DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 24, 1960.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when this bill, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, was approved by the House of Representatives it carried a price tag of $4,184 million. That was $164 million above the budget figures and it was my opinion then that it was too rich.

Now the bill comes back to us today from the other body and we find it calls for the spending of $4,354 million in this fiscal year or $334 million above the budget figures.

This is budget busting with a vengence.

It should be remembered, too, that this is the bill which provides funds for the National Defense Education Act under which fellowships are financed for studies such as comparative literature, the theater, home economics, animal ecology, the ecology and economics of flowing waters, political science, music, and folklore. What a study of the theater, music, folklore, and all the rest have to do with national defense has never been explained.

This is the appropriation which also provides several thousand dollars for a study of dog discipline; a $50,000 grant for a study of bird sounds; a $30,000 study of the circulatory physiology of the octopus, and a $33,000 grant to a foreign university for a study of both the intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of the role of relationship of husband and wife.

These are but a few of the inexplicable grants made under the appropriations to these departments and related agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I could not support this bill when it was before the House and exceeded the budget figures by $164 million. It is unthinkable that it should come back to us from the other body and the conferees should ask us to support it with increases which bring it $334 million above the budget recommendation.

I say again that this is budget busting at its worst and I want my vote recorded in opposition.

The conference report was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: On page 2, line 17, insert the following:

"WORKING CAPITAL FUND

"The paragraph under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 210) is amended to read as follows: "'Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department; (4) a central tabulating service; (5) telephone, mail and messenger services; (6) a central accounting and payroll service; and (7) a central laborers' service: *Provided,* That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further,* That such fund shall be reimbursed in advance from funds available to bureaus, offices, and agencies for which such centralized services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment'."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, and on that motion I ask recognition to explain the conference report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were to have an explanation of this bill before the conference report was voted on.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 193]

Alexander	Holifield	Morrison
Barden	Holt	Murray
Baumhart	Ikard	Nix
Blitch	Kearns	Norrell
Bolling	Kilburn	Passman
Bowles	King, Calif.	Patman
Celler	King, Utah	Powell
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Preston
Dixon	Landrum	Quie
Durham	Lipscomb	Rains
Glenn	Loser	Rogers, Mass.
Goodell	McDowell	Shelley
Grant	McSween	Smith, Kans.
Gray	Magnuson	Taylor, N.Y.
Healey	Mahon	Thompson, La.
Hébert	Mitchell	Vinson
Hess	Moeller	Withrow
Hoffman, Ill.	Morris, Okla.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 378 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet at the time the conference report was adopted, in order to give a brief explanation, but apparently did not make it clear that I desired recognition. I would, therefore, like to explain it at this time.

This is a unanimous conference report. Every member of the conference signed it. As is always the case, there were some members of the conference that felt that the appropriations were too high in some areas, and others felt they were too low, but we were all agreed that a good compromise resulted from the four sessions that we held.

The total of the bill as it passed the House was $4,184,022,731. As it passed the Senate the total was $4,485,788,931, or an increase over the House bill of $301,766,200. The conference agreement totals $4,354,357,931, or $131,431,000 less than appropriated by the Senate bill.

There were 83 Senate amendments to the bill. Most of them involved rather small amounts. The large increase was in the Public Health Service. In the field of medical research alone the House bill provided $455 million for the National Institutes of Health. The Senate bill increased this figure to $664 million, or an increase over the House bill of $209 million. So in this one field the increase accounts for over two-thirds of the total increase for the whole bill. The conference agreement was $560 million, or a decrease of $104 million below the Senate bill, and $105 million over the bill as it passed the House. This represents approximately two-thirds of the total amount by which the entire bill is now over the amount passed by the House last March.

