REMARKS OF HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, U. S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1959 UPON THE INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH AND TO ESTABLISH IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH.

DECLARATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL WAR AGAINST DISEASE

Some years ago, when the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute were moblizing private and public resources to fight heart disease, Doctor Paul Dudley White made a resounding speech in Boston. He called it, I believe, "A Declaration of War Against Heart Disease", and it marked the launching of a great attack that has had great success and shows even more promise for the future.

I propose that we adopt a similar but broader resolve: to declare war on all disease everywhere in the world, to mobilize our resources immediately, and to develop, in partnership with other nations, a worldwide attack upon the common enemy of all mankind: disease.

There is much fearful talk of "World War III". Let us resolve that it be a new kind of war -- for and in behalf of health instead of death! I strongly believe that our own people and those of all nations will heartily join in starting and carrying through to victory such a new war on disease as the world has never seen before!

Last August, in introducing in the House of Representatives a bill on international medical research as a companion to Senator Hill's measure in the Senate, I spoke of some of the benefits that have accrued from medical research and of some of the potentials that expanded international medical research would bring.

Today, I would not only reiterate how much the world and we have to gain from increased research abroad, but I would point out also that the time is eminently right, now, to seize the opportunity and march with other nations upon this new road of progress. I believe we should and must adopt legislation for expanded international medical research aid and for related, essential measures involving the application of knowledge and such activities as the proposed International Health Year.

As you know my background, you know that in my more than 18 years of service in this House I have labored to know and understand and meet the problems and needs of medical research and public health through adequate support for programs from the Congress. I hope and believe my advice to you, my colleagues, has been always sound and good. Indeed, one of the two most gratifying things in my long experience in Congress has been the continuing endorsement by you of my work, as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for health, education, and welfare, and labor departments, in which I have advised strengthening medical research. I have done so, of course, because it is through research that our people's health is being enhanced and life extended and crippling and premature death reduced.

The other most gratifying thing to me is the fact that the good people of Rhode Island have similarly and continually endorsed my devotion to this work for research and health. I can assure you that they are well informed upon this, and, in the majority by which, in the last election, they returned me to the House for another term, the people of Rhode Island showed they wanted the work for health continued, for my platform was built upon the assurance that I would seek increased research and health benefits.

I mention these things about myself as setting for telling you that it is my sober and considered judgment that the time for action upon international measures is this year of 1959, and as soon as possible. The sooner the better. For every month's delay means that much postponement of the human and economic benefits that our own nation and all nations will reap.

Moreover, although we in America were first to sound the call to arms for health for peace, others have not been slow to sense the dramatic appeal that medical weapons against disease have. Already the Ukraine has put forth a proposal, and, while you and I are certain that such proposals are primarily political and only secondarily humanitarian, the peoples of the world do not know this. Nor do they know that our philosophy for an expanded world health program is first and fundamentally humanitarian and an instrument of public policy in the same sense as those guarantees of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness contained in our American Constitution, which the world acclaims.

I am afraid that the world does not acclaim what we would propose to do because we have talked much and done little. A year has passed since a ringing call of "Health for Peace" was sounded. Many of us in Congress had, of course, long been aware and working for international medical research and the application of its results, realizing the values for other peoples' and our own health and economy and for vital influences toward peace.

While some things have been accomplished in the past twelve months, and they are extremely encouraging, I fear that other peoples may think of America as talking big and acting laggardly.

Even what America has already contributed to the health of the world is far from well and widely known around the globe, and I say this without decrying the efforts of those who have done such splendid work abroad for health and those who have sought to tell their story. For one thing, certain others have both subtly and blatantly taken credit for American accomplishment. We do not say that America is due more than her share of credit; we know that medical science always advances only through the work of researchers in many countries.

But even in such a field as the development of a successful vaccine against polio, where an American researcher brought to triumphant culmination a search of years to which, as Jonas Salk himself has many times said, many others contributed stepping stones, we can find another nation claiming this success in areas where the people did not know the facts.

Let me tell a little story to illustrate this. It is one, I think, which is illuminating and suggestive in many ways, not the least of which is an indication that America needs to tell her story further, faster, and first.

An American visitor to a Far East Country learned, to his astonishment, that the polio vaccine was considered a Russian discovery. The man to whom the American was talking was not a scientist, but nevertheless an educated man. Yet to say merely that America had a greater claim would be taken as American bragging.

Finally, as the conversation continued, the American found a way to suggest the truth.

