

# National Health Federation



## Legislative Edition

FAMILY CIRCLE .....	Page 3
BILL - ADVERSE PUBLICITY .....	Page 4
SPEECH - CONGRESSMAN DAVID KING .....	Page 5
BILL - HOSPITAL DISCRIMINATION .....	Page 14
BILL - FUND DRIVES ACCOUNTING .....	Page 15
BILL - SUGGESTED PURE WATER BILL .....	Page 16
NHF RECORDED LIBRARY .....	Page 19



## AMERICANS CRUSADING FOR BETTER HEALTH

Volume VIII — Number 2

February, 1962



Site of Our Washington Office  
1012 - 14th St. N.W.

# BULLETIN

## Important Notes

**THANKS** — to all of you who so thoughtfully sent in your 1962 dues during November and December. It was a big help.

**THANKS** — to all of you who are sending your dues in this month, and

**THANKS** — to all of you who have not yet sent in your dues, but will as soon as possible. All Federation dues are due and payable during January of each year.

**PLEASE** — be patient with us. It takes about 30 days to process a membership and get your membership card and book stamps to you.

### ADVERSE PUBLICITY BILL

**IF ANY OF OUR READERS** have had trouble with a bureau of the Federal Government and have received adverse publicity because of news releases put out by the government while your case was still pending and before final adjudication thereof, we suggest you write to the Washington Office of the National Health Federation at 1012 - 14th St. N.W. See bill covering this subject on page 4 of this issue. It is important that the Washington Office have all the information on this item.

### DUES HAVE BEEN RAISED

**BECAUSE** of the increased task of the Federation Program, brought about by the AMA and the drug interests open declaration of war on all drugless approaches to the health problem, the Board of Governors of the Federation amended the bylaws in such a manner as to raise the regular membership dues to \$5.00 per year instead of \$3.00 per year as it has been previously.

**HOWEVER** — this raise will not go into effect until the first day of June this year, 1962. This means if you pay

your dues before that date the membership rate will be the same as before. It also means that new members may join at the lower rate until June 1st of this year, 1962. We feel this should be an incentive for members to pay their dues and for new members to join before that date. From the bottom of our hearts we urge all of our members who can do so to pay at the higher rate even though they pay their dues before that date. We are in opposition to all those who would profit at the expense of the sick and who would for economic and political gain deprive the American people of their freedom in all matters relating to health.

### EXTRA GIFTS

**THANKS** — to the individuals and organizations who have made donations to the work of the Federation, either in lump sums or by payment of pledges. Without these extra funds the Federation could not have accomplished much. We do urge each one of these to do the same this year 1962.

Some health organizations have held rummage sales. The Board of Governors urges that many more such sales be held by Federation chapters and other health organizations, to raise funds for the support of the Washington Office. The Board also thanks the active members who raised their membership to that of sustaining, by the payment of \$25.00 instead of the usual five dollars, in order that funds be available to help with the work of the President and the eventual hiring of an assistant to the President. The assistant has been hired and is on the job, so the Board urges these members to continue this year as sustaining members. May we urge other members to do likewise, if they feel they can afford to do so.

National Health Federation Bulletin is published monthly, January through June, and bi-monthly, July through December, at 709 Mission St., San Francisco 3, Calif., by National Health Federation, a non-profit corporation. Fred J. Hart, Editor-Publisher. Subscription rate \$3.00 per year, included in membership dues. Single copies 25¢. Second class postage paid at San Francisco, Calif.

NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION BULLETIN

# The NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION

VOLUME VIII

NUMBER 2

**BULLETIN**

*Adventures on Health Frontiers*

*Published Monthly*

FEBRUARY

1962

## The Family Circle

By FRED J. HART

We have attended many conventions, but we can truthfully say we have never attended a better one than the National Health Federation's seventh annual convention, held in San Diego, California, at the Hotel El Cortez, December 29th, 1961 through January 1st, 1962.

Due to the fact copy for this issue had to be in the printer's hands by the time the convention was closing, except for the brief report, our readers will have to await the March issue of the Bulletin for complete details.

### This Issue Smaller Than Usual

We decided to make it so, because of lack of time and also because we want to make it sort of a legislative issue, by that we mean we want to highlight legislative bills now before the Congress and one which is soon to be introduced, plus suggested bills for members in the several states to consider having introduced into their respective state legislatures.

In doing this we are not trying to tell our members what to do, but we are trying to suggest the form such legislation should take, if there is sufficient interest in the several states on the subject matter covered in each bill.

There are certain things which can be handled on a Federal level, while at the same time, there are certain matters which can best be handled on the state level.

### For the Year 1962

Clinton Miller, now Assistant to the President of the Federation, will make

his headquarters in the Washington, D.C. office and will handle Federal legislation and regulations, etc. Harold Edwards, our former Washington Legislative Representative, has resigned as of the end of January, 1962. In addition to the legislative work, Mr. Miller will also, as Assistant to the President, look after the best interests of the Federation east of the Mississippi River.

### Tolerance

As the membership and power of the Federation grows, it must follow, "as the night the day," that the officers and members of the Federation must see to it their actions and utterances must be unbiased and tolerant of the rights of others.

The fact that some person, department of government, or other organization does not act and believe as we do, or think as we do, does not mean they are crooks, scoundrels or ignoramuses. It could very well be if we had their background, education and environment, we would act as they act. Our job is to believe in what we say and do, and by precept and example show to the world our way is best. If we become too fanatical, emotional and demanding, we thereby close the door of access to those whom we must reach, if we are to maintain our Health Freedom and advance the cause of the natural approach to Health.

(Continued on next page)

FEBRUARY, 1962

### El Cortez Hotel

We feel so indebted to the management of the El Cortez Hotel in San Diego, for the many kindnesses shown the Federation and the delegates to the convention, we feel we must squeeze this item into this particular issue. The convention facilities are second to none in the United States. The service rendered by the hotel personnel was above reproach. The rates were more than reasonable. The food was tops and the prices very reasonable. The location of the hotel in San Diego is correct and in keeping with the city, which, by the way, has the finest year-round climate in the United States. If wishing would make it so, I would wish that we could hold all of our conventions at the El Cortez in San Diego, California.

### When You Write!

The Federation's Washington Office has suggested that when a member writes to his Congressman or Senator, wherever possible a copy of the letter written be sent to the Federation's Washington Office and when an answer is received that the answer be sent to that office. This will give Mr. Miller a good lead as to what the legislators are thinking.