Another significant item in conference was for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton program. The House originally provided $150 million for this program, and this was increased by the Senate to $211,200,000, or an increase of $61,200,000. The conferees adopted the figure of $186,200,000, which keeps the amount at the same level as for last year. This is an increase of $36,200,000 over the House bill and $25 million under the Senate bill. These two items, the National Institutes of Health and the hospital construction program, account for over 80 percent of the increase provided by the conference report over the bill as it originally passed the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much was it over the budget?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is $334,135,950 over the budget.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thought this bill was exceedingly rich when it left the House at $4,184 million. Now it is $164 million above the House figure, and $334 million above the budget recommendation.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I tried to explain at that time, it was a compromise that we reached in the House last March. Some of us wanted to include more in the House bill than we did and others wanted to spend less, but we came out with a unanimous report on the agreement that was reached. Then the other body increased it by $300 million. After four long sessions, we have finally made this compromise.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately prior to the vote on the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without obligation, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the following tabulation shows up-to-date comparison with the President's budget requests for the session on the appropriation bills. At the insistence of the other body, the 16 bills thus far cleared, including the excessive Labor-HEW total reported in this morning's RECORD, exceed the corresponding budget requests to $301,807,547. Excessive nondefense appropriations pushed the total over the budget.

The two bills—public works and mutual security—on which conferences are being held today offer the last practicable opportunities to bring the total under the budget requests.

At a time when our gold reserves are continuing to dwindle, when the cost-of-living hits a new high nearly every 30 days, when the buying power of the dollar is less than half what it was only a few years back, when business profits on which the Treasury heavily depends to help pay the bills are slacking off—the situation demands that we stay within the budget.

The tabulation follows:

Status of the appropriation bills for the 86th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 25, 1960

	Bills compared with House	Bills compared with budget
Net total for the 16 session bills enacted		+$301,807,547
Loan authorizations		(+211,400,000)
Pending:		
1. Public works, as passed by the Senate	+$115,211,620	+25,869,425
2. Mutual security, as passed by the Senate	+399,304,000	−292,650,000
As the bills now stand (appropriations)	+514,515,620	−266,780,575

NOTE.—Supplemental bill is yet to come.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this bill or have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee with reference to the student loan fund. What disposition was made of that title?

Mr. FOGARTY. Last March, when the bill passed the House originally, we gave the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare everything that they asked for. They told us at that time that they would probably have to come back for a supplemental appropriation. That will be taken up on tomorrow in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill. It is not in this bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Then, do I understand correctly that there will be funds in the supplemental appropriation bill for the student loan fund?

Mr. FOGARTY. The bill is to be reported tomorrow and so I cannot answer the gentleman at this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield at that point, as I understand the situation, if amendment No. 16 is adopted, they can spend anything they like. I did not understand that that was brought up with the idea that it was going to be agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, that that is in another area and will be charged against next year's appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but it is not limited.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is the same as we are doing with reference to social security grants for public assistance and other similar programs. Then the advances are charged against the appropriation when it is made. This is what it says on page 20 of the bill "to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year."

That is the language of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but there is no limitation on what they can spend and while it might be charged to an appropriation, obviously, they can go ahead and spend anything they like.

Mr. FOGARTY. The limitation is there since they cannot spend more than what the Congress appropriates. If they spend more in that first quarter, than they should, then they are going to have to make up for it by cutting back the rest of the year.

Mr. TABER. It is a contract on the part of the Congress to provide the money and we cannot get out of it.

Mr. FOGARTY. We do this for the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of Employment Security in connection with their grant programs and we have not had any problems with reference to it.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Is the intention made clear here that it is not a contract authority and that a contract could not be read into this?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Under this provision in amendment 16 they are authorized to take the money out of the Treasury, and there is no way to get it back after they receive it.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Do I understand that the 15 percent overhead has been maintained in this conference report?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have had some serious reservations as to the advisability of expanding some of these programs as rapidly as we have. In talking with some of the administrators of schools in the administration of these research grants it seems to me we could well give consideration next year to increasing the indirect costs but not accelerating the actual grants as we have been in the past.

Mr. FOGARTY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I think maybe something should be done, but perhaps in the other direction. A study has just been completed under a grant made by the National Institutes of Health that dealt with the question of overhead costs. I would like to read it, because there is a serious question raised by this grantee as to whether any overhead costs ought to be paid.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman knows probably better than I do that the determination of costs is not uniform, not the same for different departments of Government, not the same for the National Institutes of Health, for instance, as for the military. Different formulas are used. It seems to me desirable to have uniform treatment in this regard. Some administrators of schools have serious reservations as to the adequacy of 15 percent.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss in a little more detail the action taken with respect to the appropriations agreed to for the National Institutes of Health.

THE BASIS FOR AGREEMENT

First, I should like to emphasize that I believe there is almost complete agreement between the House and the Senate concerning the basic philosophy under which the Federal Government should act in respect to medical research. This was reflected in the attitude of the conferees from both Houses in their discussions of the items that were in disagreement in this bill.

Their attitudes reflected complete agreement upon the significance of medical research, upon the objectives to be sought, and in general upon the approaches which should be followed in attaining such objectives.

The basic problems which the conferees faced were to find a financial plan consistent with these agreed-upon basic

principles and that was also realistic in terms of operational requirements.

I should like, as I did last year, to report to the House the gratification I experienced in participating with the immediate members of the Senate and my distinguished colleagues in the House in the conference discussions concerning these medical research appropriations. There was, as always, a forthright exchange of views which, as I have said, did not differ in respect to basic principles but only in honest attempts to determine the optimum level of support of these programs in order to achieve the most effective results.

The conferees have agreed to accept a figure of $560 million as the total for the several appropriations of the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1961. This amount is $104 million under the amount in the Senate version of this bill and $105 million above the allowance originally made by the House in its passage of this bill. It is, however, $160 million greater than the amount which the President had requested for these appropriations in his budget last January.

MEDICAL RESEARCH AND THE NATIONAL BUDGET

To those who are concerned about this increase I should like to say this: The President's budget proposals for fiscal year 1961 in the field of medical research in essence set forth the point of view that the development of medical research in the United States should not be accelerated. This view, I am afraid, was based wholly upon fiscal considerations.

The Congress this year, as it has in past years, has again emphasized that maintaining the existing level of our national medical research effort is a completely unwise, if not disastrous, course of action to follow.

We cannot stand still in our search for knowledge. We cannot mark time or restrain research because of contrived fiscal reasons or for misleading arguments that research is inflationary or that there are economic obstacles which stand in the way. This attitude, I believe, reflects an utter and complete misunderstanding of the meaning that medical research has for the Nation.

It is my view, and I believe the view of this Congress, that a strong and sustained and increasing medical research effort is sound national economics. The effect of medical research is not inflationary, nor does it threaten progress in other areas of our national economy.

The ultimate product of medical research is an enlargement of the wealth of this Nation. This wealth comes from the increased national productivity which derives from a well population, from reducing the loss in energy and creativity resulting from disease, and the longer effective lifespan of our people.

This Nation now spends over $21 billion for doctors bills, for the operation of hospitals, for the purchase of drugs and medicines, and other forms of medical care and health services. This vast national expenditure is a burden which can be substantially modified if we can move forward with our medical research programs.

BETTER HEALTH AND GREATER PRODUCTIVITY

Medical research can change in a radical and revolutionary manner the whole pattern of medical care, hospital services, and health practices. The achievements and the progress that is possible as a result of research findings can drastically reorder the nature of health manpower requirements and the whole pattern of medical, hospital, and health services and expenditures of the Nation.

This is not only possible, but it has happened, and happened numerous times. Outstanding instances of the revolutionary consequences of the findings of medical research are the following:

First. The whole character of the treatment of infectious disease has changed, the great threats that the pneumonias and other dangerous infections posed in the past have been almost completely dispelled by the emergence of the antibiotics. This is the result of research efforts. On the other hand, the common cold still costs the Nation as much as $2 billion a year in industrial absenteeism.

Second. We have witnessed in the past few years the diminishment of tuberculosis as a major cause of death and illness in this country as a result of the development of new drugs effective in the care of this dreaded disease. The whole structure of hospitalization in the Nation has changed as a result. Large numbers of tuberculosis hospitals throughout the country have closed or been converted to other uses and all the health manpower, nurses, technicians, and physicians, once demanded for the treatment of tuberculosis, have now directed their skills and energies to other urgent health and medical care problems. On the other hand, recent increases in the attack rate of cancer of the lung places this condition foremost in the causes of death from lung involvements.