His host told of how some of his country's territory had been under Russian domination, but was returned, except for a certain area, still held by Russia.

"Who," the American asked, "do the Russians say were the ancestral developers of that area? Do they claim that their people or your people were first?"

"They say it was theirs", his host replied. And then he smiled, as the light dawned and he saw the point. But only then was he willing to believe the best of America.

Perhaps this is far from typical around the world. I wish I could believe so. But I cannot. And yet this sort of thing is only one of the minor reasons, among many major ones, why I am sure we must proceed in 1959 to enact legislation and provide appropriations to help mount a truly great world-wide attack upon disease. We must not only declare international war upon disease with the ultimate victory of better world health, nutrition, and economy and the unity of peace. We must also provide new inspiration and new means to achieve the goal.

How do we make friends for America through international health and research?

There are many, many ways, but I shall mention only a few, just enough to illustrate the point that we can make more friends by talking and acting for the simple needs of people than by high discussions of policy or any other means. By helping people meet vital needs, like food and nutrition and health, we can become their friends and they ours.

As many of you know, I have long been interested in the World Health Organization. Just last summer I was privileged to participate in the great WHO sessions held in Minneapolis, which were a splendid success. Even more important, in terms of friendship for America, was the warm and sincere welcome given by the people of Minnesota and elsewhere to the delegates from 85 nations. They departed with a new and deeper understanding of the American people; they took to their home countries a new respect for our institutions, a new comprehension of what we are, as people interested in our own people and all the people of the world.

In Geneva, where I was a U. S. delegate to WHO, there was a friendliness within the WHO Assembly itself that is tremendously heartening. It outranks all other bodies, I am sure, in creating lasting international friendships. First names are common in the halls. Mutual respect, concern in each other's problems, constructive help, and a sharing of ideas characterize these great Assemblies.

So the WHO is an outstanding means whereby we can and do make friends.

What are some of the other ways? One that comes to mind is the contributions and visits abroad of America's fine medical men. Dr. Paul White's international work, not only as a member of professional scientific groups like the international cardiological society, but also as a private practitioner of medicine, has meant much to our country.

Dr. White has helped get research started in places where there was little or none; he has encouraged the beginning of medical schools and hospitals in remote areas; he has tirelessly contributed time and money and his friendly, wise counsel to men of all creeds, colors, and races -- all and solely for the advancement of health.

And yet Dr. White is but one of a number of eminent Americans loved and respected and sought around the world for their unselfish medical work. These men are of inestimable value as winners of friends for America. More of our skilled men and women of medicine will, I hope and feel, in days to come expand this friendship even more.

There are many other means, as I said, and on many levels. Take the very practical things, like water and food and standards of living and rolling back the tide of diseases. The DDT sprayer has won friends for us around the world.

What we do to help people get plenty of clean, safe water is understandable to people; it means benefits in terms of their everyday lives, and they can and do appreciate such helps to better living and health. As America also aids them as a partner in their efforts to get adequate food and meet nutritional needs and to improve housing, so also will they become more and more friendly with us -- and become our partners for peace, too. These are just some of the ways and means to international friendship, and much more could be said, but I think the point is made.

Let me sketch now something of the problems, the potentials, the programs and their price, and the pay-off -- all of which are essential factors in considering an expanded international health activity by the United States in partnership with other nations.

First, what is the world health situation today? A glance at this shows the problems and suggests the needs in terms of vitally needed research, essential measures to apply disease prevention and control knowledge, and indispensable means for more trained medical manpower, health facilities, and better education and information dissemination.

Overall, the world health situation shows that man has progressed far in his fight for health; the world is healthier than it has ever been before. There have been sizeable declines in the death rates from disease all over the globe, not just in highly developed areas. The world's population has, therefore, been increasing. Yet the increase has not, as some may believe, come about because of great increases in the birth rates. Primarily, the population increase is a result of decreasing death rates in many countries.

This means that medical research advances have been great and have been applied in enough force to effect declines in deaths from disease in many areas. In the last half-century, it has been said, the progress of science has been more rapid than in the previous two thousand years. The lowering of mortality from disease proves the statement.

Let us not be lulled, however. Little has been done compared to what could be done. Yet this little endeavor has produced results out of all proportion to the funds and manpower invested. I am speaking now particularly of the investment in recent years in international health, not only America's but all others. The cost of the world-wide epidemic intelligence service, for example, which first warned of and then performed yeoman service in last year's influenza epidemic, was in terms of only a few thousands -- thousands, not millions, of dollars -- and a pitifully small supply of trained medical manpower.

