

I therefore find no reasonable justification for the extensive changes to the NIH mandated by S. 540. In order to better serve the promise and the future of our national biomedical research enterprise, I am withholding my approval of this bill.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 30, 1984.

S. 2574

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval of S. 2574, the "Public Health Service Act Amendments of 1984," which would extend and amend various health professions and services authorities. I have been assured by the Department of Health and Human Services that the Continuing Resolution provides adequate authority for these programs for fiscal year 1985.

S. 2574 is a seriously flawed piece of legislation. The most serious of its many objectionable provisions include the following:

First, the bill contains authorization levels substantially in excess of my 1985 Budget. Full funding of all the programs in the bill through 1987 would total \$2.4 billion, 41 percent more than the \$1.7 billion contained in the Budget.

Moreover, S. 2574 would continue to increase obsolete Federal subsidies to health professions students and would maintain the static and rigid categorical framework to deliver such aid. The ability of medical schools to supply our society with health professionals has changed dramatically in the last 20 years. Today, our medical schools are producing nearly 16,000 new doctors each year. Although there may be some shortages of physicians and nurses in particular areas of the country, the Nation as a whole is facing a future surplus—not shortage—of physicians and nurses. Under these circumstances, S. 2574, a bill which continues excessive taxpayer subsidies to health professionals and maintains a rigid unworkable categorical framework, cannot be justified.

S. 2574 takes the wrong approach to health professions training. In contrast to the Administration's proposal for a single, omnibus reauthorization of all health professions authorities, which would permit maximum program flexibility to address current needs, the bill not only reauthorizes the existing plethora of narrow, categorical authorities, but also creates new programs. This approach to health professions training is outdated and fails to respond to the rapidly changing health care environment.

A more appropriate approach would recognize that the surplus of physicians has reduced the need for Federal financial assistance and would improve incentives for health professionals to locate in areas of the country where shortages exist. The Administration's

health professions proposals would help meet these objectives.

S. 2574 would also repeal the Primary Care Block Grant authority—a key reform proposed by the Administration and enacted by the Congress in 1981 designed to restore State control, strengthen administrative efficiencies, and improve the delivery of health services. Thus, this bill would reverse a successful trend of increased State acceptance of health care responsibility that the Administration initiated. The block grant programs for preventive health and health services and alcohol and drug abuse have been successful. The primary care block grant was made optional by the Congress, and States have been hesitant to accept it. However, to close out the option at a time when States should be willing to consider another step toward greater autonomy is counterproductive and unacceptable.

This bill contains numerous other provisions that are either unnecessary or unacceptable, including authorization for new Federal National Health Service Corps scholarships that are not needed, since the number of scholarship recipients already bound to subsidized medical practice in rural areas is adequate.

For all these reasons, I find S. 2574 unacceptable.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 30, 1984.

S. 1967

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval from S. 1967, a bill "To compensate the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Indian Community for irrigation construction expenditures."

S. 1967 would reimburse the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Indian Community for \$107,759.58 in tribal funds expended under applicable law for the construction of irrigation projects on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation from 1895 to 1913. In addition, interest would be paid at 4 percent from the date of expenditure of the tribal funds until the date of payment of the principal pursuant to the bill.

On November 20, 1962, the Indian Claims Commission, after due deliberation, issued a detailed opinion carefully considering and dismissing (among other claims) a claim for the same reimbursement that would be provided by the bill. *Fort Belknap Indian Community v. United States*, 11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 479, 510-518, 543-549 (1962). The Commission found that construction of the irrigation system was "requested by the members of the Fort Belknap Community," that it has been of great and continuing benefit to the tribes, and "that its construction and maintenance have been consonant with the fair and honorable

dealings clause within the meaning of the Indian Claims Commission Act." 11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 518-519. The tribes took no appeal from that decision.

The fair and impartial administration of justice and the protection of public resources from meritless special appropriations both require that those who have availed themselves of judicial remedies in asserting claims against the United States, and have had their claims fully and fairly adjudicated under our Constitution and laws, receive no more or less than that to which they have been adjudged to be entitled. Twenty-two years after the claims of these two tribes were dismissed by an impartial tribunal established by the Congress specifically to adjudicate such claims, this bill would authorize and appropriate to them all that they were previously found not to be entitled to.

Under the circumstances, the enactment of the bill would set aside established principles of justice and thereby encourage other and future efforts to obtain by legislation that which has been denied by a just adjudication.

For these reasons, I find the bill unacceptable.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 17, 1984.

S. 607

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have withheld my approval from S. 607, the "Public Broadcasting Amendments Act of 1984."

This bill would authorize appropriations of \$200 million, \$225 million, and \$250 million, respectively, for fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It would also authorize appropriations of \$25 million, \$35 million, and \$40 million for the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program administered by the Department of Commerce for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

Public broadcasting has an important role to play in assuring that a wide variety of information and entertainment choices are made available to American viewers and listeners. Under S. 607, however, the authorizations for Federal subsidies to public broadcasting would increase dramatically. When all of the demands on the Federal budget are taken into account, I cannot endorse the levels of spending on public broadcasting contemplated by this legislation. They are incompatible with the clear and urgent need to reduce Federal spending.

It is important to note that current-year funding for these two programs totals only \$174 million. The Oxley amendment would have resulted in a generous and barely affordable increase of 15 percent, to \$200 million. S. 607 goes much further and raises first-year funding by 29 percent to \$225 million for the two programs. By the