We know that many times it will not be possible for a person to send a copy of the letter written to the legislator, but the answer can be sent. If you desire the letter received from your Congressman or Senator returned to your files, make a notation on the letter and the Washington Office (1012 - 14th St. N.W., Room 303, Washington, D.C.) will make a copy of it and return the original.

To be Introduced in January

## A BILL

To amend the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to public statements of Federal agencies which tend to discredit.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That section 10 (e) of the Administrative Procedure Act  
4        is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following  
5        new sentence: "Where the reviewing court determines that,  
6        in the course of the agency proceeding leading to the agency  
7        action being reviewed, the agency issued or released any  
8        public statement tending to discredit any party to the pro-  
9        ceeding, the court shall regard such statement as con-  
10        stituting a prejudging of the issues and may set aside any  
11        agency action against such party, or enter other appropriate  
12        order.

EDITOR'S NOTE: This bill is being introduced at the request of the National Health Federation, in keeping with recommendation 47 of the Hoover Commission. It is probably the most needed bill in the legislative hopper. It is designed to curb the practice of government bureaus and employees destroying the reputation of individuals and firms, by issuing adverse publicity, before final adjudication of a hearing or case in court. More will be said about this bill in the next issue.

# Speech by Congressman David King

Seventh Annual NHF Convention, San Diego, January, 1962

President Hart and Members of the National Health Federation:

I am very honored at the opportunity to stand before you, at your national convention, for the second time. The first time was exactly two years ago today. And, if age brings wisdom, then by all reasonable calculations, I should be two years wiser than I was then. Whether or not I am is not for me to judge. There is one thing, however, which I am able to judge, and that is the extent of my own enthusiasm for the causes of good health through sound nutrition, and I am happy to report that my enthusiasm in this department, is higher than it has ever been in my life.

Two years ago I felt that America was eroding away its physical strength and stamina, its resistance to disease, and its toughness of body and of character through its wholesale abuse of many of nature's basic laws of nutrition, and of soil care, and I feel the same today.

Two years ago I sounded a warning. I repeat that warning today. America cannot continue to violate the laws of nature, and expect to remain forever the greatest nation in the world. Other nations are facing this problem more realistically than we are. There is an inexorable natural justice which ultimately drags down and destroys those who persist in violating nature's laws.

Now, I do not stand here, today, flying false colors. I am not a nutritional scientist. I am an attorney, and a Congressman. I do, however, have strong feelings about health and nutrition. The Church of which I am a member has taught me all of my life that physical and spiritual health are closely related. The overcoming of poor health-habits represents a great step forward in man's quest for spiritual perfection. Clean living — the avoidance of stimulants such as tea, coffee, tobacco, and alcohol — the eating of wholesome herbs and other products

of the soil, in the season thereof — these have been part of my health training from my youth. To me, this is the word of God.

It has not been difficult therefore, for me to believe that many of the afflictions of mankind are the result of the violation of God's basic laws of health. I don't have to be a scientist to grasp the simple idea that the injection of several thousand artificially synthesized inorganic chemical compounds into the human body may have possible deleterious effects upon the human system, which nature may not be completely equipped to handle.

I don't have to be a scientist to understand that when people, under modern and highly artificial patterns of living, develop an alarming number of degenerative diseases which were virtually unknown to their grandfathers, there may possibly be a connection between the two. Although I try to avoid dogmatism, since I am not a scientific man myself, I would be mentally dishonest if I did not recognize these things as a real possibility.

May I pause here, to commend your organization on the work it is doing. I have known your distinguished President Fred J. Hart for about three years. In my opinion, in all the world you would not find a man more intelligently dedicated to the cause of good health through sound nutrition, than he. His leadership has been of the first magnitude. Mr. Harold Edwards has been immensely helpful to me over the past two and a half or three years, since I have been in Congress. Patient, devoted, dedicated. Mr. Clinton Miller, newly appointed assistant to President Hart, and your other Washington Representative, I have known for many years. His middle name is zeal. His other middle name, (if a man is entitled to have two middle names), is courage.

The National Health Federation is do-

ing a good job. It is presenting to the nation another point of view in the field of health, which it has the right to do. In the general field of business, Americans insist that there be freedom for different competing firms to sell their products to the public. If a man has a better automobile, or a better mousetrap, he should be, and is, free to tell the world about it. This is the greatness of America. In politics, about which I have some familiarity, it is the same story. We have two strong vigorous political parties — each one free to tell its side of the argument, and to develop its point of view, and this is good. This is America's guarantee that there will always be a check on the party in power. No party will ever wander off too far into the dark shadows of fuzzy thinking and of self-interest, because the other party will quickly drag it back into the light of truth. Now, I ask the question, therefore, is there any reason why the same freedom should not exist in the field of health as exists in business or politics, or religion, or anything else? Is there any reason why one single approach to the problem of health, backed by powerful financial interests, should be given a complete monopoly? Is there any reason why one group of powerful economic interests should have complete and unchallenged freedom to mold and sculptor national thought on matters of health? Is there any reason why a few giant food and drug and chemical companies should be given the sole responsibility of telling Americans what cereal they should eat for breakfast, what beverages they should drink before going to bed, and what medications they should take to cure them of the thousand-and-one maladies that afflict the human race?

You ask only for freedom and justice. You do not ask that points of view at variance with your own be suppressed. You ask only that you be given the same chance to tell your story as anyone else. You have confidence in the fact that if the truth is given a fair hearing, it can defend itself from there on.

I feel therefore, that your organization is performing a great and historic mis-

sion. Yours is the respectful but persistent voice of dissent. This voice of dissent must never be silenced.

In this matter of health education, I am disturbed that so much of it is controlled by those who have strong financial interests in the outcome of that education. No one knows better than I, a member of the Congress of the United States, to what extent a person's thinking is distorted by his pocketbook. He may not realize this himself. He may feel that he is acting from the purest of motives. But it is significant to note to what extent a person's ideology happens to coincide with his own financial betterment. I have sometimes laughingly made the remark that I will give a one hundred dollar bill to the first person who asks me to vote for a measure which will do him economic injury, but which he feels is otherwise good for the country. If a Congressman knows the economic background of a person, he can tell with reasonable accuracy what that man's stand will be on any particular bill.

