous upheaval in recent years in our school system. We have in many areas deteriorated in the system of public education in order to achieve integration, or balance, or whatever you may wish to call it.

School bonds votes have been failing and the public in the South, and possibly throughout the entire Nation, are losing their confidence in the public school system. They are no longer in my area voting for the bonds needed actually in order to keep our schools at the high level we desire to keep them.

One of the main reasons for this is people, the citizens, are becoming somewhat disturbed that the sociologists are using our school system for social experimentation.

Now I happen to believe in equal rights and equal opportunities. I happen to be one Member from the South who voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1967.

I voted for equal opportunities. That is what I believe in. But, I do believe we have gone too far when we are going to completely upset all of the work that has been done in the past few years and review all of the cases in the South to see we had in school desegregation, to see whether or not they comply with the criteria as set in the Swann decision on school busing.

Some people say that this should be done, but we in the South have more integration than in the North.

President Nixon stated he was opposed to busing for racial balance purposes. When the Supreme Court announced their decision, he said:

It is the law and I am going to obey it.

I certainly agree that it is the law. I happen to have introduced a constitutional amendment and I am making an effort by this to change the interpretation of the Constitution because I think that is the proper way to handle it—through a constitutional amendment.

Wherever the courts are involved, the Swann decision, of course, must be considered. However, this approximately \$2.5 million additional money is going to allow HEW to go into areas in which there are not court cases now pending. If there is a court case, yes, the courts must consider that. But if it is not in the courts, we should not appropriate additional money merely to review schools in this area. That is the reason I offer the amendment. It would return the appropriations back to the level of last year.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk on this same section of the bill, except my amendment would strike the entire appropriation dealing with the Office for Civil Rights.

Testifying at the hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee, J. Stanley Pottinger, Director of the Office for

Civil Rights, and Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights, outlined the purposes for which he sought funding of almost \$11 million plus additional authority to spend \$1,049,000 from social security trust funds.

In elementary and secondary education, the Director of the Office for Civil Rights testified, volume 4, page 640, that in fiscal year 1972, we will be focusing attention on the following areas of enforcement:

1. Renegotiation where necessary of Title VI, voluntary desegregation plans now in effect which do not meet the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Swann vs. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, a landmark decision handed down on April 20, 1971.

2. Provide assistance to the Office of Education on questions of eligibility and civil rights compliance in administering the Administration's proposed \$1.5 billion Emergency School Aid Act, if and when the legislation is enacted by Congress.

3. Continue the program of compliance reviews of school districts throughout the country and investigate cases of possible in-school discrimination, including alleged discriminatory treatment of black teachers.

4. Enforce the May 25, 1970 memorandum and its policies of non-discrimination in districts with national origin group minorities.

But most important to my people and yours was the explanation of enforcement of the *Swann* decision. The *Swann* case was the latest Supreme Court decision to torture liberty by ordering the busing of schoolchildren to achieve some mystical and theoretical proportions of racial balance in public schools. In other words, we are not only being asked to approve of the Supreme Court busing decision, but put up the money to enforce that judicial fiat.

Without even commenting on the legal gymnastics the Supreme Court went through to arrive at its legislation of busing to achieve racial proportions. I can honestly say that I have never received a letter from any of my constituents of any shade or color who agreed with the decision or indicated that they wanted to spend any of their hard-earned tax money to be whipped into line by additional busing directed by the Office for Civil Rights. No one wants this busing of schoolchildren. The parents and taxpayers are growing weary of financing the destruction of their community school systems. What will they now think when they learn their social security trust funds are also being considered as funds to bus their children across town to a neighborhood that they don't choose to live in.

The cities are already wailing about financing woes from racial experimentation. This section would further aggravate the situation by requiring the cities to finance massive numbers of buses and additional employees. I find nothing in this bill which would finance the crises that it would create.

Certainly the Members of this body who were so laudatory in praise of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 recall that definition (b) of 42 U.S.C. 2000 C reads:

Desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race . . . but desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

This portion of the civil rights bill has never been declared unconstitutional, although the matter has been to the Supreme Court; therefore, it is the law of the land as provided in the Constitution, article VI:

This Constitution and the Laws of the U.S. which shall be made in pursuance thereof . . . shall be the supreme law of the land.

I also remind the Members that in the appropriation hearings, the Civil Rights Director also announced his intent to use these funds to extend the busing concept to higher education, thus, even denying to some college students the right to seek his or her campus.

To support in excess of \$11 million of which an undivided portion is sought to break the laws of the land is a breach of the oath of office voluntarily assumed by each Member of this body to support and defend the Constitution.

To approve of this busing appropriation, knowing in advance that the taxpayers' dollars will be used in carrying out the de facto busing laws of the Supreme Court in direct contravention of the law of the land is not only a breach of our oath, but ridicules the existing laws already enacted.

I am reminded of Thomas Jefferson's Bunker Hill analogy on the "independence of the judiciary" trampling on the "independence of the legislature." If the States and Congress were to defy the Constitution, who then if not the Supreme Court, would defend it? The answer is most obvious—the people. The people can get at legislators who defy the basic law on each election day and replace them. But there is no election day for the Supreme Court. The more serious dilemma arises, "Who will defend the Constitution if the Supreme Court abuses it?" This answer is obvious. The power of the purse rests with us here in Congress to delete all funding of the Office of Civil Rights until its unelected bureaucrats determine that they will obey the laws of this legislative body and the Constitution, not de facto laws enacted by raw judicial power. This is the solemn responsibility of each of us who believes in maintaining the "independence of the legislature."

After all, with the maverick members now serving on the Supreme Court, there is no need for an Office of Civil Rights.

I urge support for this amendment—for the independence of this legislative body—and to prevent massive forced busing of schoolchildren this fall.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to this kind of amendment. What my friend has just said was not to debate the appropriations bill. He did not discuss its merits. But he made a plea, and not very impassioned, by the way, as they usually are, that the Supreme Court of the United States has made a bad decision. The gentleman does not like it. What is the matter with that? Can you imagine how many Supreme Court decisions I do not like? Can you imagine how many you do not like?

But to try to negate it in this bill, you are flying in the face of the Constitution of the United States, no matter what you think of that Court's decision. Un-

der no circumstances could you support such an amendment and leave the Hall of Representatives with a proper face.

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

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GONZALEZ

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

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for departmental management, including \$100,000 for the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, \$47,570,000, together with not to exceed \$5,926,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein; and not to exceed \$29,000 to be transferred from "Revolving fund for certification and other services," Food and Drug Administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GONZALEZ: On page 27, line 7, after "Deaf," strike out "\$47,570,000" and insert "\$37,570,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the funds for HEW departmental management by \$10 million.

The committee has complained that despite personnel ceilings imposed by the Office of Management and Budget, the HEW folks keep asking for more people. In other words the ceiling is really a sort of floor, and what seems to be a maximum number of people in the bureaucracy is really a minimum. The committee is right to be concerned about this.

I cannot reconcile that with the fact that the committee is asking to approve more money for HEW management. It seems to me that if the concern is well founded, we ought to make that concern not merely known, but also felt.

I think that we ought to apply the rule of gross bureaucracy here. There are too many people in Government who are serving mere decorative roles. We need more Indians and fewer chiefs.

Today it takes 15 whole pages of the Congressional Directory just to make a listing of the big chiefs of HEW. That compares to 11 pages for the Department of State, which we all know is a classic study in weighty bureaucracy. HEW has nearly as many big wheels as the Department of Defense, which requires 20 pages to list them. But I confess they are not as overweight as the Department of Agriculture, which needs 18 pages worth of superchiefs to run their programs.

I believe that the weight of the HEW bureaucracy is excessive. One way to achieve the desired increase in management efficiency might be to cut the funds available to the managers, so that they can make clear-cut choices between expanding their own offices and putting people into the field to run programs.

My amendment would reduce the gross weight of HEW, and I hope that the result will be an organization that is lean and hungry. They tell me that a lean man runs faster and generally enjoys better health than a fat man. I am suggesting that we adopt a weight reducing program for HEW.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, naturally, I oppose such an amendment. This is patently, obviously punitive. I have not the faintest idea why. This ruins the effectiveness of the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Why? Obviously, this kind of thing should not even be presented here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendations that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, 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. 10061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays 25, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—372

Abbutt
Abernethy
Abourezk
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson
Anderson, III
Anderson
Tenn.

Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspin
Aspinall
Badillo
Baker
Baring
Barrett

Begich
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Blester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik

Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Byron
Cabell
Caffery
Carey, N.Y.
Carney
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conte
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellums
Denholm
Dent
Dickinson
Dingell
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Drinan
Duski
Duncan
du Pont
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaino
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Gray

Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hogan
Hollifield
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lent
Link
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClary
McCloskey
McClure
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKevitt
McKinney
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mitchell
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse

Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Hamilton
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Poff
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quile
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegler
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
McClary
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Terry
Thompson, N.J.

Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Ware

Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wolff

Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—25

Archer
Ashbrook
Bow
Brinkley
Camp
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Crane
Dellenback

Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Haley

Hall
Landgrebe
Mathis, Ga.
Rarick
Rousslot
Schmitz
Thompson, Ga.

NOT VOTING—36

Blackburn
Burlison, Mo.
Carter
Conyers
Diggs
Donohue
Dowdy
Edwards, La.
Esch
Garmatz
Goldwater
Griffiths

Hastings
Hébert
Hillis
Hosmer
Hungate
Jones, Tenn.
Kuykenfall
Kyros
Long, La.
McCulloch
Montgomery
Nelsen

Pickle
Poage
Robison, N.Y.
Saylor
Sisk
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Whitehurst
Whitten
Yatron

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Kuyken-
dall.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Robison of New York.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Whitehurst.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Edwards of Louisi-
ana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIAIMO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BUDGET INCREASED TODAY

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I think the RECORD should show what the House has done today.

In two appropriation bills that we have acted upon, we have increased the budget by \$1,833 million.

I am wondering what they are going

to say about inflation now. I wonder whose responsibility it is going to be.

It is about time that we began to stop, look, and listen when it comes to expenditures of this kind.

CONFERENCE ON THE PENTAGON PAPERS

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the chairman of the House Republican Conference charged a group of Congressmen with playing politics by conducting a conference on the Pentagon papers.

As chairman of the conference, I say it is not our objective to place the onus of the Vietnam war on any particular administration. Published reports to that effect are misleading.

As Members of Congress, it is our responsibility to look into the decisionmaking process at the Pentagon.

Our conference and its record will be open to the public. A wide variety of authorities representing a gamut of political thinking and party affiliation have been invited to participate.

All Members of Congress, including my colleague from Illinois, were invited to attend. Our conference should be judged after it has been held, not before.

History will judge the Pentagon papers. For us, it is vital to weigh this data promptly; draw the lessons necessary to conclude our Vietnam involvement now; and to avoid such entanglements in the years directly ahead.

I append a schedule of the conference as planned:

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS DURING CONFERENCE ON PENTAGON PAPERS, JULY 27-30

TUESDAY, JULY 27

2141 Rayburn, 1:00 p.m. till 3:30 p.m.: Opening session of conference on Pentagon Papers. John Dow, as chairman, will give brief opening remarks. He will then introduce outside participants who in turn will each give brief statements. Conference will then proceed as an informal discussion. First session will probably focus on the actual content and historical significance of the Pentagon Papers.

Participants from outside the Congress: Fred Branfman, Noam Chomsky, Tran Van Dinh, Cynthia Frederick, Ernest Gruening, Melvin Gurtov, Ngo Vinh Long, David Marr, David Truong, General Nguyen Chanh Thi, and Tony Russo.

3:30 p.m. till 3:45 p.m.: Press will be able to question any participants.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 28

1:00 p.m. till 4:00 p.m.: Second session of conference will take place. It is expected that conference will move into more current considerations and will examine the implications of the Papers in terms of present policy.

Participants from outside the Congress: Robert Anson, Ramsey Clark, Tran Van Dinh, Ernest Gruening, Melvin Gurtov, Ngo Vinh Long, David Marr, Jonathan Mirsky, Bishop Paul Moore.

4:00 p.m. till 4:15 p.m.: Press will be able to question any participants.

THURSDAY, JULY 29

1:00 p.m. till 4:00 p.m.: Final session of conference. Focus will probably be on the present and future course of our involvement in Southeast Asia, with discussion touching

on such points as the coming Vietnamese elections, the Presidential trip to China and the seven-point peace proposal in Paris.

Participants from outside the Congress: Robert Anson, Melvin Gurtov, Mortimer Halperin, Ngo Vinh Long, Don Luce, David Marr, Jonathan Mirsky, Marcus Raskin.

4:00 p.m. till 4:30 p.m.: Outside participants will be free to answer any questions from press.

FRIDAY, JULY 30

10:00 a.m.: The seventeen Congressional sponsors will hold a press conference to talk about what they consider to be the results of the three-day conference.

(NOTE.—List of outside participants is subject to additions or deletions.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman in the well here and now publicly repudiate the agenda for July 7 which was published in the Washington Post on July 25?

Mr. DOW. That was hearsay, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois here and now, and I never saw it before it appeared in the Washington Post.

THE WAR AND THE PENTAGON PAPERS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) took the floor to accuse Members of this body who are sponsoring this week's conference on the Pentagon papers of "playing politics with the war" and "plotting to undermine President Nixon's Vietnam policies and force acceptance of the Vietcong peace proposal—all for narrow partisan purposes."

The remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) are both a gross misstatement as to the purpose of our conference and a personal affront to those Members of the House sponsoring it.

The value of history is as a teacher. By evaluating the lessons of the past, we may know a little more about the present and the future. The Pentagon papers present us with that kind of opportunity. The light they shed on the Vietnam war, and this Nation's involvement in it, may well serve to aid us in understanding the present course of that conflict and help us to resolve it.

The gentleman from Illinois well knows of my personal opposition to American involvement in the Vietnam war from the very beginning of that conflict under a President of my own party. He knows that I have cast my vote against every appropriation to sustain that conflict and have supported every effort to bring it to an end. I believe that the administration's policy of Vietnamization contemplates a continued American presence in Southeast Asia to prop up the repressive Saigon regime. This is basically a continuation of past policy.

The seven point proposal at Paris offers an opportunity to negotiate a settlement by setting a fixed date for withdrawal and

the release of all American prisoners of war.

I urge the gentleman from Illinois to join me in calling upon the President to instruct our negotiators in Paris to negotiate seriously on the seven points.

That is the way to forge a lasting peace rather than engage in partisan attacks upon those of us who believe that the revelations of the Pentagon papers may help to bring about a change in the administration's Vietnam policy.

AGENDA FOR A MEETING ON JULY 7

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has never been my practice in the 10 years I have served in this body to impugn the personal integrity of any Member on either side of the aisle. If the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow), assures me, as he did a minute ago, that he never saw the published agenda that appeared in the press of July 25, I certainly am willing to accept his word.

I would repeat, however, certain quotes—and it does appear in quotation marks—from the agenda for the meeting of this group on the 7th of July, which made it clear that the purpose was to undermine the present policies of the administration and to obtain a democratically sponsored action forcing the acceptance of the Vietcong proposal.

This is what I wanted to call to the attention of the House. If the gentleman in that group now want to repudiate that agenda, I would be only too happy to have them do it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. If the gentleman heard me a minute ago, I said it is time to change the present policy of this administration, time for this administration to start negotiating seriously on the seven points at Paris. I again urge the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) to join me in calling upon the President to do so.

CATCHING UP WITH THE ADMINISTRATION ON VOLUNTARY TRADE RESTRAINTS

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last week I took occasion to note in the RECORD the administration's latest public relations flip-flop. This instance happened to relate to the role which our distinguished Ways and Means chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), has played in paving the way for voluntary export agreements on textiles by the Japanese and on shoe exports by the Italians.

On textiles the administration feigned surprise while doing a not-too-discrete slow burn by being upstaged by Mr.

