

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
140 Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.
Capitol 4-3121, Ext. 2424

For Release: Friday a.m.
May 23, 1958

SENATOR HUMPHREY URGES U. S. TO CHALLENGE RUSSIA FOR GREATER HEALTH EFFORTS

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) yesterday challenged the Soviet Union to join the United States in devoting a greater share of its research efforts to world health "for the sake of all humanity."

In a Senate address on work of the UN's World Health Organization--which opens its 10th Anniversary commemorative session in Minneapolis next Monday-- Senator Humphrey outlined a series of proposals for the United States to step up its own activities in support of world health activities----and urged that the Soviet Union be officially urged to cooperate.

Calling for greater U. S. initiative toward strengthening international research aimed against the major diseases of mankind, through the World Health Organization, Senator Humphrey said, in part:

"It is my hope that if the World Health Organization does act favorably upon the invitation which I am recommending, that Soviet Russia play a major part in such a constructive effort. How can it do so? Ultimately, it can do so by contributing a major share of the funds which would be necessary for strengthening research. We have an excellent precedent for such U. S.-Russian contribution of funds. Under the WHO's malaria program, the United States is making heavy contributions to a special malaria fund. Russia is contributing also, but on a much smaller basis.

"I hope that all the nations would contribute to a special research fund, usable against heart disease, cancer, and so on. Naturally, however, the United States and Russia might be expected to make the principal contributions.

"But allocation of Russian funds, alone, is not enough. I hope also that there will be increased Russian attendance and contributions at International Medical Conferences; increased exchanges of Russian doctors and scientists with American doctors and scientists; and strengthening of the translation program which is already being effectively carried out at the National Institute of Health--the translation of Soviet medical journals, abstracts, and monographs.

"These then are but a few of the ways which the Russian government could cooperate with all of the other nations in helping to dedicate Science for Peace. We, in the Congress, should in my judgement provide maximum encouragement for this purpose.

"In my judgement, we have hardly scratched the surface in cooperation of this nature between the United States and Russia....this is a field for the pooling of East-West efforts which can strike a major blow, not only for the well-being of mankind, but, indirectly, for the peace of mankind, as well.

"Such cooperation could, in my opinion, prove exceedingly fruitful; not only for the health of mankind, but for the peace of mankind," Senator Humphrey declared.

After reviewing the effective contribution to mankind already being made throughout the world by the World Health Organization, Senator Humphrey outlined a series of specific measures which he urged Congress to consider "in seeking to help strengthen WHO, as well as furthering the mutual pursuit of WHO's high objectives by the United States itself."

(OVER)

Handwritten notes and signatures:
@ [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]

Ban
Inspection

① Sub Comm on Disarm
Climate for Peace
AID - Trade - Food - Health
Science - JGJ

They include:

1. Support for legislation proposed by Senator Lister Hill (D-Ala.) aimed at increased U. S. cooperation in international scientific research against the worst diseases of mankind.
2. An amendment of the pending Mutual Security Act, supplementing the provision on eradication of malaria by, for the first time, stating the over-all policy of the United States Congress toward strengthening international research aimed against such major diseases of mankind as heart disease, cancer, and so on, urging the WHO to study plans for expanding such research, and seeking to enlist the cooperation of Soviet Russia toward such efforts.
3. Amending the Mutual Security Act to authorize use of foreign currencies obtained by the United States under Public Law 480 sales of agricultural commodities for the specific purpose of coordinated research against the major diseases.
4. Expansion of efforts toward greater U. S.-Soviet cooperation in an international "attack" on major health problems, through challenging Russia to match our contributions of funds, knowledge, and skills for joint research in behalf of mankind everywhere.
5. Inclusion of basic research into health problems in studies now under way by the Senate Committee on Government Operations into stimulating basic research on physical and social sciences.
6. Improved coordination of various medical research activities of our own government, making use of such efforts as the Educational Exchange Program, the ICA, and research by the AEC and the Veterans Administration to supplement work already under way through the National Institutes of Health under the U. S. Public Health Service.
7. Encouraging greater contributions by and participation from the private medicine profession and drug industries toward coping with world health problems.

