

1961

lieve this is what the Senator from Arkansas had in mind, too. To bring out this point does not indicate any opposition on the part of either of us to what has been done by the administration.

Speaking for myself, I support what the administration has done. I have also said, and repeat this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, the administration must go much further in the diplomatic field, in the negotiation field. It is very fortunate that, in his speech of last week, the President made perfectly clear his willingness to negotiate and adjudicate with regard to any treaty controversy which may be involved over Berlin, and he used the term "adjudicate."

The senior Senator from Oregon for some years has been pleading for the United States to at least make an attempt to get our adversaries to join in an adjudication, under the United Nations Charter, of issues which threaten the peace of the world as a result of controversies over alleged treaty rights claimed by contending parties. That includes, of course, Berlin.

Mr. President, in order that the record made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may be clarified completely, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the "Issues and Answers" program of July 30 printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS
(Sunday, July 30, 1961)

Guest: Senator JAMES W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Panel: Peter Clapper, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent, and John Scali, ABC diplomatic correspondent.

The ANNOUNCER. From Washington, D.C., the American Broadcasting Co. brings you "Issues and Answers."

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, here are the issues.

Mr. CLAPPER. Will President Kennedy's program save Berlin for the West without a war?

Mr. SCALI. Are Khrushchev's Berlin threats a bluff or the real thing?

Mr. CLAPPER. Is President Kennedy providing strong enough leadership at home and abroad?

Mr. SCALI. Should we send troops to Cuba to get back the highjacked airliner?

The ANNOUNCER. You have heard the issues and now for the answers:

From Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas.

Here to explore the issues are ABC Capitol Hill correspondent, Peter Clapper, and with the first question, ABC's State Department correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, do you share the view expressed by President Truman that Premier Khrushchev is bluffing over Berlin?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I have no basis at all to believe he is bluffing. I think he has a very serious situation in Berlin and he is determined to try to improve that situation one way or another. I do not believe he expects to precipitate a nuclear war over Berlin.

Mr. SCALI. You think this is Soviet-style brinksmanship?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Yes, I think every great nation indulges in this at times, but I think when you say "bluffing"—if President

Truman means, does Mr. Khrushchev intend to attack with nuclear weapons—in that sense perhaps you could say he is bluffing. I don't think he intends to do that.

Mr. CLAPPER. Is he deceiving for some other operation somewhere else in the world, possibly?

Senator FULBRIGHT. In a sense that is involved. I see no signs of his relenting in his activities in other parts of the world. That is Latin America, or the Far East or Middle East; they are all connected.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, the President has called for three and a half billion dollars more in military spending. At the same time he has also said we are ready to negotiate. Are you satisfied with the military preparedness and do you think it strikes the right balance between negotiation and firmness?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think so. I thought his speech the other day was very well balanced and his request for military assistance has already been approved by the Senate, as you know. I think it is well balanced.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, do you think the West should take the initiative in negotiations over Berlin?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I do. I think we have been remiss in not making proposals that would give some opportunity for negotiation. I think there are alternatives and I don't think we have been as aggressive in suggesting them as we should be.

Mr. CLAPPER. What are they?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well several have been explored and suggested in the past. One is for a different status with regard to the so-called middle Europe. The disengagement is one idea that could be discussed. The question of giving to West Germany any nuclear arms has been discussed. In the Potsdam Agreement, of course, we agreed, as I recall, not to rearm the West Germans. These are matters that could be brought up again. They have been discussed in the past and then dropped.

The question of a free city is a very difficult concept. I have read everything Khrushchev has said about it and I must say he doesn't go far enough in satisfying me that his idea of a free city is what I would think was a reasonable one.

Mr. CLAPPER. What about the Mansfield idea of a free city?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, the great problem here is whether or not you can make it satisfactory to us. I think MANSFIELD'S suggestion was along the right line. I think we ought to discuss these alternatives. I am not saying that I think Khrushchev would agree to them. But I don't see any great advantage in just taking the view that we will entertain no negotiations, we won't enter into any negotiations for any kind of a change.

