

It is indeed a pleasure to join with you today in the dedication of this new cancer research building. It is, moreover, a signal honor to be an active participant in such a significant event and to be asked to bring you some of my thoughts.

To refresh my memory as to the exact meanings of "dedication," and help determine what might be appropriate directions toward which to turn my thoughts, I looked the word up the other day.

The definition that I like best -- and one that is eminently suited to today's occasion -- is the use of dedication to mean the setting aside of something for a particular purpose, for a definite use and service.

This is certainly most fitting, because E. R. Squibb and Sons are establishing this splendid new facility, equipping it with the most modern instrumentation, and staffing it with highly skilled men and women for an especial purpose, a definite use, and a particular service: research against the most dreaded disease of our times.

Cancer used to be a name whispered in a hush. Now, at least, we hear it in the open, yet it is no less feared. But it is not because cancer is such a dread word and our most feared disease enemy that research against cancer is so important.

Rather, such research is paramount for other reasons. For one thing, cancer is a tremendous burden upon our Nation, in terms of the human suffering and death and economic damage it causes.

Cancer is the second leading cause of death in the United States, accounting for some quarter of a million deaths each year. About 450,000 new cases are diagnosed each year, and the 700,000 or so cases under treatment at any given time run up an annual hospital bill estimated at 300 million dollars. The economic burden of cancer on the Nation is said to be 12 billion dollars a year in lost goods and services.

I mention these things, not merely to reinforce the fact that you have chosen eminently well in dedicating a new weapon to the fight against cancer, but also to emphasize the fact that the costs of this disease are so great that the costs of what we are today putting into research are but small by comparison. As you well know, the total of our national resources devoted to cancer research falls far short of amounting to the annual hospital bill for cancer of 300 million dollars.

All of America's medical research is costing some 500 million dollars a year, I believe. When we place against this the costs of cancer -- and add heart disease, the crippling and killing neurological disorders, mental illness, and others -- we can see that we are not presently investing too much or too many of our resources in the nationwide research endeavor against chronic disease.

Just as importantly, we can see that we face a great challenge to meet the growing problem of chronic disease. There is a vital need to undertake more and more research -- such research as will be undertaken in this new facility of E. R. Squibb and Sons.

That is why I think this dedication is a significant event. It marks the implementation of new and additional research -- designed to help meet the research need which I mentioned. Furthermore, the very building stands as a symbol and recognition of the importance of developing new research resources if we are to conquer enemies like cancer.

E. R. Squibb and Sons are to be commended upon this and, I would like to add, upon representing so well the kind of forward-thinking by industrial partners in America's medical research which is essential to achieving the greatest possible benefits.

Let me develop this thought for a moment. The support of medical research in this country today comes from government, industry, and philanthropy or endowment. I think we would all agree that these sources are, in today's civilization, interdependent rather than independent of each other. None is an island to itself. None walks alone or goes a separate path without need of the other.

This is not to say, of course, that there is not nor should not be the greatest freedom of science and inquiry. I do not mean that the individual scientist or teams of investigators do not and should not always seek research answers along independent paths or wherever their brains tell them to seek.

What I do mean is what you well recognize, that the nature of our times, the developments that have taken place in the last quarter century in medical research, and the character of the disease enemies we attack are such that collaborative enterprise and partnership are indispensable. Thus, I would again mention that this new cancer research facility has especial meaning as a partner of allied interests in the field of research.

The strength of a chain, we know, is no stronger than the combined strength of the individual links that make it up. Medical research, it seems to me, is something like that and is made up of strongly linked components. Therefore, it is good for the whole chain of research for its parts to be strong. Thereby, industry, government, and the universities and other private and public agencies, which make up the components of the medical research chain, will each benefit from the other. Thereby, too, the people of the Nation will benefit from the whole, as industry strengthens its participation, government contributes its appropriate share, and as the other partners provide their research contributions.

There is undoubted need, as I said earlier, for increasing the Nation's medical research resources -- and all that each of the partners can do in the coming years toward this end will not be too much.

As you may know, this is not a conclusion I have reached by a few weeks or months of study and consideration. For nearly twenty years now, ever since I began to serve in the U. S. Congress, I have devoted my major attention to health and medical research matters.

For the past ten years I have been privileged to serve as chairman of the House of Representatives appropriations committee which must determine upon and provide the necessary funds for the Federal government's share in aiding American medical science.

This is a grave responsibility, as I am sure you are well aware, for the programs for which we provide appropriations and the activities enabled by these funds have had and will continue to have far-reaching consequences not only on medical science but for the people whom both science and we in Congress serve.

There are, in a sense, three parties involved in the national march of medical science and in the decisions affecting it. There are the components of research itself -- the scientists of industry, government, the university world and so on. There are the elected representatives, we in the United States Congress. There are, thirdly, the people.

Each party influences, and in turn is influenced by, the other. Yet, I think, all are motivated by and responsive to a great common goal -- the conquest of disease. And I can assure you that in my years as a representative of the people, my whole course of action and

determinations and decisions year in and year out have been held up to the basic light of that motivation. I have seen American medical research grow and develop and become a world leader, and I am proud to have been a participant in -- as well as an observer of -- that growth and of the benefits it has brought.

Because I have followed the progress of medical science so closely and so long, I would like to discuss for a moment or two some of the ways in which the efforts of industry and of government can supplement and complement each other.