WHO

1955 -
Malaria fund

"He who has health has hope", runs the old Arab proverb, and "he who has hope, has everything," Senator Humphrey declared.

"Millions of people have acquired health, and therefore hope, within the last decade as a result of the work of the World Health Organization. Millions more now have the hope of acquiring health--and it is more than a hope; it is a responsible prospect.

"This is a historical development of the first magnitude, and we have no more than glimpsed its consequences. In the past, disease has changed the course of history, as when the Black Death rolled over Europe in the fourteenth Century. We may be sure that the absence of disease will have repercussions equally profound, equally challenging, and--if we are alert enough to deal with them--a great deal more hopeful," Senator Humphrey declared.

(65-23/5/58)

(OVER)

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
140 Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.
Capitol 4-3121, Ext. 2424

For Release: Immediately
April 1, 1958

SENATOR HUMPHREY NAMED DELEGATE TO WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) has been designated by Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson to represent the Senate's majority as a Delegate to the Eleventh World Health Assembly to be convened in Minneapolis on May 26.

Senator Humphrey, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, sponsored the resolution in the Senate providing for the World Health Assembly to be held in Minneapolis.

Formal appointment of Congressional delegates to the Conference from both majority and minority parties in the Congress will be issued soon by Vice President Nixon and Speaker Sam Rayburn. Traditionally, each party designates its own representatives for such appointments.

In a letter to Senator Humphrey, Majority Leader Johnson wrote:

"Dear Hubert:

I have today recommended your appointment as a Delegate to the Eleventh World Health Assembly, to be convened in Minneapolis on May 26, 1958. I am sure that you are going to do a fine job of representing the Senate at this meeting, and it was a great pleasure to be able to recommend you.

Sincerely,

"Lyndon"

"Lyndon B. Johnson."

The WHO Conference will bring delegates from all over the world to Minnesota for an international discussion on combatting disease and protecting health through worldwide cooperation.

COPY

REMARKS
by
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
ON

UNITED STATES SENATE FLOOR

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

"He who has health has hope," runs the old Arab proverb,
"and he who has hope has everything."

Mr. President, millions of people have acquired health, and therefore hope, within the last decade as a result of the work of the World Health Organization. Millions more now have the hope of acquiring health -- and it is more than a hope; it is a reasonable prospect.

This is a historical development of the first magnitude, and we have no more than glimpsed its consequences. In the past, disease has changed the course of history, as when the Black Death rolled over Europe in the fourteenth century. We may be sure that

COPY
the absence of disease will have repercussions equally profound,
equally challenging, and -- if we are alert enough to deal with
them -- a great deal more hopeful.

This medical revolution has occurred with such startling
swiftness that we tend to take it for granted -- almost to ignore
it. Yet it has transformed society within a generation. I remember
that not too long ago, indeed, in my own childhood, my parents lived
with a haunting fear of diphtheria. Infant and childhood mortality
was so commonplace, even in relatively rich and comfortable United
States, that the family with all its children living was a rarity.
Today nobody worries about diphtheria, and the principal hazard of
childhood is the automobile. Within the last few years, we have
seen the dread of polio banished from millions of homes. All of
us could think of many other examples of the progress of medical science.

Mr. President, it is the function of the World Health
Organization to organize the effective sharing of this progress
throughout the world. But WHO is not satisfied simply with fighting
disease. Its constitution defines health as "a state of complete

physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity."

The WHO constitution also lays down other principles, which are as revolutionary in their way, as the new drugs that WHO doctors and nurses dispense. The constitution declares that:

-- The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is a fundamental human right.

-- Governments have a responsibility for their people's health.

-- Unequal health development in different countries is a common danger.

-- The health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security.

Mr. President, this is potent doctrine. And yet it is no more than the adaptation of long-recognized social principles to the scientific revolution which has been occurring in medicine. Consider the points one by one.

