

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 4

FEBRUARY 26, 1968, TO MARCH 5, 1968

(PAGES 3953 TO 5392)

since, Senator Hill, by gently but insistently forcing contending bodies to focus on a shared objective and to talk out their differences in private but before a group of their peers, has devised measures which won the wholehearted support of what had been and what in other areas often continued to be bitterly antagonistic groups. "A great compromiser," some have said of Senator Hill. But it never was compromise of principle or of objective. A resolution of differences, yes; compromise, no!

Step three in the Hill progression, which was carried on concurrently with step two, was to win bipartisan support for his objectives and his measures by the very simple tactic of proving to his colleagues that he really knew what he was talking about, that he had pre-resolved possible political differences, and by the not too common tactic of giving his colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, full and public credit for their co-sponsorship or other help in passing his bills. Almost without exception, Hill-sponsored bills on health have been reported to the Senate with the overwhelming or unanimous support of Republican as well as Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This was the pattern followed religiously during the next 20 odd years during which Lister Hill sponsored and saw the Congress enact several score of measures each of which meant a betterment in the health of America. In that pattern one element was of utmost importance: Lister Hill's knowledge of his subject. In the Congress of the United States, if a man is to really have influence with his colleagues in any area, he must display, in tandem, personal integrity and a real knowledge of his field. The maintenance of integrity was never a problem with Lister Hill. The acquisition of knowledge in the field of health and medical care he made his personal and ceaseless quest.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate's all-important Committee on Appropriations, Lister Hill devoted an unbelievable number of days over more than 10 years to the non-publicized drudgery of listening hour after hour as witness followed witness to testify at length and in pitiless detail as to why this, that, or the other item in the federal government's health budget should be maintained, increased, or stricken. And when witnesses differed, Lister Hill and his staff spent still more hours ascertaining the facts. By a most strange quirk of history, Senator Hill's counterpart in the House, the chairman of that body's Subcommittee on Health Appropriations, the late John Fogarty, was engaged in the same avid search for the fiscal facts of America's health system. Concurrently they became not only the most knowledgeable men in the Congress in that area but almost certainly the most knowledgeable in the country. The result, as we all know, was the unprecedented, really revolutionary, federal funding of health measures by the Congress which has occurred over the last two decades. And Lister Hill and John Fogarty not only persuaded the Congress to appropriate but their knowledge of the facts and of the why's and of the consequences were such that, until this time of wartime stringency, they were able to persuade Presidents to spend more on health than they had asked for and more than their budgeteers thought desirable.

Appropriations are essential to the carrying out of programs. But Congress cannot appropriate save to carry out measures that have been enacted into law. Here Lister Hill has stood alone in his preeminence. As both chair of its Subcommittee on Health and of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator Hill helped draft, introduced, held hearings on, wrote reports for, and guided through the Senate every major piece of health legislation enacted by the Congress over the last

two decades! In this process, too, he was constantly adding to his store of knowledge and his reputation with his colleagues.

Apparently even this double immersion in the pool of learning—through the appropriations and the substantive legislation routes—was not enough for Lister Hill. His social evenings, more often than not, were spent with a group of carefully selected, key members of House and Senate, at a well appointed soiree or dinner hosted by Mary Lasker, his socially and financially prestigious ally in all his health promotions. And at these affairs, too, the main topic would invariably be the need for more research, for more health facilities, for more education in the health professions as presented by one or another of the Hill-Lasker assemblage of friends and outstanding men of medicine such as Drs. Connie Traeger, Sidney Farber, Mike DeBakey, Isidore Ravdin, Dusty Rhoades, Alan Gregg, Paul White, C. J. Van Slyke, Jim Shannon, or others.

