

Mr. Lesinski, but the point of increasing the sweat is not with regard to any therapy, but with regard to means of making the sweat readily available for examination.

Lesinski: That is the point. That is true. Would you make that one experiment to see what the answer is, if you don't mind?

Whedon: Internally?

Lesinski: Internally.

At this point, Fogarty intervened and the discussion went off the record.

The Michigan Congressman also expressed puzzlement over the economics of spending research funds for drugs that later lost usefulness as resistances to them developed.

"Everytime we find out something new the bugs resist it and then we have to start all over again. So where are we getting in the ultimate end? . . . It was said to us the other day, I believe it was for syphilis, that the penicillin is used and syphilis was building up resistance to it. He [a previous witness] mentioned malaria; they had found the old methods are not as much value as they thought they were, due to the fact the malarial germ developed an immunity to the original methods. That is exactly what I am driving at, the fact you go through all this trouble, spending funds, finding means or ways of doing away with something; then the insect develops an immunity, then you have to start all over again."

Shannon attempted an explanation and the hearing proceeded, strewn with various other Lesinski-isms each of which could serve admirably as an introduction to the formidable problem of Congress's inadequacy for understanding the massive scientific effort that it is annually asked to support with billions of dollars.—D. S. GREENBERG

Congress: In Voting Assistance To Health Professions Education, House Demonstrates Its Folkways

The House of Representatives marked its return from the Easter recess last week by passing the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. This is the first major new administration bill to be voted by the House this year, and it also ranks as the education measure most likely to succeed in this session of Congress.

The bill authorizes \$175 million in matching grants over a 3-year period for construction of teaching facilities

for medical, dental, and allied professions and \$61 million for a loan program for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

Debate on the bill (H.R. 12) and the events preceding its movement to the floor offer an instructive case study of what it takes to pass an education bill and explain why more of them haven't cleared the hurdles in the House.

The health professions education bill sailed under the colors of health, not education, legislation. It originated in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and bore the name of the Commerce Committee chairman, Representative Oren Harris (D.-Ark.) as author.

Even when teaching facilities and loans for students are involved, this committee's prerogatives prevail, by the same sort of congressional logic that puts health care for the aged in the province of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee. For, as Harris pointed out during debate, in answer to a suggestion that the Education and Labor Committee might more appropriately consider some features of the measure, the Commerce Committee's charter over health legislation dates back to the 18th century.

For a variety of reasons, Congress is less inhibited about promoting the general welfare through health legislation than through education measures. The federal government's old role of fostering public health and its new one of supporting medical research are regarded in Congress as generally successful, as well as popular with the public, and most legislators feel that they do not add debits to their voting records when they vote funds to fight disease.

Over the years, the feeling has developed on both sides of the aisle that there is a shortage of doctors and dentists and that the national government has a legitimate interest in easing the situation. Southern members, many of them representing rural districts where shortages of medical and dental services may be acute, have been among the strongest proponents of action.

Although the civil rights and church-state issues have proved the undoing of many education bills, health measures have seemed less vulnerable to these controversies. During the debate on the Harris bill, for example, the civil rights and religion questions, particularly on the score of teaching facilities,

were injected but never permitted to paralyze the action. Congress, when it has its mind made up, can choose to see what it wants to see, rather in the manner of Lord Nelson when he raised the telescope to his eye patch.

Also working in favor of H.R. 12 is the fact of congressional life that all committees are not equal in influence and that a bill from the Commerce Committee reaches the floor with more momentum than a bill out of the Education and Labor Committee.

This is a year when, because of press reports of junketing abroad and legislative lethargy at home, Congress is almost morbidly sensitive about its image. The legislators were, therefore, especially irked by the attention given in the newspapers to reports of the federally subsidized nightclubbing in Europe and other activities of the Education and Labor Committee's debonair chairman, Representative Adam Clayton Powell (D.-New York).

But personalities aside, the Education and Labor Committee is looked upon as a relatively junior committee which reports a large number of proposals in two highly controversial areas of legislation, and the House, temperamentally, does not welcome controversy.

For the administration, a piquant aspect of the passage of H.R. 12 was the support given the measure by a virtually solid phalanx of medical and health professions groups, including the American Medical Association, which last year proved itself to be in the heavyweight class among interest groups in opposing medical care for the aged. Actually, the A.M.A. supported only the construction section of H.R. 12 and took no positive stand on the loan provision until the bill was scheduled for action on the floor. Then in a letter to all Congressmen dated 18 April, the association asked the legislators to support the bill with an amendment deleting the loan section.

The A.M.A. argued that the weight of testimony in the hearings on H.R. 12 indicated that "the greatest need is in the area of renovation of existing facilities and the construction of new facilities. The record further failed to disclose at this time a need for anything else."

Many references were made, during both hearings and debate, to an A.M.A. loan program, inaugurated last year, under which medical students, interns, and residents may borrow up to \$1500 a year to a maximum of \$10,000 over

a 10-year span at a basic interest rate of 5.5 percent. The amount lent was reported to have topped \$6 million, and though a spokesman for A.M.A. was quoted as saying the loan fund "would not do the whole job," it was cited as evidence that a big new federal loan program is not needed.