COPY

"The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is a fundamental human right." Those who would question this statement ought to turn it around. Are they prepared to say that a child in Haiti, for example, has no right to be cured of yaws when we have the penicillin and the knowledge of how to use it? Maybe he doesn't have a right that's enforceable. But it's a right existing in the heart of everybody who believes in the brotherhood of man.

"Governments have a responsibility for their people's health."

Every city and town in America has long had health regulations of one kind or another to meet this responsibility. As far as I am concerned, WHO simply broadens, but does not change, this fundamental principle.

"Unequal health development in different countries is a common danger." This can hardly be denied in an age of rapid and large-scale travel. Within the year, we have seen a new influenza virus in Asia close public schools in Pennsylvania

"The health of all peoples is fundamental in the attainment of peace and security." Remember the old Arab proverb about health and hope. Wars are born of despair; hope begets peace.

The World Health Organization sprang from a proposal by Brazil and China at the 1945 United Nations in San Francisco that an international health organization be established. An International Health Conference met in New York under the auspices of the United Nations in June, 1946, and drafted the WHO Constitution, which was signed by representatives of 61 countries. By its terms, the Constitution was to come into force April 7, 1948, when 26 member countries had ratified it. The first World Health Assembly met in June of that year, and WHO's ambitious program was launched in a fairly modest way. Next week, Mr. President, the tenth anniversary will be celebrated, I am proud to say, in my home town of Minneapolis.

The achievements of the last ten years are impressive:

WHO membership has grown from 61 countries to 88.

It carries on programs of technical assistance in more than 100 countries and territories.

COPY

It has a staff of about 1,400 professionals of 54 nationalities.

It operates a worldwide epidemic reporting service.

It has adopted international quarantine regulations which at once speed travel as they control disease.

It has published the first International Pharmacopoeia and more than 200 other technical works on more than 40 health subjects.

WHO's regular work is financed by contributions from its members according to an agreed scale of assessments, ranging from one-third for the United States (about \$4.5 million this year) to less than one per cent for the smallest, poorest members. WHO also receives funds (about \$5 million a year) from the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program and additional contributions from the United States (about \$5 million this year) for its malaria eradication program.

All of this comes to something less than \$25 million a year, surely a modest sum for the achievement of goals as ambitious as WHO's. But rarely, if ever, have dollars been stretched further.

COPY

WHO works in cooperation with the health services of the countries which request its assistance. It does not try to do the world health job itself. Rather, it tries to supply the technical expertise which is missing from some national health services. It convenes worldwide committees of experts to study specific problems. It sends consulting experts to advise health officials and to train health personnel. It provides training scholarships. On many occasions, it enters a fruitful partnership with UNICEF -- the UN Children's Fund -- under which UNICEF furnishes the supplies and materials and WHO the technical and professional personnel for a project.

Of course, WHO welcomes the interests of private and voluntary agencies who want to help humanity everywhere.

In recent years, more and more voluntary agencies have given material help and have cooperated with the World Health Organization in establishing hospitals and clinics.

There are 43 non-governmental organizations with whom WHO maintains official relations. The World Medical Association, which stemmed from the American Medical Association, is among these. Among others is the International Pharmaceutical Federation, the International Council of Nurses and the League of Red Cross Societies.

WHO is collaborating with 1,800 scientific institutions in the world, including laboratories, research units and scientific studies. Most of these institutions are devoting time and energy on a voluntary basis in the interest of the advancement of science. I understand that only 40 of the 1,800 organizations get any funds from WHO at all. Research is being coordinated in more than 50 laboratories in the field of influenza. Another large number are busy in polio research.

The moral is plain: There is nothing exclusive about WHO or its place in the world. It welcomes, and is designed for, the active support and cooperation of voluntary groups.

It is difficult -- even, perhaps, invidious -- to attempt
to single out one field of WHO activity for special emphasis
and discussion. But I would like to talk particularly for a few
minutes about the malaria eradication program which, so far as I
know, is history's biggest concerted health activity.

