

arms; he is a pillar of strength in the Senate."

Of Senators who particularly inspire him, BYRD lists four: RUSSELL, "his parliamentary skill, his reasonableness and reasoned judgment and his earthiness impress me greatly; he is one who has the qualifications of being President"; STENNIS, "has a judicious and at all times a great spiritual awareness, he is a real Christian gentleman"; PASTORE, "fascinates me with his intellectual grasp; the swing of his observation, his articulateness and forcefulness make him a giant"; DIRKSEN, "is one of a kind; his oratorical style, his genuine warmth are very appealing."

BYRD and his wife, Erma (she is my closest friend) live in Arlington with their aged springer spaniel, Billy Byrd. The couple's two daughters, Mona and Marjorie, are married and live elsewhere in the Washington area. The Senator is a student of Shakespeare and likes to listen to both classical and folk music. He is a Baptist. Washington cocktail parties leave him and his wife cold. "I am just as disinterested as anybody could be; I do not drink because it is a waste of time and money," he says. "I have never fired a shotgun, and I went fishing just once in my life. The only program on TV I like is 'Gunsmoke.' Politics is my hobby."

Tedious, workaday, vital politics is what he means. BYRD serves on two of the most powerful committees in the Senate, Armed Forces and Appropriations. Of the latter, he says significantly, "It is not one on which one is likely to be projected into the national limelight, but it provides oil for the Government machinery. I am content to be a workhorse."

As a West Virginian, BYRD has worked hard to help his impoverished State and some of the projects he has pushed have implication for Washington area people, such as the development of large-scale recreational facilities. "West Virginia may well be one of the playgrounds of Washington in years to come," comments his press aid, Charles Eischen. BYRD has also been legislatively active in helping the aged, pushing medical research and curbing water pollution.

Over 20 years ago BYRD was a member of the Ku Klux Klan and served as a kliegler, or organizer. ("The Klan was fighting communism," he was quoted as saying in a 1958 interview.) The Senator says now that he has outgrown the Klan, that his former membership in it is wide public knowledge and that whole matter is a closed book as far as he is concerned. But as to the Klan in 1965 he says flatly: "It is an organization that serves no useful purpose." The statement is made only after long thought and it is delivered with a note of finality.

As chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee for the District, BYRD's welfare attitudes have been said by some critics to stem from bias; they cite his vote against the civil rights bill last year as evidence for the claim. The Senator denies having a racial prejudice. He makes the point that he has had a Negro on his staff for many years and

says on the touchy subject of relief cheaters, one of his principal targets: "If people, whether black or white, are ineligible, they should be removed from the caseloads. The fact that 95 percent of ADC (aid to dependent children) cases involve Negroes is not of my making. Ineligibles bring discredit to the program. They constitute an undue drain on the taxpayer, which cannot be countenanced."

Home rule for the District is another question which BYRD speaks of in the same terms. He says congressional control of Washington has worked well, it follows the dictates of the Founding Fathers and it suits a city unique for being the home of the President, Congress, Supreme Court, Federal departments, and foreign diplomats. But he emphasizes that in his opinion one of the real objections to home rule is financial. "The city does not have the potential for securing the finances needed to pursue the ever-increasing costs of education, welfare, health, and recreation programs, and other needs," he says. "It is a matter of common knowledge, the emigration of District people to the suburbs. All too often these are people who have a taxpaying capability." Unlike other major cities, he says, the District has not the industrial tax base needed to take up the slack, nor can it obtain one.

As one of several examples of how home rule would misfire, he talks of the police department, which "has the strong backing of Congress in its efforts to combat crime; under home rule, I am afraid the police would be considerably demoralized. The pressures are terrific. I have had those pressures on me."

Public rallies protesting BYRD's welfare policies are becoming one of the rites of spring in Washington. At one this year, a woman displayed a placard reading "BYRD is for the birds." At another, held by the District of Columbia Coalition of Conscience, Bishop Smallwood E. Williams of the Bible Way Baptist Church characterized the Senator as "a little man, hard-hearted, hard-headed, biased, and segregation-oriented." BYRD retorts, "I've been called heartless many times. You should see the letters I receive from people who don't know the facts."

BYRD impatiently argues that the whole thrust of his efforts has been affirmative, not negative, and that he has in fact been of utmost aid to District schools, urging more buildings, more and better-trained teachers, and more librarians. Education, as he sees it, is a key way to help solve poverty and related social problems. But realistically, he adds, "You can only provide the tools of education. We will see the results in 25 years."

He has also acted, he notes, to encourage the hiring of more social workers, to strengthen law enforcement agencies, to expand aid to working mothers, to increase both day-care facilities and foster-home programs, and to add to the special instruction given retarded children.

BYRD feels strongly that society is being made to bear the blame for the misdeeds of

young people when it is the parents who are the real culprits. "My own experience leads me to believe that the right kind of parental training will lead to respect for law and order by the youth of America," he says. It is the fostering of just this parental responsibility to which his welfare policies seem to be directed. Make the welfare cheaters go to work and their children will benefit morally, he seems to be saying.

The Senator sums up: "In my years of work and study, there is an important lesson which I feel that I have learned—that a modest beginning need not hold a man down. Hard work, determination, and a normal amount of intelligence can carry one to almost any goal." It is Horatio Alger talk, but coming from the Senator's lips, in his well-appointed office with aids in alert attendance, it does not seem by any means outdated. BYRD's drive has brought him that far. At age 47, his political horizons are not sketched in and could be unlimited.

One Capitol Hill observer speculates on his future: "MANSFIELD and HUMPHREY have openly shown admiration and affection for him. Politically, his sharpest drawback is his home State, a small State not carrying much weight; but it is conceivable that he could be on the national ticket as a vice-presidential candidate. He's a real down-the-line administration man. He does the nasty jobs. There is a good chance that he will end up as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, one of the dozen most powerful jobs in the country. I think that's his ambition; I think that's where he's going."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Polish Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the Polish people have endured much suffering

under the Communist rule for years. But this has not taken the form of a passive acceptance of their overlords. The heavy hand of the Soviet Union has not diminished the desire of the Poles to live in freedom and dignity.

That the flame of freedom still flickers, and at times burns brightly, was demonstrated on this day 9 years ago when the factory workers in the industrial city of Poznan rebelled against the Communist-controlled regime. Driven

to desperation by wages so low they could not even buy sufficient bread with their pay, by complaints that had gone unheeded, the workers in the large steel plant, about 30,000 in all, staged an uprising which the government quickly branded as a revolt. Tanks were rolled in, artillery pounded the workers, and regular army troops mopped up the hapless workers. In a couple of days, when it was all over, more than 100 were dead and several hundred were wounded.

Though the gallant protest was snuffed out before it could spread to other towns, it did have some beneficial effects. The Polish Communist Government took heed and improved working conditions, trimmed the work week and raised pay scales.

But the meaning of this brief uprising was clear far beyond the reaches of this town in western Poland. It showed that despite Soviet oppression, the will, the desire for freedom is still very much alive in Poland. And it is this unquenchable spirit that we honor today on the ninth anniversary of the Poznan uprising.

No Show Shriver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in Washington we are all familiar with individuals who say "Yes" when they mean "No," and those who say "No" when they mean "Yes." A classic example of this technique is illustrated in the correspondence I have had recently with Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Because of its interest I am appending the exchange of letters to these remarks:

JUNE 3, 1965.

HON. ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, Jr.,
Director, Peace Corps,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: When I expressed the hope during your testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday that you testify before the Republican task force on economic opportunity, I had not really expected that you would be willing to do so. I was pleased, however, that you expressed willingness to appear before us and I should like to extend a formal invitation for you to appear either on Wednesday, June 16, or Thursday, June 17.

As you may know, we have scheduled hearings for 3 days this coming week, but we already have made firm commitments to others for those days.

The members of our task force appreciate very much your willingness to discuss your responsibilities as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Our primary purpose in holding these hearings is to see in what way the programs under your jurisdiction may be improved.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1965.