Third. We are witnessing today a basic change in the approach to the treatment of mental illness as a result of the remarkable discovery made concerning the relationship of drugs and psychological and psychiatric conditions. For the first time we have seen the total population of our mental institutions decrease and we are looking forward, as a result of the intensified efforts in this area engendered by the actions of the Congress of the United States, to new and heartening prospects in the solution of the problems of mental illness. This, again, is an achievement of medical research that is reshaping the entire character of our community health efforts and recovering for the Nation the vast creative potential of these once ill minds. Nonetheless, the mentally ill still occupy one out of two hospital beds throughout the country, and in the aggregate this group of illnesses cause the taxpayer the loss of approximately $2.5 billion.

On the basis of these few isolated but dramatic instances of the influence and effect of medical research on the one hand and of the problems yet to be solved on the other, it is possible to see that the continued movement forward in medical research holds the promise of completely transforming the balance of national expenditures and productivity in the future. The concept that we must maintain the line on expenditures for medical research, is the same as saying that we must stop now, not pursue the promising leads that have opened in respect to the viral origin of cancer, nor seek virus vaccines to control the common cold, we must not expand our effort to understand the biochemical basis of schizophrenia, we must stop now our promising inquiry into the nature of heart disease. That we must mark time, hold opportunities that now beckon in abeyance and direct our attention to a budget balance sheet. To do all this is to deny the strength and promise of our scientific capability.

It is not the role of medical research to wait. The promise of the future is too bright and too great.

Medical research is a revolutionary force. It can change in a radical manner the level of national productivity, the life expectancy of our people, and our prospect of well-being.

This progressive decrease in the ravages of disease, the tragedy of premature death, and the progressive increase in the productivity of our people and our Nation is to me an objective without parallel when we consider what our national purpose should be.

It is toward this end which we are moving in the level of appropriations which I present here to you today as a result of the House and Senate conference on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

A budget of over a half a billion dollars for the National Institutes of Health is a complicated matter. It cannot be intelligently considered except through a detailed consideration of its various parts. The following table will in summary indicate the nature of the conference agreement.

I should like to emphasize that the specific amounts set forth in this table for the individual program elements comprising the several appropriations are not intended to be fixed or absolute levels of expenditure for the individual items. When changing operating circumstances require, I believe it important to leave it up to the good judgment of the program operators to make such adjustments in these amounts as is necessary in the interest of effective progress and prudent utilization of resources.

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Senate increases	Conference agreement
Grants for research and training:					
1. Research projects at 15 percent indirect costs	$205,589,000	$235,189,000	$262,389,000	+$27,200,000	$260,000,000
(a) Increase required to pay 25 percent indirect costs	0	0	22,681,000	+22,681,000	
2. Research fellowships	14,570,000	15,070,000	22,500,000	+7,430,000	20,000,000
(a) 1960 unpaid, approved applications	(5,444,948)				
3. Training grants	66,894,000	78,894,000	128,991,000	+50,097,000	110,000,000
(b) Increase provided for forward notification on graduate training grants	0	(9,565,000)	(16,445,000)	(+6,880,000)	(16,445,000)
State control programs	10,375,000	12,975,000	13,475,000	+500,000	13,000,000
Community demonstration projects	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,625,000	+125,000	1,500,000
Clinical research centers	3,000,000	3,000,000	55,000,000	+52,000,000	20,000,000
Primate centers	2,000,000	2,000,000	12,000,000	+10,000,000	7,000,000
Construction of cancer research facilities	0	5,000,000	0	−5,000,000	5,000,000
Cancer and mental-neurology buildings construction	0	0	12,839,000	+12,839,000	12,839,000
Total, extramural programs	303,928,000	353,628,000	531,500,000	+177,872,000	449,339,000
Direct operations:					
1. Chemotherapy contracts	21,145,000	21,145,000	23,140,000	+1,995,000	21,500,000
2. Other direct operations	74,927,000	80,227,000	83,860,000	+3,633,000	82,161,000
Total, intramural programs	96,072,000	101,372,000	107,000,000	+5,628,000	103,661,000
New areas:					
1. Medical libraries	0	0	5,000,000	+5,000,000	0
2. Communications research and translation	0	0	4,500,000	+4,500,000	0
3. Instrumentation research	0	0	5,000,000	+5,000,000	0
4. Career development	0	0	4,000,000	+4,000,000	2,000,000
5. International medical research	0	0	7,000,000	+7,000,000	5,000,000
Total, new areas	0	0	25,500,000	+25,500,000	7,000,000
Grand total	400,000,000	455,000,000	664,000,000	+209,000,000	560,000,000