MILLS after its bureaucratic legions had fumbled their lines and entrance. On shoes, the administration, through one of its public relations second stringers, tried to claim all the credit when, once again, our chairman had moved ahead to open the door for a voluntary agreement which was taken by the Italians, not negotiated by the administration. The next day, however, the tune was changed.

This latest public relations flip-flop has been noted and appropriately commented upon in the July 23, 1971, Nashville Tennessean in an editorial entitled "Mr. MILLS Seems To Give White House Bad Dreams."

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the administration would learn to tread a bit more lightly in the future. It is all right to whistle when you walk by the cemetery but, in the words of the venerable Satchel Paige:

Don't look back 'cause they might be gaining on you.

As far as the public is concerned the administration has been caught on this one. I insert the Nashville Tennessean editorial in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the attention and consideration of my colleagues.

MR. MILLS SEEMS TO GIVE WHITE HOUSE BAD DREAMS

The Nixon administration's nightmare must be that it will wake up some morning and find that Rep. Wilbur Mills has singlehandedly settled the Vietnam war.

It has to be such a recurring nightmare to explain the administration's strange and transparent elephant walk in public relations when Mr. Mills hands it a victory on a silver platter.

Earlier this year, and after the Nixon administration had made a game of charades of its effort to come to some agreement with Japan on textiles, Congressman Mills stepped in and persuaded Japan to accept voluntary restrictions on synthetic and wool textile exports to the U.S.

The White House reacted as if somebody had purloined all its comic books. It went into its elephant walk and before it was done everybody was chuckling at what was obvious: Mr. Mills had easily pulled off what it had been trying to convince everybody was a near impossibility.

Last week there came another piece of exceedingly good news—and quite favorable to the White House: voluntary restraints by Italy upon its shoe exports to the U.S. The news brought cheers from the domestic footwear industry and from organized labor and others who fear the tide of imports is threatening domestic industry.

Instead of making a forthright and candid announcement of the news and giving credit where credit was due, the White House instead invited selected reporters to Mr. Herbert Klein's office where they were given a "background briefing" on the good news about Italy's export decision.

The same day in a speech before a conference of organized labor, dealing with the job problem, Mr. Mills pointed out Japan's voluntary restrictions on textiles. And, in an aside that was neither boastful nor an attempt to claim credit, he said he had helped arrange a similar limitation on Italian footwear.

Asked later by a newsman to amplify, he said he had been approached by U.S. firms to try to arrange such a deal, found it possible through Italian sources and then turned it over to the White House.

Suddenly, the White House went silent. It hadn't mentioned Mr. Mills' role at all. The

next day another "news leak" conference was called, then canceled. But "unofficial sources" were scrambling around trying to get over the idea that the shoe import restriction really was the result of long and hard bargaining by the administration's man in Rome.

The White House still doesn't want to admit Mr. Mills was helpful, but it also doesn't want to antagonize him, for the Arkansas Democrat holds in his hand the future of a great deal of Nixon administration legislation. It would have been easy enough for the White House to have given Mr. Mills credit, announced the news and had a victory. Instead it appeared both inept and ungrateful.

WHAT DO YOU DO WITH \$235 MILLION?

(Mr. NIX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the Congress eliminated funds in the administration's budget request to continue the development of a supersonic transport prototype. The particular sum involved was \$235 million.

Now I am not entirely sure what happens to a sum this large which has been deleted but I would hope that it means we have \$235 million to apply for critical public purposes.

I would like to believe that part of these funds, which was to have gone to aid one form of transportation, can now be applied to another—specifically assistance to cities to develop urban mass transportation. Anyone who commutes within any metropolitan area in this country is familiar with the detrimental effects on our environment and to our health brought about by heavy automobile traffic.

Cities are desperately attempting to develop alternative means of intercity and intracity transportation and, we all know, alternative means means money.

I have accordingly introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 372, which expresses the sense of the Congress that the President include in the budget for fiscal year 1972 an additional \$235 million for urban mass transportation and public housing to replace his original budget request of that amount for the supersonic transport.

It seems like such a logical step to take; a step which was suggested to me in a letter from the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Milton J. Shapp.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that the present administration has withheld, unconstitutionally I might add, more than \$12 billion appropriated by this Congress for urban, health, and education programs. Of this fantastic sum in appropriated moneys—the administration is not known for its lack of temerity—are some \$200 million which were to go to urban mass transit and \$973 million for public housing purposes.

These funds were authorized and appropriated because they were necessary. They were necessary many months ago and yet remain unspent. The additional funds of which I speak, the \$235 million, can be applied to meet part of the need for new public housing starts and public transportation above and beyond the \$12 billion appropriated by the Congress.

It appears that the administration is suggesting that we just sit back and wait for some politically advantageous time for it to release the \$12 billion. I, for one, do not intend to respond to such imperious suggestions nor do I propose to become a party to the myopic affliction affecting the administration's domestic economists.

ANOTHER FINANCIAL CONGLOMERATE IN TROUBLE?

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress this week and for the past several weeks, has been devoting a great deal of time to debating the President's request to give about \$250 million of the taxpayers' money to Lockheed Corp. The news media reports that the administration also wants to add to the Lockheed "bailout" about \$1.75 billion of the taxpayers' money to help industrial misguided financial conglomerates who have been having a field day juggling Government and defense contracts in recent years.

I am including with my remarks a letter I have received from Mr. James N. Anogianakis, of 4510 East 10th Avenue, Gary, Ind., regarding the financial manipulations of Gulf & Western Industrial Products Co., who has also been having a field day with Government contracts. Mr. Anogianakis is one of the officers of Local 1231, International Brotherhood, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers. I am asking the Defense Department to give me a complete report on why the Gary plant of Taylor Forge, a defense production industry under the control of this company, has been one of the 10 other companies which the Gulf & Western has accumulated in their corporate conglomeration and are now in financial difficulties. Maybe if Congress follows the administration's recommendation on Lockheed, the taxpayers will have to "bail out" the officials of the Gulf & Western conglomerate and, who knows? Maybe others.

The letter follows:

GARY, IND.

July 21, 1971.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN: I have put off writing to you the past several weeks in hopes of seeing you personally while in Gary, but since this has not come about I am putting it in writing.

Several weeks ago we were told that the Board of Directors of Gulf & Western had decided to close the Gary plant of Taylor Forge and we, members of Local 1231, International Brotherhood, Iron Shop Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers, were disturbed very much. It is not only the closing of this plant, in which we are employed, but also the closing of ten (10) other plants which, put together, has a very disturbing effect on the National Economy.

Why does the Government allow conglomerates such as Gulf & Western to buy up a number of small plants then after operating them for a year or so close them?

This evening we were informed that the Bargaining Committee had a meeting with company officials for tomorrow, but was canceled due to the company officials having

a meeting with the Air Force. The hammers, boring mills, heat treat furnaces (about 1 year old), rotary furnaces, etc. are all property of the Air Force, and we feel that this conglomerate has been making money with our money (as taxpayers) and now they tell us "We are not making enough money so we are closing your plant." I feel that such an organization does not deserve nor does it merit to have another Government contract. In the speech that the plant manager of the Cicero plant gave his workers he stated that they were quoting on an order with the Atomic Energy Commission which would total \$4,000,000 over the next 2 or 3 years, they are also quoting on 6 million dollars worth of business for the Silent Sub Program and in view of their inability to properly maintain and operate the other plants that they have swallowed up they should not be considered for this vital Government work. Why????????? They acquired the Gary Plant of Taylor Forge with all of this Government equipment and they can't make it go, how can they properly supply the above two projects?????????

In going back to the closing of plants here they are:

1. Bay Casting in Holland, Michigan.
2. E. W. Bliss Company's foundry in Hastings, Michigan.
3. Scott's Inc. in Holland, Michigan.
4. Chase Manufacturing Company in Douglas, Michigan.
5. Grand Rapids Brass Plant of the Cramp-ton Division.
6. Good Roads Machinery Div. of the E. W. Bliss Company in Minerva, Ohio.
7. Michigan Plating of Detroit.
8. Furniture City Plating of Grand Rapids.
9. Industrial Products at Grand Rapids.
10. Kamis Engineering in Pennsylvania.
11. Taylor Forge, in Gary, Indiana.

The above plants are part of the Gulf & Western Industrial Products Company alone and do not include other plant closings which have recently taken place in other Gulf & Western Groups.

They built a 3 million dollar Lab & office building and an Etch house which will make for a substantial tax write off, which should be looked into.

Mr. Madden, in closing, I and many of our local 1231 members who have read this letter, hope that you can take some action directly or indirectly that something can be done with these GIANT OCTOPUS' that have been condoned by the Government up to now. Would like to have you come, if possible, to our next scheduled union meeting, on Sunday, August 8, 1971 at the Union hall on the southwest corner of 6th and Massachusetts.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES N. ANOGIANAKIS.

UNFULFILLED PROMISES: HOUSING FOR MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

(Mr. BADILLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of our colleagues a program designed to benefit migrant farmworkers, but which is failing to achieve its objectives.

An amendment to the Housing Act of 1949 established in 1961 a program of insured loans at 5 percent interest for farmers, associations of farmers, nonprofit organizations, and States and their subdivisions for the construction or repair of housing for seasonal and migrant farmworkers and their families.

In 1965 Congress provided for grants to States and their subdivisions and to

nonprofit organizations for up to two-thirds of the cost of rental housing for farmworkers.

Through June 1971, \$32.1 million—\$17.6 million in loans and \$14.5 million in grants—has been obligated. This represents approximately 25 percent of the available loan funds and 70 percent of the available grant funds. Since the funding for the program has been running at little more than 20 percent of authorized levels, these data indicate the program has not been particularly well-implemented by FMHA.

This can be seen in another way. Through June 1971, only about 200 of an estimated 550 applications for loans and grants had been approved. The funded projects have provided about 4,000 units to house families and just over 3,300 to house individual farmworkers. According to the Rural Housing Alliance, this meets about 2 percent of the need for farm labor housing.

Sixteen organizations—six private, nonprofit organizations, and 10 public housing authorities—received grants between 1965 and early 1970. Only three received the maximum allowable grant—two-thirds of the project cost—and only two others received over 50 percent. The decision largely to limit grants of 50 percent resulted from FMHA's deference to the stated wishes of the House Appropriations Committee.

This policy has meant higher rents to the tenants of housing built with FMHA grants. The Rural Housing Alliance places the average rent at over \$50 per month plus utilities and reports at least one project that rents at \$85 per month plus utilities.

The case of Florida illustrates how ineffective this housing program has been since its inception 10 years ago. Florida received more FMHA money than any other State—\$14 million or 51 percent of all loans and grants made between 1961 and 1970. This resulted in 2,000 family units—about 50 percent of the nationwide total.

Yet, housing for seasonal and migrant farmworkers in Florida remains totally inadequate. The State health department says 40 percent of 406 private farm labor camps housing 30,000 seasonal workers are unacceptable under the State code. The Florida State Office of Economic Opportunity reports 332,403 substandard houses in the State and 17 counties where substandard housing comprises 40 percent of all housing.

An independent survey of 9,000 Florida migrants conducted by a University of Miami professor drew the following profile of migrant housing facilities in Florida: 5 percent had no electricity; 31 percent had no working sink; 18 percent had no screens; 41 percent had no functioning toilet; and 42 percent had no shower or tub.

The study found the average migrant family had five members and lived in a three-room unit.

It is evident that the program of farm labor housing grants and loans is not working. Only \$1.2 million was obligated in all of fiscal 1971, five grants totaling \$736,000 and 13 loans for a total of \$474,000.

Unfortunately the program enjoys low priority—its operation represents about one-half of 1 percent of the agency's expenditures—and FMHA is understaffed to handle the program. The FMHA limits program eligibility to public bodies, ignoring its statutory authority for grants to broad-based nonprofit organizations. Moreover, the application process is unnecessarily lengthy and complex and the grants are made on an ad hoc basis without adequate knowledge of need. The power lies with local county officials as well as local individuals and organizations, and farmworkers are effectively excluded from the process.

A very significant problem with the program is that the subsidy is not deep enough to make it attractive or worthwhile. Congress recently lowered the interest rate to 1 percent and increased the allowable grant to 90 percent of project cost in hopes of stimulating greater use of the program by growers and grower organizations. Congress must recognize, however, that the terms upon which funds are available coupled with the necessity of local initiative means that housing is unlikely to be provided for migrant farmworkers who are different culturally and ethnically from the rest of the community.

This is a program that has not lived up to its potential and that has raised false hopes and expectations among migrant farmworkers. Before we start adding new programs to old ones, let us make old ones effective.

Let us get the necessary data to make realistic funding decisions; let us staff the FMHA so that it will have the capability to carry out actively and aggressively the program goals; let us require that truly broad-based private bodies which include migrant farmworkers be eligible to build or repair housing for migrants; and let us face the possibility of a still deeper Federal subsidy if adequate housing for farmworkers is to become a reality.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND RESERVOIR

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined my colleague from Georgia, Congressman PHIL LANDRUM, in introducing a bill to name the Trotters Shoals project the "Richard B. Russell Dam and Reservoir."

Mr. Speaker, Richard B. Russell played a significant role in the development of the Savannah River. Senator Russell was born, reared and lived—throughout his lifetime—in the area of this great river. The Savannah River has one of the largest annual flow of water of the rivers of the United States and is fed by the highest annual rainfall in eastern North America. Senator Russell realized early the urgency of harnessing and utilizing this tremendous natural resource of pure mountain water for the progress and development of the Southeast. He had a passion for preserving this water for future generations.

Senator Russell supported the Flood Control Act of 1944 with subsequent approval and construction of Clark Hill Dam and Reservoir, one of the largest man-made lakes in the world. He also supported construction of Hartwell Dam further upstream, and when construction of Hartwell Dam was halted by President Eisenhower, Senator Russell played a key role in assisting the late Paul Brown and me in working out an arrangement to build protecting dams and canals at Clemson so that work could be resumed.

Later, when further development of the Savannah River was hopelessly deadlocked in controversy, Senator Russell and my colleagues Congressmen LANDRUM and STEPHENS supported the compromise I offered which authorized a dam at Trotters Shoals and a Duke Power Co. dam at Middleton Shoals. This compromise arrangement made possible the fabulous Duke Keowee-Toxaway project in South Carolina on the tributaries of the Savannah.

Approval of Trotters Shoals was especially due to the perseverance, persistence, and determination of Senator Russell. I do not believe anyone is more aware of this fact than I am as a member of the House Public Works Committee. All of the entire Nation and indeed the Free World is aware of Senator Russell's statesmanship, leadership, and skill as a parliamentarian. They know of his contributions to the military power of the United States and the cause of freedom and constitutional government. I can testify today to his devotion to the progress and development of our area, once referred to by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as the "Nation's No. 1 economic problem." That area today, due in no small part to Senator Russell, is the Nation's No. 1 area of opportunity. Mr. Speaker, it is timely, fitting, and proper that the new project at Trotters Shoals be named "Richard B. Russell Dam and Reservoir" in honor of this great and good man—one of the greatest statesmen in the modern history of the world.

SENIOR CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAMO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Fleming of the White House Conference on Aging has reported that transportation ranks second only to nutrition as being the most important need of senior citizens. In an effort to relieve that need, I am pleased to introduce a bill today which would allow elderly persons 65 and older to travel in interstate commerce for half fare during non-peak periods.

There are currently more than 20 million senior citizens in the United States who are physically and financially less mobile and who need public transportation more than any other age group. Only 1 percent of those Americans over age 65 crossed a State line last year. While the majority of our senior citizens are being forced to remain at home on fixed

incomes as transportation fares continue to rise, our transportation industry continues to falter.

The major airlines, operating with load factors of less than 50 percent are experiencing massive layoffs and expect to lose between \$150 and \$200 million in profits this year if traffic does not pick up before the year ends. Senior citizens make up only 5 percent of the airlines' customers.

The railroads which have recently come under Federal control are operating at only 60-65 percent of their maximum capacity. Though senior citizens have expressed a preference for traveling by rail, Department of Transportation figures show that the elderly account for only 4 percent of the tickets sold in the northeast and southern corridors and rail service continues to be decreased.