Now let me hasten to add: that I am not suggesting for a moment that there are not great idealists in this world, and I think this room today is full of them and there are many people who do rise above economic background. I want to make that very clear. But I am talking as a general rule. As a rule people pretty much follow the direction of their pocketbook in their thinking.

I realize, therefore, that if a large food processing plant, or a chemical company, or a drug company stands to realize hundreds of millions of dollars in profit by adding certain chemicals to the food we eat, those companies will do everything they can to influence human thinking into believing that these things are conducive to good health. They may feel that they are perfectly honest in so doing, and would be shocked at the suggestion that maybe they were not completely honest. Yet, knowing human nature as I do, I know to what extent their thinking will be distorted to fit the demands of their pocketbook.

A classical example of that is the so-

called research carried out by the large tobacco interests. You will recall that a few years ago scientists came forward with confirmation of that which they had long suspected: namely that there was a casual connection between tobacco consumption and cancer. When this news broke, the tobacco interests were immediately put on the defensive. Here was news that threatened to slash into their sales. So they made a dramatic announcement to the effect that they would forget their own self interest, and would appoint their own team of scientists to find out whether this accusation was properly founded. I will give them the credit of conceding that they were acting in good faith. But, my point is that where a multi-billion dollar industry is being threatened, it is not very likely that scientists will be exactly unprejudiced in their so-called research, and it was not surprising, therefore, that their results were at variance with those of almost every other scientist in the world who had gone into the question of tobacco-cancer causation. I well remember one of their bulletins announcing that although they had concluded that cancer might be induced by inhaling factory fumes, industrial fumes, gasoline fumes, or almost every other kind of a fume, they could not bring themselves to believe that it had been scientifically proven that it was induced by inhaling tobacco fumes. Thus, financial interest had hovered over the research laboratory, and so-called independent scientists had become the unwitting handmaidens of the tobacco trusts.

I might add, as a matter of fact footnote to that, we were all hoping that this was going to slash into the tobacco sales, but the tobacco interests just redoubled their energy. A few more hundred million dollars for advertising and as I understand it and interpret the charts and graphs, the sales have gone up even faster than ever before. This, to me, is most disturbing.

I am disturbed, therefore, that so many of our educational media are controlled by parties who, as we say, have

a "pitch," rather than by those who are looking for pure truth.

Assume, for example, that a certain medical school receives a multi-million dollar grant from a particular drug company, for the purpose of carrying out medical research. The University would have very little inducement to conduct research which might prove harmful to the financial interests of its benefactor. Now, I am not saying that this would never happen, and I am certain that there are cases where it has happened. I am merely saying that it is not likely to happen. We don't ordinarily bite the hand that feeds us.

Suppose that a particular medical journal received heavy advertising from a particular drug company. And we don't have to suppose very far, because that is a fact right here in almost every case. Again, it is not likely that that magazine would run articles criticizing the improvident use of drugs, and emphasizing the value of dietary supplements for the prevention of disease, and as preferred alternative to the ingestion of drugs.

The effect of television upon our national eating habits is unfortunate. Here again, we have turned over the most powerful educational media in the world to institutions who are not interested in education, but in selling a particular product. As a result, they have given our youth false and dangerous notions of health, and have built up a pattern of poor eating habits which will probably remain life-time habits.

I am not suggesting that we adopt a complete government censorship to correct these evils. I am suggesting that these facts make it all the more imperative that those who see things a little differently, as you do, be given an opportunity to express their point of view in order that the public might be fully informed. When unlimited power is given to one group, especially where that group is primarily interested in promoting profits rather than the public welfare — the result can only be an abuse of that power. This whole subject will bear close examination, and courageous action by

the American people, during the years ahead.

I should like to say that I deplore the practice of some federal officials in the Health, Education and Welfare in siding with one branch of healing arts at the expense of the others. The practice, in my opinion, is completely inconsistent with the American tradition of free untrammelled discussion in the approach to these problems.

Now, on the Congressional level there are some matters which I should like to report to you.

Last year, Congress amended Public Law 85-929, the so-called Food Additives Law — and this has been referred to already by previous speakers — enacted in the 85th Congress, which required that satisfactory test be made on chemicals not otherwise certified by the Food and Drug Administration, within 18 months. The food and chemical industries protested last year to Congress that this 18-month period was not long enough. They requested that the time limit be removed altogether. In other words an open-ended affair, they have as long as they want. The position of the National Health Federation was that if 18 months was not long enough, the time might be extended a little but that it should not be extended indefinitely. Naturally their position was that they would like to hold the line on 18 months and that was my position, but if the pressures were too great, that we all realized, as we did, that the 18-month limit would have to go, then your position was let's keep that time as short as we can, and that was my position. I was glad, therefore, to appear before the subcommittee handling this bill, and to argue that the time for completing these experiments should not be left open indefinitely. I argued for a two-year extension. The law as finally passed, extended the time three years. The fact that a time limit was imposed, I consider to be the direct result of the efforts of your organization, and of those few Congressmen who worked with them in accomplishing this end.

As you may know, for three years I have had the desire to have enacted into law a bill that would create an organization to clear up some of the confusion that now exists in the general field of nutrition.

Because of the fact that self-interest plays such an important part in nutritional research, and because of the fact that so many people have shown an interest in all aspects of nutrition, and so many charges and countercharges have been made, I have felt, as I believe you do, that some attempt should be made to clear things up. This must be done by sifting all of the valid evidence bearing upon questions of nutrition, adequacy of food, toxic effects of drugs and chemicals upon the human system, etc., and by trying to evaluate this evidence, and draw, if possible, general conclusions therefrom. I am not naive enough to suppose for a moment that there is any one group in the world that is smart enough to master all of the pertinent evidence on these subjects, and to come forth with a pronouncement that would be acceptable to all. I do feel, however, that progress in this direction could be made. There are so many claims that are so obviously contradictory, and so obviously the result of prejudice and self-interest, and yet which are susceptible to reasonable proof, that to say that nothing in this area can be done is as unrealistic as to say that everything can be done.

With that in mind, I introduced a bill two years ago calling for the creation of a non-partisan commission, to be appointed by the President and the Congress of the United States, to perform basic research in the field of nutrition. This bill had not only the backing of your organization, but its enthusiastic support.

This year, I re-examined the entire problem, and again was encouraged by the support of your own organization, the National Health Federation.

I was still obsessed with the idea of creating a body whose sole responsibility it would be to investigate the conflicting claims of the nutrition experts, with the

view to bring order and respectability out of the welter of confusion in which the subject is now immersed.