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: During the course of the testimony concerning the Peace Corps you brought up the subject of my testifying before the Republican task force on economic opportunity. I assumed that any hearings to which you were referring would be conducted by a duly constituted committee of the Congress.

My acceptance was in keeping with a long-established policy of a willingness and even eagerness to appear and meet with committees of the Congress. And even further,

I have always been willing to meet privately with individual Members or groups of Members of the Congress. In fact, only recently I had private meetings with the Democratic membership and the Republican membership of the House Education and Labor Committee concerning the poverty program. And I have always maintained that I should not have a public meeting with the members of one political party without the other party represented.

Consistent with this policy, I must decline your invitation to meet with your task force in any public meeting. Should any individual Members desire to meet with me privately to discuss common problems, I hold myself readily available for such a meeting, as this would be consistent with the policy I have followed for a number of years.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

JUNE 10, 1965.

HON. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: This will acknowledge your recent letter informing me that you are unwilling to appear before the Republican task force on economic opportunity.

Naturally, we were disappointed to learn that you would not be available for a public meeting. I can assure you that we would have no intention of embarrassing you in any way, as our purpose is simply to develop some factual information with respect to the operations of the Office of Economic Opportunity, as a basis for recommendations for strengthening its various programs.

We are very hopeful that you would be willing to meet with us in executive session at your convenience. Perhaps something could be arranged for the latter part of next week.

Sincerely yours,

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1965.

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: I have read with interest the newspaper reports of the sessions of the Republican task force on economic opportunity.

My position on the matters you covered has already been placed in the hearing record of the House Education and Labor Committee and, thus, it would seem unnecessary to schedule an executive session for the rediscussion of these matters.

As I have stated to you before, I do hold myself ready to meet with individual Members of Congress to discuss any aspect concerning the war on poverty. As you know, this is consistent with the policy I have followed during my years in Government service. And I am always available to the regular committees as frequently as they may wish me to appear.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

JUNE 28, 1965.

HON. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: It was a real disappointment to learn that you are unwilling to meet with Republicans, in public or private, to discuss the administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Although you profess to welcome discussions with Members of Congress, your continuing refusal to do so is hard to explain.

When first invited to testify before the Republican task force on economic oppor-

tunity, you clearly indicated your willingness to talk with us. On second thought you declined, on the odd ground that Democrats would not be present, even though I had clearly indicated that this was a Republican invitation. When invited to appear in executive session, in accordance with your declaration that you were readily available to meet privately with individual Members of Congress, you have now again refused.

How can we interpret your reluctance? Certainly your responsibilities as Director of the Peace Corps have not prevented you from making frequent public statements, and appearances, defending the antipoverty program. It is easy, therefore, to assume that you have the time but not the will.

You comment on the interest with which you have read newspaper accounts of the recent hearings held by the Republican task force on economic opportunity. We are gratified to know this. Just as those hearings interested you, and apparently the public also, so would your testimony—even if not available to the public—interest us Republicans.

Nor does it seem in character for you to resist the opportunity of discussing the programs for which you are responsible simply because you don't cherish an all-Republican audience. What have you to fear? You strongly emphasize your eagerness to appear before congressional committees, which are of course conducted in public, with both Democrats and Republicans, yet you shy away from serious Republican efforts to discuss privately the programs of the OEO. Could it be that we are interested in sensitive subjects which you would rather not discuss, in public or private?

In your opinion, it would "seem unnecessary" to hold an executive session for a "rediscussion" of matters you have already considered with the House Education and Labor Committee. We have not yet spelled out the areas which we should like to discuss, and I can only assure you that every effort would be made to avoid any rediscussion, or repetition, of your earlier testimony. I trust also that you will withhold your judgment as to the necessity of such a meeting until after it has actually taken place.

Since you reiterate your readiness to meet with individual Members of Congress, I can only hope you can still be persuaded to do so. To avoid a confrontation while professing to welcome it somehow smacks of arrogance—or an awareness of the present weakness of some of the antipoverty programs.

Sincerely,

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Medical Libraries and Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at the John Shaw Billings Centennial, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Md., on June 17, 1965:

MEDICAL LIBRARIES AND MEDICAL RESEARCH
(By the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. Representative from Rhode Island)

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to honor an individual whose great life and

work helped materially in diverse ways to organize and advance the cause of medicine. The debt to Dr. John Shaw Billings is not a debt only of physicians and others in the health sciences. It is a debt of the entire Nation. Dr. Billings' achievements in helping to consolidate and focus the progress of medicine through its literature have benefited the lives of all of us, even today, 100 years later.

It is most proper for us to recognize also that it was Dr. Billings, who, through the National Board of Health, actually made the first Federal grants for medical research. In the 1880 Annual Report¹ of the Board, Dr. Billings, in his capacity as vice president, writes to the Honorable John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury, to which the Board was answerable. Dr. Billings' letter speaks to the importance of medical research and cites the commendable work of the British Government in supporting such research. His report points out that the costs of research exceed the funds available to private investigators and emphasizes that the assistance of the Federal Government is therefore necessary. Sounds like 1965.

His report then lists out the types of projects the National Board of Health was supporting. These include:

Studies of the air, a forerunner to our present air pollution research; studies of the adulterations of food and drugs, matters about which we are still concerned; sanitation; yellow fever; disinfectants; diphtheria; and still other fields.

I have been extremely pleased to learn that my own State of Rhode Island was included in the research work financed by the old National Board of Health under Dr. Billings' direction. The annual report of the Board of 1882—83 years ago—contains a report of inspections of health resorts and under that a "Report on Sanitary Conditions in Newport, R.I." It is a very fascinating document including many maps, drawings, and illustrations including these three [unfolds three large illustrations]. One of these is a map of the city of Newport and the other two are graphs showing occupation figures and nationality figures in ward 3 of the city.

Beyond the question of sanitation the report is concerned with the city's water supply; and I believe the remarkable farsightedness of Dr. Billings is illustrated by the fact that the report contains extensive information on different types of analyses carried out on the water.

I am happy to say that the report about Newport was a very good one and I will illustrate this if I may by reading the first sentence of the report: "Newport has always been considered, and unquestionably is, naturally, an exceptionally healthy place."² Naturally I believe it still is.

From this particular locale here today it is easy to see and feel the importance of Dr. Billings' work—in the dignity, power, and significance we in America have given to medicine, and which in turn is serving to give us healthier, longer, more productive and happier lives. We stand on the steps of the world's greatest medical library. Next door to our north is the world's finest medical research organization. Across the street is the great National Naval Medical Center, and only a short distance from here is the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.

If there were a pinnacle of the world of medicine at which we could stand, this would be it.

¹ House of Representatives, 46th Cong., 3d sess. Ex. Doc. No. 8. Annual Report of the National Board of Health, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1880.

² Bowditch, E. W., report of an inspection of certain health resorts. In: U.S. National Board of Health. Annual Report of 1882. Washington, 1883. App. C, p. 153.

It is a world as yet unfinished, however. We have not defeated disease, disability, birth defects, and premature death. These problems continue to challenge us to the limit of our abilities. At the same time, we seem to have achieved, at long last, the opportunity at least for almost total victory. It would seem to be within our grasp to attain an entirely new level of mental and physical health for mankind and perhaps witness the eradication of disease entirely.

We are living in the midst of dramatic and far-reaching changes in the concepts of biomedical research, with the employment of new knowledge, new techniques, new ideas, new instrumentation, and, indeed, new types of personnel, such as mathematicians and physicists. The influence and effects of the biomedical research effort are becoming wider and its character is changing. There is ample evidence that the biomedical achievements of the near future may be dramatically more significant than any in the past. I have in mind particularly a new spectrum of work in human reproduction and human development; molecular biology and genetics, and the new light they promise to throw on work in many other biomedical disciplines; and the extensive work in viruses, in relation to cancer and other diseases. In recent testimony before Congress, Dr. James A. Shannon, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, pointed to new progress in understanding the relationship between psychology and physiology. He said: "The line between the medical sciences and the behavioral sciences is disappearing." This is as it should be.

