

*US Congress of America, 1974*

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 15

JUNE 17, 1974 TO JUNE 21, 1974

(PAGES 19327 TO 20704)

search program devoted exclusively to the study of retinitis pigmentosa. Sporadic work was done in various laboratories across the country but none correlated.

Eliot L. Berson, M.D., Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology at Harvard University and the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, was the leader in the field, having done research for six years on retinal disorders including RP.

Yet it took a personal tragedy in the life of a Baltimore County family to spur the establishing of the National Retinitis Pigmentosa Foundation. The story has been given national publicity—the vacation trip when one daughter complained of not being able to see in a semi-dark cave—visits to ophthalmologists, with the eventual diagnosis of RP—the discovery that another daughter, showing no symptoms, was similarly afflicted—and the final pragmatic advice from a physician, “go home and teach your children Braille.”

The parents rebelled. No cure? Then why not find one! The father felt that a clinical ophthalmologist working alone would never find a cure for the disease. A multidisciplinary approach would have the best chance . . . biochemists, anatomists, electrophysiologists, geneticists . . . all working together under one roof, and correlating their finds . . . they could find the answer.

Embarking upon a personal search for information on the disease, the father eventually reaches Dr. Berson in Massachusetts. His selfless dedication so impressed this distinguished specialist, as well as the Board of the Harvard Medical School, that he was promised a laboratory equipped with the best of modern technological equipment, and operated by highly qualified researchers to work on this dreaded eye disease . . . to seek its cause, cure, and treatment.

However, there was one stipulation. The father had to raise the monies required to equip this special section of the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary. The initial goal was \$300,000. This was in September 1971, and by December 31, 1971, the goal must be met.

Personal anguish was transmitted into devotion to the cause. Working tirelessly, the couple began raising the money to assure the beginning of the laboratory . . . philanthropic foundations were approached, and they responded with substantial grants. Friends and relatives helped, offering their time and personal encouragement.

The \$300,000 goal was met, and the National Retinitis Pigmentosa Foundation was born. The Laboratory for the Study of Retinal Degenerations at the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary will open in April 1974. A dream became a reality.

What Dr. Berson's work already has shown is that the retina appears to be overactive in this disease. He has hypothesized that exposure to daylight may therefore drive the tissue to destruction faster. Thus, he is beginning trial studies in which one of the patient's eyes would be completely shielded from the light by means of an opaque lens to cover the front of the eye.

“If light deprivation will stop or markedly delay the degeneration in patients in early stages of retinitis pigmentosa, then it may be possible to double the patient's visual lifetime.” He cautions, however, that the degeneration wrought by retinitis pigmentosa usually advances slowly over a long period of time and, consequently, there can be no quick answers from the therapeutic trial recently begun. Any such attempts to preserve vision for these patients will require the passage of extensive time before any benefits become discernible.

In the meantime, the Laboratory for the Study of Retinal Degenerations will be exploring the basic mechanisms underlying these eye diseases. The work of the National Foundation, however, is only beginning. An

additional \$1,500,000 is needed to fund the laboratory research for a period of five years.

The objectives of the Foundation are: (1) To inform the public of the magnitude of RP and its symptoms; (2) To inform RP victims nationwide of the existence of and progress from a laboratory for the multi-disciplined research on RP and allied diseases; and (3) To solicit funds for the construction and operation of the laboratory, to coordinate fragmented research efforts throughout the country and abroad and to underwrite other research proposals to find a cure and/or a method to retard RP.

Additional information may be obtained by contacting the National Retinitis Pigmentosa Foundation, 8331 Mindale Circle, Rolling Park Building, Baltimore, Md. 21133, (301) 655-1011.

#### TEN YEARS OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a recent article in the New York Times by Roger Wilkins gives us all an accurate and incisive assessment of the 10 years of the Economic Opportunity Act and the likely future of the poverty program.

These 10 years have been difficult ones in the fight to give the poor the rights which others in our society have long enjoyed. In particular, the past 5 years have seen one attempt after another to cripple and even destroy the progress which had been made during the mid-1960's. Yet, as Mr. Wilkins states, the legacy of the antipoverty program is real—“the poor are a little stronger, considerably more self-aware, and somewhat more self-sufficient.”