I think we ought to talk about it. I am not prepared to say just what kind of a change. I think Willy Brandt's suggestion that we have a peace conference with all 50 or 52 countries to discuss, not just Berlin, but the whole settlement of the war, including the status of the other Eastern European countries—what has been done there in accord with agreements and so on. This might clarify the air and might develop some alternative.

I thing to continue to look just at the narrow question of Berlin may be not a very fruitful policy.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, you mentioned disengagement as a possibility. Could you go into that a little more? What do you have in mind?

Senator FULBRIGHT. This has been suggested and we rejected it, out of hand. I think there was a Rapoki plan, in which there would be a gradual drawing back of the troops. Our theory was that if Russia only drew back a little ways to her borders and it

would mean our troops withdrawing all the way across the Atlantic. Well I don't know that that necessarily follows. At the moment they are very close to each other. These are matters which I think should be discussed. This caused great controversy when George Kennon proposed it, and I don't wish to stir up controversy or differences either between me and the administration or within this country. There are already too many differences. What I am trying to say is that I think we should discuss matters related to the German question and have conferences about them especially at the ministerial level in an effort to seek to avoid a showdown leading to a nuclear war. That is what I am trying to say and I think any of these issues have possibilities of discussion. Now I know some of our very important people think that this is a futile and fruitless thing, that we should not—they interpret it as weakness. I do not so interpret it.

Mr. SCALI. Senator you said that Senator MANSFIELD'S idea was along the right line. This idea of a free city, which would include all of Berlin.

Senator FULBRIGHT. A discussion of it at least and to see what kind of access.

I would not accept the idea that access to Berlin should be under the power and control of the East Germans. Now everything that Khrushchev has said would indicate he thinks that is part of it. Well I would not accept that. But we are not sure that this is the only thing he would entertain. If it was a genuine free city with completely free access, in which there was no doubt about it—guaranteed by everyone, I think there are possibilities in this direction and it ought to be discussed. I do not say that we ought to accept what he proposes. There is a big difference in this. But I believe in negotiation and discussion as opposed to ultimatums and showdowns as a general approach.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think we should take the initiative in proposing negotiations rather than wait for Khrushchev to sign his peace treaty?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Generally speaking for several years Khrushchev has made proposals, and we have said "No, we can't accept that, period." There are very few cases in which we have said, "Well, that might be interesting, but we believe this should be considered, and perhaps this should be considered, and we believe this could be reasonable." And there are other things that we could do, too, at the same time that are not related to a peace conference. If we are serious about this business, there are all kinds of trading activities going on between the East and the West that could be regulated. I have reference for example to a recent story in one of the newspapers about a new arrangement for the supplying of oil to India to supplant or to prevent and supplant the supply of oil by Russia. This is a very intelligent approach. This is the type of thing that should be going on. It shows some initiative and originality on our part and this is the sort of thing we should do which would strengthen and back up whatever negotiations we might get into with regard to Berlin. These things are all related.

Mr. CLAPPER. Getting back to the President's speech he called for our allies to do more in a military way both in the Berlin crisis and the long-range cold war toll. Do you think our allies response has been enough?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No, I do not, with regard to NATO in particular. They have not fulfilled their quotas and I think we have done more than our share in the past several years, largely because we were able to and they were in very difficult shape. The French have been diverted by Algeria. There are reasons for it. The Germans I think among all of them have not done as much as they are able and capable of doing in

their own defense. I think they are the ones we should look to to carry a much greater part of this burden.

Mr. CLAPPER. What about the British? They are having economic troubles.