Lest we inadvertently create the picture of a narrow minded, single track, pedantic bore, we open a parenthesis to point out that the Lister Hill of whom we speak is a cultured, urbane, witty and gallant gentleman with a host of other interests and conversant in many other fields. Nonetheless, it has been the awesome breadth and depth of his knowledge in the field of health and their complete awareness of it that has been responsible for the unparalleled willingness of the members of the Senate to follow without debate where Lister Hill leads in health legislation. Only once in more than 20 years, so far as the *Bulletin* knows, was the Senator wrong in his facts while presenting and explaining a measure to the Senate. In that instance, someone he had reason to trust as knowledgeable and accurate had given him misleading information. Learning this, just moments before the Senate was about to pass the bill unanimously, Lister Hill took the floor, explained the situation, and moved to defeat the measure he himself had sponsored.

Such is the man to whom the world of medicine and medical education owes so very much today. And that debt will no doubt be compounded before the year is out. For in this year of 1968, when so much legislation of such vital import to us all will be up for reconsideration, Lister Hill will still be serving in his dual role as chairman of the Committee which will enact our bills and of the subcommittee which will fund them. Historically, a lame duck Congressman, one who has been defeated or announced retirement, is a man bereft of influence. In this instance, the very opposite will be true. The Senate will more than ever be eager to take advantage of this man's wisdom while it can. The Administration will have its bills to propose. A host of claimants will appear with counter-proposals. Lister Hill will listen to all, study all, reason with all, and, finally, it will be he, more than any other man, who will dispose. Once again the cause of medicine and of health manpower will have been well served.

The *Bulletin* knows it speaks for all our teaching hospitals and schools of medicine and their staffs and faculties when it pays tribute to this great man. It is especially glad to do so at this time because it is so obvious that we are not writing an epitaph. For Lister Hill, hale, hearty, and keen of mind at 72, has too much to offer to be permitted to retire. A 45 year career in House and Senate will come to a close. We are certain that the President and our people will call on him to start another. And knowing Lister Hill, we know he will respond.

THE RIOT COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the President's Commission on Civil Disor-

¹ Save Medicare and Medicaid which were not within the jurisdiction of his Committee.

ders warns, "Our Nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." Pervasive discrimination and segregation in housing has kept the millions of Negroes from sharing the opportunity and economic progress that most whites know and enjoy. The one major sector of American life in which overt racial discrimination remains is housing.

The Riot Commission specifically recommends that the Federal Government enact a comprehensive and enforceable Federal open housing law to cover the sale or rental of all housing, including single family homes. Rarely is a report as timely as this one. Rarely has a study in such depth been done at a time when we could respond immediately. And our failure to respond to such a clear and explicit statement—prepared not by a pressure group or a group with a vested interest, but by a commission appointed by the President—will only be a signal to those trapped in the ghettos that our Government is paralyzed, that it cannot respond to a need that affects every single American. In the words of the Commission, unless drastic remedies are begun at once, there will be "continuing polarization of the American community and, ultimately, the destruction of basic, democratic values."

On Monday we face the fourth cloture vote on fair housing. A majority of the Senate is on record in favor of what the Riot Commission recommends—a law covering the sale or rental of all housing. We have compromised this stand in order that the Senate not remain paralyzed behind the cloture requirement. Monday's vote may be the final attempt—the choice remains with less than a majority of the Senate. Their choice is whether to send America further along the road of polarization and the ultimate destruction of a democracy based upon equality—or to indicate to Americans and to the world that we are not a racist society. A vote for cloture on Monday will reinforce our determination to end the unconscionable insult of racial discrimination in housing.

The Commission report contained two other housing recommendations: to assist nonprofit groups with preconstruction costs for their housing programs and to provide supplements which would make homeownership possible for low-income families. During the last session I introduced legislation for both of these programs, and the proposal currently before the Banking and Currency Committee includes these provisions.

In addition, there are many other fine recommendations in this report. It focuses on the tremendous task that faces us if we are to have a society in which peace is our way of life and the call for violence falls on deaf ears. It seems to me that every thoughtful American will support the recommendations of the President's Commission.