The airlines currently offer discounts of 33 to 50 percent to young passengers between 12 and 22 encouraging young people to get into the habit of flying. There are also special rates for servicemen, clergy and families but nothing for the elderly.

On our Nation's railroads and buslines the blind and handicapped travel at reduced rates as do their attendants. But again there are no allowances made for the elderly.

Aiming directly at the person who has never flown, Continental Airlines offered rides for \$10 on selected routes during the month of May. Under the program a would-be traveler did not know until 24 hours before the flight where he was going. All he knew was that it would not be more than 1½ hours away and that he would have to return on the next flight that returned to his home base. Continental carried 23,559 passengers during the month, 63 percent of which had never flown before.

Another example of the airlines' attempt to recruit business is Eastern Airlines' adoption of a new kind of travel called leisure class. Rather than flying either coach or first class, a passenger can choose to fly leisure class which is similar to flying on a stand-by basis. A leisure class passenger must wait to board the plane until the regular paying passengers have boarded and then he will be seated if there are vacant seats remaining. If first class seats are vacant, the leisure class passenger can fly first class at coach fares. If the plane is completely filled, the leisure class passenger must then wait to take the next plane but is allowed to fly free of charge. According to Eastern's advertisement in today's New York Times, Eastern would rather fly you free than with empty seats.

As this type of promotion indicates, there is not a carrier in the transportation industry which could not use the extra business my bill would stimulate. I suspect that substantial fare reductions could be successful in encouraging the elderly to travel more often and could be significant in relieving the loneliness of old age by allowing the elderly a greater opportunity to visit both family and friends. Approximately one-fourth of our senior citizens are living below the poverty level and do not have the means

to travel but there are still some 15 million senior citizens which my bill could benefit directly—a sizable market which remains virtually untapped by the transportation industry.

Under the provisions of this legislation, elderly persons, 65 and older, would be allowed to travel in interstate commerce on planes, buses, and trains during nonpeak hours for half-fare. Unlike the present system of airline youth fares, senior citizens would be able to make reserved seat reservations and would not be required to travel space available.

Should a carrier be able to show that it incurred an economic loss during any calendar year, because of the reductions offered to senior citizens, the carrier will be able to apply to the Federal Government for financial assistance. The Federal agency responsible for tariffs of the carrier involved would be authorized to repay the carrier for his loss in accordance with the formula specified within the bill.

Another important provision of the Senior Citizens Transportation Act is which would give preference for financial assistance to State and local bodies whose mass transit systems adopt these specially reduced rates during nonrush hour. Under this provision, a city which provides bus service at half-fare for the elderly would receive financial assistance under the Urban Mass Transportation Act before a city which does not provide the same reduced fare service.

Though there are important efforts being made in Congress to relieve the financial plight of our senior citizens through reforms in our social security, tax, and medicare programs, I believe the enactment of the Senior Citizens Transportation Act will be a significant step toward reassuring our senior citizens that they truly are not the "forgotten Americans."

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join our colleague, JIM CORMAN, as a cosponsor of the Senior Citizens Transportation Act.

As Mr. CORMAN has pointed out, the bill would cut rates for interstate travel by persons 65 and over, and also would assign preferential status, in the allocation of Federal aid, to State and local transit authorities which have pioneered in reducing fares for the elderly.

In my home area, the publicly owned San Diego Transit Corp., established special rates 4 years ago for senior citizens riding its buses, and would, under this proposal, probably qualify for Urban Mass Transportation aid ahead of systems which have not cut rates for the elderly.

In San Diego, women 62 and over and men who are at least 65 can ride anywhere for 25 cents during nonrush hours. Other passengers pay a minimum of 40 cents for the first two zones plus 10 cents for each additional zone.

Last month, 110,257 of the 1,006,353 passengers using the San Diego system were senior citizens traveling at the special rate. The reduced fares thus account for more than 10 percent of all fares, a remarkable proportion particularly when it is remembered that the reduced rates

are not available during the peak periods of 6 to 9 a.m. and 3 to 6 p.m.

I am delighted this program has proven so successful, and happy to support this bill which would recognize the special effort made by companies such as San Diego Transit.

Likewise, I applaud the features of the legislation that would cut in half the costs of interstate travel by the seniors on board trains and airliners, as well as buses.

These provisions are practical as well as humane. For in addition to giving many more of our senior citizens the opportunity to travel, they would generate new business for the carriers during otherwise slack periods. And even if the opposite proved to be the case, and a common carrier could show losses as a direct result of cutting tariffs for the elderly, relief could be obtained through the appropriate Federal agencies.

In view of all the benefits it would confer, this legislation merits early and positive action by this Congress.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my friend and colleague from the State of California, Mr. CORMAN, in cosponsoring a bill which would require common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to offer half-fare rates to senior citizens during nonpeak hours. This bill would cover travel in buses, trains, and planes.

There are several reasons why this legislation is necessary. First, most of our Nation's senior citizens are living on fixed incomes and cannot easily afford the full travel fares. Secondly, since most senior citizens are retired, they are able to travel during nonpeak hours when many common carriers travel with less than full capacity loads. This legislation would increase the number of passengers traveling during these hours and would increase the revenues of the carriers as well.

Legislation such as this would allow senior citizens and retirees the opportunity to get away from their daily routines and it would enable them to visit their friends and relatives who, in many cases, are scattered throughout the entire country.

There is unquestionably a great demand for this type of legislation. During the past few weeks I have received letters from many senior citizens in my own congressional district in Michigan urging me to support a Senate bill.

While I certainly am in basic agreement with the general thrust of the Senate bill, I do feel that the stronger bill, which we are introducing today, is essential if we are going to enact a truly meaningful law in this area. Today I would like to point out to my colleagues the basic differences between these two bills.

There are basically four major differences. First, our bill would actually prohibit common carriers from charging more than half the normal fare to persons 65 and older traveling during nonpeak periods. In other words, our bill actually assures that senior citizens would receive reduced rate privileges. On the other hand, S. 2055 merely authorizes reduced fare transportation. It con-

tains nothing that would actually guarantee the lower fares to senior citizens. I would therefore like to emphasize that our bill is much stronger in this key area—our bill guarantees lower rates, the Senate bill does not.

A second basic difference is that our bill would enable senior citizens to obtain reservations in advance for this reduced fare travel. The Senate bill provides only for travel on a standby space-available basis. I feel that our bill is quite superior in this respect, since it would avoid the possibility of a senior citizen having to wait around indefinitely in a bus or airlines terminal in hopes of obtaining a vacant seat.

A third significant difference is that our bill would authorize the head of each Federal agency involved to establish a commission of elderly persons to advise him in carrying out the provisions in the act. This is particularly desirable since it would enable senior citizens to participate in formulating policies which would affect them.

Finally, our proposal also contains a section providing that special preference shall be given to State and local transportation agencies applying for Federal aid through the Urban Mass Transportation Act if the agencies adopt special reduced rates for the elderly during nonrush hours. Since the Federal Government cannot legislate directly with respect to State and local agencies, the intent of this last section is to encourage and assist local agencies who voluntarily adopt the reduced rates for the elderly.

The Senate bill does not contain any provisions comparable to these third and fourth points. It does not authorize the establishment of the senior citizens' advisory commission and it does not encourage or assist the local agencies to enact reduced rates.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the legislation which we are introducing today is superior in all respects to the Senate bill, S. 2055. It guarantees the reduced rate fares and it provides for advance reservations while the Senate bill does neither. Overall, our bill provides for a comprehensive plan to assure senior citizens the most complete and convenient reduced-fare plan possible.

I would hope that my colleagues will give this bill their most prompt and favorable consideration. At this point I would like to insert the text of the bill into the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to prohibit common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, this Act may be cited as the "Senior Citizens' Transportation Act of 1971".

TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no common carrier for hire transporting persons in interstate commerce shall, during nonpeak periods of travel, charge any eligible elderly person more than half the published tariff charged the general public in connection with any trans-

portation which is requested by any such person.

(b) In any case in which a common carrier can show that it incurred an economic loss during any calendar year solely because of the requirement imposed by subsection (a), such carrier may apply to the head of the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the filing and publishing of the tariffs of such carrier for Federal financial assistance with respect to all or part of such economic loss. The head of any such Federal agency is authorized to pay any such carrier (1) an amount not exceeding one-half the difference between the published tariff and the tariff charged elderly persons during the calendar year covered by the carrier's application, or (2) an amount not exceeding the aggregate of the economic loss of the carrier claimed under such application, whichever is less.

(c) The head of each such Federal agency is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including but not limited to the defining of nonpeak periods of travel and regulations requiring uniform accounting procedures.

(d) The head of each such Federal agency is authorized to establish a commission of elderly persons to advise him in carrying out the provisions of this section.

(e) As used in this section, the term "eligible elderly person" means any individual sixty-five years of age or older who is not employed full time.

TRANSPORTATION IN INTRASTATE COMMERCE

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary shall give preference to applications made by States and local public bodies and agencies thereof which will adopt (or require the adoption of) specially reduced rates during nonrush hours for any elderly person in the operation of the facilities and equipment financed with such assistance, whether the operation of such facilities and equipment is by the applicant or is by another entity under lease or otherwise. As used in this subsection, the term 'elderly person' means any individual sixty-five years of age or older."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the Senior Citizens Transportation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CHOU VOWS AGAIN TO DEFEAT UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a short item in the Sunday, July 25, 1971, Washington Post, datelined Hong Kong, reads as follows:

CHOU VOWS AGAIN TO DEFEAT U.S.

(Reuter)

HONG KONG.—Chinese Premier Chou En-lai today reiterated a pledge to defeat U.S. aggressors in a message to mark the 19th anniversary of the Cuban sports day, Radio Peking reported.

The message, addressed to Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro, said:

The Cuban people's struggle has provided great support to the Chinese people and people of the world in the struggle against U.S. imperialism and its running dogs.

It added:

The Chinese government and people will as usual fight shoulder to shoulder with the Cuban people, help each other and learn from each other, and to defeat U.S. aggressors through to the end.

Mr. Speaker, I think news items such as this are a clear warning to us that President Nixon's proposed trip to Communist China must be viewed in the perspective of China's history since the Communists came to power in 1949, and particularly with regard to Chinese policy and official statements within the past few months, the so-called era of "ping-pong diplomacy."

I wish to emphasize that my own opposition to a softening of American policy toward Communist China has not developed only since the President's dramatic announcement of July 15. I have voiced my concern on repeated occasions.¹

Since it took power 22 years ago, the Chinese Communist regime has murdered between 10 and 50 million of its own citizens. It has invaded three countries, Korea, Tibet, and India, and has been condemned as an international outlaw by the United Nations. It planned, supported, and almost accomplished the overthrow and mass assassination of the Indonesian Government, which was at the time its leading non-Communist ally. It has fomented and supported guerrilla rebellions not only in South Vietnam, but in India, Thailand, Laos, Burma, Malaysia, the Philippines, and in black African countries too numerous to list.

At the very moment when we discuss a lessening of tensions between ourselves and the Chinese Communists, His Holiness Tenzing Gyatso, the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet, now living in exile in India, reported in the New York Times that:

The Chinese have launched a veritable reign of mass terror. Tibetans of all classes are beaten, humiliated, tortured or killed on such flimsy trumped-up charges as harboring subversive designs against the regime, possessing religious objects or collaborating with and helping "reactionary elements."

Mao Tse-tung, as I am sure President Nixon fully understands, operates on the basis of an ideological perception of the world and of China's role in it. In Oc-

tober, 1967, Mao loudly declared in his "Great Strategic Deployment" that the mainland of China would remain as an arsenal as well as a political-military and technological center of the "world revolution," that his regime would continue to openly supply the various countries of the world with weapons marked "made in China," thereby making it possible for the people to carry on their armed struggles.

Again in April 1969, Lin Piao made it clear in his political report to the Ninth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party that the Maoist regime would continue to commit itself fully to a foreign policy of "three antis"—"against the U.S. imperialism," "against the Soviet revisionism," and against "the reactionaries of all countries." Stated specifically was their "support for the Vietnamese people in carrying on their war of resistance against U.S. aggression and for national salvation to the end."

More recently, on May 20, 1970, Mao made a statement calling on people of the world to rise and fight for the overthrow of the United States. This was followed immediately by the launching in all mainland provinces of an uninterrupted series of anti-U.S. mass movement and demonstrations. Mao declared his desire to "bury U.S. imperialism and capitalism."

As President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger well know, the Maoist regime has long been a major source of chaos and tumult in Asia. This was confirmed in Mao Tse-tung's memorandum—"The Program of World Revolution"—which Chou En-lai brought to Moscow and submitted in person to Stalin in 1953.

In this memorandum Mao stressed:

Asia is a direct target for the furtherance of internal revolution and effective infiltration, an area that can be paralyzed or subjugated by intimidation, an area where we can achieve fruitful results by this strategy. After liberation of South Asia and Southeast Asia, it would be possible to organize in Asia an armed might of 20 million well-trained combatants that could be immediately put into operation, thereby compelling the capitalist countries to embark on the road of economic bankruptcy as a result of steady increases in defense expenditures and at the same time forcing the ruling cliques of the countries being liberated to give in. It is necessary to give the greatest amount of aid to our comrades and friends in Indochina.

Referring to the "ultimate victory" of the "world revolution," Mao went on to stress in his memorandum:

After the liberation of Indochina, communism would triumph in Burma, Thailand, and Indonesia. In these circumstances, England would reconcile itself to defeat and withdraw from the Malay peninsula. In dealing with Japan, a display of armed might is enough to place this country under subjugation and in the grip of peaceful resolution. India can be won over by peaceful means.

In an article entitled "Long Live the Victory of the People's War" written in September 1965 in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the victory of the Chinese people's war of resistance against Japanese aggression, Lin Piao made it amply clear to all that Mao's regime was

and would continue to be fully committed to the "world revolution" approach.

In this article, Lin Piao, the defense minister, stressed Mao's old adage that "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun," that "U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism are all paper tigers," that "war can reform the world," and that "nuclear weapons are not dreadful at all."

More recently, at the very time of the allegedly conciliatory gesture of "ping pong" diplomacy the Chinese Communists reiterated their determination to achieve world revolution. The Peking Review for May 21, 1971, includes the following statement on pages 4 and 5:

Following Chairman Mao's teachings, the Chinese people uphold proletarian internationalism, forever stand on the side of the people of all countries, resolutely oppose U.S. imperialism's policies of aggression and war and firmly support the people of all countries in their revolutionary struggles. This stand of ours is firm and unshakable. We will further strengthen the militant unity with the proletariat and the oppressed people and nations of the world and further unite with all the peace-loving countries and people subjected to U.S. imperialist aggression, control, intervention or bullying in the common struggle to thoroughly defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs.

It is difficult to find in this statement, made only 2 months ago, any change from the traditional aggressive posture of the Chinese Communists. Even more recently, on June 23, 1971, Premier Chou En-Lai said that the security screen the United States had erected around the island of Taiwan was a key obstacle to the establishment of diplomatic ties with the United States.

The Chinese determination to continue world revolution, and to destroy the Nationalist Chinese Government on Taiwan has been forcefully reiterated at the very moment when President Nixon has announced his forthcoming trip to China.

President Nixon's views on China are well known. Speaking during the 1968 campaign on WITI-TV in Milwaukee, Wis., he said:

Any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China. This does not mean, as many would simplistically have it, rushing to grant recognition to Peking, to admit it to the United Nations and to ply it with offers of trade—all of which would serve to confirm its rulers in their present course. . . .

Only as the nations of non-Communist Asia become so strong—economically, politically, and militarily—that they no longer furnish tempting targets for Chinese aggression, will the leaders in Peking be persuaded to turn their energies inward rather than outward. . . .

For the short run, then, this means a policy of firm restraint, of no reward, of a creative counter-pressure designed to persuade Peking that its interest can be served only by accepting the basic rules of international civility.