Senator FULBRIGHT. The British have very serious economic troubles at the moment. The only good thing about that is that it looks as if it is about to compel or contribute to a decision to join the Common Market. I think this would be a good thing over the long term although it may have very serious repercussions in the near term for Great Britain.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator JAVITS among others has suggested a loan, through Congress, to Britain. How do you feel about that?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I would think the request ought to come from Britain first. I think it is a little premature to go about suggesting loans. I don't know that they need it. They have already indicated they are going to draw on the International Monetary Fund and that is what it is for. I would hope this is enough and I would not want to endorse such a loan.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, is it possible to improve Atlantic Pact defenses without asking our allies to reinstitute and in some cases lengthen the draft?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think this would be a very proper thing for them to do. I would think the main drive of the President's proposal is the strengthening of conventional methods of warfare and that would be an important step, as he suggested for our own program.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think the British should be exempted from being asked to spend significantly more for defense because of their financial problems at the moment?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, at the moment they are apparently in very difficult circumstances. This is particularly with regard to foreign trade, and this is why they indicated the troops in Germany were such a drain. This may not have the same problem at all with regard to their own manpower.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think the West Germans then should be called upon pick up more of the tab?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I do. They did increase their contribution last year, but I think still they are the ones that are able among all of them to do more than they have done. We have been paying a very large amount, as you know, in our own troops. They refused even to consider contributing to the maintenance of our troops but they did make other concessions. I think they are still able to make more than they have.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, today more Germans from East Germany crossed into West Berlin than at any time since the uprising in 1953. What is behind this and why don't the Communists stop it?

Senator FULBRIGHT. It is a very curious thing that they don't stop it. I am told many of these people are among the best trained technicians and skilled workmen in East Germany and that this has had a very grave effect upon their industry. The theory—we can only speculate about it—may be that in anticipation of closing the frontier this tremendous rush to get out is resulting. And I have heard it suggested that the Russians are quite willing for them to leave with the idea that they will fill their places with Russians; but I doubt this is a tenable theory because the Russians do not have a surplus population, they need their population in their own country. I confess it is a mystery that the East Germans don't stop the emigration of these people. I don't know why they don't.

Mr. SCALI. Do you know of any specific impact that this outflow of refugees has had on production in East Germany?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I was told by a well-informed person a short time ago that one

of their aircraft factories had closed down because of the loss of so many of their technicians and it had crippled some other industries, I believe an automobile plant; that they had lost a very large number of the best technicians that they had in East Germany.

Mr. SCALI. In any negotiations over Berlin, Senator, would you be willing to accept any concessions on the part of the West which closed West Berlin as an escape hatch for refugees in any way?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I think that that might certainly be a negotiable point. The truth of the matter is I think the Russians have the power to close it in any case. I mean we are not giving up very much because I believe next week if they chose to close their borders, they could, without violating any treaty right I know of. We have no right to insist that they be allowed to come out. As I said I don't understand why the East Germans don't close the border because I think they have a right to close it. So why is this a great concession? You don't have that right now.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator FULBRIGHT, what about a new summit meeting between Kennedy and Khrushchev? How do you feel about it?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I am not advocating summit meetings. I think they are very touchy things. Unless this develops much further along than now—it is immature to talk about a summit meeting now. We should never exclude that if negotiations at the diplomatic level lead up to the point where it looks as if there is something to agree upon, to discuss further. In this modern day it seems to be the fashion. I have a great prejudice against summit meetings as being dangerous and leading to—perhaps bringing friction to the higher level and making more dangerous the outbreak of war, but they have more or less become fashion, so maybe I have to accept them.

But I think it is premature to talk about a summit meeting now.

Mr. SCALI. In line with the positive approach that you suggest toward negotiations, Senator, the idea has been made that perhaps one of the ways to settle this problem would be to move the United Nations headquarters to Berlin. What do you think of that?

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is a very imaginative one. I saw that in print. I don't know whether that is feasible or not. I know there are a lot of people who object to its being in New York. Most of them are people who don't like the U.N. at all and object to it.

You know one thing about this that bothers me is the idea that we cannot afford to talk and negotiate. This seems inconsistent with our whole philosophy of life, of politics, both national and international. When I think of all the talk that goes on here domestically, that this is a characteristic of a democratic system, it seems to me we ought to always encourage the quiet discussion of any differences in this field and I think it is too bad that anyone who suggests we discuss these problems is immediately said to be an appeaser, that you are getting ready to give up something or that you are going to compromise. It is going to be a Munich.

