tional charts is less significant than the fact that FDA's programs will be expanded under the reorganization.

The biggest casualty of the reorganization seems to be the old Public Health Service. Lee said that PHS now amounts to a "holding company" which includes the three major operating agencies—NIH, Health Services, and Consumer Protection. But the administrators of these agencies report directly to Lee, while the Surgeon General, previously the head of PHS, has become an assistant to Lee. As Ivan Bennett, Jr., deputy director of the president's Office of Science and Technology, sees it, "The PHS exists as a personnel system, the members of which are entitled to wear uniforms, but as a public health service agency it has almost ceased to exist." In the long run, the uniformed personnel system is also in danger, for long-pending plans for a "federal health service" would absorb the old PHS commissioned officers corps.

The latest reorganization of health activities, as is the case with virtually all reorganizations, is expected to spark some opposition. Present and retired PHS officers are not likely to be happy. And various congressmen are already sniping at aspects of the plan. But unhappy congressmen have little direct control over the reorganization. All the steps can be carried out by executive authority except for a proposal to elevate the assistant secretary for health and science to undersecretary. Congress failed to act on a proposal to create an undersecretary last year.

Meanwhile, the reorganization mill will continue to turn, for Cohen has said there will be further study of federal activities in the pharmaceutical field, in maternal and child health and family planning, in international health activities, and in health programs for the poor, with a view to possible coordination and reorganization. And with a new administration scheduled to take office next January, there is always the possibility of yet more changes.—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

Continental Shelf: Scramble for Federal Oil-Lease Revenues

The rapidly growing federal revenues from the leasing of outer-continental-shelf lands for the recovery of oil and gas are being eyed by increasing numbers of eager claimants. In fact, the supposedly long-since-settled "tidelands" oil controversy of the early 1950's seems about to be reopened. The rising interest in the continental-shelf revenues is evident from recent Senate debates over legislation to earmark part of them for the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Fund, established by Congress in 1964 to provide for the purchase of land for new national parks and other federalized state outdoor recreation areas, is now critically short of money. Under the proposed legislation the Fund would get about one-fifth of the annual outer-continental-shelf receipts, which have totaled (on the average) $265 million a year over the past 5 years but which are expected to nearly double during the next 5 years. Unless a dependable new source of revenue for the Fund is found, important conservation efforts, such as those to preserve major stands of coast redwoods and to expand national and state park systems, will be severely retarded.

Yet, in late April, Louisiana's senators, Russell B. Long and Allen J. Ellender, persuaded the Senate not to earmark any of the continental-shelf receipts for the Fund. Their success was due in no small part to the feeling of many senators that it is bad budgetary practice to commit particular revenues to special purposes. The principal motive of the Louisiana senators, however, was to keep all these revenues available for earmarking schemes of their own. They want these revenues earmarked partly for Louisiana and other coastal states adjacent to oil- and mineral-rich lands of the outer continental shelf and partly for the support of research, exploration, and development in the field of marine resources. They would, in effect, undo the 1953 settlement concerning federal rights versus states' rights in the continental shelf.

By the terms of that settlement, which followed years of legislative struggle and two presidential vetoes, Congress gave the coastal states ownership and control of that part of the shelf extending a distance of 3 miles offshore (or a greater distance if historic boundaries justified it). On the other hand, that part of the shelf beyond the 3-mile or historic boundary was to be under federal ownership, and revenues derived from oil and gas and mineral leases in this region were to go into the general revenues of the Treasury.

The earmarking of part of these revenues for the Conservation Fund is strongly advocated now by the Department of the Interior, which administers both the Fund and the outer-continental-shelf lands. It would be the first earmarking of these receipts for any purpose, and is thus regarded by Long and Ellender as an important precedent.

As this is written, it appears that the opposition of the Louisiana senators will be overcome, however, and that the Fund will share in the continental-shelf revenues. The Senate now seems to be responding to the Fund's evident need and to the political strength and ardor of the conservation groups. Some senators have received hundreds of letters urging them to support the earmarking of shelf revenues for the Fund.

On 18 June, the Senate rejected, by a vote of 69 to 13, Senator Long's proposal to have the Senate appoint conferees who, in meeting with House conferees on the Conservation Fund bill, would insist on upholding the Senate position against earmarking. The conferees actually named were expected to accept the House-passed bill's 5-year allocation of about $100 million of continental-shelf revenues each year to the Fund.

Following the vote on the appointment of conferees, Long and Ellender had all but given up hope of stopping the earmarking, and no major effort to carry on the fight was being planned. As one of their aides observed, to provoke the conservationists unduly might be imprudent inasmuch as the Louisiana senators probably would be coming before the Senate with a proposal to earmark the continental-shelf receipts not yet preempted.