In this place, on this day, at this particular point in history, it is difficult to avoid a sense of happy anticipation about the new hope being offered us by the health sciences; and it is proper that we again recognize Dr. Billings' work in having begun this great Institution, this library where this new knowledge resides for man's present and future use.

However, let me read something to you: "Unless major attention is directed to the improvement of our national medical library base, the continued and accelerated generation of scientific knowledge will become increasingly an exercise in futility."³

The statement is from a section headed Communications for Research, from volume I of the report by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

Let us consider carefully what this statement means. It is saying that the great potential benefits of medical research which I have just been talking about may not be improving the health of our Nation as they might. It indicates that the financial, human, and institutional investments we are pouring into research, to bring about better health for the American people, may be wasted or lost for the want of better facilities and methods to house, manage, and disseminate the medical literature.

This is indeed a curious commentary on the Nation which leads the world in its concern for health and medicine; and it could be a tragic commentary if the vast sums the Federal Government spends for medical research, education, and practice, were being rendered less effective because we are not willing to spend a few more dollars, relatively, for the medical libraries which serve as the communication centers for health science information.

Just how much money are we talking about?

If we talk only of research, the Federal Government is spending well over \$1 billion, and private sources are spending another

\$600 or \$700 million. Last year, out of the \$1 billion provided in Federal funds, less than \$1 million, under present legislative authorities, could accrue to the benefit of the nongovernment medical libraries. That's about one-tenth of 1 percent. If we try to make a comparison to the total budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of \$5½ billion, the comparison becomes even more ridiculous. The Federal Government is simply not paying its share of the Nation's costs for medical communications, even though it has helped to intensify the problem by its emphasis on, and support of, medical research.

We must remember that the medical libraries, as the prime storehouses and distributors of health science information, are feeling the pressures of all of our national activities in relation to health and medicine, both private and public. All of the tremendous increases in health and medical activities have an impact on the medical libraries. All research papers, journals, pamphlets, reports, conference proceedings, handbooks—nearly every printed document, in fact, which grows out of our concern for man's health, becomes something the medical libraries must acquire, store, and disseminate to those who need the information. Then these massive health activities generate greater demands on the medical libraries for services.

As a measure of these demands, let us take due notice of the fact that all public and private health and medical expenditures in the Nation today total more than \$35 billion.

If this is a measure of our health concerns, we have failed very seriously—I hope not irreparably—to recognize and tend to the fundamental requirements for medical information and particularly medical libraries.

My special concern here today is for the medical libraries in relation to the promise held for us in medical research. Medical research is impossible without an adequate information base, without the resources and services of medical libraries. It has been said—and I believe this must be true—that all medical research begins and ends with the medical literature. If this is so true, then why are we jeopardizing our own purpose by scripping when it comes to giving the medical scientist the library tools he needs?

Sir William Osler, who was a close friend of Dr. Billings, once said: "To study the phenomena of disease without books is to sail an uncharted sea, while to study books without patients is not to go to sea at all."⁴ My friends in medicine tell me that this applies today as it did at the turn of the century.

The literature constitutes an integral part of the process of studying human biology and human diseases. To limit its usefulness is to limit the scientist and to limit man's chance for the new level of health I talked about earlier.

Today it clearly is not enough to say that medical scientists need information. The real question, instead, is just how do we meet their information requirements? We long ago recognized—or we should have recognized—that the production of books and journals was not enough, and that putting these books and journals in libraries was not enough. Dr. Billings saw this 86 years ago. He instituted control and access to the literature by producing the first comprehensive index to medical articles in 1879. This has been acknowledged by many to be America's greatest contribution to medicine in the 19th century.

But the quantity of the literature for some years has so overwhelmed all of our information-handling concepts as to render them

³ U.S. President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. Report to the President; a national program to conquer heart disease, cancer, and stroke. Washington, 1964, vol. I.

⁴ Osler, Sir William: Sir William Osler aphorisms from his bedside teachings and writings. Collected by R. B. Bean; ed. by W. B. Bean. New York, Henry Schuman, 1950. 159 p.

obsolete. The worldwide production of biomedical literature is now estimated at more than 250,000 articles or 5 million pages per year. That many pages would constitute a stack higher than the Empire State Building. It obviously is of no help to the medical scientist to expose him to 5 million pages of literature in a year's time or a half-million pages or even 100,000 pages, unless you want him to do nothing but read the literature; and that is not what we want him to do. In fact, it would be impossible for him to read it in the time available. We want him to fulfill, to the most effective level possible, his capacities and opportunities for research, and if he is to do this his own effort to acquire information must be among the less time consuming of his concerns. He must have ready access to those parts of the literature relevant and pertinent to his scientific pursuits.

It is interesting to note that the problem is not new. Dr. Vannevar Bush in 1944 said: "The summation of human experience is being expanded at a prodigious rate, but the means we use for threading through the consequent maze to the momentarily important item is the same as was used in the days of square-rigged ships—the modern great library is not generally consulted; it is just nibbled at by a few." Libraries must be made more attractive and more functional so that bigger bites of information are taken by those who need it.

The quantity of the literature, however, is not the only problem. Our achievements have been such that the whole character of biomedical research has changed and out of this change has come a transformation in the structure of the health sciences. The particular classification of the sciences—necessary for their organization in teaching and research—has been outmoded. The divisions between disciplines have faded and new disciplines have been formed. Some, as we have noted earlier, have been found to have significance in nearly all other biomedical disciplines.

In 1962, Dr. Robert R. Wagner had this to say: "In the future, organization of basic science departments as separate disciplines will lose all validity. This eventuality is a natural concomitant of the centralization of biological thought. Even today, a visitor to a medical school can distinguish one department from another only by the lettering on the office doors of the department chairmen."⁵

So the problem of the scientist is not only one of tremendous magnitude in the literature but one also in which the disciplinary guidelines have ceased to have their former meaning. The complex interrelationships of the vast amount of data with which he is confronted may be such as to keep him from knowing just where to look; and certainly these two situations of quantity and complexity conspire not only to consume the time which he should be spending at his bench, but possibly also to bring confusion and frustration into his efforts. Physicians and scientists need information specialists to help them in the same way they need and use laboratory assistants and coworkers. We must begin to train these new types of librarians in abundance, and as soon as possible.

Also we need research in the field of information science. In 1960, Dr. Don R. Swanson said, "The sheer abundance of recorded knowledge and the growth rate thereof seems to foreshadow a crisis in inundation. The implied dearth of scientific information might be forestalled by engineering breakthroughs, but such breakthroughs may de-

pend on first acquiring a deeper understanding of the conceptual nature of the problem itself."⁶

Before we can develop the systems and mechanisms to provide information to the scientists—even before we can conduct truly effective research in this area—we must know what information the scientist must have.

And he very well may not know what it is he wants. Since 70 percent of the medical literature is published in foreign languages, he may not be aware of what is going on elsewhere.

He is not expected to be an information expert; and as a man whose life is devoted to uncovering new knowledge, he cannot be expected to anticipate fully and accurately, if at all, what information he is going to need to relate to his work on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis. However, he should have quick access to all information when he is able to identify his needs.

During World War II there used to be jokes about high-ranking military officers in the Pentagon pounding their desks and saying, and I quote: "I don't know what it is I want, but I know I am not getting it." The biomedical scientists of the Nation today strike me as individuals who can honestly and justifiably cry out in this manner.

NLM has begun to meet this urgent need through the use of computers. Medlars (medical literature analysis and retrieval system) provides a fast method of recovering bibliographic citations in any medical discipline or any combination of disciplines. However, Medlars' tremendous searching power has not yet been decentralized across the Nation as it must be soon. It is the only system of its type in the world and its establishment in a research library is a spectacular achievement.

Still we must learn more about the scientist's habits of using information and his requirements for urgency, variety, and volume. We must know his needs for secondary publication forms, such as indexes, abstracts, data compendia, critical reviews. There are library functions and they need to be supported considerably beyond the current level.

These studies necessarily must be related to concurrent studies in medical terminology and classification, machine indexing and new techniques, systems and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing health science information.