This seems quite inconsistent and wrong to take this attitude. We don't mean and I don't mean that we are going to give up anything. We are going to discuss it. Certainly we don't believe that this is the best possible solution to the European problem, to leave it as it is forever. I am frank to say I don't see much chance of an improvement but I always think we ought to discuss it.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator FULBRIGHT, the Communists have just published in the last day or two a new Communist manifesto de-

signed to replace one that was published in 1919, I believe.

Now this shows a great hope for communism. They are claiming great things in the next 20 years. Do you think it is propaganda or are they serious?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, it has a little of both. You said 1919. They have been proceeding in the last few years on what they call 7-year plans. First it was 5, then it was 7, and now it is 20. It is a program of development, as I understand it, not unlike the 5-year plan in India and so on. It is merely projecting what they hope to do and it serves both as an indication of their goals and I think some of those goals they will certainly realize.

They may not all of them—we usually set our goals a little higher than we expect to attain. We have done that—many people have done that. But I think it does have propaganda value and at the same time I wouldn't say that they don't expect to achieve a large part of it.

Mr. CLAPPER. We possibly do the same thing, a capitalistic manifesto to set up our ideas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think there are great differences between our two societies. There is a tendency to try to relate them closely, but really the basic value of our society is the individual's freedom. We believe if the individual is given an opportunity, that the ingenuity and energies of the individual released within the free society will out-produce a managed economy. I think their kind of a goal is a little inconsistent with our kind of a system if that is what you mean.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, if I may shift for a moment into your particular legislative arena, in the past few days you have engaged in a running debate with Senator GOLDWATER, whether in the nuclear age total victory is possible. This has led to some rather lively exchanges. How do you think you are doing in this debate?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Really it was just one exchange. I made a speech 3 or 4 weeks ago that had nothing whatever to do with, or mentioned Mr. GOLDWATER. I was rather flattered that he had read it. Apparently he did and he answered it himself, very critical of my speech, and I simply commented upon his.

I felt since he is recognized as one of the principal Republican spokesmen, that it was perhaps my duty—I don't try to answer everybody who disagrees with my views, but I thought I should in this instance and it was a very short answer. I thought his concept of a total victory is a quite unrealistic and meaningless phrase and that it misleads people in these days and I don't want to repeat what I said, I didn't think you wanted me to, but I thought that he tends to oversimplify very complicated questions and it leaves, I think, in the minds of many people some false impressions as to the kind of world we are in and I don't think this is very healthy to the development of sound policies.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, Senator GOLDWATER has called the Kennedy foreign policy weakened. And you yourself have called for stronger Presidential leadership. What is the difference?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I don't agree with Mr. GOLDWATER as to its being weakened. I think that is another example of the highly oversimplified description of this situation. President Kennedy inherited a very bad situation, as we know. He inherited the situation in Cuba and in Laos, both of them extremely embarrassing and difficult for this country and I think he has done very well, except in Cuba. I thought it was a mistake. I think he acknowledges that the effort was a mistake. Either it should have been done strong enough to succeed or it shouldn't have been done at

all. I happen to believe it shouldn't have been done at all, for reasons much too complicated to go into here. I thought it was a mistake to do that. Nevertheless that is neither here nor there. I think he has done very well and kept his head and he has spoken with restraint and I think this is what is called for.

It is very easy to stir up a war. It takes no brains and no skill to stir any country up into a warlike spirit and you can go to war, as countries have done throughout history.

The people appreciate very little the man who tries to avoid these things and they are constantly criticized for appearing to be weak and compromising and so on, but this is the thing that I value most in the President, that he has evidenced caution and that he has shown a desire to avoid a showdown and a war, because I don't believe any of us are going to profit by a nuclear war.

Mr. SCALL. Senator, speaking of Cuba, what do you think of the demands made by some Senators that we should use military force to go in to get the hijacked Eastern Air Liner from Cuba, if necessary?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well I know that is a very provocative act that they did. There are one or two things I don't know about it. In the first place, this morning's paper would indicate this man may not have been authorized to do it at all by Cuba, that he was a freelancer who thought this was a great stunt and that he would gain credit in Cuba. He was a nationalized citizen of this country.