I was not completely satisfied with the approach I had taken two years ago. It was not that the approach was that bad — but only that from a political point of view, the bill had only the slenderest chance of passage. I wanted to come up with a bill that would have more chance of passing.

I spent nine months discussing the matter with the representatives of your organization — Mr. Harold Edwards was in my office frequently — and with national figures in the health field, both private and public.

My first idea was to create a new division in the National Institutes of Health to be known as the division of nutrition and prevention.

I later became discouraged with this approach, however, because I saw no purpose in turning over to an organization an assignment in which it had little or no sympathy. The naked facts are, ladies and gentlemen, that most of the officials in the National Institutes of Health do not believe that there is any nutritional problem to be solved. I remember talking with one of NIH's distinguished doctors. He said to me: "Congressman, we at NIH don't feel that there is anything significant to learn about nutrition that we don't already know. We have discovered all of the vitamins, all of the minerals, and all of the other enzymical health-giving properties of food. Except in a few rather narrow fields, we feel that we have gone about as far as we can in nutrition, and are therefore turning our attention elsewhere."

Well, it was obvious that I could not get very much enthusiastic backing for my project from such a gentleman.

I remember the talk I had with the Assistant Surgeon General of the United States. He was very kind and gracious to me, and helpful in the things I wanted to do, but frankly very discouraging. He said, in effect:

"Congressman, we feel that the United

States on the whole is the best-nourished, most healthy nation in the world. We feel that if every housewife patronizes every section of any one of the tens of thousands of good grocery stores in this country, there will be no basic nutritional problem in America."

He did admit that there were some problems of nutrition that had not yet been satisfactorily answered, but the area was very narrow. He said that some localities in this country had local deficiencies, arising out of conditions in their soil. He said that this was a local problem, and not a national problem. He admitted that the doctors still had a lot to learn about fat in the food, and its relationship to heart disease.

I asked him about chemical additives. He said that adequate research had been performed on additives, and that science was satisfied that those additives now being used in food being sold on the market were not deleterious to the human body. I asked him about the long-range deleterious effects of those additives. He admitted that there was still work to be done in this field, that is, measuring the long-range effects of these additives, and admitted that medical science had not yet settled in its thinking the question of the long-range toxic effects of chemicals on the human system.

But the point is, he just didn't seem to be very concerned about the problem, frankly speaking.

In hearing this, I had a strong feeling that I would get little or no help from using an organization such as the NIH, which already had such strong and inflexible conceptions about the very matter which I felt needed to be investigated.

So I abandoned the idea of using the NIH. On the other hand, I did not want to set up a new organization, entirely outside existing governmental machinery, for the reason that it would stand little or no chance of becoming enacted into law. That was the trouble I had run into in my first bill.

I finally settled on the idea of setting up a new office within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be

known as the Office of Nutrition.

Accordingly, I had such a bill drafted, and introduced the same just one day before the closing hours of the first session of the 87th Congress.

The purpose of this bill, as I pointed out above, is to set up a panel or board of experts in nutrition, bio-chemistry, toxicology, agronomy, and related sciences, to evaluate all of the conflicting claims pertaining to food deficiencies. The big problem, of course, is to appoint men on this panel who are absolutely unprejudiced, and completely objective in their point of view. It is not easy to accomplish such an objective. My bill, I believe, comes as close to the achievement of this objective as is legislatively possible.

Once this panel of experts comes up with its findings, you will find yourself equipped with authoritative information which will be invaluable to you in the furtherance of your work. Let me add that I feel you will get better results, in the long run, in working with such a governmental panel or commission than you will with a private research foundation. The reason is that the government, with all of its weaknesses, and we know what they are, does have a larger proportion of its scientists who are free from the domination of financial interests, and who, therefore, will be in a better position to protect the health of all the consumers of America.

I feel that another legislative enactment having great possibilities is one requiring that whenever a government-subsidized university or other research organization publishes a scientific paper reporting the results of its own research, that it be required that the paper also disclose the nature and extent of any financial assistance which this organization may have received to conduct such research. In that way the reader will better understand just what financial interests may have played a part in the research, and will be better able to evaluate the results.

While I am on the matter of legislation, let me suggest that there are sev-

eral other fields which need our urgent attention.

There will always be an effort made on the part of some to curtail the rights of health food stores to sell their products. There are those, I'm sorry to say, who would be very happy to see every health food store cease to operate, and to turn health over exclusively to the grocery stores, the chemical companies, the drug interests, and to doctors.

I have already stated that I feel that there are many paths that lead to health, and I will bitterly resist any legislation which denies to one branch of the healing arts a fair and legitimate opportunity to express that point of view. This matter must be watched most carefully.

May I say your organization has watched this carefully. Last year, Mr. Edwards called to my attention one particular bill that had a sleeper in it. Had great explosive dangers and possibilities, and we got on that one right away. There will be others. This must be watched.

There is another problem that has reared its head in the past few years. And, let me quote from the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Luther L. Terry, with whom, in this particular case, I believe all of you can agree one hundred percent.

Now, we don't always agree with the Surgeon General of the United States, but in this particular quote I think we can go along 100 percent. Let me read you, if I may, two or three paragraphs from a recent article by him, perhaps you have already heard about it or read it. If so, I hope you'll indulge me in my repeating it. Dr. Terry said—

"When I entered the Public Health Service some 20 years ago, I was taught by the senior physicians of our Corps that whatever else in our environment was dangerous to health, our water supplies were safe. One could go anywhere in our country, turn on the tap, and drink a glass of water without worry. Some of the water might taste like medicine and some it might be strangely colored, but it couldn't harm you. But

three dangers — one potential and two actual — are causing us to re-examine our water's spotless reputation.

"The potential danger is radiation. So far, we know of no water in the United States which approaches a level of radiation immediately dangerous to health.

There is no such water as far as we know.

"We are keeping very close watch, however, and must continue to do so as the uses of nuclear energy increase in the years ahead.

"The third danger is something else — something new.

"Modern man is living in a new kind of environment which has been largely created in the incredibly short time of 20 years. In this brief period at least a half million new chemical compounds have come into existence. We manufacture these substances, we use them, and when we are done with them, in a good many cases, we discharge them into our rivers and streams or dump them on the ground and let them seep into our underground water supplies. And then, days or months or years later (in minute quantities, it is true), we drink them.

