

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, M.C., SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND -- WEAN -- OCTOBER 30, 1962.

Good morning ladies and gentlemen:

We Americans have achieved the highest living standard of any nation in history, and we have pushed the fight against poverty, disease and premature death further than it has ever been pushed before. One dramatic result of our progress has been that in 1962 one of every 11 of us has passed the age of sixty-five. Back in 1900, it was only one in 25. By the most conservative estimates, the number of our senior citizens will have risen to 20 million in 1970. At the present time there are 5.5 million Americans who have reached or gone beyond their 75th birthdays. That number will probably increase by about 2 million in the next ten years.

This is, or ought to be, good news. But for untold numbers of elderly people and their families in America today, what ought to be the golden years are instead filled with worry and anguish. Automation reduces the need for the lifetime skills of older workers; loneliness and frustration are the lot of many older people in a society which

has not learned to use their still valuable talents. One in every six of our senior citizens is on relief. Even with Social Security benefits, the average money income of people over sixty-five in our affluent society is about \$1,000 a year.

It is not for the lack of talking about the problems of aging that those problems today remain largely unsolved. Many of you will recall that I have time and again proposed that constructive action should replace mere talk. Many of you will remember that I sponsored the White House Conference on Aging, which was held after three years of preparatory meetings in January of 1960. But neither the White House Conference, nor 12 regional meetings, nor 30 Senate hearings have brought us any nearer to a proper solution.

It is my unalterable conviction that America's senior citizens are entitled to what might be called The Golden Age Bill of Rights. Such a Bill of Rights would include adequate income and medical care, opportunity -- when possible -- for employment, chances for meaningful activity, and suitable housing. It would also include the right to benefit from proven

research and services to achieve independent living.

These and other rights for the elderly can be achieved only through a permanent, independent U. S. Commission on Aging. So long as the needs of senior citizens are pigeon-holed in a minor bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, we will get exactly nowhere in meeting them. That is why I have sponsored legislation for an independent federal agency with adequate resources and authority to act. I want to see funds made available to the States to establish, or to improve, their present facilities for aging people. The legislation which I have introduced in the House also calls for \$10 million a year for five years for grants for community projects and an additional \$2 million for training personnel for research and demonstration projects.

Under my bill, Rhode Island would receive a grant of \$105,000 for the first year. The work of our State Commission on Aging displays the kind of autonomy which the Federal agency should have and I am sure that this State could well become a model for the entire country under the plan which I have proposed.

Elderly people have rightly become increasingly impatient with the failure of their national government to develop anything in the nature of a really major program to gain for them the goals to which they are entitled as Americans who have contributed to this country's present wealth and greatness. They have every reason to demand that the promises made to them by leaders of both political parties should be fulfilled. If I am re-elected, I will continue to make it one of my major concerns to bring an end to the delay, empty talk, and half-hearted measures which have for too long stood in the way of the rightful goals of our senior citizens.

If this means a struggle with some of the bureaucrats in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I am prepared to undertake it. I believe that we in Rhode Island respect independent thinking. Independence has been identified with this State ever since the days of Roger Williams. When the good of our people is at stake, it must be fought for. During the past 87th Congress I demonstrated this belief on several important occasions.

When, for example, I learned that a member of Congress was using his official mailing privileges to try to get Rhode Island firms to move their

industries to his district, I took immediate action. I proposed legislation to put a stop to this highly improper practice, and although the gentleman in question is a friend of mine, I had to tell him that such personal considerations no longer counted when his industrial propaganda hit the Rhode Island border.

It is my belief that the independent farmer is and always has been one of the great mainstays of our freedom. I cannot in conscience give my support to any legislation which aims at regimenting agriculture and subsidizes farm prices. You just cannot lower government costs, increase farm income artificially, and keep food prices stable--all at the same time. I voted to defeat the Department of Agriculture's program of so-called "supply management" because I did not believe that increasing federal expenses and adding to the huge stockpile of farm surpluses was good for Rhode Island or the nation. I could see no advantage for our people in a law that would have meant an increase in the consumer cost of bread that could have amounted to \$450,000 a day. Nor could I lend my support to a measure which would have restricted the productive rights of dairy farmers and would certainly have meant an

increase in costs to the consumers of milk and other dairy products.

In my 22 years in Congress I have always been associated with measures designed to meet changing economic needs. But I have also made it my business to be very certain that such measures were so framed as to give the fullest protection to our industries. Today it is obvious that the European Common Market is changing much of the world trade picture and providing a strong barrier against Communism in Europe itself. I recognize that ways must be found to deal with this new fact of international life. But I felt keenly that the trade bill which passed the 87th Congress was far too sweeping in its grant of power to decide which American industries are to suffer the ill effects of tariff reductions. I voted against that measure, and if I am re-elected, I intend to do all in my power to strengthen programs of tax relief and other benefits, such as loans and technical aid, to help those industries which may suffer. Fighting to keep Rhode Island's textile, rubber, machine tool, and jewelry industries strong is not merely a local concern. It affects the well-being of our whole economy.

I supported President Kennedy's nomination long before it was the

popular thing to do, and I believe that the record of his first two years in the White House is one of outstanding accomplishment. Under his leadership we beat back the recession and moved forward. Along with business recovery went area redevelopment, an improved minimum wage, the manpower retraining program, and progress in welfare services-- all of which I strongly supported. In defense and foreign affairs we have attained a new level of strength and the arm of Federal law enforcement against gambling, the rackets, and organized crime has been made more effective by three new major laws. Today we lead the world in space communications and our progress in space exploration has been greater than anyone hoped two years ago. If we have not made the progress we should have made in aid to education and the medical care of the aged, it was only because of the obstructionist opposition of some Republicans and their Dixiecrat allies. But that is a situation which the American people are going to correct on Election Day.

When that day comes, I believe that the people of Rhode Island's Second Congressional District will agree that on the basis of my record of 22 years I have done my best to represent them faithfully and fearlessly.

I look forward to the opportunity of getting back to work on the many projects -- such as my legislation for a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities -- which I hope to see enacted in the next Congress. The problems of automation, the protection of our industries and our agriculture, the welfare of youth, the needs of our schools, and the rights of our senior citizens call for the kind of help which requires not only good intentions but a practical program that is backed up by legislative experience. In that belief that I have such a program and such experience, I feel justified in asking the voters of the Second Congressional District to give me their support and to re-elect me on Tuesday, November 6.

Thank you.