Long and Ellender do not yet have an active proposal of their own outstanding, but they have had a part in developing legislation recently introduced in the House by a Louisiana congressman, Edwin E. Willis, chairman of the Special Judiciary Subcommittee on Submerged Lands. The principal provisions of the Willis bill, on which 4 days of hearings have been scheduled to start 24 July, are (i) that 37½ percent of the revenues from the outer continental shelf shall go to the state or states adjoining the submerged lands producing these revenues, to be spent on public schools and roads, and (ii) that the remaining 62½ percent shall be deposited in a Marine Resources and Conservation and Development Fund and used for the support of various activities, including pollution abatement in the Great Lakes and in coastal areas, fisheries development, aquaculture, hurricane protection, oceanographic research, and the development of sea-grant colleges.

According to Willis, his bill follows the precedent of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, which allocates most of the revenues derived from federally owned mineral deposits to the Reclamation Fund but reserves 37½ percent of the revenues for the states in which they are produced.

The Willis proposal, unlike some earlier proposals by Louisianans, does not seek to extend state regulatory jurisdiction to the federally owned outer continental shelf, although some oil companies plainly would prefer state to federal regulation. "We don't want this pegged as an oil company bill," one congressional aide remarks.

The main hope of the Louisianans is that most members of Congress from the 23 coastal and 8 Great Lakes states will rally to the idea that continental-shelf receipts should benefit coastal states and marine-resource development. Accordingly, as part of the effort to prevent the earmarking of receipts for the Conservation Fund, Long was buttonholing senators from the coastal states and, in effect, warning, "You don't know what you're giving away out there."

NEWS IN BRIEF

• **EDUCATION BUDGET SLASHED**: The House Appropriations Committee has cut $848 million from the Health, Education, and Welfare Department budget request for educational activities. Among the cuts was a nearly one-third reduction in funds for a proposed Education Professions Development Activities program. A Research and Training bill was also cut substantially with more than one-third slashed from the request. Another bill affecting colleges and universities, the Higher Education Facilities Loan Fund bill, was not substantially affected by the cuts and will provide the same basic program level as for 1968. In spite of major overall cutbacks in the HEW budget, HEW has been allotted $14.28 billion for its overall activities, almost $3 billion more than it received in 1968.

• **UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO RECEIVES $12 MILLION**: A gift of $12 million—one of the largest single contributions in its 76-year history—has been given to the University of Chicago for its school of medicine by the A. N. and Jack Pritzker families of Chicago. The Pritzkers own the law firm Pritzker and Pritzker, and various real estate and lumber interests. George W. Beadle, president of the university, said Chicago's medical school will now be known as the Pritzker School of Medicine. Beadle said the funds will be used to strengthen the faculty and to create four endowed chairs in different branches of the medical school.

• **INTERNATIONAL DECADE OF OCEAN STUDY PLANNED**: Vice President Hubert Humphrey has announced a favorable initial Soviet response to President Johnson's March proposal for an international decade of ocean exploration during the 1970's. Humphrey's report was announced by Edward Wenk, Jr., National Council on Marine Resources executive secretary, who recently met with officials of Soviet science agencies and the Foreign Office, in Moscow. Wenk said that similar favorable responses were noted in meetings held in London, Bonn, and Oslo. Humphrey, who is chairman of the Marine Science Council, has asked the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering to prepare preliminary recommendations on the planned U.S. scientific contribution to the decade. It is expected that the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, a unit of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, will play a key role in the international planning.

• **NASA AUTHORIZATION**: The House of Representatives on 18 June approved the Senate version of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) authorization bill. The bill, which has been sent to the President, calls for a cut of about $357 million from the proposed $4.37 billion for NASA. It provides for the full $55 million requested for the new NERVA nuclear rocket engine development program. The House also retained the amendment of Senator Carl T. Curtis (R–Neb.) which denies NASA funds to colleges and universities that bar U.S. Armed Forces recruiters from their campuses.

• **FDA TO REVIEW COMMENTS ON ANTIBIOTICS**: Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Commissioner James L. Goddard has extended to 9 August the period for comments on proposed regulations for the use of antibiotics in food-producing animals. The new FDA regulations would bar the use in food-producing animals of injectable antibiotics, including some forms of penicillin, all of which have been cited as a possible health hazard to man when traces remain in meat, milk, and eggs. Written comments may be submitted to the Hearing Clerk, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. All comments will be reviewed before new regulations are published in final form.

• **VANCE ELECTED YALE TRUSTEE**: Cyrus R. Vance, U.S. Ambassador-at-large and deputy negotiator at Vietnam peace talks in Paris, has been elected as a Yale University trustee over conservative spokesman and editor William F. Buckley, Jr. Ambassador Vance succeeds William McChesney Martin, Federal Reserve System chairman of the board. He will begin his 6-year term as a fellow of the 19-member Yale Corporation, the university's governing board of trustees, starting next month.