We see new methods of agriculture and land irrigation and the increase in the total of the habitable and tillable area of the world -- with influence on health and economy.

Moreover, directly against disease itself we see progress on many fronts. There have been real advances against cholera, a tremendous world problem. Perhaps the most notable victory, although it is like the winning of a battle and not a whole war, has been against malaria. Then there have been gains against typhus, a deadly disease enemy in many parts of the world.

Again from the overall view point, the life span of man on earth has been extended and there has been some decline in the death rate of infants. Progress has been made against venereal disease around the world, and some advance, though little and far from what could or should be accomplished, against tuberculosis.

All this is to the credit side of the ledger. The other side shows that, while we have come far, we have farther still to go. The familiar illustration of the iceberg is apt. What has been achieved is but the top part, which we see, of the iceberg. Nine-tenths of it is underneath. Just so, the greatest part of the world's health problems is still unsolved.

While I have been speaking chiefly of infections and communicable diseases, and those which no longer are as great a health burden in the U.S. as the chronic diseases like heart ailments and cancer, I must say that in those countries abroad where communicable diseases have been reduced, chronic illnessess have emerged as today's great cripplers and killers just as in our country.

Thus, as we all well know, the war against disease has only just begun, in terms of man's life on earth through the ages, in just a few countires. The truly international war for health remains to be declared, as I said earlier.

To return to the problems, we find them tremendous and staggering. The incidence -- the rate at which disease strikes -- is high in scores and scores of infectious diseases too numerous to mention in hundreds of countries. The prevalence -- the amount of debilitating disease -- is vast. The mortality from almost any disease one could name in any country, including our own, is far higher than it should be and we cannot be proud of man's record when we think of what can be accomplished if we really turn overselves and our resources to total war against disease.

There are many diseases now widely prevalent where the simple application of knowledge already won, of public health practices, could greatly reduce or even conquer the problem -- among them typhus, yellow fever, venereal disease, rickettsial diseases, some bacterial diseases, and, perhaps above all, what is still a No. 1 world problem: malaria.

Many other diseases, and some of those mentioned, however, still will require intensive research of various kinds, and I would not imply that any great victory in the world war against disease is easy of attainment.

Consider the appalling lack of health resources and facilities, for one thing, and you will see why victory is no easy matter but must be won, as always, with sacrifice and hard toil and expenditures that are hard to come by.

Around the world, there are manpower lacks in medical fields which are tremendous. I believe the world ratio of physicians to population is something like one doctor for each two thousand people; in some or many countries it is perhaps one physician to each ten thousand persons. The same holds true for dentists and is so, or nearly so, for other types of

necessary health and medical personnel. The ratio of hospitals is probably even worse, with many millions of people almost completely without hospital facilities of any kind withintheir reach of money or distance.

If I have not stressed the dark side of the picture enough, let me turn to its economic aspects, because a poor economy is always related directly to a sick people.

The great potential markets of many areas of the world cannot be fully opened until the economies of those areas are expanded and their purchasing power is increased. The lessons for our own business and industry, since we are a country that in most things produces goods that we need to sell abroad, are obvious.

Economic advances around the world cannot take place unless the manpower is vigorous and productive. Sick people are not consumers nor producers. A high percentage of the people of the Middle East, much of Asia, large parts of Central and South America, and most of Africa, are sick -- suffering from infectious or communicable diseases, many of which are preventable or curable, or from undernutrition, which better health and other things, such as newer methods of agriculture, could alleviate.

The people of these areas cannot, without the partnership of others, build the type of country they should have; they alone cannot control or mold their environment. Yet the great fact of the twentieth century is that man has made his environment largely controllable; the knowledge exists whereby he can, in the main, manage adequate food, shelter, clothing, housing, medicines, and so not merely survive but even enjoy a productive life.

Yet the people of these areas cannot do so without the help of their fellow man in more fortunate countries. They cannot build the base upon which a good economy can be erected. Nor, to be practically worldly, can they be good customers for others.

One of the greatest matters of our times, is the fact that the world cannot accomodate, economically and socially, the expanding populations unless those populations are healthy, vigorous producers. In what field could the United States show its great concern for human beings and their happiness, no matter who nor where they are, better than by helping them gain a healthier life through modern technology?

Here is a great opportunity, the greatest perhaps of all time, to show the people of the world that we are concerned with them for their own sake, not to master them but to master their great enemy, disease.

