

ments and services of an Eye Institute, so that the products of a vastly intensified eye research program may be translated into preservation of sight for millions of Americans.

I would like to lay to rest a ghost which could haunt these hearings and have a substantial bearing on the outcome of this legislation; namely, the cost of administering a separate eye institute as compared with the cost of administering the eye programs now going on in NINDB.

As you may know, I was originally a practicing ophthalmologist and, therefore, had a thorough understanding of the medical and professional aspect of this matter. I am a businessman and I am cost conscious. I believe I have been reasonably successful in developing MCA-Universal-Decca which I founded as one of the world's largest entertainment industries. I am presently chairman of the board.

I do not think the Federal Government should do anything in a given way if there is a more efficient or less costly way of doing it. I know this is the attitude of our Congressmen and this is being reflected by recent actions on appropriation bills. I agree with this congressional attitude, and I assure you I would not be here today if I did not have the complete conviction that a separate National Eye Institute would cost less to run than the present eye programs within the NINDB.

On this basis alone, even if there were no other compelling considerations, this Congress should be moved to act favorably on the bill which is before you today.

It is my humble opinion that if you reduce—yes, I mean reduce—the administrative budget of eye programs within the NINDB by 10 percent and put the remaining 90 percent into a separate National Eye Institute, you would get better administration of the programs in vision and improved research and training through elimination of the time and effort wasted in the neurological supervision of ophthalmology.

In the words of the Surgeon General, I ask those responsible for public health services to “hammer out their words into sharp, pointed action.” I urge this committee, with all the sincerity and conviction of which I am capable, to endorse and support before the Congress this proposal for the establishment of a National Eye Institute.

Thank you.

Dr. MAUMENEE. Mr. Chairman, this concludes our prepared testimony.

Mr. JARMAN. Gentlemen, on behalf of the subcommittee I certainly want to commend you for the brevity of your presentation, and for your consciousness of the time limitations under which the committee has to operate in hearings.

I also commend you upon very effective panel presentation and I assure you that we will thoroughly study your statements.

We appreciate your emphasis on the particular things you think we should keep in mind.

I was very interested, Mr. Stein, in that final part of your statement with reference to cost. With any bill that we take to the floor of the House and Senate these days, the spotlight is on costs and what additional costs may be involved. The presentation of this bill to either body and both bodies certainly will involve question of what the cost