"Some of these substances come from your home. In 1947, the housewives of the nation used 275 million pounds of detergents. Last year they used more than 3.2 billion pounds. They also used more bleaches, powders and other household cleansers, much of which went down the drain and into the nearest waterway.

"Others of the new substances come from farmlands. Every rainfall washes fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides off the crops and fields and into the streams and rivers. Unlike most other forms of pollution, these cannot be traced to a single source.

"Still others come from factories. All industrial production has increased 65 per cent since 1947, and the chemical industry's production has increased 176 per cent. Use of plastics, one of the major types of chemical product, has increased from 277 million pounds in 1940 to over six billion pounds last year.

"The most disturbing thing about

these new substances is that nature cannot handle them as efficiently as she handles human waste and other impurities of natural origin. Fish, plants, mould, bacteria and other living organisms in water can, in time break down any natural impurity and use it as food. But for many of the man-made compounds, there seems to be no organism that can give us a helping hand. Once these substances get into the water, they are diluted, but they persist for long periods of time."

And so he goes on. I'll pass over quickly. What he is saying here is that we need to set up basic standards, standards of purity. Now, I realize that your idea of purity and his idea of purity probably are not one and the same thing. That I understand, but nevertheless, what he says, as far as he goes — he doesn't go far enough, but as far as he goes he is talking sense and I suggest that this is an area which will call for close examination during the years to come, because this is a problem with which we must come to grips. We cannot go on year after year, decade after decade, pouring these thousands and millions of tons of chemicals into our pure water streams, and underground water courses and allowing them to contaminate the waters that our Nation must rely upon for its health. This is something that will call for legislative action, for close and vigilant supervision.

It seems to me from this that what we need is a national standard of purity of water. I've already discussed that — let me move on.

Let me say that we do wrong to assume that everyone connected with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is opposed to health as you understand it. This would be an oversimplification. There are some who are fighting a courageous battle within their own governmental department. Maybe they don't go quite as far as you do. But they are showing great courage and they need your encouragement, and not your condemnation.

Now, that brings me to the matter of

public relations. You have a program. But that isn't enough. If the program isn't sold to a substantial number of people, you have failed. Your organization is not just a nice social group to meet together every year and exchange viewpoints, and go home again. It is an organization for action — it is to change the face of the land.

A beggar could hammer on the huge bronze gates of Jerusalem until his fists were pounded into a jelly, or until he died of old age, but he would never get inside the Holy City until he found a key, or until someone inside, with a key, let him in. You need to find the key to the hearts of millions of people, and of their representatives in Congress. Now, may I speak frankly, and say that you have a long way to go. I can count up about six or eight Congressmen who are friendly to you to the extent that they would cast an unpopular vote to support your program. Well, six isn't very many. There are 437 members of Congress. You need at least 100-150 good friends before you can expect to enact any significant legislation. As far as the Senate is concerned, I doubt whether you have more than one or two Senators at this moment who would come out strongly in favor of a bill supporting your point of view, if it put him in direct opposition to some of the large pressures which are felt in Washington.

This morning, your President Hart spoke to you very plainly and candidly on the matter of tolerance. Let me talk to you equally plainly on the matter of understanding the position of a Congressman.

First, remember that a Congressman is required, by law, to represent his district — not just a part of his district, but all of his district. Although he can be a champion of a particular point of view, up to a point, he cannot carry his advocacy of that point of view so far that it puts him completely and permanently at variance with the great majority of his constituency. If he does, then he is not representing his district. Now I am not saying that a Congress-

man cannot display courage. Many of them do display remarkable courage. I am not saying that a Congressman is supposed to be just a rubber stamp and do what the majority of his district wants him to do. I am not saying that he has no right to do any creative thinking — to lead his people. He does have that right and that duty. But I am saying that there is a limit beyond which he cannot go if his people are not with him. A Congressman can be 10 steps ahead of his people, but he cannot be 100 steps ahead of them. If he is, they won't see him around election time. He'll be so far out ahead, so they'll get themselves another man to represent them back in Washington.

This is one of the unchangeable facts of political life which you must recognize. If this were not so, then our whole system of representative government would break down. It would cease to be representative, and would move in the direction of dictatorship. And, dictatorships are bad, even where the dictator believes in good things.

So when you present a bill to a Congressman, the first question which will interest him (after having satisfied himself on the merits of the bill) will be whether the bill has good support in his district and he's not lacking in courage in asking that question. He's just doing his duty. If he finds that the bill has very little general support, he will be entitled to suggest to you, in all fairness, to try to plow a little more ground back home before asking him to champion your bill in Washington.

As we say in Washington, there is no glory in just spinning your wheels — in committing suicide. A Congressman may be perfectly willing to be courageous and to take chances, but he cannot be expected to do it foolishly. The charge of the Light Brigade may have been a very romantic and dramatic episode in military history, but from a military point of view it was a colossal blunder, and lost the battle. If we have to die, we would rather die in victory, than die in defeat.

Let me make another suggestion. You are a health organization. Limit the activities of your organization to health. The picture in Washington is confusing enough, without compounding the confusion by injecting into the picture a hundred other issues — good issues, but irrelevant to the cause of sound nutrition. Furthermore, Washington is controversial enough, believe me, without making a lot of enemies by antagonizing those whom you need as your friends, by injecting into the picture other issues on which you cannot agree.

There may be a hundred congressmen who would be very happy to go along with you on pure food legislation, if you limit your pitch to pure food legislation. You need their help. You cannot possibly succeed without it. But if you become associated in his mind or in their minds with a lot of other controversial issues with which he cannot agree, then he will be inclined to drop the whole matter. Remember, there are many good causes — thousands of them, in fact — for which a Congressman can spend his time and effort. He quickly finds out that he cannot espouse all of them — only a half dozen or so. That is all. He hasn't the time, the strength or facilities to go beyond that. He may be perfectly willing to make health food one of his causes — but if, in his mind, health food is linked up with several other causes which he cannot espouse, he will immediately cross the whole thing off his list, and go to some other cause which is more consistent with his political philosophy.

I am not suggesting for a moment that you need keep silent on issues about which you have strong feelings. As a citizen of this great country you have the right and the duty to speak up. I am suggesting only that you not mix the two together. Your health program is complex enough. Its pathway is beset by enough boulders and thorns, at best. Don't put more of them in your way. Strip your demands of as many irrelevancies as possible. State your position simply, logically, fervently. I have often

heard you state that the best food is food that is served up unmixed and unadulterated. I am suggesting that you serve up your legislative program — unmixed and unadulterated. It will set far better with Congressmen, and be much more apt to be enacted into law.