Just 3 short years ago President Nixon declared that:

I do not believe we should recognize Communist China now or admit it to the United Nations because that would be in effect putting the seal of approval on Communist China's present very aggressive course against India and against our forces, in Vietnam, and against all of its neighbors.

¹ May 27, 1971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Page 17296, "Dialog With Peking."

June 14, 1971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Page 19781, "Judd Rejects Appeasement of China."

June 17, 1971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Page 20716, "Chou En-Lai Spreads Propaganda."

June 21, 1971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Page 21158, "Firmness Urged on China."

June 24, 1971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Page 22132, "China's U.N. Admission Opposed."

July 13, 1971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Page 24849, "Which China at the U.N.?"

July 26, 1971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Page 27196, "China's Aggressiveness Is Unchanged."

President, Nixon was, of course, elected because people had faith that he would fulfill his campaign promises. The American people have justifiably become concerned over the question of credibility in Government. They feel that if the man they support and elect is in no sense obligated to pursue the policies which caused his election, then the people do not in fact rule, or control their own Government.

Unless President Nixon is clearly reversing his own campaign promises, and since we know that he understands both communism and the aggressive policies pursued since its inception by the Chinese Communist Government, we can only assume that he has information available to him, which is not available to us.

The public record shows only a reiteration of its previous support for world revolution by the Chinese Communists. On the basis of what we, as informed citizens and observers, can know and understand, Communist China's policy has not changed, while our own policy seems to be changing. If President Nixon's trip is based upon some private understanding that the Chinese Communists will cease aggression, and that the security and integrity of Taiwan will be maintained, we must hope that the President will share this information with the American people and our Asian allies at the earliest possible moment.

If our allies in Asia feel betrayed, if the American people feel that we are approaching an aggressive and militant Communist China in the spirit of appeasement with which the British faced an aggressive and militant Nazi Germany in the 1930's, then the President's trip will not bring an era of peace, but an era of increased tension and conflict. Beyond this, the American people will support the President's trip only if they believe that he knows something which they do not with regard to China's world posture. On the basis of the record itself, China proclaims itself to be unchanged, to be interested in the domination not only of Taiwan but of all of Asia.

In fact, the Chinese Communists published a list of 32 slogans for May 1, International Labor Day, 1971. These slogans give clear insight into their unchanged public programs and objectives. Some of these slogans are:

Hail the great victory of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must be prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today. People of the world unite, and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs!

Firmly support the Arab peoples in their struggle against colonialists and neo-colonialist aggression, subversion, intervention.

Heighten our vigilance, defend the motherland! Be ready at all times to destroy the enemy intruder. We are determined to liberate Taiwan.

The Communist leadership has made no attempt to conceal their determination to conquer Taiwan, which they call an intrinsic part of Chinese territory. An article in the Peking Review of May 7, 1971 declares that:

Taiwan is part of Chinese territory from time immemorial . . . The Chinese people will never permit the U.S. Government to play with the plots of "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan." When and how the Chinese people liberate Taiwan is entirely China's internal affairs, and no foreign government has any right to intervene.

Only if Mr. Nixon knows something we do not know, can a meeting at this time produce the peace we desire.

It is difficult to believe that the President would alter our historic opposition to the tyrannical regime of Mao Tse-tung, and justify this de facto recognition of the regime, without concrete concessions in exchange. And in view of the President's overriding concerns in the international arena, namely the release of America prisoners of war and the end of the war itself, it would seem logical that these are the concessions that have been promised. The President, of course, cannot make such concessions public until they materialize. If such concessions have, in fact, been secured, and if China has ceased its aggressive world goals, then the President is to be commended for his initiatives.

If such concessions do not materialize, however, and if our policy changes and weakens while the Chinese policy remains the same, our country will be in a desperate position in Asia, and our allies will feel betrayed and our people deceived. I am confident that President Nixon understands all of these things, and it is on the basis of this understanding that we must all hope for success in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, on the morning of July 15, the date of President Nixon's announcement that he would visit Communist China, I contacted the State Department to ask for clearance to visit Communist China next month. I am anxious to learn if the Communist China regime, which supposedly is softening its stand on America, will allow an American who has been critical of it to visit China.

Will they permit me to talk with the Chinese people, will they permit me to travel freely, to take pictures and to determine for myself if there has indeed been a thaw and a change in Chinese policy that would indicate that Communist China is ready to subscribe to the United Nations' principles of peace, freedom, and human dignity? The answer should prove interesting.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the remarks which I made last week in rebuttal to an editorial broadcast on WBBM television in Chicago:

WBBM television, in its recent editorial endorsing President Nixon's planned visit to Communist China, cautions us not to expect too much from the visit and, at the same time, endorses our recognition of Red China and her admission to the United Nations.

I think it is important for us to recognize one very significant point in considering the expectations of the trip.

I am totally convinced that the administration has secured from Red China concrete concessions which include a release of American prisoners-of-war and an end of all hostilities in Vietnam by the President's May, 1972, deadline.

I do not think the President would so radically depart from our traditional policy

toward Red China and grant "de facto recognition" except in exchange for something that is so essential in the minds of all Americans.

In view of Red Chinese policies of the past 20 years, there would be no justification for the President's visit without these concessions.

Nor has there been any sign of change in Communist China's policies which would justify recognition of her and her admission to the United Nations.

The recent report of the Lodge Commission on Red China said there is no basis for admitting her to the U.N. unless and until the world has evidence that she truly intends to subscribe to the principles of peace, freedom and human dignity. To date, there has been no such evidence.

Nothing would be better calculated to bring the United Nations into total disrepute than the admission of a gangster nation that is committed to the overthrow and destruction of every principle upon which it is founded, a nation whose policy has been one of promoting aggression world-wide, of suppression of her own people and a genocidal policy toward her neighbors.

Communist China has systematically exterminated between 10 and 50 million of her own people and, in one recent month, there were more refugees who took flight out of Red China than who took flight over the Berlin Wall in one 10-year period.

These practices do not, I submit, categorize Communist China as a nation fit to be welcomed into the community of civilized nations.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. As reported in "Geography for Today" the United States produces almost 50 percent of the world's wealth. The average American has twice as much to eat as the average person elsewhere in the world, and the average American can expect to live 2½ times as long as the average citizen of Southern Asia."

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, of this year, we in this free and proud land must join with all other free men, throughout the world, and mark with sadness the third anniversary of the Soviet invasion of the then free and independent nation of Czechoslovakia. This invasion smothered the new breath of freedom that the Czechoslovak people were beginning to enjoy after almost 30 years of Nazi or Soviet terror.

These proud people, the Czechs, the Slovaks, and other groups within the country, have once again been squashed under the tyrannical heel of an imperialistic invader. These poor, unfortunate people have once again been enslaved.

While the Czech leaders were attempting to give their people a greater degree of freedom, a freedom mixed with a workable socialist economy, an economy of their own choosing, their neighbor to the east, the Soviet Union, invaded.

The Soviets, acting under the guise of the quasi-legal Brezhnev doctrine, a doctrine not recognized as being legal by the United States, or customary international law, invaded and interfered with the domestic affairs of a sovereign state.

The Czechoslovak people attempted to repel this invasion, but the greater strength of the Soviet Union prevailed, and once again this state had become a captive nation, ruled by a dictatorial power.

The leaders of this reform movement, this movement toward freedom, have since either been removed from all offices or have been demoted to the lowest level possible. As for the reforms they tried to initiate, they too have gone down the drain, with the injustices common to states occupied by Soviet Russia. All the freedoms of 1968 have been lost.

The actions of the Czech people, as exemplified by the self-sacrifice of Jan Palach and the crowds of mourners at his funeral, show that the people of Czechoslovakia are not content under this new form of occupation. The people of this nation have showed that they do want to return to the freedoms of the spring of 1968.

Our freedom, which we in this country hold most dear, is tied to the freedom of people throughout the entire world; we must be conscious of their needs as well as of ours. Mr. Speaker, as August 21 approaches, we must not and cannot forget the people of Czechoslovakia. They must be remembered.

NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which provides for the establishment of a National Rural Development Center. This legislation is long overdue. This center would conduct research programs—both basic and applied—aimed at broadening our understanding of all aspects of the rural community, as well as providing a clearinghouse for all information on rural development.

There are only about one-half as many farms today as in 1950. Over this period, farm population dropped from 23 to 9.7 million; from 15.2 percent of the total population to 4.7 percent. More than 20 million people have abandoned farms and small towns for the city since World War II. Seventy percent of this Nation's population now lives on 2 percent of the land.

Some of this migration is assuredly the result of technological innovations which have allowed us greater productivity for each man-hour. But much of this migration must be attributed to the relative unattractiveness of farming as an occupation and as a way of life. Many family

farms are sold, because none of the children want to remain on the farm and live the lives their parents lived, with low income, long hours, and few of the luxuries of life. The average age of farmers today is over 50 years old. A 1967 survey indicated that over one-fifth of urban adults had a rural childhood background.

Until recently, the rural to urban migration has been seen as possibly desirable, and even, in fact, inevitable. During the past few years, however, there has been much discussion about the desirability, indeed the necessity, of not only curbing the migration to urban areas, but of attempting to reverse it. The National Rural Development Center would be a significant step in the direction of achieving this very important aim.

This legislation is vital because successful rural development efforts will help slow the migration from rural areas and thereby help to reduce the increasingly complex pressures on urban centers; more effective use of the resources of the rural areas of America will contribute to a stronger and more stable national economy; and it is essential to the national interest to stimulate the economic and social development of the rural areas, including farm communities and the smaller towns and cities.

The center would conduct basic and applied research programs; collect, analyze, and disseminate relevant information on rural development and facilitate the exchange of such information; conduct or cause to be conducted short-term educational programs for the personnel of public and private agencies of rural areas or serving the interests of such areas; and design and conduct, or cause to be conducted, experimental projects and provide technical assistance to public officials and rural areas.

The center would be governed by a board of trustees appointed by the President. Five members of the board would be appointed from officials of Federal, State, and local public agencies concerned with some significant aspect of rural development; five from among individuals who are engaged in educational, research, or other scholarly work relating to the development of rural communities; and five from among individuals from the general public who by virtue of their residence, interest, or vocation are specially qualified to serve on the board. In making the appointments, the President is requested to give due consideration to the appointment of individuals who, collectively, will provide appropriate regional, interest, organization, and political balance on the board.

One of the most important charges of the center would be to conduct research programs with respect to: A further understanding of the dynamics of the economic and social development of rural areas in the United States and their interrelationship with urban areas; the formulation and effectiveness of National, State, and local policy concerning rural development; the development of new techniques in science and technology to the problems of rural areas.

Lack of information is not the only problem in the field of rural develop-

ment research. Availability and knowledge of other research done in the area is also a barrier. The center would serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of information among individuals, institutions, national, State, county, and local governments, and the like. Access to information is the key here. Our citizens, institutions, and Government officials will know where to go if they need information; the existence of the center should also act as a catalytic agent for research by other institutions. Because of the centralized responsibility for information on rural development, limited research funds will not be wasted by duplicate research projects.

Equally important, the center may design and conduct experimental field projects to test their basic research findings.

The center would have the authority and resources to carry out programs, to make grants and contracts so as to stimulate additional activity in other public and private institutions. It would also have the authority to—and be encouraged to—receive grants from private sources.

Another important aspect of the center's research effort would be the development and application of scientific and technological advances to make rural life more attractive. Transportation and communication technology can eliminate the disadvantages of distance and population scarcity. Improvement of health care delivery systems can make rural life more attractive for physicians and more healthy for rural citizens. Technologies may be developed and applied to make the small- and medium-sized farms more viable and competitive with large-scale operations. The number of worthy projects is overwhelming.

I am sure you are aware that this concept is in existence in several other important areas. There are clearinghouses for information about education; there is much research and coordinated study in the area of urban problems and urban affairs. As important as agriculture is to this Nation, we must not continue to treat it as a neglected stepchild—we must not continue to treat our farmers as second-class citizens.

IN MEMORY OF THE LATE CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember my friend and predecessor, the Honorable Michael J. Kirwan, who died 1 year ago today after serving nearly 34 years in the House of Representatives.

I rise to remember a great Congressman and a good and decent gentleman.

Congressman Kirwan will best be remembered for his efforts to protect our environment. Long before it became fashionable, Mike Kirwan was making untiring efforts to preserve our country's soil and water. As chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, Congressman Kirwan was a vital force behind Federal conservation ef-

forts, including national parks, dams, reservoirs, and other public works projects.

The most significant tribute we, his friends and colleagues, can pay to the memory of Mike Kirwan would be to carry on the vital conservation programs to which he devoted his life.

I am sure Mike's spirit lives on in this Chamber he loved so well. His spirit will continue to inspire the hearts of those who have pledged themselves to dedicated public service in the Congress of the United States.

His many friends and colleagues in Washington, D.C., and around the Nation sorely miss him and think of him on this day.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—XXI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Will Wilson, proclaims that all the illegal acts of Frank Sharp took place after he left the employ of that gentleman. But the record shows otherwise. The record shows that a great many questionable deals consummated by Frank Sharp took place while Wilson worked for Sharp in various capacities. These were deals that he should have been acquainted with, and deals that he would have had a part in if he had been performing the job that Sharp was paying him to do.

For example, the 1968 annual report of Sharp's National Bankers Life Insurance Co. was falsified in that it showed as an asset a \$2 million item that was in fact a note that has not been paid to this day. It was a note that was generated by an insider, self-dealing transaction that Wilson played a key role in setting up. Wilson knew that the deal was questionable, he knew that the assets claimed by the insurance company were shaky, and he knew that the insurance company's annual report was false with respect to that item, which represented some 7 or 8 percent of the total assets of that company.

This supposed asset of National Bankers Life was in truth and in fact a loan from the insurance company, which Sharp owned, to the Sharpstown Realty Co., which Sharp also owned, secured by stock in Sharp's bank, Sharpstown State Bank. This \$2 million loan from Sharp to Sharp, secured by Sharp, is supposed to have been a great asset of the insurance company that made the loan. But that loan has never been paid and never will be.

Wilson was general counsel of the Sharpstown State Bank, general counsel of Sharpstown Realty, and general counsel of National Bankers Life when that loan was made. He could not have been ignorant of this blatant self-dealing. Wilson was general counsel of the insurance company when its doctored annual report for 1968 appeared, reflecting this deal. He can hardly say that he was not around when all that took place.

Wilson was also in Frank Sharp's employ when Sharp magically increased the capitalization of his bank by some \$3 mil-

lion through the device of lending that same amount from the bank to the Jesuit Fathers, who then turned about and loaned the money to Sharpstown Realty, which invested in capital accounts of Sharp's bank. Wilson could not have been unaware of this deal. Surely the general counsel of the bank would have been aware that suddenly his bank was worth a tremendous amount more one day than the day before, thanks to the investment made by the realty company for which he was also general counsel, thanks to the loan which the bank had made just a few days earlier to the local Jesuit order, which not long before had been a beneficiary of a great gift of the bank's stock.

There were other deals, of course.

Wilson helped set up the deal whereby the Sharpstown State Bank loaned \$3 million to Frank Sharp's son-in-law, who then bought an insurance company.

Wilson was also around when another Sharp company, Dallas Bank and Trust, loaned \$320,000 to Nashwood Co., which then bought First Financial Life Insurance Co. Sharp's National Bankers Life issued a guarantee to cover this loan, much as it issued the guarantee that resulted in the loss of \$550,000 in National Bankers Life assets to cover another bad loan from another Sharp bank. This latter deal was plainly and simply criminal conversion of corporate assets, and I have very little doubt that it is identical to the one that Wilson participated in, and which I have just described.

Wilson cannot say that he was not around when all this happened. He cannot say that he was not around when other rotten deals were made by Sharp and his pals.