I should like to explain for the information of the House, the basis of the conference action in each of the major NIH functional areas and relate the amounts proposed for these areas to the levels contained in the appropriation bill passed by the House earlier in the year.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

A total of $260 million is provided to be utilized for the making of grants in support of medical research projects carried out in the universities, medical schools, and research institutions in the country. This amount will provide the funds necessary to continue the research programs which are now underway supported by NIH grants in these institutions and in addition permit the awarding of grants for most new applications received during fiscal year 1961 which withstand the rigorous scientific review carried out by the NIH review bodies and which are recommended for payment as being important to the solution of major disease problems by these several National Advisory Committees of the NIH.

This total increase in funds for research grants should be viewed in terms of the important areas of research inquiry which will benefit. A very few of these areas selected as examples of both past progress and present opportunity would include viruses and the cause of cancer, radiation and the treatment of cancer, drugs and the mentally ill, surgery and heart disease, dental caries and infectious agents, causation of arthritis and drugs for treatment, arteriosclerosis and strokes and a whole host of such practical problem areas as mental retardation, drug addiction, alcoholism, to say nothing of the pressing medical problems of our elder citizens.

FELLOWSHIPS

A total of $22 million is provided for the support of research fellowships in fiscal year 1961. This program of research fellowships is an essential activity directed toward the development of the supply of senior teachers and research investigators which will be needed to staff the medical schools and research laboratories of the future. This allowance will permit the payment of substantially all the backlog of unpaid-approved fellowship applications now in hand and extending the senior fellowship awards to include the clinical areas. It will also permit providing broader support for medical students and enlarging the foreign fellowship program. This amount also includes $2 million for the awarding of approximately 100 research fellowships as a means of establishing research professorships to enlarge opportunities for stable careers in academic medicine and research.

TRAINING GRANTS

An amount of $110 million is provided for the support of training grants to support training in the sciences and disciplines basic to medicine and medical research where shortages continue to exist in terms of current needs and to provide for enlargement of the trained research manpower of the future. Included in this amount is sufficient funds, estimated at $16.4 million, to permit reordering the payment periods for training grants which will allow such grants to be made on a forward payment basis—an arrangement necessary to permit proper planning and effective conduct of these programs.

Important areas of manpower development which will be benefited by this increase in training grant funds include:

Investigators in the sciences fundamental to clinical medicine.

Experimental approaches to providing greater research and scientific content to the training of physicians.

Research pharmacologists in the field of mental disorders.

A wide range of specialized manpower contributory to cardiovascular research.

Virologists, immunologists, and immunochemists whose work is basic in the fields of infectious diseases and allergies, and now of crucial importance to virus-cancer investigations.

Investigators able to pursue genetic phenomena at the molecular level.

Biophysicists and biochemists who can pursue the basic phenomena of chemical and energy transformations at the cellular level.

Research neurophysiologists and neuroanatomists essential to the research attack upon the disorders of vision and cerebrovascular diseases.

CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTERS

A major feature of the conference agreement is the provision of funds for several special programs which had been included in the Senate-passed version of the appropriation bill and had their origins in the extensive recommendations made by the Jones committee. Most important amongst these special programs is the designation of $20 million for the further development and support of a program for the establishment of large-scale clinical research centers throughout the country This program has its origins in the efforts made by the National Institutes of Health to provide support for a series of clinical and metabolic research facilities undertaken in fiscal year 1960.

During this past year some eight grants, totaling approximately $3 million, were made to eight medical institutions in the country. These grants provided funds for the establishment of specially designed clinical and metabolic research facilities, staffed and equipped to meet the growing needs of programs involving research investigations in the clinical area. This program has met with enthusiastic support and approval in the research community of the Nation. The Jones committee report called for an enlargement of this program to permit the establishment of broadly based clinical research centers. It is intended that these centers will provide a stable framework in which a variety of medical and scientific disciplines can be organ-

ized for a concentrated attack upon major disease or health problems. All laboratory and clinical facilities and supporting services necessary for the research program to be carried out would be encompassed within such centers.