What I am saying, then, is that in order to make your program succeed you need not only courage, but wisdom—you need them both. This is a big country. There are 182,000,000 people in it. Many of you will live to see that day when it gets to 350,000,000. Many of those who do not agree with you have also made great contributions to this nation—have worked hard and sacrificed much for their country—just as you have. Their contributions must not be disparaged. You must not conceive of everyone who disagrees with you as an enemy of the nation. If you are wise, you will work with these people, patiently and steadfastly.

But neither should you lose your sense of comitment. You are in the same position, somewhat, as the brave Dutch people who, for hundreds of years have been fighting the sea—holding it back and off their land with dikes and pumps. This ceaseless fight has bred a certain stubbornness and rugged quality in them—but they are winning the fight, and that is the important thing. Their homeland is secure.

In your struggle, the rising tide which you are fighting is not the Atlantic Ocean, but the oceans of chemicals, impurities, contaminants, and foreign substances which men find profitable to put into our food.

This is your struggle—it is breeding a certain ruggedness in your personalities, but this ruggedness is the best American tradition and will win out.

In the kingdom of food, you are the enlightened nobility, the brave warriors, you are America's conscience, and that conscience is our light. You are the voice of freedom, and that freedom is our salvation.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 12, 1961

Mr. CELLER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

## A BILL

To deny tax exemption to certain hospitals and similar organizations which discriminate against doctors of medicine.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3 *That (a) section 504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954*  
4 *(relating to denial of exemption) is amended by redesignat-*  
5 *ing subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by inserting*  
6 *after subsection (a) the following new subsection:*

7 **"(b) HOSPITALS AND SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS**  
8 **WHICH DISCRIMINATE.** — In the case of any organization  
9 described in section 503(b) (5) which is a hospital or a  
10 medical education or medical research organization, exemp-  
11 tion under section 501 shall be denied for the taxable year  
12 if such organization fails or refuses to accord to any duly  
13 licensed doctor of medicine the equal privileges of its facili-  
14 ties on the grounds that such doctor does not belong to a  
15 duly constituted county, city, State, or National medical  
16 association or society."

17 **SEC. 2.** The amendments made by this Act shall apply  
18 only with respect to taxable years ending after the date  
19 of the enactment of this Act.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 20, 1961

Mr. HERLONG introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

## A BILL

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the filing and publication of additional information by certain tax-exempt nonprofit organizations which conduct public fund drives, in order to protect the public against improper utilization of the proceeds of such drives.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States*  
2 *of America in Congress assembled, That section 6033 of the Internal Revenue*  
3 *Code of 1954 (relating to returns by exempt organizations) is amended by*  
4 *redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection*  
5 *(b) the following new subsection:*

6 **"(c) CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS CONDUCTING PUBLIC FUND DRIVES.—**  
7 Every organization—

8 **"(1)** which is exempt from taxation under section 501 (a) for any tax-  
9 able year,

10 **"(2)** whose operations in such year are not confined to a particular State  
11 or locality, and

12 **"(3)** which during such year makes one or more organized public appeals  
13 for subscriptions or donations of funds from which it derives an aggregate  
14 of \$1,000,000 or more,  
15 shall (whether or not it is required to file a return or furnish information under  
16 the preceding provisions of this section), as a condition of such exemption, file  
17 with the Secretary or his delegate a full and complete accounting of the funds  
18 so derived, including a statement of the exact amount expended for the prin-  
19 cipal stated purpose of such appeal or appeals, the cost of raising such funds,  
20 the amount expended therefrom for buildings and equipment, the amount ex-  
21 pended therefrom for administrative purposes, a statement of the salary or  
22 commission (or both) paid therefrom to any person where the aggregate amount  
23 thereof in such year is in excess of \$10,000 or is paid at a rate in excess of  
24 \$10,000 a year, and such other information as may be required by regulations  
25 of the Secretary or his delegate. The records on which such accounting is based  
26 shall be kept available for audit and inspection by the Secretary or his delegate,  
27 and shall be open to inspection by the public, for such period during and after  
28 the taxable year involved as may be required by regulations of the Secretary  
29 or his delegate."

30 **SEC. 2.** The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply  
31 only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of  
32 this Act.



# SUGGESTED PURE WATER BILL FOR STATE LEGISLATURES

An act to amend Section \_\_\_\_\_ of the Health and Safety Code,

The people of the State of \_\_\_\_\_ do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 4031 of the Health and Safety Code is amended to read:

4031. It is unlawful for any person, district or corporation, to furnish or supply to a user water used or intended to be used for human consumption or for domestic purpose which is impure, unwholesome, unpotable, polluted, or dangerous to health, or to which there has been added any medicinal or other substance with the intent or for the purpose of affecting the physical or mental functions of the body of any person consuming such water; unless approved by a majority of the voters in the area affected, at a regular, or regularly called election, for that purpose.

The governing body of the area to be affected may place the matter before the voters at a regular election, or call a special election for the purpose of submitting to the voters of that area the proposition as to whether or not the voters approve the adding to the water supply of any medicinal or other substance with the intent or for the purpose of affecting the physical or mental functions of the body of any person consuming such water.

The ordinance establishing the election shall fix the date on which the election shall be held, the time, the place, and the purpose of the election. The ordinance shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the area to be affected. Such notice shall be published at least 90 days before the date of the election.

4045. Any voter or group of voters may, not less than 60 days prior to such election, prepare and file with the governing body of the area to be affected an argument for or against the proposition to be submitted. The argument shall not be greater than 300 words in length. If more than one argument for or more than one argument against the proposition is filed within the time permitted the governing body shall select one of the arguments for printing. No more than three signatures shall appear with any argument. The governing body shall mail or cause to be mailed, to each registered voter in the area to be affected one copy of the argument for and one copy of the argument against the proposition. Such arguments shall be mailed with the sample ballot.

4046. Another election in the area to be affected on the same or substantially the same proposition shall not be called by that governing body within four years after such election unless requested to hold such an election by a petition signed by not less than 10 per cent of the registered voters in the area to be affected if the election is to be consolidated with a general election in the area, or 15 per cent of such voters if the election is to be a special election.