Let us tell the world, in great blazing signs of service, what we are, what we stand for, and what we want them to be; free and healthy men and women under guarantees of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness even as we ourselves are. This is the true American tradition and the real American purpose.

In discussing the problems of the world's health, I have suggested or implied, I believe, more than a little of the potentials that expanded international health and medical research holds in the way of human and economic benefits. I should, however, illustrate more specifically what the victories we may expect in a great new world war against disease will bring.

Here, I shall illustrate the potentials first by citing examples of practical dividends, to the U.S. as to other nations, achieved through international health means.

The international reporting of diseases, and the operation of an early-warning network for world-wide communicable diseases, through the World Health Organization, affords an excellent example of tremendous savings in lives, sickness prevented or controlled, and literally millions of dollars. Think what the cost of the Asian influenza epidemic last year would have been had we not been forewarned! Through the international health communications network, outbreaks of highly infectious or communicable diseases anywhere in the world are broadcast to WHO headquarters in Geneva. Then the news is broadcast to health authorities all over the world, to ships at sea, to airports and seaports, enabling health authorities to apply appropriate measures to check disease spread.

The influenza outbreak shows us how a disease can spread around the globe in a matter of months. Asian flu came from inland China and, spreading in both directions around the world, hit the U. S. on both coasts at almost the same time. Because of the early warning network we knew of the beginning and the spread and were able to take steps to soften the blow. Extensive measures were adopted, a vaccine was developed, and, while there was much flu sickness, it certainly would have been far worse had we no knowledge of it.

One other example, of a different kind, will be enough to more than prove the future potential of expanded international health activity by citing past experience. This is the case of malaria.

About ten years ago, some three million people died each year from it, and another three hundred million suffered from its weakening effects. It may have been, may still be, the world's most costly disease, because of the chronic invalidism it causes and its vast extent. It retards commerce and business and industry and agriculture -- and no highly malarial country can be more than a pitiful semblance of what it could be without the disease. Regions of our own country knew this some years ago, and had there been no malaria prevention, control, and treatment programs in the U.S., we would find ourselves a far less productive nation than we are.

But technical advances, new knowledge from research, came and changed the grim picture. There were two major advances: one was DDT and the other was drugs. DDT meant the possibility of whipping malaria by eradicating the mosquitoes which spread it. The new drugs meant that the parasite responsible for malaria could be killed in the infected person's body, and safely for him.

Application of this knowledge, and other new information, has done much against malaria. It is still a No. 1 disease for attack by international health measures; it still presents problems of great magnitude not only to health control services but also to research.

Yet the world-wide fight against malaria has had tremendous successes, and this one campaign alone has been responsible for perhaps the most outstanding improvement in the world's health.

Today, the number of deaths from malaria have been reduced to about half of the number caused a little over ten years ago; and the amount of the disease has been similarly reduced. Economic gains have followed in countries where substantial reduction or elimination of malaria has been achieved.

What achieved this? It was won through by cooperative international medical research and application measures, by partnership among nations, and by the World Health Organization and all allied with it. The United States can well be proud of the share it has put into this great enterprise, and we can and should do even more, for the full potential of a world free from malaria, yet to be realized, will mean much to us, as to others, both in humanitarian and in economic terms.

The business future of the U. S., we all know, is deeply involved in investments and sales abroad. We will benefit in dollars from medical research and the application of its knowledge to conquer disease. But we are not unique in this. Other countries also depend upon foreign sales and investments. They, too, will benefit. I say this because I do not believe that the American businessman is less altruistic than the thrifty Scots or French businessman, or the shrewd German or Chinese, or the Scandinavian or Australian, or any other. I think that all people, in whatever country, who stop to think, will realize that improved world health is to their good. I think that this matter of expanding research and disease control around the world is one -- perhaps the one -- truly global effort in which all nations can and will join as real partners.

What this can mean was well expressed last year by Dr. Marcolino Candau, Director-General of the WHO, who said:

"I am convinced that, if the great advances gained in science and technology are put at the service of all the people of the world, our children and their children will live in an age from which most of the diseases our grandparents and parents took for granted will be banished. It is in our power to narrow further the gap which exists between the few countries which have already reached a relatively high level of health and the many others which are still in the early stages of their health development.

"Through intensified and well-coordinated research we shall be able to find the means to cure or prevent the diseases which today prevail in the economically developed areas and tomorrow may strike those regions which are in process of rapid development."

Now let me turn to the program, mentioned earlier, which we should establish to win the new war against disease and which will let the world know that the United States is backing its words with faith, friendliness, and finances.

