

**STATEMENT OF HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, U. S.
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECOND DISTRICT OF
RHODE ISLAND BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH
AND SAFETY IN SUPPORT OF HIS HEALTH FOR PEACE
BILL, JULY 21, 1959**

Mr. Chairman:

I am here in support of my bill, H.J. Res 370, which superseded H.J. Res 129, which provides for the establishment of a National Institute for International Health and Medical Research to provide for international cooperation in health research, research training and research planning.

The consideration here of this legislation for a world war upon disease through medical research may well be the most significant deliberation with respect to the future welfare of our country and of the world in which any of us have ever participated.

For myself, I am sure that the subject of expanding medical research throughout every part of the earth is of great importance.

Not used

No less important, of course, is the urgent fact that we must increase the scope and depth of the life-saving and progress-bringing scientific work in our own country. As you well know, I have devoted myself to this task during the nearly two decades I have been in Congress, and I am happy that again this year we are going to provide for vitally needed growth and development of the health sciences in the United States by providing the essential appropriations without which that expansion cannot take place.

This much you, as well as I, feel confident about. We should be equally assured that, concurrent with this health expansion of U. S. medical research, there are provided the ways and means whereby medical scientists in other parts of the world can join more fully with our own researchers in a great scientific endeavor against disease and for good health for our own and for all peoples.

The legislation proposed for an international medical research institute and program and funds represents the ideal "ways and means" to do this.

Let me say at this point that I did not make the above statement lightly. It is a wholehearted recommendation based upon an informed opinion derived from much careful thought and attention and time given to the matter. It has been my privilege to have the opportunity, coupled with deep interest, to have participated in many discussions, here and abroad about research; to have visited with medical researchers overseas from many nations; and to have been one of your Congressional representatives to several World Health Organization assemblies wherein health and health research were matters of profound import to the delegates of some 90 nations of the world.

My considered judgment is that we of the United States ought to embark upon this endeavor of international medical research with new vigor and new ways and increased means. Let me cite my record on this subject.

Last year I introduced into the House its first bill, companion to Senator Hill's, for expanded medical research through a new International institute and as a scientist-to-scientist program -- and I spoke wholeheartedly for it because I believed (as I still do) so much depended upon it.

Again, on January 12 of this year, I introduced this legislation in the House. I rose and spoke upon the floor concerning it, recommending the declaration of the first truly international war upon disease through use of the tremendous, latent potential weapons for world health -- and peace -- that lie in medical research.

Again, in the summer, I repeated my endorsement of the proposed bill, in an improved and refined version that had had the benefit of the careful thought of many brilliant minds, both in our own bodies of Congress and among eminent scientists. What I said then, and also in January, I must reiterate now, urging that we declare a new world war against disease, because I want to make it crystal clear that my support of the bill in the "yesterdays" is as strong as my support today.

As I said at the first of this year:

The American Revolution was an idea translated into action. It inspired people everywhere to be free. America has continued to inspire them as a great, free nation. Today, we have a parallel idea, a war and a revolution for freedom from disease. The international medical research program is, in a sense, an

extension of the American Revolution. Let our second American Revolution be this world war against disease.

Now, let me proceed to some of the cold facts about this war and revolution.

The proposed bill is a sound legislative measure because it provides for a scientific program, administered through scientific means, acceptable to and workable within the framework of the international scientific community, and valid as a method of achieving international cooperation in research, research training, research planning, and the interchange of research knowledge.

The program would be a scientific one, administered on a scientist-to-scientist basis; it is thus of science and by science, yet for the peoples of the world.

No other method, I believe, could satisfy

criteria which any proposal for strengthening international medical research must meet. This is so for the fundamental reason that scientific inquiry and interchange and teamwork cannot be based upon anything but a method which not only permits but also requires the participation of the scientific community in the implementation and administration of research activities.

The proposed legislation assures this. It insures also that a focussed and concerted scientific effort be mounted in many disease and health research fields not now receiving the attention they must have. It insures that research disciplines be brought to bear upon gaining new knowledge both of specific disease problems not now well studied around the world and of basic life processes -- and new knowledge here is essential to the greatest ultimate victories over disease.

Furthermore, in addition to international

scientific collaboration in research studies themselves, the legislation provides new opportunities for research training, research planning and coordination, and interchange of scientific information -- all, it should be emphasized, working with international scientific bodies concerned with health research.