4047. Any special election shall be called, noticed, held and conducted, election officers appointed, voting precincts designated, ballots printed, polls opened and closed, ballots counted and returned, returns canvassed, results declared, and all other proceedings incidental to and connected with the election shall be regulated and done, in accordance with the provisions of law regulating municipal elections.

If the election at which the proposition is presented to the voters is a general election, the election shall be called, noticed, held and conducted, election officers appointed, voting precincts designated, ballots printed, polls opened and closed, ballots counted and returned, returns canvassed, results declared, and all other proceedings incidental to and connected with the election shall be regulated and done, in accordance with the provisions of law regulating such general election.

Sec. 5. The Legislature hereby declares that it is not the intent of the Legislature in enacting Chapter 7.5 of Division 5 of the Health and Safety Code to indicate legislative approval or disapproval of the principle of fluoridation of water.

## AMA versus NHF

The AMA has for years been the public front for the allopathic theory of medicine and the drug interests. As an organization, it has done many things of merit during past years. We have no fault to find with its legitimate activities.

We find fault with what we feel are its illegitimate activities, such as seeking to

destroy all branches of the healing art not in accordance with the allopathic or drug theory of healing and its failure to clean its own house of charlatans and quacks.

NHF—an organization of the people, now finds itself as the voice of the people, the only national organization prepared to face the AMA as a champion of the people's rights and the natural ap-

proaches to health (commonly called drugless) as held by some 30 million Americans.

Since the AMA has at its recent Quack Congress declared that it is determined to destroy the great Chiropractic profession, the National Health Federation has automatically become the public defender of this large branch of the healing art.

The Federation is organized to work for freedom of choice in matters relating to health and to resist all efforts by any group to create a monopoly of any kind in the field of healing. We believe that each branch of the healing art should clean its own house and improve its own methods and modalities. We believe that each branch of the healing art has its quota of charlatans and quacks and that such are detrimental to the public welfare and should be eliminated, but that it is not the duty of one branch of the healing art to undertake so to do, in any but its own branch.

The Federation further believes that departments of government should not make alliances with any one branch of the healing art to the detriment of other branches or schools of thought.

## New York Doctors Scandal

NEW YORK, Jan. 13 — A physician sees a patient once and charges him for 40 visits.

Another physician gives his stationery to a "shyster" lawyer and instructs the lawyer to make out the medical report for the purpose of an insurance claim.

A third physician bills a patient for a series of X-rays that never were taken.

The catalogue of fraud and misconduct, mostly arising from auto accidents, is enough to convince the state Board of Regents that the swindling now practiced by all too many physicians in New York "staggeres the imagination."

### Most in City

The board is investigating 1,300 physicians, most of them in New York city, on various charges of unprofessional conduct.

August J. Bardo, Jr., director of the division of professional conduct for the state Board of Education, expects that number to approach 1,500 within a few weeks. There are 35,000 MDs in New York state.

"The medical profession," Bardo said today, "is getting a black eye."

Recurrent complaints from insurance companies, he said, instigated the investigations.

### 40 Disciplined

The Board of Regents undertook the investigation of medical misconduct in January, 1960.

Bardo, appalled by the fast-rising number of doctors implicated in the swindling, spoke today of the "frightening" extent of the evidence. — San Francisco Examiner, January 13, 1962.

(Editor's Note: This item is published by us not to condemn the many wonderful doctors belonging to the AMA, but rather to demonstrate the fact the AMA has a good many quacks and charlatans within its own ranks, and should devote its time and energy to cleaning its own house, while the other branches of the healing arts do likewise.)

## Membership

You will be glad to learn the membership of the Federation grew by the addition of new members during 1962, equal to 22% of the total membership.

Since the drug interests publicly declared war on the drugless approach to health, the number of folks joining the Federation is twice what it was at this time last year. We urge every member to redouble his or her efforts to get the story of the Federation into the hands of countless thousands of Americans. This can well be our year of victory.

## In Memory of

A memorial gift was sent in by Anna Williamson of Alderpoint, Calif., in memory of: **Ellen Arlena Corzine** of Terre Haute, Indiana, beloved wife of James (Continued on next page)

Leon Corzine, and loving mother of Jane Ellen and James George Corzine.

A donation in the form of three subscriptions was sent in by Dr. Kathleen G. Ellington of Glendale, California, in memory of **Kate Tomlin** of Lancaster, California, who passed away last year.

A check was sent in by The American Legion & Auxiliary of Alderpoint, California, in memory of **Mr. John Willey, Sr.**, beloved father of John, Joe, and Robert Willey of California.

Dr. Mona W. Frick sent in a memorial gift in memory of her beloved husband, **Harry Frick**.

Beulah Y. Brubaker of Placentia, California, sent in a memorial in memory of her friend, **Harriet Ward**.

Several members of the Hemet Better Health Club gave a monetary tribute to their member and friend, **Lloyd Wixom**.

In memory of the mother of Mrs. Yanofsky of Brooklyn, New York, a generous donation was given by Mr. Samuel Cohn of New York.

Dr. John C. Vann of North Hollywood sent in a memorial gift in memory of **Donald Whiteaker** of Torrance, Calif.

The staff of Valley View School of Duarte, California; the staff of Northview School of Duarte, California; the staff of Beardslee School of Duarte, California; and the staff of Royal Oaks School of Duarte, California, sent in donations in memory of **Isaac S. Crecelius**, beloved father of Mr. Charles Crecelius, Board Member of the National Health Federation.

Leo and Edna Berken of San Jose, California, loyal and staunch supporters of the National Health Federation, contributed a substantial sum to the Federation in loving memory of Mr. Berken's sister who passed away in June of 1961.

(Editor's Note: We can think of no better way of remembering departed loved ones. Our sympathy goes out to these good friends who mourn departed friends and relatives and we assure them the funds received will be expended in such a manner as to bring lasting benefit to the sick and afflicted of America.)

### YOUR CAMPAIGN KIT

To those of our members and friends, who would like a KIT containing authentic information, with which to meet the false and misleading statements to-wit;—that America's Food Supply is better than nature made it and that depleted soil can produce as healthy food as natural enriched soil, etc., the following will be good news.

The Federation is embarking on a project to furnish our members with such a Kit. This Kit looks a good bit like the one being distributed by the American Medical Association on the outside; there the likeness ends. The A.M.A. Kit is filled with statements by authorities who are apt to be biased because of their employment, training, or because their research funds are provided by business enterprises interested in manufacturing and processing America's Food and or Drugs, as they appear on the shelves of the Food and Drug Stores of America.