I have noted recently that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare disclosed to the newspapers his budget request for Fiscal Year 1960. But I failed to find anything in the stories indicating that there would be any Administration request for new or additional funds for international medical research and health activities. Yet the Administration and the Department have stated strong interest in expansion of health measures for peace.

While I am as staunch an advocate as anyone for not providing for non-essential activities, I do not believe in being penny wise and pound foolish.

I believe in establishing and providing for activities that will bring us far greater returns than the outlays. Increasing the scope of U. S. participation in world medical research and health measures will do this. Moreover, such a strengthening of our international efforts is not merely desirable, it is essential. It is essential to our defense, to our continued and growing prosperity, and to our own national fight to prevent and control killing and crippling diseases.

These are some of the reasons why I am introducing into this Session of Congress the bill, first introduced in the closing days of our last Session, to increase the scope and opportunity of medical research through an intensified international program. I have joined with Senator Lister Hill in this endeavor, and he is recommending, just as strongly to the Senate as I to you, that you consider it a matter of greatest importance and support the passage of the measure. The bill provides for the fullest development of the medical research potential of the whole world.

The bill further provides that this shall be done under the leadership of the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service. The scientists of the Institutes, as you know, have demonstrated well what can be done, in partnership with the medical schools and other research centers throughout the entire U. S., in providing a national war against disease that is already paying off splendidly. This is being done both through the grants programs and through the high-calibre research the Institutes conduct in their own laboratories. What is not so well know, perhaps, is the fact that the National Institutes of Health has a great wealth of experience in participating in international research, its training, and interchanging scientific knowledge with others.

They work closely with WHO, with international scientific societies and research centers, and their studies and some of those supported through grants are already bringing us new and important research information from abroad. National Institutes of Health research fellows from America study in foreign countries where there is real scientific opportunity, and, even with present resources, the Institutes are bringing brilliant foreign scientists here so that we may learn from them and they from us.

Thus, I say, a National Institute of International Medical Research, working within the framework of the National Institutes of Health, the Public Health Service, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, can give outstanding and unique leadership to development of the whole world's research potential.

The program authorized under this measure would strengthen the research activities of the WHO and other international bodies and encourage the participation of scientists and nations around the world. It would not conflict, compete with, or duplicate with them. The amount asked to launch this new war against disease is small compared to its benefits in health, in international goodwill, and in the advancement toward peace.

The time for action is now, and recent international events only emphasize that we should not delay action in this field of humanitarian science. So, I earnestly submit that we take up and pass the measure.

Let me turnnow for a moment to other measures which I believe also worthy of your support. While emphasizing research, I have in my remarks also pointed out the importance of the whole world health problem and of activities derived from and related to research.

In my opinion -- and that of many others, including non-government health and medical authorities -- we should also move forward upon other health fronts in addition to research.

We should strengthen and expand activities, such as those I mentioned in connection with the great problem of malaria, for the application of current medical and public health knowledge. As I indicated earlier in discussing this, there are a number of diseases which could be conquered or greatly curtailed. The knowledge is in hand, but there is not enough money, trained manpower, or facilities being provided today. Through the World Health Organization particularly, and through and with Public Health Service participation -- and the Public Health Service has tremendous world-wide experience in disease prevention and control -- we ought to step up the front-line warfare against disease.

Additionally, I believe that we also should support a new measure, first introduced also in the previous Session, which will provide a catalytic agent -- a triggering mechanism as it were - for the new international war against disease.

I refer to the measure calling for an International Health and Medical Research Year, somewhat in the manner of the International Geophysical Year. There are many areas where means for specifically organized and directed scientific effort on an international basis would be of great value in the solution of disease and health problems.

The mechanism of an International Health and Medical Research Year would, moreover, have even greater importance and one beyond the limits of its life-span.

This importance would lie in the continuing advancement that the "Year" would make possible in relationships and patterns of collaborative effort for the furtherance of medical research and health measures in the common cause of mankind.

In closing, and again urging that we here and now declare a new world war upon disease through passage of the legislation discussed and support of intensified international health activities, I would like to hark back to the beginnings of our country. The American Revolution was an idea -- an idea translated into action. It inspired people everywhere to be free. It continues to inspire them as a great historical idea that became reality and brought forth a great, free nation.

It seems to me that we have here today a somewhat parallel matter. We have an idea -- a war and Revolution for health -- to achieve freedom from disease. We can translate it into action and reality.