I commend this article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE WAR ON POVERTY: 10 YEARS LATER

(By Roger Wilkins)

The House of Representatives voted the other day to repeal the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and to let the Office of Economic Opportunity die next month. The Senate is likely to follow suit. The Times reported that “few members . . . rose to mourn the end of the agency,” which had been intended by President Johnson to bring “total victory” in the war against poverty.

The mind ran back ten years to the spring of 1964 when Bill Moyers turned from a visitor in his White House office, punched his telephone console with the heel of his shoe and took a call from a Congressman who wasn't sure what he thought about the poverty proposals. There was Texas oil in Mr. Moyers' voice but steel in the political turkey he was talking. When he was through, the man's vote was firm.

The White House heat was on. Though incubated under John F. Kennedy, the poverty program was to be Lyndon B. Johnson's first major legislative effort. He wanted a win badly, and he got it.

The field was brand new, and idealists, visionaries, politicians, hustlers—bureaucratic and otherwise—and, ultimately, the poor all rushed in. Sargent Shriver donned a new hat and soon his intense driving brand of structured chaos turned O.E.O. into the hottest shop in Washington. In the countryside, the booklet of community action guidelines became, for a time, a new Bible. An instant body of Talmudic scholarship sprang up around the words “maximum feasible participation of the poor.”

Congressmen and mayors quickly became leery. The voiceless poor were becoming a loud unmanageable rabble—containing, incidentally, the seedbeds of viable new power rivalries—with which they had to contend. Horror stories about mismanagement, discourtesy, radicalism and thievery were soon being fed back to gleeful conservatives in Congress. Beneath all the clamor, however, real change began to occur. New programs were developed out of community action. Among them: Headstart, Legal Services, innovative manpower efforts and new health-delivery programs. But the main development was that groups of hitherto powerless people had, for the first time, the opportunity to handle sufficient amounts of money to generate for themselves the beginnings of some power. They also developed government management skills and new community services opportunities for people who needed jobs.

It was not a neat and tidy process, and hostility grew. President Johnson became disenchanted and left office without fully comprehending the real accomplishments of the program. Over time, Richard M. Nixon became a determined foe of O.E.O. He succeeded in dismantling it and in scattering the programs all over the domestic side of the Government. The idea of a focal point for poverty in the Government—a place where advocacy, evaluation planning and governmental oversight could come together—is dead.

But the legacy is real. Legal Services—thought by many to be the most effective and economical tool in the effort to empower the poor—seems fairly sure to win its perilous two-year fight for survival. Headstart appears to be a permanent \$500-million Federal effort. Community action—supported by a broad coalition of governors and mayors, including George C. Wallace—seems destined to continue in some form or another as a kind of ombudsman for those who need governmental services. The House bill would send it to Health, Education and Welfare. Senator Jacob K. Javits intends to try to set up a new independent Community Action—Community Development Administration. Whichever form finally emerges, barring a veto, Mr. Nixon seems to have lost his fight to destroy the heart of the anti-poverty effort.

The principal legacy is that the poor are a little stronger, considerably more self-aware and somewhat more self-sufficient. In many instances, their vision of their own potential has been enlarged. There is around the country a network of poor people and their advocates who know something about manipulating the system in order to alleviate poverty. That network did not exist in 1964. Citizen participation has become a part of our legislative landscape. The “invisible poor” have become visible and have entered the nation's consciousness. A foundation has been laid to await the next cycle of legislative creativity.

It wasn't “total victory” but it was a good beginning. And it was far from the total failure and the unmitigated mess is detractors claimed it to be.

#### FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS: A CONVERSATION WITH SENATOR PERCY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, several weeks ago I had the pleasure of appearing with Irma Lazarus of WCET-TV in Cincinnati, Ohio, on the “Conversation with Irma” program. Ms. Lazarus and I discussed the past, present, and future of Federal involvement with and support for the arts and humanities in this country. Since we shall soon be discussing this subject in the context of appropriations for fiscal year 1975, I believe the transcript of the broadcast might be of in-