But these recommendations are not the only striking part of the Commission report. During these several months of tremendous effort, the President's Commission on Civil Disorders has taken on the task of finding out what is wrong with America at home. Their answer is a grim one. But I believe it is a true one.

Mr. President, last summer the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] and I, along with several other Senators, introduced a joint resolution to establish a Special Commission on Civil Strife. At Senator HARRIS' suggestion, the President acted the next day to create a commission by Executive order.

In my remarks at the introduction of this resolution last July, I said that one of our problems in dealing with civil disorders is "that we have not, surprisingly, explored the fundamentals resulting in these examples of civil strife, and have not come to a national understanding of what they involve."

I said I hope that this study would "help disclose to the American people the enormous character of the social problem we are facing. I believe that this Nation is as sick as it has ever been. I believe that one of the first and necessary steps to its cure is an understanding of the vast character of the problem that lies ahead of us. It literally involves the remaking of the Nation."

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders has diagnosed that sickness for us. It describes an America that is becoming a divided society, with black and white separate but not equal. It defines an explosive mixture of discrimination, poverty, and ghetto frustration. It bluntly tells the patient the source of his symptoms—white racism.

That is as hard to take as a diagnosis of cancer. And it is just as threatening. For white racism is by nature a fatal illness in a free society, and our pride in the skill and forthrightness of the diagnosis should be matched by our horror at what we find within us, at the final verdict which we have suspected and feared, but hoped to avoid.

This is a society of opportunity. White racism will kill it if we do not act to protect ourselves from it. This is a society of freedom. White racism will kill it if we do not act. The prognosis is just as clear as the diagnosis.

The illness of this society has reached the point where its symptoms are specific and dramatic—violence, despair, rage. Our system is crying out to us for treatment. I cannot believe that we will ignore the best advice we have. I cannot believe that we will refuse to face up to the critical state of our national social health. I cannot believe that we will fail to accept treatment that can sustain the life of the society we cherish.

We must have fair housing. We must have greater opportunity. We must destroy the cancer of white racism. If we do not, history may have an interesting autopsy to perform. But autopsies are always performed on corpses—and this one will be the corpse of the free society to which we are dedicated and which we are elected to protect and serve in this Congress.

If we do act, there will be no miraculous 24-hour cure, for this is no 24-hour illness. But every day that we delay makes recovery more difficult. We must begin now.

SERVICE TO OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Johnson recently

announced the award of contracts totaling more than \$2 million to establish service centers for older Americans. At the same time, President Johnson pointed out that while we have not done all that is needed, we have made great strides during the past 7 years in helping older Americans attain a secure and decent life. At this point, I should like to insert President Johnson's remarks on that occasion into the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SIGNING OF CONTRACTS FOR OLDER AMERICANS, THE CABINET ROOM, FEBRUARY 15, 1968.

Secretary Wirtz, my distinguished friends:

One of our great poets had this to say about getting older: "The years between 50 and 70 are the hardest. You are always being asked to do things, and yet you aren't ancient enough to turn them down."

Well, today we are giving a great many older citizens a chance to do a great many things. And I'm willing to bet that we won't get turned down.

Today we are launching a program to provide work in community service projects for retired or unemployed citizens who are 55 and over.

The three contracts that were referred to by Secretary Wirtz that we will sign will create more than 3,000 job opportunities in the coming year. These jobs will be in schools, hospitals, in beautification projects and other efforts that will improve life for all of us.

There are a good many of us in this room today who can remember seeing people grow old 20 or 30 years ago: seeing what old age did to them.

Too often, it meant being alone. Too often, it meant being dependent on someone else—their children or their sons-in-law. It meant that as the years mounted up, their savings dwindled down. And worst of all, it meant being sick and afraid because they just didn't seem to be able to afford to be sick.

Things have changed some since then, largely because of a leadership that people like you have provided.

In March, more than 17 million older citizens will receive a Social Security increase of some 13 percent. When the benefit checks go out, another one million Americans will be lifted above the poverty line—a goal that we are working toward.

Medicare—that for many, many years was not seriously considered and after it was considered and passed, many said would not work at all—is now flourishing. More than 20 million senior citizens have its protection. Last year, 7½ million of these senior citizens received help in paying their medical bills. That is a fact—not a fantasy.

But beyond all of this, we all have another goal. That goal is to guarantee—to every older American—not only security, but the pride of being able to be active and being able to be productive.

Last year we took a major step toward that goal.

We passed a law forbidding age discrimination in employment.

We renewed and strengthened the Older Americans Act. It promised a new sense of involvement and usefulness to hundreds of thousands of our citizens.

And that is only a small part of the story. More than 4,000 Foster Grandparents in 38 states; nearly 300 older VISTA volunteers; 500 older Peace Corps volunteers; more than 3,000 members of SCORE—the Service Corps of Retired Executives—have already learned what it is to have a feeling of pride in serving others, regardless of one's age.

Now we meet here again this morning in another good cause. Soon, after the signing

of these three contracts, thousands of older citizens will know what it is to have a long life. They will know what it is to have a full life; to know what the wise Frenchman meant when he said: "Growing old is nothing more than a habit which a busy man has no time to form."

In this day of trouble and trial for our people, I want to salute those representatives, who are here in the Cabinet Room this morning, of the older Americans in our country, for your objectives, for your goals, for your persistence and for the manner in which you have represented those for whom you speak.

You have spoken where it counts; you have been represented in the rooms where there is a pay-off.

In December we signed a Social Security Bill. It affected the lives of millions of people directly; it affected the lives of all of us—all 200 million—indirectly.

President Truman proposed Medicare. But you testified for it—and you presented your opinion—your concern—and your dissent—and your voice—and your logic—and your argument before the committees.

Those committees listened and they learned. As a consequence, 7½ million of your fellow citizens have benefited.

There will be hearings in the days to come—hearings on poverty, hearings on education, hearings on health, hearings on security for older Americans.

While we have made great progress, we have just gone a few steps up a long road. I had three figures in my mind that were brought to me by the Budget Director this year when we signed the budget.

The first one was on manpower training that is very important to you. In 1960, our budget was \$3 billion—\$3 billion for manpower training.

By fiscal year 1964—just before I took office—that had increased to \$4 billion plus.

From 1964 to 1968, largely through help that you and other concerned citizens have rendered in the Congress, in the precincts and in the election, the Congress—by an overwhelming vote—increased that \$3 billion in 1960 and that \$4 billion in 1964 to \$12 billion in this year's budget.

In poverty, which affects us all, but affects no one more than the older American—one million were removed from the poverty level by the last Social Security Bill alone—that poverty group was receiving a little over \$9 billion in the year 1960.

We had moved that \$9 billion up to \$12 billion by the fiscal year 1964. In 1964, we renewed our pledges that were made and our promises of 1960 when President Kennedy went from one end of this Nation to the other. We pleaded with the members of the appropriate committees to try to move forward with the New Frontier and the Great Society.

From 1964, when we had \$12 billion to '68, this year, we have \$28 billion—more than double the amount of federal funds spent for those below the level of \$3,000.

Now, finally, if there is anything that is vital to every citizen of this land, it is health. It doesn't make any difference how many PhD's he has if he is bedridden and can't get out of his room and requires the care of other people.

Education is one of the reasons, I think, that America leads the world. I was reading a book last night; Europe was very concerned about our industrial management. They felt that we were taking the place that some of their citizens should be taking. But they said we have this great ingenuity and this great industrial management system primarily because of the education of our people.

So health, education and Social Security: In 1960 we were spending \$19 billion in that field. Fiscal '64—a little over three years later—we were spending \$23 billion in that field.