

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

*U.S. Congress.*

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 14

MAY 30, 1973 TO JUNE 6, 1973

(PAGES 17215 TO 18462)

inevitable, they may well stop following their politically "safe" but dawdling courses. They would have to stop spending so much money on such things as elaborate road systems, military establishments and petrochemical industries that not only produce needed fertilizer but a hundred other less crucial "national" products.

The hungry nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America spend \$26 billion annually on armaments—three times what they receive in official development assistance. If this \$26 billion, or a large part of it, were spent on tube wells, irrigation ditches, fertilizer and agricultural research, it might become possible to head toward a true "green revolution." If, simultaneously, the nations' communications industries focused on teaching the perils of a six-child (and even a three-child) family, and if economic rewards went to those who practiced what the nation preached, a significant birth-rate drop might be possible. Then, indeed, famine would not be inevitable.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Neighborhood Youth Corps program has in the past provided employment opportunities for thousands of young people who would otherwise have no chance of finding jobs during the summer months. Last year in Minnesota alone, 10,000 youths found employment through the NYC program.

This year, despite continued high unemployment, the administration has decided against allocating necessary funding for the NYC summer program. I feel this decision would seriously aggravate the desperate shortage of work opportunities for young people. Ultimately, I believe it would be extremely wasteful in terms of America's greatest resource, the ability and potential of our youth.

I am hopeful that the Congress will adopt legislation to assure essential funds for the summer NYC program, and I will strongly support such action in the Senate.

As evidence of the intense concern for continuation of the program at the State level, I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will read the following letter which I recently received from Minnesota's Gov. Wendell R. Anderson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Governor Anderson's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN.,  
May 18, 1973.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRITZ: Last year, 10,000 of our youth obtained summer employment from a \$4.5 million Neighborhood Youth Corp program. The national administration has decided not to allocate any summer funds to the program this year. The result will be that 10,000 youths who otherwise would have needed employment will be without jobs.

The administration has suggested that other alternatives are available. Without going into a discussion of them, I can assure you that none of them will provide anywhere near the level of funding necessary for a meaningful program.

Last summer, even with the summer NYC program, youth unemployment was a serious

problem in many parts of our state. We have no reason to expect that the situation will be substantially different this summer. The absence of the summer program thus further aggravates what already is a grave problem.

I am writing at this time because I recently was told that Senator Javits is considering an appropriation bill amendment to provide funds for a summer NYC program. I wanted you to know how strongly I feel regarding the need for such legislation. I know that you are aware of the need and that you share my concern.

Please let me know if there is any way that I can assist in the passage of this legislation.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely,

WENDELL R. ANDERSON.

#### NURSING THREATENED BY NIXON BUDGET PROPOSALS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the national health community will be dealt a near-fatal blow in its attempts to improve the Nation's health if the Congress supports President Nixon's health budget proposals. The Nixon amended 1973 budget offering set a new low for health funding. This administration has slashed over \$500 million from the 1973 health budget in its amended budget. Their 1974 budget proposes that financial aid to community mental health centers, regional medic-aid programs, research training grants for young scientists, and Hill-Burton hospital facilities construction and modernization programs be terminated and that funding for many other programs be drastically reduced.

The health manpower budget will be reduced by \$58 million. Federal funding for nurse training, institutional support to schools of public and allied health, and capitation payments to many educational institutions will be eliminated.

I am particularly distressed that at a time when nursing should have an ever-increasing role in the delivery of health care Federal support for nursing education has been targeted for virtual elimination by fiscal year 1974.

The health care of the people of this country requires the availability of competent, soundly educated nurses. Federal support for nursing has helped to increase the nurse supply and broaden and modernize the scope of nursing education. In the 10-year period, 1960-70, the registered nurse population grew by 43 percent while the U.S. population increased 2.95 percent. Much of the increase can be attributed to the Federal investment in nursing.

In 1971, recognizing that nurses are among our Nation's most valuable resources, the Congress—by a vote of 81 to 0 in the Senate, and a vote of 324 to 0 in the House—reaffirmed its commitment to deal with the critical shortage of nurses and to excellence in nursing and nursing education by passing the Nurse Training Act.

Through this act Congress sought to increase the numbers of practicing registered nurses in the United States to 1.1 million by 1980. The act provided funds for construction grants to nursing schools and loan guarantees and interest subsidies to encourage nursing schools

to expand their facilities; financial incentives for many schools to increase their enrollment and expand their curriculums; and incentives for schools that developed programs to identify, enroll, and assist needy persons with a potential for training in nursing. In short, it provided a wide range of financial assistance to nursing schools and students.

Since the passage of the act considerable progress has been made. In 1971, when the Nurse Training Act was passed, there were 353 registered nurses per 100,000 population, or 723,000. In October 1972, the ratio had increased to 361 registered nurses per 100,000 and, as of January 1973, there were reportedly 776,000 registered nurses.

Total admissions to schools of nursing for 1972 show an approximate increase of 17 percent over the previous year's admissions. Enrollments are up 23,849 from the 1971 level of 187,551, and graduations increased by 3,899 in 1972 from the previous year. The Nurse Training Act, designed to correct an inequity in the level of Federal support for nursing, has provided a vital boost for the often ignored, but vitally important field of nursing.

Indeed progress is being made, but by no means is the job done. The projected need for registered nurses by 1975 is 1 million.

In his 1972 health message President Nixon emphasized the importance of Federal support for nursing:

The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 and the Nurse Training Act of 1971 which I signed last November will spur the greatest effort in our history to expand the supply of health personnel. Additionally and importantly, it will attract them to the areas of health care shortages, helping to close one of the most glaring gaps in our present system.

In view of their 1973-74 health budget proposals and other recent developments, I believe it is instructive to recall former Attorney General Mitchell's enjoiner regarding this Administration. He cautioned the Nation to watch what this administration does; not what its representatives say.

What have they done for—to—nursing education and nursing?

Emily Holmquist, president of the Indiana State Nurses Association and executive director of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, has directed my attention to a most impressive documentation of the impact of the proposed health budget. It is entitled, "Analysis of President's Budget, Fiscal Year 1974, National Institutes of Health, Health Services and Mental Health Administration and Related Areas, Spring 1973." It was prepared by the Coalition for Health Funding and I recommend it to my colleagues in the Senate.

The coalition's critique of the administration's fiscal year 1974 proposed budget for nursing is informative as well as alarming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it and a table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: