

"(1) for any natural person who is a director, officer, or employee with management functions, of any person engaged in commerce at the same time to hold the position of director, officer, or employee with management functions, or to have a representative or nominee who represents such person as a director, officer, or employee with management functions, in any other person (a) who is an actual or potential competitor, or (b) who is an actual or potential customer, or supplier, or source of credit or capital, or (c) whose principal business in purpose or in fact is the holding of stock in, or control of, any other person in commerce;

"(2) for any person engaged in commerce knowingly to have a director, officer, or employee with management functions who, at the same time, holds the position of director, officer, or employee with management functions, or who has a representative or nominee who represents such person as a director, officer, or employee with management functions, in any other person (a) who is an actual or potential competitor, or (b) who is an actual or potential customer, or supplier, or source of credit or capital, or (c) whose principal business in purpose or in fact is the holding of stock in, or control of, any other person in commerce;

"(3) for any person to be a representative or nominee of any person who is a director, officer, or employee with management functions of any person engaged in commerce so that such director, officer, or employee with management functions may hold the position of director, officer, or employee with management functions, in any other person (a) who is an actual or potential competitor, or (b) who is an actual or potential customer, or supplier, or source of credit or capital, or (c) whose principal business in purpose or in fact is the holding of stock in, or control of, any other person in commerce.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall apply (1) if any one of the persons involved in an interlocking relationship shall have capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than \$1,000,000, and (2) if any one of the persons involved in an interlocking relationship is engaged in commerce; provided, however, the provisions of this section shall not profit any interlocking relationship when one of the persons involved directly or indirectly lawfully owns more than 50 per centum of the voting stock of the other or others, or where 50 per centum or more of the voting stock of each of the persons involved in an interlocking relationship is directly or indirectly lawfully owned by the same person.

"(c) To the extent that any provision of the Federal laws listed herein, and any regulations promulgated thereunder, are inconsistent with the provisions of this section, the provisions of this section shall take precedence and shall be controlling:

"(1) Clayton Act, section 10; 15 U.S.C. 20 (1964);

"(2) Panama Canal Act, as amended; 49 U.S.C. 5(14), 5(15), 5(16) (1964);

"(3) Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, sections 1(3)(b), 5(4), 20a(12); 49 U.S.C. 1(3)(b), 5(4), 20(a)(12) (1964);

"(4) Banking Act of 1933, as amended, section 32; 12 U.S.C. 78 (1964);

"(5) Communications Act of 1934, as amended; section 212; 47 U.S.C. 212 (1964);

"(6) Federal Power Act of 1935, as amended; section 305(b); 16 U.S.C. 825(d) (1964);

"(7) Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended; section 17(c); 15 U.S.C. 79(c) (1964);

"(8) Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended; section 10; 15 U.S.C. 80a-10 (1964);

"(9) Federal Aviation Act, as amended; section 409; 49 U.S.C. 1379 (1964);

"(10) Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; section 8; 27 U.S.C. 208 (1964);

"(11) McCarran-Ferguson Insurance Anti-trust Moratorium Act, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1011-1015 (1964).

"(d) Any person who willfully violates this section 8, or any regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$50,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court."

Sec. 3. The provisions of this Act shall be effective on and after twenty-four months after the date of enactment.

ALLOWING WAIVERS OF CERTAIN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill I introduce today is done so with regret—regret that the strong intent of this Congress to provide increased benefits to those covered by social security has not had the results it should have had in many cases.

It has come to my attention that many of our veterans who are receiving disability pensions, as well as social security benefits, have had their veterans pensions decreased by amounts tripling the increased benefits provided for in the amendments to the Social Security Act we recently approved.

I could cite many examples, but I believe that one will suffice. A Rhode Island veteran who was receiving \$75 per month in veterans' benefits has had that monthly stipend decreased to \$43 per month because his social security benefits were increased by \$7.10 per month.

This is but one example of many in my State alone and I know that throughout the country there must be many more who are affected in this same manner. I know that it was not my intent to decrease anyone's income when I voted for the Social Security Amendments of 1965—in fact, it was my high hope, and I believe it was likewise with the majority of my colleagues, that all of our social security recipients would benefit from the increase we approved for them. To have our good intentions boomerang in such a manner is particularly distasteful to me and I hope that my colleagues will see fit to adopt this measure I introduce today with little or no delay. In this way, we can speedily correct what may seem a minor injustice, but no injustices were contemplated when we approved these changes in the social security law and certainly innocent people should not suffer because of an oversight in the provisions of the amendments.

DENTAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech which I delivered at the National Conference on Dental Re-

search and Education, Washington, D.C., on October 6, 1965:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MEDICAL-DENTAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION
(Speech by the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress from Rhode Island)

Thank you, Dr. Hine. Before beginning my talk, I want to offer you my best wishes for your coming year as President of the American Dental Association. The dentists of the Nation have often furnished strong leadership in the health field and I'm sure they will continue to do so during your tenure in office.

Let me say, too, that I think this meeting takes place at a most appropriate time. The 1st session of the 89th Congress, now drawing to a close, has made remarkable progress in health research and health education. Combining what has already been passed with what can be reasonably anticipated, I think the title we have been given, "The Health Congress," has been fairly earned.

A number of us here in this room have spent a lot of hours over the years persuading Congress to be realistic both in appraising the health needs of the Nation and in allocating enough money to meet those needs. We've had setbacks during this time but the accomplishments of the past 2 years compensate quite adequately for any previous disappointments.

Strong support for health research dates back more than 2 years, of course, but this isn't true of support of professional education. In this, Congress tended to lag, to hold back. But now we are moving on both these fronts and I, for one, am most hopeful that we will intensify our progress in coming years.

The topic I am to address myself to this morning is "The Role of the Federal Government in Medical-Dental Research and Education." I have only one quarrel with the title. It is, scientifically speaking, 8.3 percent ambiguous. The word "role" has two possible meanings: a factual recitation of what the Federal Government has been doing or a qualitative judgment as to whether it has been doing too little, just enough or too much. I'm going to pay some attention to both these interpretations but I imagine you would agree that the latter is the more significant of the two.

In looking at what the Government has, in fact, been doing, I'm sorry we don't have an exobiologist to lead the discussion. Exobiology—if you haven't noticed it—is a new discipline defined as being the study of life on other planets. I call it a new discipline advisedly since some scientists deny its existence, saying no one has yet demonstrated that it has any real subject matter. It seems to me unduly harsh, if not un-American, to say that a man shouldn't talk just because he hasn't anything to talk about and so I'm going to ignore that particular criticism.

In fact, I'm going to go even further. When I suggest that we could use an exobiologist, I mean one from some other planet. He could help us, perhaps, to see this country in an objective manner, with fresh eyes, without the prejudices we all inescapably acquire through the years.

Looked at in this way, the United States is a nation of some 190 million people accounting for an annual gross national product of about \$650 billion and a total labor force of some 75 million men and women. Though we enjoy a median family income of nearly \$7,000, other available statistics tell us that one out of every five families is impoverished; that is, has an annual family income of less than \$3,000. A considerable number of us, 77 million, are either less than 21 or more than 65, ages during which special health needs are evident.

As a nation, we have, in the past 5 years, become acutely conscious of the extent to