Mr. SCALL. Well the Cubans still haven't returned the plane.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, it was a sort of windfall for them and it is a propaganda element. They can't use the plane I am told because they don't have the machinery that is necessary to start it but it is something to talk about.

I would hesitate to say offhand that we should not do anything there. I think it would be very drastic to go to war over that plane. We have 10 planes that our private citizens have attached for private bills. Perhaps we could work out something. That is a complicated matter. It is a little bit like the tractors deal. I don't think it is worth going to war about.

Mr. SCALL. Well, Senator, Under Secretary Bowles has suggested that the way to handle Castro is to concentrate on aiding other Latin American countries with their development programs and letting Mr. Castro wither away and die on the vine. Would you agree with this approach?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think, generally speaking, it is a right policy. Mr. Castro is very irritating and embarrassing, but we ourselves have much to blame ourselves for over the past 50 years. We had Cuba. We could have guided it in nearly any direction. We neglected our opportunity when we had the opportunity to do with Cuba, proper things. It is embarrassing. I do not think that it would be any great achievement for a country of 180 million people to go down and knock off this fellow. After it is done what have you done? What have you accomplished and how have you contributed, other than to have removed a little embarrassment? I don't think I would do that, and I think what you say is correct, that we must concentrate on the rest of Latin America, and if it succeeds he will be isolated.

Mr. CLAPPER. You were critical of the Cuban invasion of the island. Are you satisfied that there is no behind-the-scenes effort to try it again?

Senator FULBRIGHT. To my knowledge there is not. I know of these groups. There is a big ad in this morning's paper that would indicate they are seeking groups of Cubans to drum up enthusiasm and support for this, but I assume you mean by our Government.

Mr. CLAPPER. Yes.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I know of no such plans.

Mr. SCALL. Senator, one of the things that seems to have aroused the suspicions of the Republicans is an alleged plan to give diplomatic recognition to Communist China and to favor its admittance to the U.N., and that plus whatever plans are underway for recognition of Communist Outer Mongolia. Do you see any reason for such suspicion?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No. I think in this case we as a country are prisoners of our past mistakes, if you like. The sentiments of this country have been developed to such a pitch our President has no freedom of action in this field. Our Senate just passed unanimously a resolution supporting the view of nonrecognition of Red China, which it has done, I do not know, 15 or 20 times. It has become a ritual, a Republican ritual. This stems from the old days of McCarthy in which they thought—the Republicans believed, and maybe with reason, that they were succeeding in proving that the Democrats were soft on communism and this is a hangover from those days and these very difficult taboos or whatever they are, voodoo, voodooism, or prejudices or whatever you want to call them, to overcome, so we go through this ritual every year, repeating this thing. And, of course, nobody in public life can be in favor of recognition of China.

And also Mr. Chiang Kai-shek is involved in this and we more or less take our orders from him in this field. When he objects we have always been very good about going along with it.

Mr. Scall.

I guess this is the proper policy. I am not objecting to it. He is important in that area and we consult with him as we do in other places. And I don't think we are going to recognize Red China. I do not favor it at this time. I don't know anybody who does.

I rather get tired of this repetition of this kind of resolution. Who is to say we should. Yet we are forced to put another resolution through. I haven't said we should. Nobody said we should.

Mr. CLAPPER. Will we recognize Outer Mongolia?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I doubt it—for much the same reason. I think much could be said for doing it, on the ground of information, of knowing what is going on in that area, or being able perhaps to contribute to the differences between China and Russia. But for the same reason that we will not recognize Red China, because of the price of dissension within our own ranks at home; it is too great to pay. I don't know whether it was wise or not. I don't know enough about Outer Mongolia. But the reasons that have been given by those who purport to know would indicate that we might learn something of value to us. But I think we have no freedom of action in this field because of domestic politics.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, turning to domestic politics, there is some word now that perhaps the foreign-aid bill will not offer 5-year loans, but just 3. Would this be an acceptable compromise to you?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No, not to me. I am for 5 years. When you say "acceptable," if the Senate votes it, what do I do, jump off a bridge? Of course you accept it. I am against it but I think it would be very foolish to do it and I shall not vote for it.