It is worth noting that A.M.A. opposition to the federal loan program seemed relatively perfunctory as compared to its campaign against medical care for the aged. There was no upsurge of congressional mail from back home of the kind that reached flood stage when Medicare was under consideration last year.

The question of whether or not a bill will pass is usually settled before it comes to the floor, but the quality of the management of the debate often influences a bill's final form, particularly when, as in the case of H.R. 12, the measure comes out under an open rule permitting unlimited amendment. Harris, who managed the debate on his own bill, is one of a group of experienced, informed, and unflamboyant southerners who, as chairmen of committees or important subcommittees, have the prestige and practice in the House to keep things under control.

The crucial moment in the debate on H.R. 12 came on a vote to recommit the bill to committee with instructions to delete the student loan provision. When the motion was defeated 239 to 171, it was apparent that the bill was headed for final passage. On final passage the bill carried, 288 to 122.

Although the loan program was the most stiffly opposed feature of the bill, several speakers during the debate expressed forebodings that the "bricks and mortar" section, too, might open the way to federal control of medical schools, and thereby breach the defenses of the medical profession against government interference.

The question of need for more medical, dental, and health personnel was a central one in both the hearings and the debate, and the result, as is often the case with manpower data, was interesting but inconclusive.

While the number of physicians per capita seems to have increased slightly—from 135 per 100,000 population in 1940 to 137 per 100,000 today—the effects of specialization and of the concentration of physicians in the cities have complicated the picture. Fourteen states, for example, are said to have fewer than 100 doctors per 100,000 population, while four states have 160

or more per 100,000. The Congressmen showed special concern over the effects of the influx of foreign physicians and over the growing scarcity of "family doctors," defined as general practitioners, internists, and pediatricians.

Although the debate centered on the education of physicians, the bill would also help to provide teaching facilities, although not loans, for allied health professions.

In final form the bill authorized \$175 million in construction grants over 3 years. Of this, \$105 million is to be used for matching grants for teaching facilities to train physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, or public health workers; \$35 million, for dental schools; and \$35 million, for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing medical, dental, and health teaching facilities.

Under the student loan program, \$30.7 million is provided for the first 3 years for loans to students of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry, together with sums necessary (an estimated \$30.7 million more) to enable students receiving these loans to continue their training after 1966.

The measure now moves to the Senate, where hearings have been promised but not scheduled in the busy Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The Senators are expected to give the proposal a friendly reception, and the odds seem to favor the administration's getting its first fruits, after 2 years of frustration, in the field of education legislation.

Certainly, in giving priority to the Harris bill and steering it along, the administration has followed a strategy of compromise.

The economy bloc in the House was placated by a reduction in the scale of the bill from the \$800-million, 10-year version which the committee reported last year in response to the President's request.

A scholarship program which had provoked the opposition of a sizable antischolarship coalition in the House and raised the choler of the A.M.A. was replaced by the loan feature. And the bill was given precedence by the administration and the leadership and became the first major new measure of the 88th Congress to reach the floor of the House.

The cooperation of the House Rules Committee in allowing the measure to come to the floor was temporarily withheld by Chairman Howard Smith of Virginia, who regarded H.R. 12 as an

education bill and said he wished to wait to see what else would be forthcoming in the way of education legislation.

H.R. 12's most obvious competition came from a bill under consideration in the House Education and Labor Committee's subcommittee which handles legislation on higher education, a bill sponsored by the chairman of that subcommittee, Edith Green (D.-Ore.).

The Green bill provides for grants and loans for academic facilities and expansion of the NDEA loan program and would include medical and dental schools and their students in its benefits.

The Green subcommittee was on the verge of reporting the bill when a White House meeting on education legislation was convened. Immediately afterwards the Green bill was side-tracked, the Rules Committee voted out the Harris bill, and the leadership scheduled action on it to follow the recess.

The administration denies any "deal" with the Rules Committee, but presumably the administration was not eager to see a higher education bill come out of committee, since the Education and Labor Committee is now considering an omnibus education bill [*Science* 139, 474 (1963)] which includes proposals on higher education among its two dozen sections.

During the debate Mrs. Green quelled whatever jurisdictional resentments she may have felt and confined herself to contributing significantly to successful efforts to affix key amendments to the bill. Earlier, however, in a Rules Committee hearing on the Harris bill, she expressed a nagging feeling of futility common to congressional proponents of education legislation when she said, "If legislation is to be passed, we should introduce a bill to build schools and call it the educational public works bill or turn education over to the Defense Department."

—JOHN WALSH

Growing Old in America: Frauds, Quackery, Swindle the Aged and Compound their Troubles

Few, one suspects, of America's aging citizens share the sanguine view Browning's Rabbi Ben Ezra held of the process: 'Grow old along with me. The best is yet to be/the last of life for which the first is made. . . .' Statistics, corroborated by daily impressions, suggest that in America the "last of life"