In addition, the whole scheme of biomedical librarianship as it is now practiced must be studied and reevaluated—the object being to meet fully the users' needs.

We must immediately begin to develop medical libraries with a new concept of service responsibilities to the medical scientist. These libraries must have the flexibility and versatility to be active—not passive—partners in the research process. They must be staffed with people of imagination, advanced training and special skills necessary to assist the research scientist in every possible way. Certainly these libraries must have the resources in books, journals, equipment, and people necessary for them to fulfill their missions.

Just 2 months ago volume II of the report by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke was released. It contains a section entitled "A Program for Developing Medical Libraries." It was prepared by the Subcommittee on Facilities of the Commission, and it tells a truly alarming story of the state of disrepair of the Nation's medical libraries. I think I should state frankly that we, the American people,

have permitted this unfortunate condition to develop.

Let me read from one part of the report: "The cutting edge of the country's medical research program may be blunted by the growing inability of scientists to gain quick and easy access to biomedical data they need. Teachers and students are hampered in their educational pursuits. Of direct and immediate importance to the health of the Nation are urgent needs of medical practitioners of all types for more ready access to the growing body of new medical information. Inefficiency in the medical library network creates an insidious ignorance which neither science nor the practice of medicine can condone. It results in the unplanned and unnecessary duplication of research efforts. It postpones the application of new knowledge potentially important to the alleviation of human suffering."⁷

It is very difficult for me, indeed, to think of a more serious charge against this Nation.

The report goes on to present hard facts and statistics on the medical library needs. Let me cite some of these. For example, there are 6,000 medical libraries in the United States, but only 3,000 medical librarians—one-half of a librarian for every library. The needs for additional space, so that the libraries can be of a size sufficient to meet minimal standards, total into the millions of square feet. The requirement for books and journals totals into the millions. And in the area of training, despite the tremendous deficit in the number of librarians, only 40 additional professional librarians are being added to the field of medicine every year—while the attrition is 150.

The situation is truly desperate.

So this is our challenge. What is to be done about it?

There is before Congress at this time a bill which would establish the legislative and program foundations for this work. I refer, of course, to the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. This bill constitutes formal recognition for the first time in this Nation's history of what have been our failings in the medical information field and of what we must now do to correct our past errors.

I have been tremendously impressed by the reactions of just about all elements of the library and biomedical community to this bill. I will not go into a great amount of detail but I would like to name for you some of the organizations which have formally expressed their wholehearted support of the proposed measure. These include: The American Heart Association, American Dental Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American College of Physicians, the American Federation for Clinical Research, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Society for Biological Chemists, the American Thoracic Society, the New York Academy of Medicine, and others.

Notice that none of these organizations is a library organization.

But in addition, of course, there have been formal indications of very strong support by the Medical Library Association, by the Special Libraries Association and by the Association of Research Libraries.

I can think of few legislative measures which have resulted in such a strong, concerted reaction of support from such a broad segment of the American health science community.

As I have become more and more familiar, as a layman, with the medical information

⁵ Wagner, R. R.: The basic medical sciences, the revolution in biology and the future of medical education. Yale J. Biol. Med. 35: 1-1, 1962.

⁶ Swanson, D. R.: Searching natural language text by computer. Science 132: 1099-1104, 1960.

⁷ U.S. President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. Report to the President; a national program to conquer heart disease, cancer, and stroke. Washington, 1965, vol. II.

problem, I have become more convinced that the establishment of an extramural program for the National Library of Medicine is essential and urgent. Also I wonder if the Nation should not take further advantage of the great skill and power of this institution and establish within the National Library of Medicine a National Center of Biomedical Communications. This Center, as a carefully coordinated division of the Library, would serve to carry out a number of service activities beyond those presently possible for the National Library of Medicine. I have in mind, for example, the need for improved approaches to the production of abstracts and the coordination of abstracting activities. I have also in mind the fact that the needs for medlars services, and the development of new and advanced medlars systems, will exceed the present capacities of the Library. Beyond these additional service activities, a National Center of Biomedical Communications would be closely and continuously concerned with research and development in the biomedical communications field. As I have tried to indicate in this talk, new additional informational activities are critical to the continued advancement of medical research, but, at the same time, we need a great amount of research in the communications and information processes themselves. This Center would become a national focal point for such work. A complex of regional medical libraries, under NLM's guidance, would be an essential part of this picture. My concern here of course is not to heap further honor on this fine institution, so much as it is to see to it that the Nation makes maximum use of every possible resource to help meet the needs for medical information.

Let us make no mistake about what our real mission is. It is the realization of the unprecedented research achievements held in the balance for us at this moment in history. It is the fulfillment of the great promises for better health and longer lives for the American people.

Great societies of the past invented libraries to preserve and transmit knowledge. If we are to achieve in this Nation a society of the greatness I consider possible, we must begin immediately not to reinvent the library but to capitalize on this achievement and to fashion it to these medical research and other needs which have overtaken us in recent years. The challenge before us cannot be met by legislation alone or by the National Library of Medicine alone, or by the private sector of the economy alone. The challenge calls for a wholehearted cooperative effort by everyone concerned. What Dr. Billings started in 1865 must be further supported in 1965. The future well-being of this Nation depends on it, literally.

Thank you.

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, [Mr. HART], has been one of the most forceful advocates in the U.S. Senate of the principle of one man, one vote in ap-

portionment of State legislatures. Senator HART took a leading part in the Senate debate on this vital subject last year and is prepared to do so again.

In a recent newsletter, Senator HART very clearly and very emphatically outlined his position on this issue for the benefit of the people of Michigan. I for one could not agree with the Senator more, and since he has stated the case so well, I will insert his newsletter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope all of my colleagues will take a few minutes to read the text of Senator HART's important and very timely newsletter:

SENATOR HART REPORTS: HOW SHALL THE VOTES BE COUNTED

Every citizen, when he leaves the polling booth, is entitled to a little glow of satisfaction at having made his influence felt—at having voted for candidates whom he believes will best represent his views.

It is easy for anyone to assume his vote has been counted as equal to all others. After all, if you have voted once and everyone else has voted once, doesn't that make everyone equal?

The answer: Not necessarily.

But votes can be diluted and the malapportioned vote, like watered whisky, may appear unchanged while actually having its effect significantly reduced.

The U.S. Senate, in which I serve, is a clear example of intentional malapportionment. Michigan, with a population of 8 million, sends 2 Senators. Alaska with a population of 250,000, sends 2 Senators. Not a very good break for the Michigan voter.

But the U.S. Senate was necessary to the formation of the Nation. The Thirteen Colonies were independent units and the smaller ones refused to join any union unless the Constitution assured them of an equal voice in at least one body of Congress.

So it was finally decided that the U.S. Senate system, however undesirable from the viewpoint of pure democracy, had to be accepted if there was to be any Federal system at all.

The question now is whether State legislatures should be allowed to copy this system. Should 200,000 urban and suburban residents, for example, be represented by 1 vote in a State senate while, say 50,000 rural residents get an equal voice?

Last year, the Supreme Court answered "No." It ruled that both houses of a State legislature must be chosen on a one-man, one-vote basis.

Now there is a strong movement in Congress to overturn this ruling. Those who disagree with the Court are proposing a constitutional amendment that would allow one State house to apportion on the basis of land area if the plan were approved in a referendum.

Basically, the issue stems from the rapid growth of the Nation's cities and suburbs and the understandable desire of rural areas to conserve their diminishing political power.

In the North, the Republicans would be the beneficiaries of such an amendment because Republican strength is largely in the countryside. In the South, where Republican strength is centered in the cities, the Democrats would stand to gain most.

Debate on the matter is likely to begin in the Senate shortly and I hope you will follow it closely even though the arguments sometimes seem tedious and easily dismissed as political squabbling. Because the principles are important.

Advocates of a constitutional amendment will argue that the people of each State should be allowed to decide how their legislatures are to be apportioned.

Opponents counter that there are certain constitutional guarantees that should not be tampered with by any majority, should not ever be made the subject of political campaigns.

These include the right to life, liberty and property, to free speech, freedom of worship and the right, under every possible circumstance, to an equal voice at the polls.