The National Health Federation's Kit, contains 14 well written documented pieces of literature, written by men whose research and thinking are not colored by the source of their research funds, their salaries, or previous training. Our purpose in publishing and distributing this KIT is to enable our members to give the public the other side of the nutrition picture. Having both sides of the picture will enable the public to arrive at a true conclusion.

These Kits will sell at the price of \$1.50 each, or in lots of 5 or more at the rate of \$1.00 each. These prices are only sufficient to cover the cost of printing, handling and mailing. If after you receive a KIT, you do not feel you make use of it, or it is not what you expected, you may return it in good condition and your money will be refunded.

Send orders direct to National Health Federation, 709 Mission St., S. F. 3, Calif.

## National Health Federation RECORDED LIBRARY

A service of the National Health Federation and Merle Enterprises, Box 145, Lombard, Illinois

Special Convention Order Form for tapes and records of  
NHF 7th Annual Convention,  
December 29, 1961 to January 1, 1962, San Diego, Calif.

Records are 33½ RPM and tapes are half track 3% IPS normally.

Two topics are available on one dual track tape for \$1.00 plus cost of the highest price one chosen. Example: one \$4.00 topic plus one \$3.00 or \$4.00 topic for \$5.00. List longest of the two as Code A1 at price shown (if there is a difference) and the second as A2 at a price of \$1.00. List additional topics (two on one reel pen to be sufficiently longer to necessitate an increase in cost you will be advised, pen to be sufficiently longer to necessitate an increase in cost you will be advised. If shorter (decreased cost), a refund will be made.

(R)—record or records. (T)—tape.

#### Title and Speaker

#### Prices

- Mental Health—Its Implications**, by John E. Olson, M.D. (R) \$4.25, (T) \$3.50.  
**Natural Approach to Health** by Dr. Bernard Jensen. (R) \$5.25, (T) \$3.50.  
**HCL in Your Diet** by Dr. E. Hugh Tuckey. (R) \$6.25, (T) \$4.00.  
**Proper Nutrition Panel**, by Betty Morales in charge (See Cost vs. Time schedule)  
**The Iron Curtain in Nutrition** by Dr. Royal Lee (without ques. and ans.) (R) \$5.25, (T) \$3.50.  
**The Iron Curtain in Nutrition** by Dr. Royal Lee (with questions and answers) (R) \$6.25, (T) \$4.00.  
**It Can Happen Here** by Mrs. Elliott. (R) \$8.25, (T) \$4.50.  
**Fluoridation** by Dr. John E. Waters, D.D.S. (R) \$5.25, (T) \$3.50.  
**Dental and Glandular Health Panel** by Dr. John Vann. (R) \$4.25, (T) \$3.00.  
**Glandular Health Through Applied Nutrition** by Dr. D. E. Chatterton (without questions and answer). (R) \$5.25, (T) \$3.50.  
**Eye Witness Report of A.M.A. 'Quack' Congress** by Harold Edwards. (R) \$4.25 (T) \$3.00.  
**Drugless Healing—What Now** by Dr. Frank C. Maurice. (R) \$5.25, (T) \$3.50.  
**Nutrition and What Is Being Done About It** by Congressman David King of Utah. (R) \$6.25, (T) \$4.00.  
**Washington General Council Report** by Chas. O. Pratt. (R) \$4.25, (T) \$3.00.

On tape orders add 25c per order for wrapping and mailing **BOOKRATE** or 75c for **Special Handling Parcel Post**. Record prices include mailing **BOOK RATE** — add 50c per order for **Special Handling, Parcel Post**.

(Editor's Note: May we urge our readers to look this list over carefully and use as many of these talks, etc., as you can. We urge you to also send to Merle Enterprise for a catalogue of all the talks given at the last five NHF Convention. These talks are by experts in their fields. They are both educational and inspiring. When you have used a taly at your meeting, may we suggest you loan it to other groups interested in good health. In this manner we can multiply our convention audiences by thousands. Many groups including our own chapters write to us for suggestions for speakers for their local meetings. We know of nothing better than these tapes or records. Please make use of this fine tape and record laboratory. Write to Merle Enterprises, Box 145, Lombard, Illinois.)

Published for Distribution to Members  
Without Extra Charge by the

## NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION

709 Mission Street  
SAN FRANCISCO 3, CALIFORNIA

Return Postage Guaranteed  
Entered as Second Class Matter

Subscription: \$3 Per Year (to Non-members)

The subscription price of the National Health Federation  
Bulletin is included in the membership dues.

PRICE FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS ISSUE  
25¢ each — 8 for \$1.00 — 40 for \$5.00 — 100 for \$12.00

PLACE  
3¢ STAMP  
HERE

- I wish to become a **REGULAR MEMBER** of the National Health Federation and am enclosing \$3.00 as dues, \$1.50 of which is for a subscription to the **BULLETIN** for the current year. Family membership \$4.00.
- I wish to become an **ACTIVE MEMBER**. I am enclosing \$5.00 as dues for the current year, \$1.50 of which is for subscription to the **BULLETIN**.
- I wish to become a **SUSTAINING MEMBER** and am enclosing \$\_\_\_\_\_ (minimum fee, \$25.00) as membership dues for the current year, \$1.50 of which is for a subscription to the **BULLETIN**.

Name.....

Address.....

Mail direct to **NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION**  
709 Mission Street, San Francisco 3, Calif.

Doctors engaged in practice accepted only as Active or Sustaining members.

Renewal

New Member

## Special Bulletins

- 1—**Thanks to all of you** who attended our great convention at San Diego.
- 2—**Clinton Miller**, Assistant to the President, has established his headquarters at the Federation Office in Washington, D.C. He will devote full time to legislation and other business of the Federation.
- 3—**Your president** is already thirty days behind in answering his mail, so please pardon delays.
- 4—**Please keep sending** in clippings on items having to do with health.
- 5—**The November-December** issue of the Bulletin is so popular, we have already exhausted two printings of it and have another 10,000 on the press. We have many back orders, which will be filled as soon as the next shipment arrives. Be patient with us.
- 6—**The January** issue on mental health of our children is just as popular and we are now ordering another rerun.
- 7—**Due to the fact** this issue had to go to press about the time the San Diego convention closed, we will have to wait until the next issue to tell you about what wonderful things the San Diego folks did to make the convention a great success. We are almost tempted to go back there next year.