Senators from the southern Atlantic states, for example, were told of studies indicating the presence of large phosphate and manganese deposits off the Carolina and Florida coasts. To judge from their contribution to the Conservation Fund debate, senators such as Ernest F. Hollins of South Carolina and Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii were impressed by Long's arguments. His views are likely to gain wider acceptance, moreover, once intensive development of outer-continental-shelf resources occurs in regions other than those adjacent to the Gulf states. Development of outer-shelf oil and gas is expected soon off the California coast near Santa Barbara, and somewhat later in the Gulf of Alaska.

But because the Willis bill and similar proposals not only reopen the "tidelands" controversy but have the look of special-interest legislation, their chances of acceptance seem poor. Senator Ellender himself has confessed that he is not optimistic. However, the prospects for less ambitious proposals which do not seek new bonanzas for the states adjacent to oil-rich submerged lands may be much brighter. Interest in marine resources was greatly stimulated by the passage in 1966 of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act and the National Sea Grant College and Program Act. On 24 June, Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, chairman of the Commerce Committee, was to hold hearings on a new bill of his to establish a Marine Resources Fund. Each year the fund would receive $50 million in outer-continental-shelf revenues, with up to half that amount going to the sea-grant program and the other half going to other marine-resource development programs. An identical measure, introduced by Representative Alton Lennon of North Carolina, chairman of the subcommittee on oceanography, and signed by 17 cosponsors, is pending in the House.

Just what will result from this surge of interest in the revenues from the outer continental shelf is not yet clear, but the scramble for these revenues has begun in earnest.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

Hunger and Malnutrition: HEW Says Nation Must Know More and Do More

"Hunger and malnutrition are intolerable in this country and should not be allowed to exist," proclaims a recently completed report of Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). Few would radically disagree with such a statement. The question is, however, Why have hunger and malnutrition been allowed to exist?

Whenever an unmet social need surfaces, most people find it consoling to be able to point to a villain other than themselves. The "villains" most often mentioned in this case are the Department of Agriculture and its Secretary, Orville L. Freeman. The tendency to single out the Agriculture Department as a culprit has been heightened as the Poor People's Campaign has focused on the elimination of hunger as a top-priority issue and as the residents of Resurrection City have staged large demonstrations around the Agriculture Department.

Two of the charges which have been leveled against Agriculture are that the Department is oriented primarily toward helping the farmer (especially the wealthy farmer) dispose of his surplus crops, and that, under Freeman's administration, the Department has been returning many millions of dollars to the Treasury, dollars which should have been used to feed Americans whose diets are inadequate. In its recent report HEW seems to be engaging in a rare practice—criticism of one federal agency by another—when it states: "We must change the emphasis of some of our major activities from efforts primarily designed to distribute and use surplus food supplies to efforts to deal with a critical health problem. There is no reason why we cannot see to it that the distribution of our enormous food supplies satisfy both economic and health needs."

In a 14 June hearing before his subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, Senator Joseph S. Clark, Jr. (D–Pa.), challenged Secretary Freeman directly: "My own view, tentative to be sure, is that philosophically you are so imbedded in the concept of disposing of surplus food for farmers . . . that your bureaucracy is incapable of making a necessary philosophical adjustment so that you really can feed the hungry as your primary concern." Clark told Freeman that he thought Congress should press to have HEW or the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) take over this job.

When hunger and malnutrition first began to emerge as a public issue. Freeman seemed to play down its importance. Recently, however, Freeman has seemed to be moving to the position that malnutrition is a major problem and that his Department should make greater efforts to deal with it. On 13 June, Freeman asked Congress for a $100-million increase in food stamp funds, as opposed to the $20-million increase he had requested in February. When House Agriculture Committee chairman W. R. Poage (D–Tex.) angrily asked why he hadn't asked for a larger amount before, Freeman explained that he had acquired a deeper appreciation of poverty in recent months.

In his testimony the next day before Senator Clark's subcommittee, Freeman said he knew there was room for improvement in his Department's programs for feeding the poor, but he added that his Department had been, for the past 7 years, "toiling in a rocky soil of public indifference, watered with the casual interest of the Congress, state legislatures and local units of government."

Freeman has a valid point. A Congress, a President, or a public truly concerned about the food needs of the poor would have done much more about acting to fulfill these needs. In the 14 June Senate hearings, Senator George S. McGovern (D–S. D.) said: "There has been an unfortunate emphasis, I think, on fixing blame for existing conditions on some one person or some agency, when the fact is that the blame must be widely shared by all