They add that the Federal Government's role in urban and suburban affairs can only be diminished if the State governments show a greater concern for this fast growing section of their constituency.

No officeholder who numbers both rural and urban constituents can take a position on this one without suffering some political damage. Yet, citizens deserve a fair explanation of the issue and an idea of how their representatives stand on it.

In my opinion, the one-man, one-vote principle is a sound one. I think each citizen should have the same voice regardless of what part of the State he moves to. And I believe no majority, even all voters but one, should be permitted to deprive that one remaining citizen of his equal voice.

And while the following statement is bound to bring a small avalanche of disapproving letters, it nevertheless should not be a secret.

When the constitutional amendment proposal comes up for Senate action, I intend to be among those who fight it.

A Tribute to Lance Cpl. Russell Rowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 19, 1965, death came to a young Marine lance corporal, Russell Rowe, of Zion, Ill., one of the first casualties in our military operations in Santo Domingo in behalf of freedom and stability in that country.

Lance Corporal Rowe exemplified the courage and loyalty of the Marine Corps and of our Nation's military men in all the services. On April 30, Corporal Rowe led a fire team of four men in the occupation of an area protecting a group of snipers. Although the operation was successful and Corporal Rowe acquitted himself with exceptional bravery, he suffered grievous wounds from which he failed to recover. Corporal Rowe's experience was the subject of national recognition, and upon his arrival at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington he was provided with the most expert medical assistance and support in valiant efforts to save his life.

Corporal Rowe's courage on the battlefield and in his final struggle for life was supported by the devotion and steadfast attention of his loving mother, Mrs. Dorothy Harkness, and his fiancée, Miss Dora Compostella, whom he intended to marry in August. Mrs. Harkness and Miss Compostella came to Washington as soon as they received word that Russell was at Walter Reed, and remained

with him constantly. They were both at his side when death came. Corporal Rowe was also visited by his brother Richard who is a member of the Marine Corps stationed in California and who was flown to Walter Reed Army Hospital to visit with his brother immediately following his arrival there and again during his final hours.

Corporal Rowe is also survived by a brother, Robert, 14, and two sisters, Anita, 11, and Kathleen, 9, and by his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Barcarella of Chicago, and his stepfather, Meryl Harkness of Zion.

Cpl. Russell Rowe graduated from Steinmetz High School, Chicago, in 1961, and had completed his entrance examinations for later admission to Wright Junior College. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in November 1961, and received his recruit training at San Diego. He also served aboard the U.S.S. *Coral Sea* before being sent to the Dominican Republic.

The Marine Corps under its commandant, Gen. Wallace Greene, rendered every possible service in attending to the fatal wounds of Corporal Rowe and the corps extended appropriate honor to this young Marine hero. The award of the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star with the official citations are also to be presented posthumously by the Marine Corps.

Shortly after receiving word of his wounds, an American flag was flown over

the Capitol in Washington and also above the Marine Memorial Iwo Jima statue at Arlington. While it was not possible to deliver this flag to Corporal Rowe during his lifetime, it is to be presented to his loving mother and other members of the family in ceremonies which are now being arranged.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty which has befallen me but one about which I want all Members of this House and the people of the Nation to know. While Corporal Rowe is but one young man in the community of Zion in the 12th District of Illinois, a son, grandson, brother, and fiancé of one small group, he is in a larger sense representative of all the gallant young men who are serving with our military forces in various parts of the world. His bravery, his sacrifice, his devotion to his country, are significant in that the cause to which our Nation is dedicated is that of freedom and peace for all mankind. The affection and devotion which many persons held for this young man, and particularly the love demonstrated by his devoted mother, cannot help but touch the hearts of all and elicit expressions of profound sympathy on the part of all Americans toward the family which survives him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and honor to a fallen hero of the U.S. Marine Corps, Lance Cpl. Russell Rowe, and I bow my head in prayer and in the knowledge that Russell Rowe, the spiritual child of God, lives eternally in heaven.

Excise Tax

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO**

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, many consumers have written to me wanting to know exactly which items have been affected by the reduction of excise taxes and by what percentage. Therefore, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a complete list of those items which are currently affected by the excise tax reduction, the percentage of reduction, and the base price for determining the percentage reduction. I have also included the effective date of reduction of the excise tax. I would like to note that there are several exceptions to this following list. For example, the tax on automatic clothes washers was removed several years ago. Shampoo floor polishers, while an appliance, have been exempted from excise taxes since 1958. Motor powered, household lawnmowers were previously subject to a 5-percent excise which has now been removed. I wish to emphasize that many of these taxes were levied on the manufacturers' price and not on the retail price. Please note the distinction in the following tables:

Brief summary of major tax provisions of Public Law 89-44, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965

Item	Prior law		Under new law	Effective date
	Base	Rate		
A. RETAILERS				
Furs.....	Retail price.....	10 percent.....	Repealed entirely.....	June 22, 1965
Jewelry.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Luggage and handbags.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Toilet preparations.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
B. MANUFACTURERS				
Passenger automobiles ¹ (refunds as to sales after May 14, 1965).....	Manufacturer's price.....	10 percent.....	Reduced to 7 percent on June 22, 1965, 6 percent on Jan. 1, 1966, 4 percent on Jan. 1, 1967, 2 percent on Jan. 1, 1968, and 1 percent on Jan. 1, 1969.	
Schoolbuses.....	do.....	do.....	Exempted.....	June 22, 1965
Camper coaches and bodies and self-propelled mobile homes.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Farm feed, seed and fertilizer equipment.....	do.....	8 or 10 percent.....	do.....	Do.
Small 3-wheeled motor vehicles (also includes household-type power lawnmowers subject to 5 percent tax which is repealed). Auto parts and accessories ¹ (except parts primarily used for trucks and buses).....	do.....	10 percent.....	do.....	Do.
Refrigerators ¹	do.....	8 percent.....	Repealed entirely.....	Jan. 1, 1966
Freezers ¹	do.....	5 percent.....	Repealed entirely.....	June 22, 1965
Air conditioners ¹ (refunds as to sales after May 14, 1965).....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Electric, gas, and oil appliances ¹ (there was no excise on washing machines).....	do.....	10 percent.....	do.....	Do.
Electric light bulbs ¹	do.....	5 percent.....	do.....	Do.
Radio and phonographs ¹	do.....	10 percent.....	Repealed entirely on Jan. 1, 1966, except tax on bulbs used in previously taxable items repealed on June 22, 1965.	
Television sets ¹	do.....	do.....	Repealed entirely.....	June 22, 1965
Phonograph records ¹	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Musical instruments ¹	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Sporting goods ¹ (except fishing equipment).....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Cameras and film ¹	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Projectors ¹	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Business machines ¹	do.....	5 percent.....	do.....	Do.
Pens and mechanical pencils.....	do.....	10 percent.....	do.....	Do.
Lighters.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Matches:				
Plain.....	Each (but not more than 10 percent of manufacturer's price).	10 cents.....	do.....	Do.
Fancy.....	2 cents per 1,000, but not more than 10 percent of manufacturer's price.		do.....	Do.
Playing cards ¹	5½ cents per 1,000 Pack.....	13 cents.....	do.....	Do.

¹ Provision is made for floor stock refund.

The Full Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 20, 1965, an editorial entitled "Subsidizing Waste."

Because of the statements made in the editorial and because of the splendid reputation of the Star as a newspaper of integrity and responsibility, I did something which I very seldom do—write a letter to a newspaper editor.

In replying to the editorial, I kept in character by failing to adhere to the rules and regulations of brevity. I must admit that not among my virtues is my failure to embrace terminal facilities in speaking or writing.

After reading my letter, the Star characteristically rendered the courtesy of contacting me personally, explaining that my letter was too lengthy for full publication under their rules of "Letters to the Editor" and asked my permission to cut down the letter. I readily agreed, fully cognizant that a fair and equitable editing of the lengthy letter would result. My confidence was not misplaced, and on Thursday, June 24, the Star did publish the abbreviated copy of my reply. In doing so, none of the essentials of my letter were deleted and a most fair presentation was made. I do appreciate the position and courtesy of the Star.