Mr. SCALL. Is there a compromise being arranged—

Mr. CLAPPER. Excuse me, I am sorry. I have to interrupt, here. Our time is up.

Thank you Senator FULBRIGHT for being with us today on "Issues and Answers."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I wish to say a word about the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He was subjected to a heck here on

the floor of the Senate the other day in the colloquy, and the Record speaks for itself; but as a member of the committee, I rise as his witness.

In my judgment, not only the Senate, but the American people, are exceedingly fortunate to have a man with the keen intellect, depth of perception, knowledge of history, and understanding of foreign policy issues that confront, not only this country, but mankind, in the person of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT).

I want the Record to show this afternoon my complete confidence in the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I speak most respectfully when I say to the State Department and the White House, "You will do well to heed and counsel with this student and statesman in the field of foreign policy." As a matter of fact, the White House and State Department have been doing it and, in my judgment, it has been to the benefit of the White House and the State Department and the country.

I do not always agree with every proposal of the Senator from Arkansas; and when I do not, probably he is right. Perhaps sometimes I may be right, and he wrong, in a disagreement. But we are being served by a chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee who is dedicated—I repeat, dedicated—to the great cause that confronts the United States and mankind—namely, winning a safe and permanent peace without, to any degree whatsoever, sacrificing the interests of the United States.

I wanted to say these things today about the chairman of the committee, and to say them in his absence from the floor, because I have been reading some of the comments, and unfair stories, that have been published about the Senator from Arkansas. I wish the Record to show this afternoon that, having served under his tutelage and leadership on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have complete confidence in his leadership and complete approval of the high order of his statesmanship.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the subject matter before the Senate. To my friend from Wisconsin I wish to say that I usually find myself in agreement with him in regard to needed cutbacks in an appropriation bill. It is with a heavy heart that I tell him I have to leave him on this one, because I do not believe the committee has brought to the Senate, in a committee report, a recommendation of too high an appropriation in the whole field of health. To the contrary, I do not think the committee has gone far enough.

I have made some study of the hearings, and I think the Senator from Ala-

13220

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 1

bama will testify in support of the observation I now make. The committee had before it representatives of professional advisory committees in the field of health representing a cross section, I think, of the various centers, research groups, medical schools, and research authorities in this country. They recommended sums far in excess of the sums being recommended by the committee.

I will ask the Senator from Alabama if that is not true.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. The truth is that for the medical research program they recommended an increase of \$335 million. The Appropriations Committee reported an increase of \$195 million, in round figures.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I share his high regard for the President of the United States. The President of the United States, when he was a Senator from Massachusetts, served on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have been a member for some years, under the very able leadership of the Senator from Alabama, who is chairman of the committee and is also chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which reported the bill now before the Senate. There is no question of the keen interest of the Senator from Massachusetts had in this whole field when he served on the committee. I certainly agree that the President of the United States, based on his Senate experience, and other experiences, is a well-informed man in this field—but not infallible.

Also I wish to say, most respectfully, that the President of the United States submitted his budget request in advance of the hearings which the Senate committee conducted on this subject matter. The President of the United States did not have the advantage of the documented evidence that the authorities in the field of health submitted to the Senate committee. Therefore, I cannot reach the conclusion which the Senator from Wisconsin reaches, if I am correct in my assumption that it is his conclusion, that the budget's recommendation would have been the same if he had had the same benefit of the enlightening information which the expert witnesses presented to the subcommittee of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The Senator from Wisconsin loses me in the force of the argument he makes by saying, "We ought to back the President because this is the President's recommendation." I only say, "This is the President's recommendation before the fact. This is the President's recommendation before the record was made. This is the President's recommendation before the committee had the benefit of this body of very valuable information, on the basis of which the committee has made its final recommendation."

I say to my friend from Alabama: I know the problem which confronted him in the committee, exactly as I appreciate the problem which confronted the President when he presented his budget to the Congress. Imagine all the demands for appropriations. Imagine all the good

causes which were presented at the so-called executive level in the development of the Presidential budget. Not even a Solomon could really be sure of his wisdom in the decisions and recommendations the President has to make in his final submission of a budget to the Congress.