The Senate-passed version of the bill provided $55 million for these research centers. The conferees have agreed that a level of $20 million is perhaps a more realistic and feasible level to initiate what undoubtedly will be a substantial program of great importance to the further development of medical research in the Nation.

PRIMATE RESEARCH CENTERS

A total of $7 million is provided for the further development of centers for research utilizing subhuman primates. This program was begun in fiscal year 1960 when $2 million was made available. These funds were granted for the establishment of a large primate center near Portland, Oreg. This center will make available several species of primates in adequate numbers and with appropriate facilities to meet the needs of scientists engaged in research requiring the use of primates. Although the Senate proposed a level of $12 million in fiscal year 1961 for this purpose, the conferees agreed that $7 million, a reduction of $5 million from the Senate allowance, but an increase of $5 million over the House allowance, would be an adequate amount to satisfy the more urgent needs in this area during fiscal year 1961. On the basis of experience gained in this more modest initial effort, it will be possible to develop an appropriate goal in this important program area.

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

The conferees also agreed that special emphasis in fiscal year 1961 should be given to the further extension of NIH research programs through support of investigators in foreign countries working in fields important to the program objectives of the several institutes. The Senate allowance for this purpose totaled $7 million. The conferees agreed that $5 million was a more appropriate amount for this purpose. In the conferees' view this amount should be utilized in addition to current funds now being utilized for research support of foreign investigators.

CONSTRUCTION

A total of $12,839,000 is provided for two important building projects at the National Institutes of Health; $12,139,000 of this amount will be for the planning and construction of a joint mental health-neurology basic science laboratory building; $700,000 is intended to be utilized for the planning of a new building to house cancer research activities at NIH. These projects will provide the means to deal with the increasingly difficult problems of space shortage which are hampering the progress of research activities at the Bethesda installation of NIH.

A special item of $5 million has been provided in the cancer appropriation to be utilized for taking care of a special need in the development of cancer research facilities which require nonmatching funds.

The conferees agreed to allow the full authorized maximum of $30 million to be used for matching grants for research facilities construction under the health research facilities construction program. This amount was previously allowed in both the Senate- and House-passed versions of the bill, but is an increase of $5 million over the President's budget request.

I have attempted in the foregoing to single out the major elements of increase in this over important series of appropriations. Both the Senate and House reports contain observations concerning the views of Congress on the direction and emphasis which should be given in the development and conduct of these national research programs. The National Institutes of Health is expected to pay careful attention to these observations in the planning and development of its programs during the forthcoming year.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and all the members of the subcommittee, for the very fine bill they have brought in. One item particularly is of vital importance to the people of Chicago, namely, the appropriation of $500,000 to undertake a study of water pollution in the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway. The total cost of this survey as estimated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is $12 million. The fund approved by this bill permits a significant start on that survey.

I stated that this appropriation is of vital importance to the people of the city of Chicago, but that is an inadequate understatement. Actually, this is a national bill. It is of vital importance to the people living on the Great Lakes because it seeks to protect that vital water resource for the enjoyment of those living today, and for future generations to come. It is of importance to all the people of our Nation, not only in the preservation of the waters of the Great Lakes but because of the essential scientific information the study will elicit. For decades literally, a harassing, vituperative verbal and legal battle has been fought between the States bordering on the Great Lakes and the people of Chicago. Chicago needs the waters of Lake Michigan to live. Chicago needs such waters to dispose of it sewage and waste so that its people may continue to grow and prosper.

Years ago, when the city's pollution was discharged into the lake, it contaminated the drinking water and epidemics of typhoid ravaged Chicago's population. It was only when the flow of the Chicago River was reversed and a portion of Lake Michigan's waters were diverted to move the waste along the Illinois Waterway, that Chicago's health problem was solved.

Water is a precious resource and the opposition of our sister States to our withdrawal of water can be understood if not appreciated. They have flung recriminations against the people of Chicago charging that we are stealing water from the Great Lakes, which is untrue. The water has not been stolen. It has been withdrawn pursuant to authority granted by the Federal Government. The fact remains that the disputants have been at loggerheads. The effort has been made to withdraw an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water from Lake Michigan as an experiment for 1 year to determine whether such withdrawal would have any harmful effects upon Chicago's sister communities on the Great Lakes. Objection to the proposal has been violent, not only in the debates in the Halls of Congress, but in the courts in a suit filed by a number of the States in the Supreme Court of the United States to require Chicago to return its sewage into the Great Lakes.

This appropriation approving the study brings the olive branch of peace to the dispute. For the first time the parties will be able to obtain tangible facts where speculation and estimates existed before. For the first time actual measurements can be taken of the effect of the diversion on lake levels and upon harbor, shipping, and power facilities. For the first time, a scientific study will be made of lake currents and drifts to ascertain the situation in the lower end of Lake Michigan to determine whether sewage may be safely returned therein or whether the method now used by the city in washing it along the Illinois Waterway is not only the preferable method but the only feasible method.

The time for accusations, for invective, for playing politics with the diversion issue is over. This is the time for cooperation and working together, for purposeful mature effort to obtain the basic information which will permit everyone to know what to do and to take the steps necessary to preserve this vital water resource and the health of our communities.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 6, line 2, insert "including conveyance by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the United States of title to the land on which such building is to be situated,"

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 14, line 14 insert:

"PHARMACOLOGICAL-ANIMAL LABORATORY BUILDING

"For plans and specifications for a special pharmacological-animal laboratory for the Food and Drug Administration, $150,000."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein, with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named therein, insert "$100,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 19, line 25, insert "Grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, loans, and payments under all titles of the National Defense Education Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligatons incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides, as follows:

Grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, loans, and payments under all titles of the National Defense Education 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 for the same purpose for that fiscal year.

Under this amendment No. 16 there is carte blanche authority given to the agency to do what it pleases and incur any liability it might want to and take the money out of the Treasury. Frankly, so far as I am concerned, I am not prepared to let any agency have that authority, therefore I hope the House will refuse to approve this motion.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this language is exactly the same as that carried in the bill in previous years for grants made by the Bureau of Employment Security, and we have also done it for social security programs. If we do not do this it will be impossible for the program to operate in these colleges where the students are asking for loans if the appropriation bill is late next year.

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

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

Mr. TABER. If we are going to do things this way and allow them to take the money right out of the Treasury, there is no restraint whatever.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. This would permit them under the National Defense Education Act to grant funds for the study of the theater, music, jazz, and the policy and economics of flowing water, and all that sort of thing, is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. This bill does not govern that at all. The basic legislation governs that.

Mr. GROSS. They have made grants for fellowships for the study of those things.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman did a very good job when the bill was on the floor in bringing to light some of these problems. I assume they have corrected any weaknesses because of the gentleman's interest in the program.

Mr. GROSS. Under the language of this amendment they can go even further.

Mr. FOGARTY. This would allow the students to get these loans even if the annual appropriation bill is late in being passed and thus enable the administrators and the schools and colleges operating under the program to carry out a better program.

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

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to inquire if the adoption of this amendment will make available sufficient funds for the applications of these students for loans?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. That will be taken up tomorrow in connection with a deficiency appropriation bill. There is a request pending before that committee to increase funds for student loans. That will be taken up at that time. This pertains to the first quarter of the next fiscal year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. From what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said, as I understand it under this bill this group could go direct to the Treasury and get their money. I assume that the House has something to do with appropriations. I understood the gentleman to say earlier that the Senate increased the bill we sent over by something like $500 million, is that right?

Mr. FOGARTY. It was not quite that much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Senate increased the bill by a little over $300 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Three hundred million dollars. I thought they had in their bill $500 million and you cut it down or your committee cut it down to $300 million?

Mr. FOGARTY. I mentioned a figure of $664 million for the National Institutes of Health. We cut that figure by $104 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My information is that over the years every bill we sent over there they up it; is that not right?

Mr. FOGARTY. We think we did a pretty good job in reaching the compromise we did this year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In reality we do not have too much to say about how much is appropriated.