In order, however, for the full and complete record to be presented to the Members of this body, I am offering for your information the complete text of the editorial and the complete text of my reply, both of which speak for themselves:

[From the Sunday Star, June 20, 1965]

SUBSIDIZING WASTE

Any nation with an annual \$49 billion outlay for defense is going to have trouble with politicians seeking a helping of this gravy for the home district.

Recent approval by the House of a scheme to keep open obsolete military bases offers an example of how Congressmen have become accustomed to this Federal largesse.

By means of a quickie amendment to a \$1.9 billion military construction bill, Chairman RIVERS, of the House Armed Services Committee, would hand Congress a veto power over any future base shutdowns.

The Rivers clause would require the Defense Department to give House and Senate advance notice before phasing out any installation. And either body would have up to 70 days to block the closing.

The amendment is nothing short of an outrageous poaching by Congress on the executive branch. Is President Johnson to come to the House Armed Services panel, hat in hand, every time he wants an outmoded depot dropped? And is there a Representative alive who will agree to such a shutdown in his home district when he can quietly prevent it?

In the past 4 years the Defense Department has announced 669 base closings and reductions at an estimated saving which ultimately will total \$1 billion annually. Nearly 1.5 million acres of land are being returned to

civilian use. It is not within the realm of the possible that this could have been accomplished under the Rivers amendment.

As Representative LUCIEN NEDZI, of Michigan, observed, we should expect the Defense Department as the greatest single employer and spender in the Nation to set an example in economy. It should not subsidize waste. It must not keep open useless bases merely to provide employment.

The House amendment is a parochial, short-sighted, selfish piece of logrolling. The Senate should strike it from the bill.

JUNE 21, 1965.

EDITOR, THE EVENING STAR,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is only because I have the highest respect for the integrity and objectivity of the editorial policy of the Evening Star that I pause to write this letter. After reading the editorial in your Sunday, June 20, edition, entitled "Subsidizing Waste," I cannot remain silent because I believe that had the author of the editorial looked at the other side of the coin, he would have written differently.

Permit me to refer to a pertinent sentence of your June 20 editorial:

"And is there a Representative alive who will agree to such a shutdown in his own district when he can quietly prevent it?"

I can answer that question with a strong affirmative reply because I am just such a Representative, and I think I am very much alive.

For substantiation, I refer to another editorial from the Evening Star published December 13, 1963, and which states:

"Let's strike off a medal of some kind for Louisiana's Congressman HÉBERT. For he is truly a man of distinction.

"The walls of anguish were rising from Capitol Hill after Defense Secretary McNamara had announced that 33 military establishments will be closed or cut back.

"Mr. HÉBERT, whose district will lose two installations, was heard to say: 'I've been preaching economy for all these years, and I'm not going to start screaming now just because they shut down something in my backyard.'"

When Camp Leroy Johnson was ordered closed in my home district (New Orleans, La.), I publicly praised the action of the Department of Defense and proudly declared that I could not and would not fight waste in other sections of the country and defend it in my own backyard. My fight against waste in the military for some 14 years as chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee for Special Investigations is a matter of record, and that record shows that I was instrumental in saving billions of dollars in the Defense Department and proposing policies and methods which have been put into effect by Secretary of Defense McNamara, accounting for much of the current savings claimed by the Department of Defense.

When the first list of closures of bases was announced 4 years ago, I not only agreed with the closing of the Algiers Naval Station in my district, but went even further and invited the Department of Defense to go an additional step and make a study with the view of consolidating all military activities in my area in the interest of economy. I finally accomplished that consolidation a week ago, and only on last Sunday, the day that your editorial appeared, I made a television broadcast to my constituency, telling them that they could not expect operation of the military on a wartime basis during peacetime—shaky as that peace is at the moment.

I have vigorously supported any move in the interest of economy, and by the same token I have just as vigorously opposed any action which I did not consider economical or more efficient. However, I do not write

this letter to defend my actions, but to express my concern about the broader aspects of the problem of base closures.

The American public is prone to take as fact and dogma any statement appearing in a newspaper, especially when the public is constantly told that authenticity and accuracy are undeniable. The average reader, in no small tribute to your paper, backs up his assertion by saying: "And besides, I read it in the Evening Star!"

Your June 20 editorial makes this statement:

"In the past 4 years, the Defense Department has announced 669 base closings and reductions at an estimated savings of which will ultimately total \$1 billion annually."

Where is the proof and documentation to validate such a statement? The Defense Department, through its effective propaganda machine, makes the statement, and the news media pick it up as a fact, without challenge. Now, as a matter of fact, these figures spoon-fed to the public through the media are misleading, if not totally false. As an example, much of the savings in the closures are credited to reduction of civilian personnel. This is a bookkeeping device which switches the charge of the civilian employment maintenance to another agency of the Government, with absolutely no savings in fact.

And how much does the Government recover by returning vacated property to civilian use? In the New Orleans area alone, not a red penny has been recovered by the Government from sale of the abandoned land. All vacated land has been given free to State and educational institutions. I approve of the procedure in this, but I do not approve of the legerdemain of the Defense Department in making it appear that the Treasury is being reimbursed.

Your editorial further states: "The amendment is nothing short of an outrageous poaching by Congress on the executive branch."

Have you ever stopped to think of the many outrageous poachings by the executive branch on the constitutional powers of the Congress? It is happening every day, but nowhere have I read a word of objection or heard a voice of the news media protesting against Government by executive directive instead of legislative action and procedure.

Your editorial says: "Nearly 1.8 million acres of land are being returned to civilian use. It is not within the realm of the possible that this could have been accomplished under the Rivers amendment."

Are you not aware of the fact that there is not an inch of real estate under present law and practices that can be disposed of without action by the House and Senate Armed Services Committee? The Rivers amendment which your editorial questioned would merely extend to proposed closures of activities at certain bases and would have nothing to do with the disposal of the real estate which is covered by present practice.

Under present conditions, the only time the public or a Member of Congress knows anything about the contemplated closure of a base is when it is publicly announced by the Defense Department. The decision, in effect, has already been reached, and the Member of Congress, in the legitimate performance of his duties, cannot challenge the logic behind the closing. It is only in rare instances that the Member of Congress can examine the alleged figures either to challenge or justify the alleged savings. Is the Department of Defense so infallible that it has not erred in 669 closings?

All that the House Armed Services Committee is attempting to do is to implement Congress' constitutional duty of "raising and maintaining" an army and a navy. All that the Armed Services Committee is fighting for is to be recognized as a full working partner in the business of national defense and security.

My colleague and chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, does not need me to rise in his defense, but I resent the continued efforts of some people to make him a scapegoat. In this particular instance, the record shows that he has the almost unanimous consent of his committee and the House of Representatives itself, which adopted the bill and the amendment on an overwhelming voice vote.

The House Armed Services Committee and the Nation is fortunate to have such an energetic and dedicated leader as chairman of the committee. His interest is the same interest as the President, the Secretary of Defense, and all other Americans—the defense of this country.

Chairman Rivers faces a challenge from which many others would fade. He follows in the footsteps of the great Carl Vinson, of Georgia, whose name became synonymous with the military, and who was one of the most beloved men ever to serve in the Congress of the United States. Filling his shoes is a tremendous order, but MENDEL RIVERS in a few short months has left little or no space in those shoes, big as they are.

It is most difficult for those of us who are fighting for something which a great many Americans believe in to get our story across to the public, mainly because we take a different road than the one walked by those equally dedicated patriots who disagree with us. Newspapers have more paper and ink than any of us has, and the air for us is only to breathe, and not to utilize to broadcast our views. Nor do we have millions of dollars and hundreds of experts for propaganda, as does the Department of Defense. We do not have 1 penny appropriated to us to get our story told.

It is only when individuals like myself become so concerned that they write letters like this to the editor of a great and respected newspaper like the Evening Star, in the hope that the words and our views will be printed and that the public will pause to realize that a pancake, no matter how thin, has two sides to it.