The above points constitute some of the primary considerations that urge favorable action upon the proposed measure.

There should also be stressed such facts as these:

There is no conflict, but rather reinforcement in the long run, with the objectives and programs of other components of the Public Health Service and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of other agencies of government, and of private organizations here and abroad in what might be broadly defined as the field of the application of knowledge -- measures to prevent,

control, or manage disease and to improve health.

There is no abrogation, but rather strengthening, by parallel as it were, of the mission and activities of present international research efforts of the Public Health Service, such as are exemplified by existing Institutes of the National Institutes of Health and which have won international acceptance and approval in their fields.

This legislation is highly desirable because it clearly sets forth the Congressional responsiveness, intent, and guidance upon a matter of vital importance to the health of the American people and of the world. The purposes and principal provisions of the bill afford a scientific, practical, and effective means of achieving health improvement through medical research. The establishment of the Institute and its program of research represent a sound and forward-thinking investment.

Furthermore, this legislation provides for

a constructive and imaginative enlargement of the role and responsibility of the National Institutes of Health in supporting and strengthening international medical research. Concern with international medical research matters must be an increasingly major aspect of the Public Health Service operation. Therefore, this legislation, which provides an operating framework and appropriation authorization as a basis for program implementation and development, is both desirable and needed.

Let me turn now to areas of interest where specific comment of a substantive nature will elaborate upon the general conclusions above and illustrate definitively why in my opinion this legislation deserves support and action.

First, we may review briefly the nature and extent of present activities of the National Institutes of Health, in international medical research. As you know, the Institutes are charged by law with specific categorical missions. Though

these missions are broad because the disease problems attacked are large, there are many limitations in terms of their objective of conducting and supporting research activities designed to provide knowledge about cancer, heart disease, mental illness, neurological diseases, and so on.

This is as it should be, for there must be concerted effort which has specific goals for delineable problems in discrete, though complex, disease fields.

The Institutes, therefore, have been rightly concerned with developing, in collaboration with scientists abroad, international research efforts. Yet each effort must be delimited in terms of a categorical mission.

The record of the National Institutes of Health's participation in international research in previous years shows clearly that, within our present legislative framework, it

is not possible to realize to a desirable degree the true potential that already exists for the development of international medical research endeavors.

The Institutes can and should increase their international research efforts as is appropriate within the framework of their mission and appropriations. The proposed legislation does not abrogate, but protects this.

What is most significant, however, is the fact that the legislation provides the means for filling gaps, for seizing latent opportunities, and for establishing a general program enabling American scientific partnership and participation in world-wide medical research to an extent and depth hitherto impossible -- a research program likely to produce new scientific knowledge undreamed of today.

Thus, the new approach, envisaged by the creation of an Institute and a program for the

purpose of aiding international cooperation in general medical research, would move us ahead on the road of scientific progress.

It is my belief, stemming from my visit abroad as well as from discussions in this country, that the new international medical research participation represented by the Institute and its program would meet with warm acceptance by those concerned with research, on the part of both individual scientists and professional organizations, here and abroad.

The expressions of many scientists themselves, and of others concerned in research programs in this country, certainly indicate a belief in partnership and participation by the United States in international medical research on a stronger and better basis than is currently possible.

The attitudes of those abroad were epitomized for me by the remarks of Dr. M. Lopez Herrarte, Minister of Health, Guatemala, who

in response to my comments on the views of the United States toward international research and health activities said:

"The words of Congressman Fogarty of the United States of America bring us hope, and we are sure that all our countries will receive as a blessing any help that may be given to us in this respect."

It is quite clear, also, that we in the United States have a great deal to receive from international research activities as well as a great deal to give. I departed from the World Health Assembly in Geneva with renewed confidence that the needs for working together in international health are urgent and well recognized by the nations of the world, that the potential mechanisms for collaboration are well established and that much more productive activity could be undertaken through our passage of the legislation for expanded international medical research.

As I returned to the United States to resume my active work in the Congress, I did so with new insight into the value both of better health and of increased research as a focus for affirmative international activity, as a cause to which people of good will everywhere are dedicated, and as a goal which is both practical, achievable, and symbolic of the highest aspiration of man to be at peace with his fellow man. It is, therefore, my firm feeling that we ought to enact the proposed legislation and make possible this new endeavor that will bring so many benefits to our own and to all shores.