Mr. FOGARTY. We do by our votes.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of the other body ever cutting this particular appropriation bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. Not this one. This affects every section of our society. It affects human beings. It is a popular field. The people are vitally affected and so are interested in these programs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman agree that it also affects the taxpayers of the country?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. And I am sure the taxpayers are willing to pay for this kind of a program, because in the end it is going to save them money.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Well, it appears to the chair that the gentleman's request comes rather late. The chair has already declared the motion agreed to and ordered the clerk to report the next amendment in disagreement.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 194]

Alexander	Healey	Morrison
Alger	Hébert	Murray
Ayres	Hess	Nix
Barden	Hoffman, Ill.	Norrell
Baumhart	Holland	Passman
Blitch	Ikard	Powell
Boggs	Jones, Ala.	Preston
Bolling	Kearns	Quie
Bowles	Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Buckley	King, Utah	Shelley
Cahill	Landrum	Sisk
Celler	Loser	Smith, Kans.
Cooley	McDowell	Taylor, N.Y.
Curtis, Mass.	McSween	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Magnuson	Thompson, La.
Durham	Mahon	Vinson
Glenn	Metcalf	Whitener
Goodell	Mitchell	Widnall
Grant	Moeller	Withrow

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 22, line 18, strike out "for research, training, and traineeships, and other special project grants, pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for", and insert "for grants and other expenses for research, training, traineeships, and other special projects, pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for expenses of."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "For grants and other expenses (including not to exceed $150,000, in addition to funds provided elsewhere, for administrative expenses) for research, training, traineeships, and other special projects, pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for expenses of".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 24, line 4, insert "expenses incident to the dissemination of health information in foreign countries through exhibits and other appropriate means;".

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 24, line 20, insert "*Provided*, That section 208(g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'eighty-five', and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and fifty', and by striking out 'seventy-three' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and fifteen';

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 30, line 5, insert ": *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization of retired ships' officers and members of crews of Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels, and their dependents, and for payment therefor."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 32, line 2, insert "not to exceed $2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General;".

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 32, line 23, insert ", of which $700,000, to remain available until December 31, 1961, shall be available for plans and specifications for a research facility for the National Cancer Institute."

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

The Clerk read as folows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 34, line 13, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF MENTAL HEALTH-NEUROLOGY RESEARCH FACILITY

"For construction of a combined basic and collaborative research facility for the National Institutes of Mental Health and Neurological Diseases and Blindness, including a physical biology component, and including plans and specifications, fixed and semifixed equipment, access roads and parking facilities, extension of existing power, refrigeration and other utility systems, $12,139,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Mental health activities' and 'Neurology and blindness activities', as determined by the Surgeon General."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 45, line 16, insert:

"WORKING CAPITAL FUND

"The paragraph under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 369) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department; (4) a central tabulating service; (5) telephone, mail, and messenger services; (6) a central accounting and payroll service; and (7) a central laborers' service: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That such fund shall be reimbursed in advance from funds available to bureaus, offices, and agencies for which such centralized services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment'."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 52, line 15, insert:

"SEC. 903. Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public and for payment in advance for publications available only upon that basis or available at a reduced price on prepublication orders."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 53, line 3, insert:

"SEC. 905. Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82 and concur therein.

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.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include extraneous matter in my remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the members of the House conferees and the members of the House Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], on agreeing to the Senate amendment in adding funds for schools in impacted areas. Unfortunately, there has been a perennial problem concerning Public Laws 815 and 874, in explaining to the membership that this is not Federal aid to education or a Federal handout as such, but is simply a program by which the Federal Government can meet a portion of its obligations to the various communities in which its agencies are located. Obviously, when the Federal Government becomes a principal industry in a community and does not pay taxes for the land it owns as other industries must do, there is a deficiency in the economy of that community to render the services that must be provided as a result of the existence of the industry in the area. One of the most vital services which must be provided is an adequate public school system.

Yet, as I stated above, in spite of the simplicity of this obligation, it seems necessary to explain the problem over and over again. Fortunately, the Congress has repeatedly recognized this responsibility and has continually granted the appropriations pursuant to the act as well as renewed and extended the act on previous occasions.

The problem that exists here today is the fact that even though we recognize the responsibility from time to time, we fail to appropriate the full amount which is authorized and the amount to which the communities would be entitled under the formula agreed upon. This makes it extremely difficult for the communities involved to formulate a sound budget or financial program. It is, therefore, imperative for the Congress to state what it intends to do and fulfill its promises in a way in which the communities can count on these funds. The action taken by the conferees to eliminate the current deficiency, I am certain, will help many communities involved in overcoming a serious problem of meeting a deficiency in the school budget for this current year.