I do not see how any man could deny the truth that Wilson was around, that he was in Sharp's employ, that he held key positions in Sharp's companies—he does not deny that himself. Yet he says that all the crooked deals took place after he left. The deals I have described, and there are others—all took place while Wilson was a hired hand of Frank Sharp's. He knew of them, knew of their illegality and questionable legality, knew and took part in them despite all that. Can we seriously say that such a man as that, who knowingly took part in the greatest scandal and conspiracy in Texas history, is fit to be in charge of the criminal division of the Department of Justice?

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF THE OVER-65 AMERICANS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York, (Mr. BIAGGI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of last week I discussed some of the many financial problems experienced by our elderly Americans. I also discussed three tax reform bills and three medicare reform bills that I have introduced and am presently circulating for cosponsorship. Today, I would like to discuss two social security reform bills that complete the package of eight measures to aid our over-65 Americans.

As I have pointed out previously over

half of the 3 million elderly Americans are living on incomes under \$5,000. Approximately 25 percent are living on incomes below the poverty level. Most of these people were not in dire financial straights until they retired.

One of the most discriminatory and deleterious provisions of the social security law is the restriction on a person's outside income while receiving social security. Most people do not get more than \$2,000 dollars a year. Even if they earn the \$1,680 allowed, they are not above the poverty line.

The result is that many have to go into State institutions for the elderly, go on welfare or die a slow death of malnutrition. This is the "reward" for years of hard work and contributions to the social security retirement fund.

The law becomes even more discriminatory against the hard working wage earner since only wages are included in the earnings test. That is, if a person gets \$50,000 a year from stock dividends, interest and other investments—but earns no wages—he can still receive social security benefits.

Thus it makes no sense to continue to penalize those who must work to survive even at the expense of forfeiting their social security payments. Moreover, it makes no sense to deny those who would like to supplement their meager social security payments after retirement their right to work.

My bill, H.R. 7018, which calls for the elimination of the outside earnings limitation, would eliminate this inequity in our social security laws. I am presently engaged in gathering signatures all over the country in support of this bill. I must say, the response is overwhelming. While the House Ways and Means Committee in H.R. 1 has raised the limitation to \$2,000, I am hoping the Senate Finance Committee will eliminate the limitation altogether.

The second bill I want to discuss today is H.R. 8238, which would increase the social security lump sum death benefits payment to \$750.

This provision has not been changed in 20 years despite the fact that the average funeral costs have gone up almost 200 percent in the same period. The \$750 payment will give those covered by social security a basis which will provide some protection against adverse financial setbacks because of funeral costs.

The social security lump sum death benefits payment is presently set at three times the monthly benefits payment up to a maximum of \$255. The present minimum monthly check is \$70; thus, most receive the maximum benefit.

I would like to include at this point in the RECORD a table of the average prices for adult funerals selected in the years 1958 through 1969 and projected figures for 1970 and 1971:

1958	-----	\$661
1959	-----	697
1960	-----	708
1961	-----	738
1962	-----	755
1963	-----	763
1964	-----	757
1965	-----	790
1966	-----	820
1967	-----	850

1968 -----	879
1969 -----	926
1970 (projected) -----	975
1971 (projected) -----	1,050

These average prices are for regular adult services and do not include funerals for infants, children, or indigents.

The figures include the charges of the funeral director for his professional services and those of his staff, for the use of the facilities and equipment he has available, and for the casket selected.

These figures do not include the cost of the vault, cemetery, or crematory expenses, the price of the monument or marker or any miscellaneous costs such as an honorarium for the clergyman, flowers, additional transportation charges, burial clothing, or newspaper notices.

The simple fact is that if \$255 was considered a fair sum in 1951, it cannot possibly be a fair sum now. In fact, the rising costs of funerals have been the subject of numerous investigative stories and documentaries in the mass media. Yet this body has never addressed itself to changing that portion of the social security law.

The number of death benefits recipients have been fairly constant in the last several years, varying between 1.2 and 1.3 million annually. In 1970, 1,258,000 lump-sum death benefits checks were paid out by the Social Security Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for these reforms is clear. Our elderly Americans deserve better than we have given them in the last two decades. I hope that the 92d Congress will go down in the history books as the Congress that reached out to help the elderly. My colleagues can make a start in that direction by co-sponsoring these two bills with me this Thursday. Again, they are:

H.R. 7018: A bill to eliminate the outside earnings limitation for recipients of social security benefits.

H.R. 8238: A bill to provide for an increase in the lump-sum death benefits payment to \$750.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN AMENDMENT

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of letters and resolutions from responsible and concerned women and women's groups all over the United States. I would like to share a few of them now with all my colleagues to further emphasize the critical need and concern felt by American women and men for the enactment of the equal rights for men and women amendment without any amendments whatsoever.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Augusta, Ga., July 22, 1971.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
House Judiciary Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: We of American Association of University Women voted at our recent biennial convention in Dallas to strongly

support the Equal Rights Amendment, without crippling amendment.

As Division Legislative Program Chairman for Georgia, I want to express the views of the Division: we appreciate your voting against the Wiggins amendment and urge your continued support in reporting the ERA out of the House Judiciary Committee without any amendment. We feel that an amendment will weaken the ERA.

Yours sincerely,
Mrs. BOB SIDEMAN,
Legislative Program Chairman.

WOMEN'S BAR ASSOCIATION OF ILLINOIS,
July 19, 1971.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives, House Judiciary
Committee, U.S. Congress, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EDWARDS: The Women's Bar Association of Illinois urges your support for the Women's Equality Act for 1971, H.R. 1961, and its underlying principles. Enactment of this bill will be a significant step toward erasing existing discriminatory inequities in the fields of employment, housing and public accommodations and achieving the goal of full legal equality for women—a task that was begun over a century ago.

As both lawyers and women, we deem it a national disgrace that federally protected rights assured for other classes of citizens are denied to women as a group. We seek to enlist your aid in ensuring that this important bill is reported out of your Committee and ultimately enacted into law.

Very truly yours,
STEPHANIE W. KANWITT.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
San Francisco, Calif., July 16, 1971.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDWARDS: At the request of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, I am pleased to forward for your attention the attached resolution which opposes H.J.R. 208 in its amended form and endorses S.J.R. 8 and S.J.R. 9 which provide for an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women.

Sincerely,
ROBERT E. JOSTEN,
Washington Representative.

Enclosure.

OPPOSING H.J.R. 208 IN ITS AMENDED FORM,
AND ENDORSING S.J.R. 8 AND S.J.R. 9 PROVIDING
FOR AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
RELATIVE TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN
AND WOMEN

RESOLUTION NO. 367-71

Whereas, Three constitutional amendments have been introduced before the Congress, H.J.R. 208, S.J.R. 8 and S.J.R. 9, providing that equality of rights under the Law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex; and

Whereas, Prior to referring H.J.R. 208 to the floor of the House, the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee caused the Bill to be amended to permit individual States to perpetuate discriminatory laws which would have as their purpose the barring of women from certain occupations and the establishment of different working conditions for them; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco does hereby express its strenuous opposition of H.J.R. 208 in its amended form and urges the members of the California delegation to take whatever action is necessary to eliminate said amendment; and be it

Further resolved, That this Board of Supervisors does hereby call upon Senator John Tunney and Senator Alan Cranston to urge the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Com-

mittee to set early hearings for the consideration of S.J.R. 8 and S.J.R. 9 and to recommend enactment of said Bills without amendments thereof; and be it

Further resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to his Honor, the Mayor for transmittal to the Federal Legislative Representative with the direction that he disseminate this resolution to the State's representatives and Senators for all action consonant with the intent of this resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco at its meeting of June 28, 1971.

PHILIP P. ENGLER, Acting Clerk.
Approved: June 30, 1971
JOSEPH L. ALIOTO, Mayor.
July 5, 1971.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1971.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: At its national convention last month, in Dallas, the American Association of University Women adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution to support the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution. The convention voted equally strongly to ask that the amendment be passed "without crippling amendments."

The AAUW, established in 1882, is an organization of 170,000 members, organized in about 1,700 local branches throughout the United States. It is dedicated to the education and advancement of women, to the development of equal opportunities for all citizens and the elimination of all forms of discrimination.

We urgently ask your continued support of the Equal Rights Amendment and of reporting it out of the House Judiciary Committee without amendment of any kind. We shall be grateful for your interest and support.

Sincerely,
ALICE L. BEEMAN.

JULY 16, 1971.
To: Members of the Judiciary Committee,
United States House of Representatives
From: MRS. EMILY P. MARTIN
Re: H.J. Res. 208

Over eight hundred women of the Indiana Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., assembled at their annual convention, adopted a resolution requesting your immediate assistance in approving H.J. Res. 208 without change.
(Mrs.) EMILY P. MARTIN,
1970-71 State President.

SUNNYVALE, CALIF., July 8, 1971.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: I learned of the regrettable amendment which has been added to the Equal Rights legislation, H.J. resolution 208. This amendment vitiates the intent and purpose of the legislation, crippling it and rendering it useless.

The unamended legislation serves a valuable and useful purpose, in that it removes a legal obstacle to the full participation of women in the mainstream of American society. It redresses an inequity which works to the detriment of both men and women.

I urge you to support the unamended proposed legislation, in your capacity as chairman.

Sincerely yours,
RHODA FREIER.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN,
San Rafael, Calif., July 19, 1971.

THE HON. DON EDWARDS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: In behalf of the Marin County, California, Chapter of the National Organization for Women, I wish to extend

our most sincere appreciation for your favorable vote for the Equal Rights Amendment (H.J. Res. 208) recently.

It is a tremendous encouragement and relief that some members of the Congress, yourself included, are actively working for the civil rights of all the people, knowing that an improvement in justice for one group is an improvement for our entire society.

We heartily support your efforts.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH SMITH,
President.

GREECE: ABOLISHING DEMOCRACY OUTRIGHT

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, while others were silent or misled, journalists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak steadily and often brilliantly provided an insight into Greek political affairs and U.S. policy on Greece. They have pointed out since 1967 the unfortunate tendency of many American officials to work comfortably with dictatorships abroad. This has damaging consequences both in the short and long term.

Woodrow Wilson, a long time ago, expressed an old, noble, and very practical idea when he said:

America is not ahead of other nations (merely) because she is rich. Nothing makes her great except her thoughts, her ideals. . . .

And in another time, the Younger Pitt told the House of Commons that it is wise for a democracy to "hold out a prospect to other nations . . . of what the exertions of a free people can effect." In short, it is in our best interests that we live up to our democratic ideals in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. We have not done so in the case of Greece.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the timely and important Evans-Novak column, which appeared in the July 26, 1971, Washington Post, is set forth below:

PARADOX FOR GREEK DICTATORS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

ATHENS, GREECE.—George Rallis, a hard-right conservative who used to be minister of interior during the old days of Democratic government in Greece, finally got his passport and took a four-week trip to Europe last winter, stopping off to see King Constantine in Rome and former Prime Minister Karamanlis in Paris.

When he went to the airport to leave Greece for a second trip abroad, the police refused to stamp his passport, thus blocking his departure. When all appeals were rejected, Rallis, one of Athens' leading lawyers brought a daring legal suit against the police for a violation of the constitution. He sued before the public prosecutor of the court of misdemeanors in Athens.

Rallis lost his case, but the reason he lost tells much about justice and civil liberties under the dictatorship of the army colonels, led by Prime Minister George Papadopoulos, who seized power in the 1967 coup d'etat. Rallis lost because the court accepted as fact a charge by the Greek intelligence service that was utterly unprovable.

The charge: That Rallis, in private conversations during his winter trip abroad, "came into contact with political personalities of the Common Market, NATO, with former Prime Minister Karamanlis and King

Constantine, journalists, etc." during which he discussed "matters pertaining to the overthrow of the established order" (the colonels' dictatorship).

That testimony of the Greek intelligence service was accepted *carte blanche* by the court of misdemeanors. The charge of conspiracy, in other words, was sustained by the court without a single shred of evidence. The court was told:

"By various ways, which cannot be disclosed here, the security services have established that, during these sessions, matters concerning" the overthrow of the military junta were discussed. No evidence, no witnesses.

The Athens' press, ostensibly uncensored, was afraid to print the record of this trial. Rallis finally found a commercial printer who said he would publish the documents and Rallis paid him in advance. The next day, the money was returned with apologies. The printer said he would not take the risk.

What happened to Rallis is the barest tip of the iceberg of thought control by which the dictatorship maintains its tight grip on the country. By conservative estimate, at least 50,000 counter-subversion agents, many of them in the military services, keep the lid tightly clamped on public criticism of the regime.

This is done by well-publicized case examples: A three-month jail sentence for a village peasant who complained out loud about inadequate pensions; the surveillance of prominent politicians; the elaborate spying system, which is reported to have put police informants in most back-country villages, in all schools and universities, and in several hundred Athens taxicabs.

The calculated result: To convince opponents that the regime has eyes and ears everywhere and that they risk prison if they speak out, thus preventing any serious conspiracy against the regime from getting organized.

Accordingly, one can only make a vague estimate of how much support the dictatorship really has. With criticism smothered by the fear psychosis exploited by the regime, accurate measurement is impossible.

High officials who talked to us claim with some justification that many of Greece's 10 million citizens were disillusioned by the admittedly squalid partisan wars in the old days of parliamentary government. It is said they enjoy a new sense of confidence and security under Papadopoulos. Thus, George Geogelas, the former Communist who is the regime's chief propagandist as minister of information, told us that "the large mass of the people, without all being necessarily enthusiasts, are satisfied today."

Why, then, does the regime not lift martial law and hold elections? Answer: The people have not yet developed sufficient discipline to risk a return to democracy.

In short, to instill discipline to enable the Greeks at some future date to enjoy the blessings and responsibility of parliamentary government, it is necessary to abolish democracy outright—a Delphic paradox which has now convinced all but incurable optimists that the dictatorship will never voluntarily restore true parliamentary government.

PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, July 25 marked the 19th anniversary of the adoption of the Puerto Rican Constitution of 1952, providing commonwealth status for a land of extraordinary capacity and notable attainment. It is fitting that we mark this occasion, for it marks

our tribute to the Puerto Rican people, wherever they may be, including the hundreds of thousands residing in the United States, and in my own city of New York.

The story of Puerto Rican progress is remarkable in every detail. Known until very recently only as the land of the sugarcane, the coffee-bean, and overwhelming poverty, Puerto Rico has advanced—within one generation—to a position of economic stability unrivaled in the Latin American community. Symbolic of this development, above all other factors, is the Puerto Rican Constitution, which we hail on this occasion.

The struggle for success and human dignity on the shores of Puerto Rico has been long and arduous. In 1897, following several decades of impassioned political protest, the "Charter of Autonomy" was secured from Spain, only to be set aside when the United States took over the following year. Under American authority, the people had only the barest measure of home rule for many years. Added to this political deprivation was the stark lack of economic opportunity on the local level. Foreign investors profited from Puerto Rican goods sold abroad, but the Puerto Rican people derived little from any such transactions. Despite dramatic developments in the sugar industry, a broadening of the public education system, and the beginnings of a comprehensive public health program, Puerto Rico remained in a state of stagnation, both economic, and political. Rising population, without corresponding industrialization, led to serious unemployment.

Throughout the first three decades, virtually all the Governors of Puerto Rico filled their official reports and public statements with statistics on mounting trade, favorable balances, increasing members of schools, telephones, and miles of roads constructed. In the meantime, however, the people were suffering to the point of desperation. Slow starvation was everywhere in evidence. Health conditions were disgraceful: malaria, tuberculosis, and gastrointestinal diseases were exacting a dreadful toll. Poverty was endemic.

Responding to this situation, in the 1930's came the New Deal program of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, implemented largely by the Puerto Rican leader, Luis Muñoz Marin, and Rexford G. Tugwell, the American Governor. With the aid of the Puerto Rican Relief Administration, work was begun on the redistribution of land, rural resettlement, governmental regulation of labor relations between sugar producers and their employees, establishment of cooperatives, extension of rural electrification, the beginnings of local industrialization, and the construction of various university laboratories to aid in the training of Puerto Rican technicians.

After a stormy but effective start, overriding the protests of the sugar interests, the Puerto Rican Relief Administration settled down to a long existence as a Federal agency for spending Federal funds. In 1954, it was liquidated as such. The PRRA accomplished much, but was succeeded by something far better—the

resounding emergence of Puerto Rico, under the direction of the remarkable Lius Muñoz Marin.

In 1940, a liberal political organization headed by Marin, called the Popular Party, secured its first limited success at the polls, campaigning on a platform calling for "Bread, Land, and Liberty." Successful in its initial programs, the Popular Party attained political ascendancy. In the first popular election of a Governor, in 1948, Luis Muñoz Marin was nominated by his party and elected with an overwhelming majority.

Riding the wave of popular satisfaction generated by the successes achieved by the Luis Muñoz Marin administration, the people of Puerto Rico adopted their own constitution on July 25, 1952. Under its provisions, an elected legislature now passes and provides for the enforcement of all Puerto Rican laws. These, in turn, are subject to review by the Federal courts, the same as the laws of all the States. But to a great extent the operation of Puerto Rico rests now in the hands of its people.

Significant strides have been made. The Puerto Rican economy has diversified. Education and health care have greatly improved. Yet the successes which have been accomplished, and which we note in commemorating the 19th anniversary of the adoption of the Puerto Rican constitution, cannot obscure the problems which remain.

Much discussion and controversy has occurred regarding the ultimate status of Puerto Rico. That is an issue which the people of Puerto Rico should themselves resolve. Meanwhile, these people are citizens—valued citizens—of the United States. Thus, the disabilities under which they suffer must not be allowed any longer.

While Puerto Rico has enjoyed economic growth, the current per capita income there is still only \$1,426 annually. This is far below the statistics for any of the 50 States. Four out of every five Puerto Rican families earn less than \$3,000 annually; one-half receive less than \$1,000 annually. Unemployment is at a level of 33 percent of the potential labor force. At the same time, the cost of living is extremely high.

It is clear that, while we can look with gratification on the economic progress of Puerto Rico, there is still very far to go. And it is the responsibility of this Congress and of this Government to assure that those further steps are taken.

Thus far, these steps are not being taken. Currently, Puerto Rico is specifically excluded by Federal law from at least eight Federal programs. These include a portion of the social security program and the school milk program. In addition, Puerto Rico is discriminated against by virtue of arbitrary ceilings or formulas embodied in other Federal laws and based on the low per capita income. Thus, residents of Puerto Rico not only suffer the burden of a per capita income figure far below that in the 50 States, they are also subjected to lessened eligibility for Federal programs because of this low per capita income, thereby compounding the misery.

It is clear, then, that, while we can

proudly commemorate the 19th anniversary of Puerto Rico's adoption of its constitution, we must do so not only to honor the determination of a proud people, but also to affirm our determination that existing inequities be eliminated and that the island of Puerto Rico shall indeed be a land of plenty for all her citizens.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, since 1916, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act has stood as the finest example of compensation for injury statutes in our country. It was the forerunner of many of State laws on this subject. Federal employees view with pride the consideration extended to employees and their families who experience disability or death from job-related causes.

The most recent revision of the Federal law occurred in 1966. Those amendments represented an updating of the statute in terms of changes in the needs of Federal workers and the desire of the Government to continue its preeminent position in this field of employee benefits.

Quite appropriately, then, the 92d Congress should consider further revisions of the statute to insure the posture of the Federal Government as a model employer in this area. The need for additional amendments is demonstrated by four developments.

In the interim since 1966, many State compensation laws have been liberalized.

Benefits for Federal workers have been improved in many respects. As an example, substantial revisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act were approved by the 91st Congress.

Dollar values have changed dramatically since 1966. A keystone of the compensation law is a guarantee to disabled workers that they and their families will have income related to their wages when they suffer on-the-job injuries.

Finally, Congress has enacted numerous laws in recent years aimed at alleviating the social and economic hardships encountered by either our entire population or segments of it.

These changes justify a thorough review of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act by the 92d Congress for the purpose of equating its benefits with the realities faced by injured workers today and in keeping with an enlightened personnel policy by the Federal Government as an employer.

For these reasons, I have introduced a bill designed to assure injured employees that the compensation statute will continue as an example for other jurisdictions to emulate.

In summary, the bill proposes these revisions in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act—

The present statute permits a widower of a deceased Federal worker to receive benefits only when he is wholly depend-

ent on her because of physical or mental disability. Similarly, a husband can be considered a dependent for determining the rate of compensation a disabled female employee will receive only if he is totally dependent on the injured worker because of physical or mental disability.

Our pattern of social thinking has changed dramatically in the United States in recent years. No longer can a husband be viewed in all cases as the sole breadwinner of the family. In many instances the family's standard of living and the education and welfare of children are based on the combined income of husband and wife.

In my own experience with the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, we have acted to erase the artificial differences between the entitlements of husbands and wives that is based on a concept no longer considered valid.

The bill allows a widower to receive benefits because of the demise of his Federal employee spouse, if he lived with her or was dependent on her at the time of her death, or if living apart for good reason or because of the desertion of the husband by his wife. Also, the bill allows an injured female worker to obtain the extra 8½ percent augmented compensation for dependents if she has a husband who is a member of the same household, receiving regular contributions for his support, or if she has been ordered by a court to contribute to his support. In essence, the bill treats husbands the same as wives.

Under existing law, an injured worker may receive medical service in U.S. facilities, such as Public Health Service and Veterans' Administration hospitals, and by designated private physicians and hospitals. However, the latter can be utilized only when Federal Government sources are not available or practicable.

Employees should be given greater discretion in selecting the physician or institution to provide treatment. The Department of Labor has advocated free choice of physicians by the injured employee in their recommendations to the States for upgrading compensation laws. More than 20 States have incorporated this concept in their statutes.

The bill would permit Federal workers to use physicians or medical facilities from a list approved by the Secretary of Labor. It would include, of course, existing Federal facilities.

The present law requires a reduction in the compensation received by an injured employee if his disability changes from total to partial. Stated another way, if a partially disabled employee is unable to return to the job he held at time of injury, then the Secretary of Labor must determine the earning capacity of the partially disabled employee—and reduce his compensation—on the basis of the applicable 66% or 75-percent compensation rate—to the difference between the employee's pay on the date of injury and his new earning capacity. While this is considered a reasonable practice in the field of workmen's compensation, it works a hardship on those who either are in, or would like to enter, an approved vocational rehabilitation program at the time of a change in disability from total to partial.

The bill would permit the Secretary of Labor to continue compensation at the total rate as an inducement for partially disabled employees to remain or enter into an approved program designed to rehabilitate them vocationally—and would in all likelihood create a savings in future compensation benefits in virtually all cases.

Compensation awards for loss of an arm, leg, foot, hand, eye, and so forth, are specified in the present law by the part of the anatomy and the number of weeks involved. Loss of an internal organ or the permanent loss of use of a worker's back cannot be compensated in this manner.

If an employee suffers this kind of loss attributable to an on-the-job injury, justice and logic require that he receive at least the same type of benefit as those who lose an external member.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to provide compensation for such losses, not to exceed 350 weeks of compensation benefits.

At least three States permit schedule awards for this type of disability—North Carolina for permanent loss of use of the individual's back or internal organs, and Minnesota and South Dakota for loss of use of the back.

Some Federal employees become totally helpless because of the injury they have experienced to the extent that they require the constant service of an attendant. Under the existing statute, they are entitled to an additional monthly allowance not exceeding \$300, established in 1966.

The bill recommends increasing that maximum monthly allowance to \$400. General increases in wages for this type of service account for the proposed figure.

Injured workers who participate in vocational rehabilitation may be paid a maximum of \$100 monthly for maintenance while participating in the program.

Increases in the cost of these items since the \$100 figure was established—in 1960—justify advancing this figure to \$200, as recommended in the bill.

For example, an injured worker may receive the maximum each month for several months toward food and lodging costs incurred while undergoing a training course in another city; or he may receive only \$70 per month for carfare and lunch expenses while engaged in a different type of course within the city in which he resides. The allowance is used also to defray the cost of supplying uniforms and their maintenance, tools, and books related to this training.

A requirement that the Bureau of Employees' Compensation review an individual's case when he reaches age 70 to determine whether his wage-earning capacity has declined is found in the present law. If a determination is made that his earning ability has deteriorated, his compensation may be reduced.

For a worker whose injury is job related to experience reduction in benefits due solely to age, portrays the Government as a callous employer. Any step to curtail his benefits is unwarranted from both the economic and social standpoints.

The bill proposes to repeal this provision of the law.

The existing statute generally prohibits compensation payments and veterans' benefits or military retirement or retainer pay for military service simultaneously.

If a Federal worker incurs a job-related injury, which is compensable, it is inequitable to deprive him these benefits solely because he is entitled to payments from other sources for different purposes. His ability to realize compensation payments should be based on the merits of his claim and its compliance with the law governing his injury as a civilian employee.

For this reason, the bill permits compensation payments, regardless of any Veterans' Administration or military retirement or retainer pay which may have been authorized.

Other bills applicable to accomplish this change insofar as military retirement or retainer pay is concerned, have been introduced in the current session.

Unless an individual's injury results in a disability which continues for more than 21 days or the original disability becomes permanent, he may not receive compensation for the first 3 days of disability under the current law.

As a matter of equity, a worker should not have to forgo any compensation benefit, if his condition is work related. In effect, the present statute requires those who do not meet the conditions described above to underwrite the compensation law.

The bill reduces this period to pay loss on the fractional part of the date of injury that follows the injury or on the date disability begins. Fractional parts of a day would be covered only if the disability continues for more than 3 days or becomes permanent. Of course, medical treatment would be available from the time the injury occurs. In actual practice, most Federal agencies provide full pay on the date of injury or the date disability begins—thus virtually no employee would be forced to underwrite the law.

One of the problems experienced by injured Federal employees is the lapse in time between the injury, their assertion of a claim, the receipt of claim forms by the BEC, and the commencement of payments. Much of this problem revolves around the processing of papers by agencies to the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. While some improvement can be achieved by the Bureau in expediting adjudications, the worker is unaware that the problem exists principally at the employing agency level.

He is aware only that he has experienced an injury, has taken all necessary steps to present his claim, yet must utilize his annual or sick leave, if available, or is in a leave without pay status. In the absence of compensation payments, the worker is not receiving the attention his plight deserves under the compensation law.

To alleviate this problem the bill authorizes Federal agencies to continue payment of an injured worker's salary for no more than 90 days at the applicable 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ - or 75-percent compensation rate. The interest of agencies would be

protected because they would be required to pay only in instances where they do not disagree with the claim. They would be able to controvert the claim and thus subject it to processing by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation.

The rationale of the 90-day period is that it would dispose of a majority of noncontroversial claims by the agencies subject, of course, to review by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. Employees would receive payments promptly, thus avoiding justified complaints about delays now encountered.

To make certain that the interest of all parties—the Government and the employee—are safeguarded, this provision would be administered only after promulgation of necessary regulations by the Secretary of Labor.

Generally speaking, claim for compensation on account of injury or death must now be made within 1 year. Failure to file within 1 year may be waived by the Secretary of Labor if filed in 5 years and the Secretary finds first, that the failure to comply was due to circumstances beyond the control of the individual claiming benefits; or second, that the individual claiming benefits has shown sufficient cause or reason in explanation of, and material prejudice to the interest of the United States has not resulted from, the failure.

Congress amended the statute in 1968 to permit local law enforcement officers to qualify for Federal Employees' Compensation Act benefits under certain specified circumstances involving a crime against the United States. Claims for injury or death in these situations may be made within 5 years after the occurrence.

A small number of meritorious claims of Federal employees are not paid because of the existing 1-year requirement. Rescinding the present 1-year time limit will provide parity between Federal workers and local law enforcement personnel in this regard, and will permit consideration of the limited number of justified claims which are now denied because of the rather stringent 1-year limit.

The maximum funeral allowance for deaths attributable to job-related injuries was fixed at \$800 in 1966. Since that time the average cost of funeral services have risen, just as other items in the economy.

One State has established \$1,250 as the maximum available for burial of fatally injured employees. Seven others have designated \$1,000 for this purpose.

These developments have resulted in increasing from \$800 to \$1,250 the allowance for this cost item in the bill.

When the price index maintained by the Bureau of Labor Statistics rises at least 3 percent and maintains or exceeds that rate for 3 consecutive months, compensation beneficiaries are entitled to a corresponding adjustment in monthly benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act. The bill adds 1 percent to that adjustment to account for the delay between the determination that cost of living has advanced to or surpassed the 3-percent figure and reflection of this development in monthly checks.

A similar provision was enacted by

Congress in 1969 for retired civil service employees.

Agencies are now required to reimburse the employees' compensation fund for expenditures for compensation received by their employees. The practice is known as a "chargeback." It was included in the 1966 amendments to the Compensation Act on the theory that it would make Federal agencies more aware of the need for eliminating conditions which would cause injuries to employees.

When hearings were undertaken by the House Education and Labor Subcommittee considering the legislation, vigorous opposition was voiced by employee representatives. They maintained that introduction of the chargeback would encourage agencies to repress justified compensation claims because of the impact on their budgets.

Since the enactment of the provision, Federal agencies have complained that it requires inclusion of compensation costs in their budget requests, thereby creating additional budgetary planning and execution problems. Further, many agencies maintain and compare their records with the charges levied by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, thereby creating further administrative expenditures.

The present statute prohibits payment of administrative expenses from the compensation fund—except for certain specialized legal services relating to subrogation of claims involving third parties. Consequently, the Bureau of Employees' Compensation receives funds for salaries and expenses through the normal appropriation process. This process, which involves continued justification of basic program items, takes up the time of the administration, the Bureau, and of course, the Congress.

A far more efficient system, somewhat like that used to administer the Civil Service Retirement Act, would permit the Bureau to plan to spend for administrative matters within the ceiling of 6 percent of the annual authorized compensation benefits. The bill so authorizes.

The figure of 6 percent is considerably lower than comparable expenditures in the private insurance field, yet it is believed to be sufficiently high to permit flexibility. Bureau expenditures for salary and expense at this point in time are between 4.5 and 5 percent.

In all compensation statutes, there are provisions for benefits to surviving widows and widowers and children of workers who die due to job related injuries. This is true in the Federal service also; and the bill increases the percentages payable to survivors of Federal employees to agree more with those States that have adopted higher benefits.

The present law limits the maximum level of benefits to surviving widows and widowers and children to 75 percent of the employee's earnings. We have retained this principle in the proposed legislation. At the same time, the percentage of salary payable has been generally raised by 10 percent and the division of benefits between a child or children and the surviving parent has been changed to provide more for the parent as the party responsible for the welfare of the children.

With this background, there follows a comparison of present benefits and those changes incorporated in the bill:

(In percent)

Survivors	Present total	Proposed total
1. Widow or widower, no child	45	55
2. Widow or widower, 1 child	55	65
3. Widow or widower, 2 children	70	75
4. Child alone	35	55
5. 2 children	50	65
6. 3 children	65	75
7. 1 parent ¹	25	35
8. 2 parents ¹	40	60
9. Wholly dependent brother, sister, grandparent, or grandchild	20	30
10. 2 or more wholly dependent brothers, sisters, grandparents, or grandchildren ¹	30	50
11. 1 or more partially dependent brother, sister, grandparent, or grandchild ¹	10	10

¹ Compensation may not exceed 75 percent after payments to widow or widower and children.

Finally, the bill proposes to "make whole" the Federal worker who is disabled by a job-related injury and later recovers to the point where he can resume Federal employment. The philosophy of workmen's compensation involves a commitment by the employer that an employee disabled because of conditions beyond his control should receive financial and medical assistance to protect himself and his family.

As a corollary, his tenure and status as a Federal employee should not be impaired, if he is able to return to work.

Therefore, the bill preserves all civil service rights of workers who recover from disabling injuries. Included are restoration to the same or equivalent position prior to the injury, entitlement to general salary adjustments and within-grade increases occurring during his absence from the job, and maintenance of retention rights, health, and life insurance coverage, promotions, and tenure.

As indicated above, the purpose of these provisions is to insure that the employee will incur no loss of status, rights, or benefits as a result of his work-related injury.

VICE PRESIDENT'S UNJUSTIFIED ATTACK ON AMERICA'S BLACK LEADERS

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with several of our colleagues to express my personal indignation over the recent verbal attack made by Vice President AGNEW against the black leaders in America. Having swept into his proscription "most" black leaders without naming any of them, he has, in effect, condemned them all, since none can say who was and who was not his intended target.

I can think of no figure in our national life in recent years who has done as much to debase the level of public discussion as our peripatetic Vice President. It was bad enough when he roamed around the United States using his office as a platform from which to hurl new

forms of insults, threats, and intimidations against those whose policies and positions did not conform to his political philosophy or self-interest. Following his lead in the 1970 political campaign, many of his party's candidates adopted personal vilification as a prime element of their campaign strategy. Happily, the voters in most instances indicated their displeasure with AGNEW-type tactics by electing the candidates who had been subjected to such abuse.

Undaunted, Mr. AGNEW has moved to the world stage to continue his diatribe against Americans in public life who happen to have incurred his displeasure. It used to be said that "politics stops at the water's edge." Whether this was ever desirable as a basis for national policy, it is obviously no longer realistic. But, surely it goes beyond the bounds of propriety and common sense for an American in public office to use an official trip abroad as a forum for public attacks on fellow Americans.

In so doing, and particularly in his calculated insult against the leaders of the millions of Americans of African ancestry, Mr. AGNEW has not only undermined the ability of all black American leaders to represent this country in dealing with the nonwhite majority of the world's population, but has demonstrated to all the world his authoritarian instincts, his narrowness of vision and his shortcomings as a statesman.

It is ironic that one sent abroad as a "goodwill ambassador" has managed so dramatically to project an image of ill will. He has thereby done a grave disservice to the America of Martin Luther King and Whitney Young, of Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt, and of the many living leaders, in and out of Government, who have dared to act to make real at home the creed that our Nation first proudly proclaimed to all the world, "that all men are created equal."

How unfortunate, how tragic that America's second highest elected official should so unmask his own failure to understand what America is all about.

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT F. KELLER, ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE 1971 COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a thoughtful and enlightening address recently delivered by the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Robert F. Keller, at the commencement exercises of Benjamin Franklin University, here in Washington, D.C., held on June 24, 1971.

I know that General Keller's address will be of interest to all Members of the House and the Senate not only because of the importance of the position which

he holds, but also for the sound, good sense and the positive, constructive approach of the message which he brings to the members of the under-30 generation.

The address follows:

"THE CHALLENGES TO CREATIVITY"

(Commencement address by Robert F. Keller)

A few days ago at one of our universities here in Washington, the commencement address was given by a newspaper columnist whose specialty is humor. I understand his remarks drew a good many laughs. Let me state at the outset: I am neither a columnist nor a humorist. You cannot look forward this evening to a searing commentary in the guise of humor on those who occupy positions of responsibility in the present Administration. Neither am I a Bob Hope. Some of you may recall the occasion a few years ago where Hope, speaking to a graduating class, said: "My advice to those of you who are anxious to go out into the world is—reconsider, and don't do it." But Bob Hope has had a change of heart. This year in speaking at a college graduation he had this advice: "To you people who are graduating—who are about to go out and make this a better world—all I can say is: HURRY! There is a lot of work to be done." And there is.

Not long ago I read in the papers about a new and big machine that can chew up a large tree into chips, from trunk to branch tips, in a matter of minutes. This example of modern technology and its threat to the environment is said to be the answer to the developer who has a heavily wooded area to clear so that he can build new houses. It takes 30, 50, 70 years to grow trees, depending on the size and kind; yet here is a machine that can make an entire tree disappear in minutes. Obviously, a machine of such devastating power must be used with extreme care.

Since we, in this country, often seem too ready to poke fun at our leaders and institutions, thereby chipping away at the public's confidence in society, this is another area where extreme care is always needed. Not that political and other leaders should be immune from ribbing and criticism. But there is a time and place for everything.

I have spent most of my working life in the Federal service, at the General Accounting Office—where we work closely with the Congress, its committees, and members, year in and year out—and I know how fragile and precious a thing public confidence is. Like the trees, it takes generations to build a viable society. Just because someone does like a particular administration or a particular public figure does not excuse those who—in that time-worn but apt phrase—seem all too ready to throw out the baby along with the bath water.

I came onto the job market in the 1930's. This was at the bottom of what was rightfully called the Great Depression. The ratio of unemployed to the total available work force was far higher than today's 6 percent. The economics of the depression pushed my generation off the campus into all kinds of experiences, few to our own choosing. Perhaps it was a good thing. We were forced to learn to swim even if the water was frigid.

Then along came World War II and most of us were directly affected. World War II was different from our involvement in Vietnam. But that is not the point; the point is that then, as today, forces were at play which drastically altered our personal lives and our career aims.

But these events had their plus side. They forced us to grow and develop. We wouldn't have planned it that way but, given those circumstances, most of us managed and emerged the better for it all. And that is why I do encourage you today to go out

into the world with conviction, courage, and with one other quality that is indispensable—as much common sense as you can bring to bear upon your experiences and adventures.

I am seconded in these thoughts by one of our great scientists, now a senior citizen, Dr. Vannevar Bush who for 60 years participated in, and helped to shape, the events of his lifetime. In a book of reminiscences published this year called "Pieces Of The Action," Dr. Bush has something of importance to say to us here today.

Dr. Bush says: "In every civilization, at some time, there has been confusion, with young men doing foolish things, with the great body of the public inert or yearning to be led somewhere, anywhere . . . Yet always there has been a small minority, intelligent, comprehending the current political system, scorning both the flighty radical and the protesting reactionary groups . . . It is this central core that ruled our last generation, its business, its churches, its government. Amid the tumult, we have today a group that understands and that will rule in the next generation. I am not saying that this outstanding group has always ruled us well in the past, or will rule as well in the future—I merely say there is a group that will rule. We do not need to worry too much about the ones that harass us with their insanities; as they become older they will be controlled. But we need to think more about the solid, keen, presently undemonstrative youths who will build our system of government and industry of the future, and who will build it not as we dictate, but as we transmit to them, as best we may, the wisdom to do it well."

What kind of a world are you going out into? Today's generation knows a lot more about the world than mine did when we were where you are now, so I hesitate to answer that question. Instead I suggest a sort of quantum jump to some 29 years ahead. Why 29 years? Because we are that close to a new century, the year 2,000 a.d.

This gets me to some extent into the business of making predictions on serious matters. Perhaps you have heard the nuclear physicist's definition of an optimist—"someone who still believes the future is uncertain"?

Toward the close of Thomas Jefferson's life—I am going back many generations now to 1825—about 10% of our people lived in cities and towns. By 1960—some 135 years later—some 70% of the population lived on 1% of the land—in cities and towns. The remaining 30% lived on 99% of the land. By 2000 a.d. 90% of the American people will live in urban areas on less than 2% of the land (excluding the new state of Alaska). Fortunately, much of the Nation will still be relatively open area. The chief effect of these changes will continue to be, as it is now, the necessity to adjust to mass living in large urban areas.

In 1935 the population of the United States was approximately 127 million. Now we are a nation of some 200 million. In the year 2000—if present trends continue—we may have a population of more than 340 million. The economic and social consequences of our population growth will multiply our responsibilities for providing food and shelter and by geometric progression.

There will be heavy concentrations of people on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts within 50 to 100 miles of the oceans. The population of the Atlantic seaboard today from Boston through Washington is upwards of 27 million. Bureau of Census projections show an increase to over 60 million along this 400 mile strip by 1990. An equally massive metropolitan area is foreseen for the 200 mile Pacific coast zone from Santa Barbara to Los Angeles to San Diego and the Mexican Border. The area from Chicago to Pittsburgh

and north to include Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Akron, Buffalo and Rochester will likely contain more than one eighth of the U.S. population.

These three areas will contain nearly one half of the total United States population, including the overwhelming majority of the most technologically and scientifically advanced, and most prosperous and creative elements.

Accompanying, and contributing to, the expansion in population and urbanization have been spectacular increases, in productivity—on the farm and in the factory, in transportation and communication, and in health and recreation. We have contrived to produce the products required to meet the needs of our society through the skillful application of resources and inventions and through the liberal use of the raw materials of the world. Today 5% of our people grow more than enough food for all the rest.

Much of the society that we know is a product of the scientific revolution which is in full tide over much of the world: in communications, nuclear power, medical care, increased production of food, and a seemingly limitless number of additional achievements.

In the United States both the number and production of professional manpower made up of scientists, engineers, and technicians is larger than ever before. In the 1960's they numbered nearly two millions; in the 1970's their number will climb to four million, or more.

But these figures do not tell the whole story. It is, and will be, the role of the scientists and engineers to discover and develop; it is, and will be, the role of others—no doubt most of you in this room—to understand the implications of these developments for both public and private benefit.

That is the challenge, as Dr. Jerome B. Weisner, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has said in his words, and I quote:

"Although most of us appreciate the individual creations of science for what they permit us to do, we do not fully comprehend the fundamental change that the scientific revolution has brought about. . . . Our only hope lies in understanding the forces at work, and then trying to guide the evolutionary process more to our liking."

In commenting on today's high standard of life in the United States and in words singularly appropriate to this occasion, Dr. Weisner has also said:

"I'm not sure we're all that much happy for having this degree of affluence. It may very well be that the young will teach us something about this; it is one of their sermons to us. There are other things in life."

If I were asked—what is the central aspect of concern today and tomorrow—I would say it is the change in the scale of movements and the sweep of events. This change of scale goes right across the board: from the pace of population growth to the increase of new inventions and new products, to communications to weaponry.

Unfortunately, the relentless drive to improve our material standard of living at a time of rapid growth in our population accelerates the depletion of our natural resources and increases the pollution of our environment. Resource depletion and pollution, in turn, have been important factors in increasing business costs.

The most careful planning, the highest degree of cooperation between business, government and labor, and the greatest ingenuity of our scientists and engineers will be necessary to resolve these and the many related social, environmental, and economic problems.

Our future will turn on reassessing and redefining our national priorities. You will live increasingly in an economy of priorities and of agonizing choices between public purposes and private preferences. Unless

some magic step is taken to achieve a national consensus as to our paramount purposes and goals the challenge of priorities will be one of the greater historical tests of our political machinery.

We must close the gap between the two cultures, the scientific and the humanistic. We can no more leave science entirely to the scientists than we can leave Government entirely to the politicians. We must comprehend the scientific environment. We must find ways to make science and public policy compatible, not merely as to national purpose, but particularly as to a working compatibility.

How else shall we make a contribution in the fields of weapons control and disarmament? In eliminating environmental pollution? In harnessing our energy sources for both human and industrial needs? In understanding the requirements of education and vocational motivation? In meeting the requirements of an exploding population at home and abroad? In providing the rising nations of the world with gifts of technology?

These are the questions that face you now as well as in the next 29 years and probably beyond. But I believe that no problem is more directly related to the future of our democratic society than the necessity of attracting the best talent available for the public service: That is where you come in.

While a democratic society's Government is not expected to have a monopoly of the most able people produced by that society, it can ill afford to provide for the public service an iota less than its full share of talent. And this applies to all our Governments: Federal, State, and local.

High on the list of the requirement for unusual talent is the accountant. As some of you may know, my organization in Government—the General Accounting Office—is observing its 50th anniversary this month. The law creating GAO came into being June 10, 1921 and GAO opened for business the following July 1. Between the time that GAO started and World War II, many circumstances profoundly affected the environment in which the accounting profession developed. The depression of the 1930's had forced the Federal Government out of its more neutral role in American society of earlier years. It began to grow. Its policies now began to affect economic, social, scientific, and other forces for improvement.

With World War II, the discovery of nuclear fission, and the cold war, the Federal Government grew even more rapidly. The policies of the Federal agencies as they became more involved with the private sector gave impetus to the accounting profession for developing higher standards of accounting, auditing, and reporting, and the development of expertise in related fields. Someone said recently: "The accountant should bow to Washington three times each morning because its laws and regulations have made the profession what it is." I don't buy that completely but it has had its effect.

Having become the biggest business in the world, the Federal Government looks at accounting as a great deal more than just recordkeeping. Today the needs of the Congress, agency heads, and the public requires that accounting be used not only as a tool for recordkeeping and for the evaluation of recordkeeping, but also as a tool for management and for the evaluation of management. Top management in the Government, including the Congress, had previously emphasized how well the agencies controlled and spent their appropriations. It is now equally, or even more, interested in knowing how efficiently the managers perform. Are programs achieving their objectives? Are better alternatives available? Because of this emphasis on more efficient management and program evaluation staff members of the

GAO have increasingly developed their capability in these fields.

I believe that there will be even greater challenges to creativity in the future than there have been in the past and that these challenges will include a need by the accountant for a greatly expanded body of knowledge. This will be true for all accountants—those in the Federal Government, in State and local governments, in private industry, in public accounting, and in the teaching professions.

The accountant is no longer a bookkeeper, a write-up man, or a tax preparer; he is a professional evaluator of and an adviser to management. As a professional, he must first obtain, usually from a formal educational process, a common body of knowledge. You have reached this point. But, throughout his life, he must—like doctors, engineers, scientists, and lawyers—continually learn and apply new knowledge as it is discovered.

In a society that is moving more and more toward placing human values above the physical and material; in a profession that increasingly uses automation and electronics in a great deal of its physical work; in organizations that now use teams of specialists to measure and evaluate performance in rapidly shifting circumstances, it seems clear that you will be called upon to be far more innovative and far more creative than those who have come before. It seems clear, in short, that the challenges to your creativity will be almost endless.

We are standing on the outer edge of that new world of auditing. You will soon be deep within it. Do you need any further encouragement from me? I don't think so. I think most of you are prepared to cope with the unforeseen and the unforeseeable.

I was concerned in preparing for this occasion. I wondered if I could communicate a message to you. In case I have not let me try once more. Appropriate to all I have said—and much more concise—are these words by the historian Elting Morison:

"How to give individual men the evidence they need to make sensible judgments about the kind of world they want to live in, and

"How to give them the power to make their judgments stick,

"That is the unfinished business of the next third of a century."

Thank you very much and my sincere congratulations to each and every one of you.

SACB APPROPRIATION

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include a memorandum.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to request permission to insert in the RECORD a memorandum that should put to rest some of the issues raised during the debate today on the motion to table the motion to instruct the conferees regarding the SACB appropriation. I am placing in the RECORD a legal memorandum that addresses itself to the principal legal issues that have been raised in connection with the issuance of Executive Order 11605. I believe this memorandum will document the legality and constitutionality of that order and I hope that all Members who have been concerned with these problems will read the memorandum and feel assured of the full justification for the issuance of the Executive order.

MEMORANDUM ON LEGAL ISSUES RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH EXECUTIVE ORDER 11605 AND THE SACB APPROPRIATION

Last year the Congress approved the appropriation for the Subversive Activities

Control Board for fiscal 1970. It was well aware at the time that recent court decisions had prevented the resources of the Board from being utilized to full advantage. Plans by the Attorney General to give the Board specific duties were then on the drawing boards and Congress therefore appropriated sufficient funds to keep the Board in business. These plans have been completed and the Board has been assigned specific and important functions, consistent with the other work previously delegated to it. We are met, however, with the paradox that the Senate is now willing to continue the Board's appropriation only on the condition that it remain essentially inactive. This, indeed, is the result created by the Senate's vote on Monday, July 19, which amended this year's appropriation bill so that the SACB will not have funds to carry out the duties assigned to it by the President pursuant to Executive Order 11605. See 117 Cong. Rec. 25898 for text of the Senate amendment.