Many diseases are controlled; few are eradicated. And of
those few, none in modern times has had the worldwide incidence
of malaria. The year WHO was born, 300 million people -- about
one out of every eight in the world -- had malaria. Because even
then the disease was virtually unknown in most of North America
and northern and western Europe, the proportion in other parts of
the world was much higher than one in eight. Indeed, in some areas,
it could practically be taken for granted that everybody had, had
already had, or would have, malaria.

The malaria mortality rate is low -- only one per cent.
But even at one per cent, that meant that in 1948, three million
people died from malaria.

Over and above this really appalling loss of life, malaria's greatest damage is not as a killer but as a disabler. The customary chills and fever of malaria attacks last only six days, but the disease's enervating effects last much longer. It has been estimated that malaria decreases efficiency by about 25 per cent for a whole year. Further, it makes its victim more susceptible to other diseases, as for example, pneumonia, and is thereby indirectly responsible for an increased number of deaths from other causes.

As the world's greatest single disabler, malaria is the world's most expensive disease in economic terms. A person with malaria is less than fully productive, if indeed he is productive at all. His food and his clothing have to be produced, and his housing has to be provided, by somebody else. When substantial numbers of people are in this position, it is a burden even on the wealthiest society. But the countries where malaria occurs are mainly underdeveloped. In this kind of an economy, the loss of

COPY

productivity caused by the disease becomes well-nigh insupportable and operates as an effective bar to economic development.

Eradication of malaria, therefore, pays immediate and spectacular dividends, not only in the reduction of human suffering but also in cold dollars and cents. One of the contributory factors in the increase in food production in India has been the fact that malaria eradication has made it possible for people to live in and cultivate fertile areas which malaria had previously made uninhabitable.

The tools for malaria eradication did not become available until the development of DDT insecticide in World War II. Some national malaria control programs were already underway when the World Health Organization entered the picture in 1948 and made malaria control a top priority. The distinction between control and eradication is important. WHO's original goal was simply "to eliminate malaria from the world as a major public health problem." and its technique was mainly in DDT-spraying of houses.

COPY

It soon became apparent, however, that mosquitoes were developing resistance to DDT, and WHO concluded, in 1955, that the only way to control the disease successfully was to eradicate it totally before the mosquitoes had time to develop complete resistance. This can be done in any given area over a three-year period by breaking the man-to-mosquito-to-man cycle by which malaria is transmitted. Malaria stays in the blood stream for about three years. If mosquitoes can be controlled for three years, the disease will die out.

WHO has plans to cover the world in this program over a five-year period beginning in 1957, and encouraging progress has been made.

The incidence of malaria has been reduced by one-half in the ten years since 1948.

Mr. President, if WHO had done nothing else, it would have performed a monumental public service. But, as I indicated briefly a moment ago, it has done much else.

COPY

Its most dramatic and spectacular accomplishments have been in the field of the infectious diseases -- malaria, tuberculosis, yaws, syphilis, yellow fever, influenza, and so forth. This is a reflection of the fact that this is the field in which medicine itself has made its most dramatic advances.

WHO, however, is taking on two other functions which will become increasingly important and significant as the traditional infectious diseases fade into the background. These other functions are in the field of mental health and the field of atomic radiation.

As more people live longer, and as they live under the increasingly complex conditions of modern society, mental illness becomes an ever greater health problem. This is true in highly developed countries such as the United States, I suspect, and it is particularly true in countries undergoing the social stress of changing from a primitive to a modern economy. This is one of the big health problems of the future -- perhaps the biggest single problem. Every country on earth needs more knowledge and

COPY

more professional people trained to attack it. WHO has started none too soon and can, I hope, devote increasing resources to the problem of mental health. The problem particularly needs the approach embodied in WHO's constitution as a state of affirmative well-being and not simply the absence of disease.

