

survey was planned by NINDB in the field of visual research. This pinpoints the orientation of those who have been making policy program decisions at NINDB.

I will not attempt to even list all the recommendations and conclusions based on the eye survey. I believe it is worthy of note, however, that though this was the product of the best thinking at that time, few of the recommendations calling for Federal sponsorship have been undertaken.

There is one statement in the publication that I would like to call to your attention, namely:

The following recommendations are made with the emphatic statement that ophthalmic research support must be a joint effort involving all segments of our society both public and private. . . . A separate National Institute for Ophthalmology within the National Institutes of Health is a need which must now be anticipated and ultimately acted upon.

In my talk to over 600 individuals concerned one way or another with ophthalmic research, I did not find anybody truly opposed to this concept for the future, although a handful had minimal reservations about its immediate necessity.

That was in 1962-63.

I think you should know that today it is the conviction of the overwhelming number of investigators in eye research that the time has since come to seek establishment of such an institute, and among many of them is the opinion that it is now overdue.

One of the most eminent of these men has spoken for the rest of us in the following words:

The creation of a separate institute would be the most important thing that has ever happened to ophthalmology. At present, we are limited to a predominantly neurological division of the National Institutes of Health, which however gracious, can never understand fully the problems and requirements of ophthalmology.

Under the present system, we are committed to being a small appendage with minor ophthalmic representation in the administration. One should not forget, of course, our debt to neurology for permitting us to be allied to their Institute during our formative years.

But ophthalmic research is now sufficiently established that a separate institute might well be justified.

Ironically, there is a parallel today between our relation to NINDB and the relation some 15 years ago of NINDB to the National Institutes of Health.

The NINDB was established by law in 1950 but for the first couple of years the funds for the then new Institute were included in an item called Operating expenses, NIH.

The Chief of the Neurological Institute, who was then Dr. Pearce Bailey, was not able to testify to the Appropriations Committees of Congress on the detailed needs and programs of NINDB as the chiefs of the other institutes were.

He was on hand at the hearings to provide information and material as his superiors called on him to do.

But it was the Director of NIH who gave the testimony for the "Operating expenses" item in which the NINDB's funds were contained.

In March 1952, the late Congressman John Fogarty, who was the chairman of the House Health Subcommittee on Appropriations brought this to the attention of the House of Representatives in the course of debate on the health appropriations bill.