

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS,  
SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND - WEAN - OCTOBER 23, 1962

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen:

As recently as one generation ago it would have been quite unusual for a candidate to talk about scientific problems in the course of a political campaign. Today the people have a right to expect public officials to concern themselves with such problems because everybody knows that science is no longer something which is just the business of research workers and specialists.

Recognizing this fact, Dr. James B. Conant, one of the greatest scientists and educators of our age, has said: "Because of the fact that the applications of science play so important a part in our daily lives, matters of public policy are profoundly influenced by highly technical scientific considerations." I heartily endorse this statement. During my 22 years in Congress I have spared no effort to acquaint myself with the public implications of scientific progress and I have been especially active in the field of the health sciences.

Some have gone so far as to call me a "health zealot." I accept that as a compliment, for I am sure that no single scientific battle

has a greater claim on a man's zeal than the battle against such things as cancer, heart disease, neurological disorders and other afflictions which take millions of lives every year.

A decade ago, at a time when the Federal government was spending \$100 million for research on the diseases of plants and animals, little or no public money was being used to find out the causes of the major illnesses of human beings. I am happy to have played a part in changing that picture. Federal support for medical research jumped from less than \$3,500,000 in 1946 to more than \$738,000,000 in 1961.

I believe that the people of the Second Congressional District in Rhode Island agree that this is progress. In seeking their support for re-election, I am asking them to give me the opportunity to continue to promote legislation which will cause that progress to advance. Far from slowing down private research efforts, the programs which I have sponsored have aided and stimulated them. Support for private medical research has, in fact, risen from \$42 million in 1940 to \$335 million in 1960.

I hold no brief for wasteful spending. In the 87th Congress, for example, I called for a thorough investigation in depth of the rise in welfare costs of all kinds. It is essential that we should keep a constant check on such matters as the distribution of welfare responsibility between federal, state, and local agencies and on eligibility standards for welfare recipients. But the money spent for the scientific knowledge which brings health and healing is, in my opinion, money well spent.

The people of Rhode Island know, I am sure, that federal tax dollars which have been used for the health sciences have not only benefited the nation as a whole but the people of this State in particular. In the fiscal year of 1960, for instance, federal funds spent on medical progress in Rhode Island amounted to \$1,200,000.

We in Rhode Island can be especially proud of the new hospital in-the-round at Ladd School. This building, which embodies the most advanced features in hospital design, was constructed at a cost of \$1 million -- \$300,000 of which was made possible by a federal grant.

Rhode Island's colleges and universities have become leaders in

the health sciences. The Honors Science Program of the National Institutes of Health to develop young medical research students at Providence College is unique in the nation. The Child Development Study administered with federal funds by Brown University is doing outstanding work. And the new health science building which will be erected at the University of Rhode Island will have research equipment and facilities made possible by a federal grant of \$217,000.

It is a false view of economy in government to cut back on research projects that will eventually lead to the conquest of diseases which deprive us of able and productive citizens, cause the annual loss of countless manhours in industry, keep hundreds of thousands of children from developing normally, and bring untold distress and hardship into the lives of millions of our people. And it is equally shortsighted to fail to realize the vital part which the health sciences can play in the international struggle to eliminate the conditions of impoverished and disease-ridden existence on which Communism thrives in many parts of the world.

Right here in our own country we are only beginning to have anything like an adequate understanding of how much the whole nation can gain when the findings of scientific research are applied to the needs of handicapped children and adults. It is estimated that because of injuries or handicaps 3 million American adults require continual professional assistance; 250,000 new victims are numbered among the disabled every year, but only about 100,000 are returned to work through existing rehabilitation programs. Only about one fourth of this country's 6 million handicapped children are now receiving the education they need to learn to live independently. I have strongly supported legislation to establish local training centers for the disabled because I believe that helping people to help themselves is good for the whole nation.

Every federal dollar we put up for such a program will be multiplied ten times in savings on relief costs. In addition, we will have the benefit of the skills of those who have learned how to make their own contribution to the economy. I feel confident that my bill to train more teachers for the deaf, which was written into law, will bear fruit

in many increasingly useful lives in the years to come.

I also look forward to the time when, as a result of research now in progress, we will have the clues to cerebral palsy, mental retardation and other disorders of that type which afflict children. Yet, it is going to take a continued and growing massive effort by the combined forces of government, private research agencies, and interested citizens to do the job.

The same thing holds true of cancer research and the drive against heart disease, which causes more than half the deaths in the United States every year. In 1960, for example, 900,000 people in this country died of heart ailments. Of that number, 200,000 were in the working ages between 25 and 64 years of age. Had they lived, it is estimated that they would have increased the national income by over one billion dollars.

When it is realized that responsible scientists foresee the possibility of conquering both cancer and heart disease in this century, it should be apparent that a broad national offensive against these diseases is called for so that we may win the victory at the earliest possible time

and save the greatest possible number of lives. If I am re-elected, you may be sure that I will continue to oppose any suggestion of retreat or cutback in funds for research in the health sciences. Knowing what we know today, the only way to move is forward.

Keeping pace with the age we live in means keeping pace with scientific advances and learning to live with a lot of new ideas. Our technology is transforming our whole environment, and it is the law of nature that only those who can adapt their living habits to a changing environment can survive. Water pollution, air pollution by auto fumes, and the great question of the safety limits of exposure to radioactive fallout -- these are environmental problems which we of the twentieth century have produced and must solve. The hazards of the nuclear age are not only the hazards of war; they are also the hazards of living with the daily consequences of the application of new knowledge to the normal activities of civilized living. The immense blessings of science and technology carry with them many grave responsibilities, not the least of which is the study of how to protect our environment from pollution and how to leave the earth a cleaner and better place for our children to live in.

I have felt for some time that all of our efforts to deal with the problem of environmental pollution will have to be coordinated in one federal agency. In the meantime, however, the work of such existing agencies as the Food and Drug Administration must be greatly strengthened, and I have supported legislation for that purpose.

What I have learned of the relation between science and government leads me to believe that in their cooperation lies the way to real future progress. What I have done to advance that cooperation leads me to hope that the votes of the Second Congressional District will continue to place their confidence in my ability to serve and represent them.