The study of the health hazards of atomic radiation is also of the utmost urgency. In view of the controversy surrounding this question and of the division of respectable scientific opinion on the subject, this seems to me a peculiarly appropriate subject for WHO.

The health revolution to which I referred in the beginning has come about through solution of the problem of infectious diseases. This in turn is creating other problems of a social, political, and a medical nature.

The most dramatic result is the increase in population stemming largely from reduced infant mortality. At the present

rate, total world population will double by the end of the Twentieth Century, which is not so very far off. That will mean almost five and a half billion people. The demand which these people will make on the natural resources of the world are almost incalculable. The problems of international political organization in such a crowded world -- the problems of how this number of people can live peacefully together on the same crowded planet -- are equally great.

As more people survive into middle age and old age, the nature of their health problems changes. When life expectancy at birth is no more than 30 or 35 years, not many people live long enough to worry about heart disease or cancer. These two diseases, however, are already the largest killers in the United States and most of Europe; they can be expected to increase in other parts of the world as WHO and its collaborators win the battle of the infectious diseases.

Mr. President, I would like to see WHO take the lead in organizing a concerted worldwide attack on cancer and heart disease.

These are certainly appropriate matters for international scientific concern. They should be outside the cold war. There is no ideology in a cancer cell.

In his State of the Union message to Congress in January of this year, President Eisenhower made this proposal to the Soviets. He said:

"...we now have it within our power to eradicate from the face of the earth that age-old scourge of mankind: malaria. We are embarking with other nations in an all-out 5 year campaign to blot out this curse forever. We invite the Soviets to join with us in this great work of humanity.

"Indeed, we would be willing to pool our efforts with the Soviets in other campaigns against the diseases that are the common enemy of all mortals -- such as cancer and heart disease."

The World Health Organization, of which the Soviet Union is a member, seems to me a good place to start these efforts at medical collaboration.

The first decade of WHO has seen more progress in public health than the preceding century. This is a strong statement,

COPY

but I believe a warranted one. In some countries, life expectancy has increased by 12 years in the last ten. When, previously, in all history, was such progress made?

WHO is, indeed, off to a running start, and it will have to run even faster if in its second decade it matches the progress of its first. Scientific discoveries are outrunning our ability to apply and utilize them. Despite the enormous work which has been done, there are still millions of people who are sick and who could be made well by a single dose of an antibiotic and who could be kept well by simple measures of environmental sanitation.

WHO's work will never be done. This is not cause for despair. It is cause, rather, for pushing ahead even more vigorously. WHO deserves the support of all of us. Mr. President, I am particularly pleased that in the next few days, my own home city of Minneapolis will be host to the World Health Organization and will honor all the goodwill and solid achievement which WHO represents.

###

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR U.S. ACTION

COPY

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to spell out a few specific points which might in some measure serve to further the great work of W.H.O.

In particular, I should like to submit recommendations for 6 specific actions.

We in Congress might consider these actions in seeking to help strengthen W.H.O., as well as furthering the mutual pursuit of W.H.O.'s high objectives by the United States, itself.

SUPPORT OF GOAL OF SEN. HILL'S BILL

1) First, it is my understanding from newspaper reports that there is in the process of preparation a major bill which is aimed at increased international scientific research and cooperation against the major diseases of mankind.

I understand that this bill will be offered by the distinguished Senior Senator from Alabama, (Mr. Hill,) who is universally acknowledged as the Dean of legislation in the field of Health.

I want to commend my good friend from Alabama.

I want to assure him that I, for one, together with my colleagues, will welcome this legislation which, the press indicates, he is preparing and which

will be the latest in a long line of outstanding health bills which rightly bear his name.

TWO AMENDMENTS TO M.S.A. BILL

2) My second and third recommendations bear upon the Mutual Security Act of 1958, S. 3318, which our Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is in the process of marking up.

As I have indicated to my associates, this bill can become a major landmark in the unfolding story of the World Health Organization and related efforts. It can become such a landmark by our adding two relatively brief amendments.

a) Invitation for Widening W.H.O. Research: The first amendment would supplement the provision on eradication of malaria which is to be found in this bill, and in previous legislation.

