

Mr. ROGERS. I understand it is estimated in the country that there are 200,000 to 300,000.

We have a distinguished colleague from Illinois, who may know about the Chicago problem. Congressman Springer is here, our distinguished minority leader on the committee, and he may have some questions.

Mr. SPRINGER. Just one or two, Mr. Chairman.

Doctor, were you any part of the AMA structure at the time we passed the heart, stroke, cancer bill?

Dr. CANNON. If "structure" is an all-inclusive term, I certainly was. But I was not one of the spokesmen at that time. I am aware of the statements that were made.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, never will I accept the testimony of anyone who comes before this committee as an expert on a program until I am more than satisfied.

The gentleman from Florida and I kept this thing within what we thought were reasonable boundaries at that time. It came over here from the Senate with one and a half days of hearing at \$970 million, almost a billion dollars to start a program, and I have never seen such an array lined up for that bill, and I almost swallowed it, until I went home and thought about it. Then I just began to make some investigations to find out what should be done.

And despite all the mean things that were said about the distinguished gentleman from Florida, and me, too, during that time, that we were keeping that bill from coming to the floor, we finally got it out at \$320 million. We didn't let it out until they agreed in the other body that they would pass our bill.

If my figures are correct, we are almost at the end of 3 years, and out of what they called a piddly little \$320 million, they have been able to spend \$85,200,000 to date.

I am coming back to this for one reason only, and that is that you are now asking for \$65 million for the fiscal year 1969, and nothing has been said, I take it, Mr. Chairman, with reference to any possible remaining 2 years.

Mr. ROGERS. It has been said, and they are submitting the figures.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to see that.

I come back again to my colleague in saying that at the time you were speaking on this before, your people doubted that this program could be undertaken. They went on and pointed out why, in terms of personnel available and so on.

I am glad that what you said and what I said and Mr. Rogers said, and a few others on this committee, has come true. Only it has come even more true than we anticipated. This is about the only time we have overevaluated a program.

This was a program that I supported energetically, once I thought it was within some reasonable means. But I merely point this out, that I am extremely skeptical of anyone who comes before us with figures unless they can be justified.

This was, may I say, what I considered to be the best testimony in the country. But you ought to go back and see that testimony, from Dr. DeBakey on down. It was presented before this committee, to justify a program for a billion dollars, which turned out 3 years later to have spent \$85 million.