In general, E.O. 11605 amended section 12 of E.O. 10450 to assign to the SACB the function of holding hearings, on the application of the Attorney General, to determine whether organizations fall into certain designated categories. It should be noted that the categories are virtually the same as those which existed previously. Within this general framework, however, criteria have been added designed to meet vagueness or due process problems and, as explained below, to insure that the order does not infringe on First Amendment rights. E.O. 11605 does not give the Board the power to hold hearings determining the rights of individuals.

Unfortunately, the Senate debate on the appropriation bill was marked by a number of statements which reflected basic misunderstandings of the authority for and scope of the order.

The function of designating organizations was previously conferred on the Department of Justice by the President by Executive Order. See E.O. 10450, section 12 (1953); E.O. 9835, Part III, para. 3 (1947). The list of organizations is prepared for the information of federal employees and for the convenience of persons completing applications for federal employment. Membership in or affiliation with a designated organization is one factor to be considered in connection with the employment or retention of individuals in federal service.

The order is therefore essentially an exercise of the of the President's authority, specifically conferred by Congress, to prescribe regulations for the employment of individuals as will best promote the efficiency of the Civil Service and to ascertain the character and ability of applicants for that service. 5 U.S.C. 3301. The validity of the listing power has been confirmed by the courts. *National Lawyers Guild v. Brownell*, 225 F. 2d 552, 556 (D.C. Cir. 1955), cert. denied, 351 U.S. 927 (1956); *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. Clark*, 177 F. 2d 79, 84 (D.C. Cir. 1949), reversed on other grounds, 341 U.S. 123 (1951).

Congress has given the President the power to delegate functions vested in him by law in addition to any general right that he may also have. 3 U.S.C. 301, 302. The number of orders accomplishing such delegations are legion. During the debate on the appropriation some suggestion was made that the President cannot expand the functions of an agency after they have been specified by Congress. But that is, after all, no more than the President does whenever he uses his delegation power. The quasi-independent status of the SACB does not preclude such delegation. The memorandum submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee (117 Cong. Rec. 25901) demonstrates that such delegations have been made without objection to agencies which may be characterized as independent or quasi-judicial such as the FPC (E.O. 10485); the FCC (E.O. 10530); the

Federal Reserve Board (E.O. 8843) and the ICC (E.O. 11423).

This is not therefore, as has been alleged, a case of the exercise of inherent power. Since the President has acted, pursuant to statutory authority conferred on him by Congress, citation by opponents of the appropriation to *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, (117 Cong. Rec. 25889, and 25896), where President Truman seized the steel mills without statutory authority, is not apposite.

Allegations have also been made that E.O. 11605 would violate the right of free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment. This allegation is without foundation in that the order fully protects these rights. The case of *Boorda v. SACB*, 421 F.2d 1132 (D.C. Cir. 1969), cert. denied, 397 U.S. 1042 (1970) overturned the SACB's statutory listing procedure, noting that it failed to distinguish, where feasible, between those engaged in constitutionally protected activities and those who are not. The present order complies with the rule of the *Boorda* case and provides for listing of organizations only when they engage in designated unlawful activities which are not sanctioned by the First Amendment. All the categories of groups which may be listed specify that the organization must act unlawfully. See section 12(d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) of E.O. 11605. The emphasis is on violation of specified laws, including commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States. See section 12(d)(1)-(4).

Any reference to advocacy in E.O. 11605 includes the proviso that such advocacy must be unlawful. The order is thus consistent with *Yates v. United States*, 354 U.S. 298, 321, quoted during the Senate debate (117 Cong. Rec. 25900), since it allows for the distinction between incitement and mere "doctrinal justification." The Supreme Court has, of course, continued to refine this distinction on a number of occasions, e.g., *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444, and the order is drafted so that the Board can take into account the First Amendment standards articulated by the Court as they develop.

By no stretch of the imagination would the order cover activities cited in the Senate debate such as placing peace symbols on cars, reading certain newspapers or filing petitions (117 Cong. Rec. 25574). Nor, as suggested could it include Senators opposing the appropriation. (*Ibid.*)

The request for an appropriation for the Board to enforce E.O. 11605 was therefore constitutional and legally justified.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of illness.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today and tomorrow, on account of illness.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. CRANE, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. LENT, on July 28, for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEMP, on August 4, for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUNNELS), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROY, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARNEY, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BIAGGI, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. COTTER, on July 28, for 60 minutes.

Mr. CAREY of New York, on July 28, for 30 minutes.

Mr. ECKHARDT, on July 28, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KOCH, to revise and extend his remarks made today.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), immediately following his remarks on the agricultural conference report today.

Mr. QUIE, to revise and extend his remarks immediately prior to the vote on the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York, to follow the motion he offered today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TIERNAN, immediately prior to the vote on the amendment offered by Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. RARICK to extend his remarks following Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia in debate in Committee of the Whole on his amendment.

Mr. RYAN, to extend his remarks prior to vote on Scheuer amendment today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEELE in 10 instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. ROBINSON of New York.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. ERLNBORN.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in four instances.

Mr. PELLY in three instances.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. TERRY.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. MAYNE.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. MIZELL.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. HARVEY in two instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. DU PONT in two instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUNNELS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. BURTON in two instances.

Mr. BADILLO in six instances.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in eight instances.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in five instances.

Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.

Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

Mr. UDALL in 10 instances.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in five instances.

Mr. STEPHENS in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. MIKVA in eight instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mrs. MINK in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mr. BEGICH in two instances.

Mr. CULVER in five instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

The bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1139. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, so as to permit certain persons under twenty-one years of age to obtain insurance coverage under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the committee on House Administration, reported that that

committee did on July 26, 1971, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1892. For the relief of Stephen C. Yednock.

H.R. 1907. For the relief of Arnold D. Smith.

H.R. 2110. For the relief of the estate of Julius L. Goepfing.

H.R. 2246. For the relief of Charles C. Smith.

H.R. 3344. To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable under prevailing mortgage market conditions direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code.

H.R. 3753. For the relief of Sgt. Ernie D. Bethea, U.S. Marine Corps (retired).

H.R. 6217. To amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

H.R. 7271. To authorize appropriations for the Commission on Civil Rights.

H.J. Res. 714. Designating the week of August 1, 1971, as "American Trial Lawyers Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 28, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

995. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Water Resources Council, transmitting the Council's report on a comprehensive program for water and related land use in the Ohio River Basin, pursuant to Public Law 89-80 (H. Doc. No. 92-148); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

996. A letter from the Tulsa Regional Solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the decision on appeal in the matter of the heirship determination of Julie Gonvil Pappan, deceased halfbreed Kaw allottee, pursuant to Private Law 90-318; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

997. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the second in a series of interim reports stemming from the U.S. Metric Study, prepared by the National Bureau of Standards, pursuant of Public Law 90-472; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 1. Joint resolution concerning the war powers of the Congress and the President; (Rept. No. 92-383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 561. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9922, a bill to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; (Rept. No. 92-384). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 562. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10090, a bill, making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, (Rept. No. 92-385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 9417; (Rept. No. 92-386). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 10091. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry on public, Indian, and other lands within the United States and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of industry and national defense; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELL (for himself and Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. QUIE):

H.R. 10092. A bill to assist school districts to meet special problems incident to desegregation, and to the elimination, reduction, or prevention of racial isolation, in elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERGLAND:

H.R. 10093. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 10094. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 10095. A bill to extend to hawks and owls the protection now accorded to bald and golden eagles; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 10096. A bill to amend chapter 81 of subpart G of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10097. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOW (for himself, Mr. DEVLUMS, Mr. ROE, Mr. SABRANES, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 10098. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured or used by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 10099. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to insure the procurement and use by the Federal Government of products manufactured from recycled materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOW (for himself, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 10100. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 10101. A bill to prohibit the alteration of coins in use and circulation for any purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10102. A bill to establish a joint Committee on Classified Information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10103. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for appointments to the service academies of sons of State and local policemen and firemen killed in line of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10104. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the appointment to the Merchant Marine Academy of sons of State and local law enforcement officers and firemen killed in line of duty; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 10105. A bill to amend the Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970 to extend for 6 months the existence of the organizational unit within the Civil Service Commission preparing a comprehensive job evaluation plan for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself and Mr. McCORMACK):

H.R. 10106. A bill concerning legal counsel of recipients of loans under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 10107. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MANN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 10108. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 10109. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1899, commonly referred to as the Refuse Act, relating to the issuance of certain permits; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 10110. A bill to provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANDRUM (for himself and Mr. DORN):

H.R. 10111. A bill to provide that the project referred to as the Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir on the Savannah River, Ga. and S.C., shall hereafter be known and desig-

nated as the Richard B. Russell Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 10112. A bill to grant child care centers status as educational institutions, and to assist such centers in raising capital by permitting donation of surplus Federal property for their use; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 10113. A bill to provide additional Federal assistance for State programs of treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 10114. A bill to provide for the construction and improvement of a certain road on the Navajo Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 10115. A bill to regulate the dumping of material in the oceans, coastal, and other waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10116. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10117. A bill to amend section 734 of title 44, United States Code, to require the Public Printer to furnish recycled material for the official use of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 10118. A bill to improve education by increasing the freedom of the Nation's teachers to change employment across State lines without substantial loss of retirement benefits through establishment of a Federal-State program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 10119. A bill to amend the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 and certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to retirement of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 10120. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 10121. A bill to prohibit any instrumentality of the United States from using as a prefix to the name of any person any title which indicates marital status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 10122. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make loans to associations of fishing vessel owners and operators organized to provide insurance against the damage or loss of fishing vessels or the injury or death of fishing crews, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 10123. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the retired pay of retired officers of the uniformed services shall not be reduced because of certain employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 10124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax

simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 10125. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize reduced-fare transportation on a space-available basis for certain persons who are 65 years of age or older; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOW, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIX, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 10126. A bill to prohibit common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 10127. A bill to prohibit the manufacture or importation of coin replicas unless such replicas are manufactured in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 10128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the continuation of the investment tax credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10129. A bill to establish an Independent Consumer Council as an independent nongovernmental organization to represent the economic interests of consumers of goods and services made available to them through the trade and commerce of the United States before Federal departments and agencies, to receive complaints and arbitrate voluntary adjustments thereof, to gather and disseminate information for the benefit of consumers, to authorize governmental assistance and support, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10130. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide equality of treatment for married female veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10131. A bill to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government serving under overseas limited appointment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 10132. A bill to provide a uniform administrative workweek for all employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 10133. A bill to provide benefits to survivors of firemen killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. POWELL, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 10134. A bill to restore the income tax credit for investment in certain depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 10135. A bill to amend section 11 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage

Control Act to except beer driver-salesmen from the requirement of obtaining a solicitor's license under that act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 10136. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize assistance to small business concerns in financing structural, operational, or other changes to meet standards required pursuant to certain Federal or State laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10137. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for more effective control of aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 10138. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Rural Development Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 10139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. RYAN):

H.J. Res. 808. Joint resolution designating August 26 of each year as "Women's Equality Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution to repeal the Formosa resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.J. Res. 810. Resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the period September 12, 1971, through September 20, 1971, as "Myasthenia Gravis Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 811. Joint Resolution to establish the Congressional Medal of Valor and to authorize its award to certain next-of-kin of servicemen missing in action or prisoners of war in Indo-China by the President with the advice and consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 812. Joint Resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the planning and design of a national memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.J. Res. 813. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating 1971 as the "Year of World Minority Language Groups"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H. Con. Res. 381. Concurrent resolution to establish a select joint committee to be known as the "Committee on Freedom of Information"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANN:

H. Res. 563. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H. Res. 564. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 565. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 10140. A bill for the relief of Ivan Augustus Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 10141. A bill for the relief of Michele Biundo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 10142. A bill for the relief of Emilia Ruffolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 10143. A bill for the relief of Eileen Catharine Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 10144. A bill for the relief of William E. Parrish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 10145. A bill to provide that a gold medal be presented to the widow of the late Louis Armstrong; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE—Tuesday, July 27, 1971

(Legislative day of Monday, July 26, 1971)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. DAVID H. GAMBRELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we beseech Thee to look with favor upon our Nation and our people. Though undeserved, Thou hast given us a great and good land rich in resources, both natural and human.

Manifest Thy presence in our lives, O Lord, giving us grace to fulfill Thy precepts, binding our diverse elements into a spiritual unity, guiding us in the establishment of full justice for all, and using us in the service of all mankind.

By Thy Spirit, lead the Members of this body to the highest truth and the best resolution of their waiting tasks.

May goodness and mercy follow us all our days, that we may abide with Thee forever. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. DAVID H. GAMBRELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GAMBRELL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 26, 1971, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 292, 293, 294, and 295.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFERRAL OF A BILL TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The resolution (S. Res. 46) to refer the bill (S. 634) entitled "A Bill for the relief of Michael D. Manemann" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims for a report thereon, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. RES. 46

Resolved, That the bill (S. 634) entitled "A bill for the relief of Michael D. Manemann", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims, and the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-299), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to refer the bill S. 634 entitled "A bill for the relief of Michael D. Manemann," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims. The Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case on the bill S. 634 which, by this resolution, is being referred to the Court of Claims are found in the departmental report on an identical bill (S. 557) of the 91st Congress, and are as follows:

From the records available to the Air Force, it appears that on January 16, 1962, as a result of a routine skin test for tuberculosis which had proven positive, Mr. Manemann was given a chest X-ray at a U.S. Air Force dispensary in Taiwan. The Air Force physician who analyzed the X-ray film reported it as

negative, i.e., as showing no sign of tuberculosis. The medical records do not show any further action in Taiwan after this "negative chest" report.

On March 25, 1965, Mr. Manemann underwent a routine medical examination for entrance into the military service. This medical examination included a chest X-ray which proved abnormal, showing an infiltrate and a cavitary lesion in the left lung. As a result, on March 26, 1965, he was admitted to the Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver, Colo., for treatment. X-rays at Fitzsimons, taken that date, revealed a nodular infiltrate throughout the left lung with a thin-walled cavity in the left upper lobe. The diagnosis was advanced tuberculosis.

By July 22, 1965, the infiltrate was cleared, through drug therapy, and some reduction of the cavity was also accomplished. However, surgery was eventually required. Mr. Manemann underwent lung operations on November 4, 1965, and again on November 29, 1965, at Fitzsimons General Hospital. The postoperative hospital course was satisfactory and Mr. Manemann was discharged from the hospital on February 17, 1966. He was placed on prescribed medication, to be followed at the Fitzsimons Outpatient Tuberculosis Clinic. He visited the clinic monthly for the following year, during which time no symptoms or signs of the disease reappeared. At the time of the January 1967 visit, it was reported that he was employed in fairly heavy work and tolerating it well. His last visit to the Fitzsimons Clinic was on February 9, 1967, at which time it was understood that Mr. Manemann would have periodic checkups at a local county clinic. It has since been reported that Mr. Manemann has progressed satisfactorily, that there has been no residual disability, and that he is presently employed as a mechanic for an automobile agency. Pulmonary function studies of Mr. Manemann's lungs, conducted at Fitzsimons General Hospital, September 18, 1968, resulted in a finding of "mild obstructive defect with normal vital capacity."

In 1966, Mr. Manemann filed a suit against the United States under the so-called Federal Tort Claims Act. The suit was based upon the same allegation of negligence as contained in S. 557. The case was dismissed on the basis of the foreign country exception in the Federal Tort Claims Act (*Manemann v. U.S.*; C.A. Colo. 1967, 381 F2d 704) which, without regard to the question of negligence, provides that the United States may not be sued for torts of its officers or employees allegedly occurring outside the United States.

A remedy was available to Mr. Manemann, however, in that he could have filed a claim under the so-called Military Claims Act (10 U.S.C. 2733) any time within the 2-year statute of limitations prescribed by that act, that time having expired on March 25, 1967. However, the Department of the Air Force has no record of a claim having been filed.

There having been no trial on the merits and no claim filed, there was no occasion for investigation of Mr. Manemann's case until presentation of S. 3188, 90th Congress, in 1968, that bill being the predecessor of S. 557,