I stress the fact that the President did not have the benefit, at the budgetary stage, of the documented evidence the Senator from Alabama and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee had.

Furthermore, I am not going to be persuaded by an argument that I ought to follow the President because this is the President's recommendation, because my responsibility as a Senator is quite different from that of the President. My responsibility as a Senator is a legislative responsibility. As a legislator, I have to take a look at the evidence which is presented in support of proposed legislation. I have to decide as a Senator as to whether the weight of the evidence supports X recommendation or Y recommendation. If I think it does, I ought to be bound by that evidence, and not by an opinion recommendation a President submitted in a budget message at a time he did not have before him the evidence which I as a legislator have been called upon to evaluate and to make a decision based upon. So I have never in my 27 years in the Senate been persuaded very much by the argument that I ought to do something because it is a Presidential recommendation. Rather, I ask myself the question, when each legislative issue is before me, "What does the evidence show?"

As a Senator it is my duty to evaluate the evidence and to vote in accordance with what I believe will best promote the public interest. Under our system of the separation of powers and checks and balances, if the President thinks the Congress goes too far awry then he has a constitutional obligation to veto what we do. I am perfectly willing to always meet that action on the part of the President.

I cannot speak for the President. I do not know what the President's position will be if we vote for this committee recommendation and the House in conference agrees to a sum very close to this figure. That is the concern of the President, not of mine. I will pass judgment upon what course of action he may follow if it comes back to me for further Senatorial action.

What I am satisfied about is that the committee has not gone far enough. That is why I cannot support my good friend from Wisconsin in his amendments to cut back in this whole field of health. I wish to say a few words about the need from the standpoint of public interest and from the standpoint of national defense in connection with appropriations for health.

Mr. President, it is very easy to say, in the course of debate, when one feels rather deeply about some subject before the Senate, "This is more important than anything else," or "This is more important than something else." I try to avoid that error in logic. I think it usually is an error in logic.

I wish to put it this way: I do not think anybody can successfully refute the fact that the health needs of the American people are sorely in need of greater attention by the Congress of the United States. I think we in the Congress for many years have been most inadequate in appropriating the minimum amounts of money which ought to be appropriated to seek to relieve suffering humanity in the United States and elsewhere in the world, for that matter, from the scourges of diseases which take such a heavy toll day after day and year after year.

Therefore, for some reason I cannot get very much concerned about a proposal to cut back on health research. I cannot find myself filled with very much enthusiasm about a proposal to accept a budget estimate in regard to appropriations for heart disease or cancer research, or with respect to any of the other terrible tolltakers of human life. I would rather err in the other direction. I would rather appropriate more than can be used, with some check in the appropriation to provide for a reversion in case the money cannot be used efficiently and effectively.

I wish to mention one small item. My colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has commented upon, in connection with proposed legislation, air pollution in the United States, the matter of gases which are filling the atmosphere particularly of our cities, apparently, so the scientists say, as a result of heavy motor vehicle traffic. There is not only the assumption but also now a body of scientific data being collected which gives cause to believe there is a direct cause-to-effect relationship between air pollution and cancer. We had better find out. One thing we know is that the incidence of cancer is increasing. We know that lung cancer incidence is climbing.

The Senator from Alabama and I certainly are not medical authorities, but I think we have a legislative responsibility to do everything that we can to get every last dollar which can be efficiently and effectively spent in regard to research in connection with the question of whether or not there is a cause-to-effect relationship between air pollution and lung cancer and other forms of cancer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator of course knows there is no cancer which progresses more rapidly or is more fatal or deadly than lung cancer.

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. HILL. While the Senator speaks about lungs and respiratory disease, of course the Senator has noted the tremendous increase in the disease known as emphysema. We have no cure for that disease. It is a terrible disease, as a result of which the cells in the lungs break down, and the broken-down cells fill up with water moisture, which makes it impossible for the oxygen to get into the blood stream of the body, and the patient does not live long.