First, let me say what is self-evident, but perhaps worth stating: that industry has a vital stake in the programs of Federal support of research, in their size, their nature, and their effectiveness. This, of course, as I have indicated earlier, is also true in reverse: between government programs in relation to industrial research.

The strengthening of medical science and the increasing of medical research resources through government support has meant, I think, a great deal to pharmaceutical research in the past. It can and should continue and mean even more -- particularly as understanding and relationships on all levels - scientific, administrative, advisory, and others -- continue to increase and deepen.

The patterns for this which such a research institute as we are dedicating here today can establish will provide a shining example of further and future partnerships.

Moreover, at the scientific and technical levels of industry and government or government-supported medical research groups, there are undoubtedly many ways in which mutual interest and appropriate collaborative undertakings can foster interchange and cooperation on a growing scale.

This does not imply that close and cordial relations do not already exist between scientists in government laboratories, scientists in universities supported by Federal grants, and scientists in pharmaceutical laboratories. Such relationships and cooperative work are traditional in American science, are extensive, and have been many times most productive. This can, however, grow and develop in pace with what I, as many others, foresee as a period that will become the brightest era in American medicine and science.

Another way in which there can be strengthened links between the components of American medical research lies in what might be called areas of particular mutual interest.

Let me explain this general statement with specifics. We in Congress, and especially those of us like myself who are continually and deeply concerned with medical research activities, study the needs as expressed by the public, by scientists, by interested groups, and by the facts and figures of health and hospital and medical studies and surveys of many sorts.

Areas of emergent need and of prime research opportunity are thus determined. These are areas wherein the best scientific, objective judgment indicates that progress can be made if programs are provided with support and implemented. Among some of them developing in recent years, in disease-oriented fields, are, for example, those of perinatal disease and death, mental retardation, alcoholism, cystic fibrosis, diabetes, gastroenterological disorders, mental illness, high blood pressure, and cancer chemotherapy.

Then, too, in what I will call "behind-the-laboratory-bench" fields, there come to light critical needs that must be met if the present rate of progress is to be maintained and if there is to be any hope of increasing this rate in the future.

I refer here to such things as the need for funds for educational facilities for medical schools -- for which I have sponsored legislation and which is coming to be more and more recognized. I refer also to the necessity for encouraging the field of physical biology, for providing adequate research training programs, for the development of research in the aging process and for action programs to complement this, and for environmental health research.

All of these are areas and fields in which you have much interest, of course, but let me return to the first group of research program areas -- those concerned with disease-oriented objectives -- because it is from among these that I would further illustrate the opportunity for collaborative endeavor by the specific example of cancer chemotherapy.

This, too, is most pertinent for us today, since we are met to dedicate a splendid new research facility to the war on cancer.

The development of industry and government supported programs in this field afford, I think, a heartening example and a challenge for the proper kind of mutually worked out relationships in other fields in the coming months and years.

Dr. J. R. Heller, Director of the National Cancer Institute, reported to my committee in our last hearings that, in his own words, "The national voluntary program of cancer chemotherapy research is now in full operation, with each of its phases operating at a high level of efficiency and effectiveness." He also said that the pharmaceutical, chemical, and allied industries were taking a most active and important part in the program and that the trend was strong toward greater participation. I know that this has continued, and I hope that it will further increase and influence partnership efforts in other areas of important research needs.

I say this because of something which you know as well as I: that we cannot afford less than our very best efforts to push ahead on the road of medical research progress. We must not merely walk along; disease runs ahead and apace, and we must - to put it bluntly - progress faster or die.

Cancer is such a racing enemy that it will outstrip us completely unless we devote extraordinary enterprise to its conquest. This we are doing, and this new laboratory of E. R. Squibb is concrete evidence that we all share this conviction and have faith that increased research against cancer is imperative and is a good and necessary investment.

If the present incidence and mortality rates from cancer should continue, some 40,000,000 persons now living will develop cancer during their lifetime -- and 26,000,000 of them will die from cancer.

The saving of lives will depend upon more effective and early diagnosis, upon prevention, and upon more effective treatments than we now have, and probably life saving will depend most largely upon the development of more effective treatments. Here, the brightest hope - many hold - lies in finding chemical agents that could reach and destroy, without harm to the person, cancer cells in whatever part of the body they may be located. The smallest returns require an enormous effort and outlay, as you well know, in chemotherapy research.

Yet the effort and outlay, we all feel, are well worth making and, hopefully, within our lifetime there will come that marvelous day when, if not a cure, something as effective, say, as insulin for diabetes is discovered for our most dreaded disease enemy, cancer.

I am very happy, may I say again, to join with you in dedicating this new research building in the war against cancer. E. R. Squibb and Sons are to be congratulated most heartily, and I wish great success to the research inquiries which will be carried forward herein.

In closing, let me quote from a remark of many years ago made to the Joint Committee of the House and Senate which considered the original legislation to create a National Cancer Institute. I think it is appropriate to the present moment.

This was by Dr. Clarence Cook Little, Director of the Jackson Memorial Laboratory, Bar Harbor, Maine, who said: "A war was never won by a general advance on all fronts at once. It was won by advancing in the sectors where you can advance, then in another sector, and then consolidating between. That is what research is. The need is here. The opportunity is here."