Under this proposed Amendment, the Congress of the United States, in addition to re-stating its policy aimed at the eradication of malaria, would, for the first time, state its overall policy that there should be a strengthening of international research aimed against the major diseases of mankind, such as heart disease, cancer, etc.

Under this proposed Amendment, the Congress of the United States would specifically invite the World Health Organization to explore the possibility of strengthening of such research.

In response to such a proposed invitation, a detailed study might be made by a W.H.O. Committee. This Committee would report back to the W.H.O. at a later date. Therefore, no U.S. funds would, at present, be authorized under the Amendment. Funds under the present malaria program would, of course, be continued.

Let me point out that, as the W.H.O. explores this research issue, it would enlist, I hope, the cooperation of Soviet Russia. Such cooperation could, in my judgment, prove exceedingly fruitful; not only for the health of mankind, but for the peace of mankind.

I shall have more to say about this in just a moment.

Time is unfortunately short. Since, as I have indicated, the World Health Organization commences its Assembly next week and since the Mutual Security Bill will not have been completed by then, I am stating this matter publicly now in order to help encourage the thinking of interested Members of the Congress and members of W.H.O.

The Policy Statement on Research, then, would be one of the brief

COPY

Amendments which I propose to the M.S. A. Bill.

b) PL 480 Funds for Research: A second brief Amendment would simply authorize the use of funds generated under Public Law 480 for the specific purpose of coordinated research against the major diseases.

This Amendment would be an addition to an Amendment which I have already introduced in the form of S.3313.

Under my S.3313 Amendment (which the Administration proposes to accept, but in amended form) Public Law 480 funds could be utilized for the purpose of "collecting, collating, translating, abstracting, and disseminating scientific and technological information."

(I should like to point out that already, over and above S.3313, PL 480 funds are being effectively utilized for international exchange, education, and information activities.)

Under this additional phraseology which I am now suggesting, the Congress would be pin-pointing medical research as one of the major purposes for which PL 480 agreements might be designed and executed, just as it would pin-point the dissemination of scientific information as one such purpose.

Consumption of nutritious foods from the farms of the United States help

to build and sustain healthy bodies of our friends overseas.

COPY

Is it not, therefore, completely logical that, from the sale of these very foods, the currencies which are generated, shall be used to make still healthier the bodies of those who consume those foods?

A healthy individual can help his or her own country. A healthy individual can help make his land a better friend of the United States, a better customer of United States products; a better salesman to the United States.

FOURTH SUGGESTION - SPECIAL U.S.-RUSSIAN RESEARCH FUNDS

I have earlier referred to enlisting the cooperation of Russia. Let me now make my suggestion specific.

It is my hope that if the World Health Organization does act favorably upon the invitation which I am recommending; that Soviet Russia play a major part in such a constructive effort.

How can it do so?

Ultimately, it can do so by contributing a major share of the funds which would be necessary for strengthening research.

We have an excellent precedent for such U.S.-Russian contribution of funds.

Under the W.H.O.'s malaria program, the United States is making heavy

contributions to a special malaris fund. Russia is contributing also; but on a much smaller basis.

COPY

I hope that all the nations would contribute to a special research fund, usable against heart disease, cancer, etc. Naturally, however, the United States and Russia might be expected to make the principal contributions.

But allocation of Russian funds, alone, is not enough. I hope that:

- a) There will be increased Russian attendance and contributions at International Medical Conferences;
- b) Increased exchanges of Russian doctors and scientists with American doctors and scientists;
- c) Strengthening of the translation program which is already being effectively carried out at the National Institute of Health. I refer to the translation of Soviet medical journals, abstracts, and monographs.

These, then, are but a few of the ways which the Russian government could cooperate with all of the other nations in helping to dedicate Science for Peace. We, in the Congress, should in my judgment provide maximum encouragement for this purpose.

In my judgment, we have hardly scratched the surface in cooperation of this nature between the United States and Russia. In my judgment, this is a

field for the pooling of East-West efforts which can strike a major blow, not only for the well-being of mankind, but, indirectly, for the peace of mankind, as well.

FIFTH SUGGESTION - GOVT. OPERATIONS COMMITTEE STUDY

It has been my privilege, as my colleagues may be aware, to serve as Chairman of a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Operations which has been reviewing S.3126, to create, among other goals, National Institutes of Scientific Research.

In the course of Hearings which we have held, we have reviewed the problems of stimulating basic research in mathematics, engineering, the physical sciences; including physics, chemistry, astronomy, geophysics, oceanography, meteorology; biological sciences; and the social sciences.

It is my feeling that this Subcommittee might give further attention specifically to the interrelation of basic research into the many fields whose ultimate effect may be the eradication of the major afflictions which beset mankind.

This is a subject which admittedly tends somewhat to cross over Committee lines.

Like my colleagues, I have a deep respect for the separate jurisdictions

of the various Senate Committees. **COPY** The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the Legislative Reorganizations Law, is responsible for Health legislation, as such.

The Senate Committee on Government Operations, for analysis of the organization of the Executive Branch. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for the international phases of our activities.

Here, then, are three Committees which are now, or will be at work along somewhat parallel paths. It is my hope that there can be the closest cooperation between these three Committees without, in any way, impairing their separate functioning.

SIXTH SUGGESTION - BETTER ORGANIZATION OF RESEARCH

My sixth suggestion is for improved coordination of the various medical research activities of the Government, at home and abroad.

Such improved coordination would be particularly necessary if the W.H.O. research, which I envision, is carried out.

It is fortunate that there is a considerable amount of basic and applied medical research already under way in the international field.

The United States Public Health Service, with its great National Institutes of Health is, of course, the expert medical organization directly responsible for

our research against the major diseases. It is bringing in foreign scientists and sending out U.S. scientists to foreign research facilities.

The U.S. State Department is responsible for the Educational Exchange Program, which the Nation rightly knows as the Fulbright Program. And it is responsible for the Smith-Mundt Program. Both of these programs have brought to our shores, and have sent overseas, many outstanding scholars in the field of health.

A third agency, the International Cooperation Administration has long been responsible for providing technical assistance to strengthen public health and to achieve related objectives, especially in under-developed countries.

So, too, in the field of research against disease, important contributions are being made under the research programs of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and the U.S. Veterans Administration.

In my judgment, neither of these research programs is proceeding at the high level of authorization which is essential, respectively, for (a) using atomic energy, e.g. radio-isotopes, for healing, and

(b) for coping with the illnesses faced by the 22 million veterans of the United States.

And I could cite other agencies of the United States Government such as

the Department of Defense, which, **COPY** directly or indirectly, are involved in health research and rehabilitation.

Long ago, the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government stressed the importance of better coordination of Federal health and research activities. In my judgment, there should definitely be such improved coordination; both at home and abroad without, in any way, sacrificing the legal prerogatives of the respective agencies as authorized by the Congress.

SEVENTH SUGGESTION - CONTRIBUTIONS FROM
PRIVATE MEDICINE & DRUG INDUSTRIES

And now, I submit my 7th suggestion. It is a cordial invitation to fine non-governmental groups to make a still greater contribution to the health of mankind.

This is of course a Nation of private medicine and of a private pharmaceutical industry.

It is my hope that, from the great private medical, and related professions, and from the great pharmaceutical industry of this Land, will come the continued leadership which they can give and, I hope, will give so as to stimulate the "revolution in health" of which I have spoken.

CONCLUSION

W.H.O. can achieve the noble purposes under its Constitution if we and

all other nations re-examine what we ourselves can do and should do to help

COPY

it.

"He who has health has hope."

Perhaps, these seven suggestions may help, if only in some small way,

to provide both health and hope to ourselves and to all mankind.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org