Thank you for your indulgence.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

First Reunion of the "Callaway"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GALE SCHISLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, the first reunion of the U.S.S. *Callaway* (APA-35) is scheduled for August 1-4, 1965, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C. Reservations are to be made by July 22 with Mr. Wallace Shipp, 5319 Manning Place NW., Washington, D.C., or Mr. Duane E. Blumh, 633 Stearns Avenue, Washington, D.C.

The *Callaway* was launched October 10, 1942, by Western Pipe & Steel Co. in San Francisco, Calif., under a Maritime Commission contract. The *Callaway* sailed from Norfolk October 23, 1943, for San Diego and began the training of marines in preparation for the first of her five assaults. She landed troops for her initial firing at Kwajalein. She next sailed to Guadalcanal and from there proceeded, with combat troops, for the occupation of Emirau. The *Callaway's*

third assault was the Battle of Saipan, June 15. She then launched her troops September 17 in the Palaus and returned to Manus and New Guinea to prepare for her assignment to the first reinforcement echelon for the northern Leyte landings.

The *Callaway* distinguished herself as a member of the Blue Beach Attack Group in the Lingayen assault. In January of 1945 a suicide plane broke through heavy anti-aircraft fire to crash on the *Callaway's* bridge. Damage was able to be kept to a minimum, but 29 of the *Callaway's* crew were killed and 22 were wounded. Temporary repairs put her back in action and she carried Marine reinforcements from Guam to Iwo Jima.

She continued to transport men and equipment between the bases and operating areas of the Western Pacific, and then embarked Japanese prisoners of war at Pearl Harbor. Two transpacific voyages carrying homeward bound veterans ended with the *Callaway's* own return to San Francisco March 12 1946.

A Legislator Looks at the Pharmaceutical Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at a luncheon of the Pharmaceutical Advertising Club at the Hilton Hotel, New York City, on June 22, 1965:

A LEGISLATOR LOOKS AT THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

(By JOHN E. FOGARTY)

I appreciate that kind introduction. I would have thought myself better known to you as one in Congress who provides more money for Government health programs than they need or should have, to do a lot of things you think the Government shouldn't do anyway—judging from some of the comments I have heard.

In any case, it is true that for more than 20 years it has been my privilege, as a Member of the Congress, to serve the people of Rhode Island, the people of the United States, and the people of the free world. And it is true that during this time, in addition to my regular duties, my special field of interest and activity has been in connection with the programs of the Department of Labor and of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It has been an altogether satisfying experience. I know of nothing that is more important than the health and well-being of people, which is basic to happiness, to productivity, yes even to the capacity to protect and advance the cause of freedom. And I am sure this is a view you share.

It is my understanding that most of you who are here today at this luncheon meeting of the Pharmaceutical Advertising Club are here because you communicate for the pharmaceutical industry. I submit that given the issues confronting that industry today, it is also important that you communicate to its members and particularly to its leaders.

What is there to say to them? In my view, it is simply this: Unless the pharmaceutical industry finds better ways to demonstrate its concern for the public interest to provide more tangible evidence of its ability to be in at least some respects self-regulating, it is destined gradually to be changed in character, by public mandate.

I want to elaborate on that. But first I want to make one point absolutely clear. As a bricklayer (and I am proud that I am still a card-carrying member of the union representing that skilled trade), as a citizen, and as a Member of Congress, I am committed to a belief in private industry and in the values of the free enterprise system. Under that system, this Nation has grown and prospered. The private component is vital to our kind of society and essential to our way of life. Do not count me among those prophets of doom who make a career out of predicting the socialization of all things. Do not count me, either, among those committed as a matter of political and economic philosophy to public ownership and public controls over the operation of all essential industries and functions. My natural inclination is to want to help repair and correct and strengthen, rather than to weaken and destroy private initiative. That is why I was happy to accept the invitation to join you today. I feel I have some things to say, or at least a point of view, that may help you, and hopefully, those you communicate to within the industry.

As far as the general public is concerned, "the industry" begins with the prescription drug manufacturer and ends with the retailer. This is another way of saying that to the consumer, the thing that matters is the immediate availability at a reasonable price of what the doctor has prescribed. Notice that I leave quality out of this. Quality may be readily apparent when the consumer buys a car, a shirt, a radio. He knows what quality consists of, and he makes his own judgment about whether he wants or can afford to pay for a premium product.

But with prescription drugs, as all of you must know, the situation is different. The consumer is a captive—he has—for the most part, no choice either about what he will buy, or what he will pay for what he buys. And yet the product involved—the prescription drug—is, or may be, the difference between life and death, health and sickness, freedom from pain and suffering.

As compared with other industries, there is something different about the prescription drug industry. And there should be something different about the prescription drug industry's performance of its business in terms of the public interest. I am not at all sure that there is.

I understand that there are something like 1,200 companies known to be manufacturing prescription drugs in the United States alone. Literature from the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association indicates its membership to be about 140 companies. And I have heard that the top 20 companies do more than 80 percent of the prescription drug business in this country. In addition, the financial world records that profits as a percentage of sales in the prescription drug business are high. It is near the top of all industries in this respect, and apparently continues to improve its position despite the warnings it has been receiving and the controls that have been imposed since Senator Kefauver first threw the spotlight on the industry in 1959.

Now I know that the retail price of prescription drugs has been going down the last 5 or 6 years. According to the Consumer Price Index, there has been a significant decline at the same time that prices for food and other goods have been rising. This is certainly to the drug industry's credit. But the fact remains that the public still has

the impression that drug prices—and profits—are too high. And this is a problem which the industry must somehow deal with. What has its reaction been?

As a Member of Congress, I have been the recipient of some of it. You talk about your investments in research. You emphasize high risks and rapid product obsolescence. You proclaim how essential and expensive it is to inform physicians about new products. You speak of quality control and of the vital importance of product reliability. You point to the retailer and the ways in which his operation of his business affects the price of your products to the consumer.

I am sure each of these factors has a valid bearing on the question of prices and profits. One would think that they would answer the question—particularly when combined with the acknowledged and unparalleled record of the U.S. prescription drug industry in discovering and developing new drugs that have significantly assisted the physician in advancing the public health. But I think the continuing harassment of the industry from many quarters suggests that the question has not been satisfactorily answered for many people.

Certainly research is a most desirable function for the reinvestment of profits made by the pharmaceutical industry. A number of companies have truly outstanding research laboratories, and the industry invests several hundred million dollars in this field. But is this a characteristic across the board? Do all the companies—all 1,200 of them, or even all 140 of them in the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association—carry out a share of the research endeavor? I think not.

Moreover, I am sure it is fair to say that the bulk of the industry's research must be invested in what is called developmental research, and quite properly so. Much of the basic research in medicine is done by scientists in university and Government laboratories, and they are supported either by tax funds or voluntary contributions. In this sense, others outside the industry help finance the acquisition of fundamental knowledge which, in turn, helps the industry in the development of new products. And it seems to me that this imposes yet another special responsibility on the industry to keep the public interest in mind in the conduct of its business.

Like research, the high risk and rapid product obsolescence factor is, I am sure, a valid one. It undoubtedly adds to the cost of drugs and it probably means that profit margins must be higher than in some other industries. And yet with the rapid—some would say excessively rapid—introduction of new prescription drugs during the past 20 years, there seems to have been little damage to the financial strength and stability of the industry and its members. And I can't think of how long it has been since I heard of a pharmaceutical company that failed because it was losing money.

The industry has a special challenge and responsibility in connection with the quality of its products. There can be no compromise. They must be as safe, as effective, as uniform in quality as it is possible for man and science to make them. Unfortunately, but understandably, people expect absolutes as far as their health is concerned. They expect the doctor to help them, and the drugs and vaccines the doctor uses to help them, 100 percent of the time. Yet there are no absolutes in the health field; no surgery is sure to cure, no drug is sure to amellorate. So the dilemma is one you must live with. To compound the dilemma, the measures of quality are not readily apparent. One pill looks very much like another pill to the patient.

I support and applaud the industry's effort to sustain the uniformly high quality of its prescription drugs and vaccines. When a

drug fails, in terms of either safety or effectiveness, it is a terrible thing. The initial failure of the Salk polio vaccine and the tragedy of thalidomide are cases in point. There is value in the quality of products related to human health, and people are willing to pay for it. Yet the industry may overstate the case when it talks quality as a factor in price.

To go back to the point about the 1,200 manufacturers for a moment—surely all of them do not build into their products all the quality factors that characterize the products of Eli Lilly, for example, or Upjohn. But their prices seem to be about the same. And if there are variations in the quality of drugs, the people don't seem to hear about it. They have the impression that drugs are all about the same, all checked and approved by the Government.

Right now, for example, you are trying to sell the idea that it is better to prescribe drugs under their brand names rather than their generic description. The implication is that there are real differences in the quality of drugs, and that a brand name helps guide the buyer to the most reliable manufacturer and the highest quality product. But the public has not really been told this. If one drug is less safe, less effective, or less uniform in quality than another, then the people assume it shouldn't be on the market. So it seems to me that you have a problem in product differentiation when those differences are certainly not apparent.

Now as to the distribution system for prescription drugs. I have seen several members of your industry, in effect, shrug their shoulders and throw up their hands, as much as to say that nothing can be done about it. When the question of cost to consumer is raised, the manufacturer looks at the retailer and says, "On the average, he adds 100 percent to our price to him and charges it to the patient, and nobody ever accuses him of profiteering on prescription drugs." And the retailer looks at the manufacturer and says, "Look at his sales and earnings statements. He's making all the money." Did you ever see a retail pharmacist who got rich in the business? I don't know the rights and wrongs of it, but I do know the forgotten man in such a situation is likely to be the patient.

As far as he is concerned, he sees only one thing, the bill, and applies only one measure—whether the drug helps. He is unlikely to love you for what you do. The most you can expect is that he will understand and respect you, and accept your prices and profits as necessary and reasonable in the light of the services you perform.

How can this be achieved? You who are in this audience should know the answers better than I. You are the pharmaceutical advertisers—the communicators for the pharmaceutical industry. Now, with whom do you communicate? The doctors? Yes, abundantly. The pharmacists? Yes, to a limited extent. Anybody else? I'm afraid the answer to that is, not really.

In other words, the industry has grown up believing that it is the doctors, not the people, who are your customers. Perhaps some of you would not even acknowledge that you deal in consumer goods.

Under the circumstances, it is understandable that you would give primary attention to communications with physicians and pharmacists, since they are the ones who prescribe and provide your drugs. But they are special circumstances, and their very special nature requires action and communication that goes beyond narrow commercial expediency. For—and make no mistake about it—the people are looking at you, and it is past time for you to be looking to the people. The physician-pharmacist-pharmaceutical manufacturer team, which may have been thought sufficient unto itself at one

time, is no longer protection against public and governmental scrutiny.

How about it, you communicators? Are you prepared to recommend to the managements you represent that they must take their case to the people, as well as to the professions, if they wish to survive and to retain their basic characteristics under our free enterprise system? Are you prepared to recommend that they find new ways to meet the challenges that confront them?

Part of the answer lies in telling people what you do. The other part is in doing better.

In the first instance, one does not have to look very hard to find good things to say. You know what they are better than I do—the products of your research, the care you devote to manufacturing and testing, the value of your services to physicians and others in the health professions, and so on. I have but one suggestion to make in this respect. Don't fall to remember that people care less about what you do than about what you do for them. As a legislator, I can tell you that the case has not been made to me and many of my colleagues, just as it has not to the American people. What are you doing—for them? Tell them, so they will have some basis for judging the merits of your present performance.

I have said that the industry should accommodate itself to the inevitability of essential change.

What do I mean by this? Let me give you just a few illustrations.

1. Are you prepared to adjust profit margins if this is indicated, as drugs are made available under the medicare and other programs that will make health care more widely available to those who need it most?

2. Are you prepared to assume responsibility for an increasing share of the financial needs of medical schools and other health centers—institutions from which you derive many benefits? They are a source of basic knowledge, the primary place for testing your drugs, the primary source of trained manpower for your research, and medical programs, the only source of physicians who later will prescribe your products. And yet, if I am correctly informed, industry has dedicated only relatively small amounts of its profits to these institutions.

3. Isn't there some way you can reduce the price of drugs required for chronic illness? It seems to me that the patient who has to take maintenance doses of the same drug over a period of years could be considered at least as a quantity purchaser, and entitled to a quantity discount?

4. New drugs are becoming more and more complex, and it is therefore more and more difficult to know how they will affect the patient on a long-term basis. Isn't there some way you could devote more of your research to developing new tests and procedures to permit more accurate estimates of the safety?

5. Does the industry, which so strongly protests overregulation, have the capacity to be more self-regulating? Is there in fact any way for the association that represents the industry to insist on the maintenance of certain principles and standards, and to discipline or reject those companies whose performance falls short?

6. Is there a way—assuming the maintenance of the patent system and of some means for company identification with the products it manufactures (and I hope both of these can be protected, since they are fundamental to the free enterprise system)—is there a way to achieve more price competition?

These are some of the challenges, as they appear to a Congressman in Washington and as they appear, I believe, to many of the American people. I have spoken frankly about them because I have come here as a friend. I want to be helpful, and con-

structive, because I know that you are as dedicated as I am to improving the health of people everywhere.

Indeed, no industry in the world has done more to relieve the sufferings of mankind, to push the frontiers of medicine forward toward healthier and happier living. You lead every other country in the development of new drugs. Nearly two-thirds of all the major new compounds made available since 1941 have been developed in the United States. And 90 percent of these have come from company laboratories.

You have worked conscientiously to improve the quality of your products, to make them as safe and as effective as humanly

possible. Although you have received very little credit for it, you have supported measures to strengthen the Food and Drug Administration and, even, to add some new controls over drugs. You have responded willingly and often to the call of public service. And in recent years you have even cut some prescription prices.

For the most part, you have done all these things in the shadow of anonymity. You have worked through physicians and pharmacists, so that the public hasn't recognized the good you have done. And this is too bad, for you have a lot to be proud about. The country has many reasons to be proud of you and grateful.

Now, however, the American people and the Congress are taking notice. They are watching what you are doing, listening to what you say. And you, in turn, are having to listen to them. This requires some adjustments and poses some difficult challenges, I know. But it also presents an extraordinary opportunity.

For a pharmaceutical industry, working in harmony, understanding, and partnership with the American people, would be less vulnerable to outside criticism and interference. It would be an even greater force for the improvement of the Nation's health. And this would be in your interest as well as the public's.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of light and truth: From all the baseness that lurks in our own hearts, we turn to the crystal purity of Thy holiness. From the vain deceits of the changing world in which we live, before each day's deliberations we would turn from the tyranny of drab details to the shining splendor of the heavenly vision which haunts us, and to which we dare not be disobedient.

In our hearts we know that the destiny of this Nation is inseparably bound up with loyalty to its national heritage. That heritage is rooted in Thee. All our beginnings proclaim that creed. Apart from faith in spiritual verities, even our loved America has no meaning relevant to today's world situation.

Strengthen our belief that what is best for our Nation under God is best for the whole world. Thou knowest that in our hearts we have no dream of good for men and women and children under our flag, that we do not passionately desire to share with all Thy children of every race and kindred, beyond all the frowning frontiers of this now sadly divided earth.

We ask it in the name of the Christ whose coming kingdom will unite into one fraternity all the sons of men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 28, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 24, 1965, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 856. An act for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; and

S. 1000. An act to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsi-

bility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8126. An act to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement; and

H.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution designating the bridge constructed over the Washington Channel of the Potomac River, in the District of Columbia, as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge."

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1229. An act to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7060. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 8126. An act to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide

broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement; and

H.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution designating the bridge constructed over the Washington Channel of the Potomac River, in the District of Columbia, as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge."

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Select Subcommittee on Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 4493. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap (Rept. No. 379).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 4525. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs (Rept. No. 380).

HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COM- MITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 381)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon.