

COLLEGE PRESS

Question: Senator, what conclusions have you reached from your recent committee hearings into the government's security program?

Answer: First of all, let me emphasize that if there's one thing the hearings have proven, it is the fact that it is inaccurate to talk about "the government's security program". There is no security program, but only a mass of security programs - plural - as many programs as there are agencies. There is no uniformity, no real coordination, and indeed, I have seen little evidence that those who are nominally in control of the machinery are even interested in exercising control. If I learned anything at all in our hearings, it is that no one in the government really knows or is interested in what is going on in the security program beyond the point of his own nose. Every official wraps himself up in his own security responsibilities, defined as narrowly as possible, and chants the virtues of the status quo even though he is wholly unable to justify it and does not even understand it.

I want to say very candidly that I'm convinced when the historians, public administrators and political scientists write several years hence, with objective and dispassionate analysis, about the government employees security program,

they will undoubtedly regard it as of major significance in large part because it is a classic example of incredibly poor administration. I would go even further. The record of administration of the government employees security programs would be almost comical were it not a matter of life and death to our nation and of brutal impact upon thousands of our citizens.

I make these statements without political passion. I usually enjoy the opportunity to belabor and criticize my Republican friends, but I very strongly believe there is no place for such partianship in conservation of the present security program. That's why I have urged a bipartisan, high-level commission to take this entire situation out of the realm of politics, and come up with recommendations the public will support. All the evidence I have been able to gather supports the need for such a commission. I recognize that many constructive attempts are being made to improve the program, such as the study by the New York Bar Association. They may make helpful recommendations. But there must be some place where all such studies and recommendations can be channeled together and appraised for their merit, and that appraisal should be by a body above the level of politics.

Most of the difficulties in the security program exist

because we have not yet come to grips with the vital tasks of defining the perils which we fear, of constructing a logical and effective security program for meeting these perils, and of deciding as a matter of conscious choice the price we are prepared to pay for security.

COLLEGE PRESS

Question: Senator, now that Dr. Salk has discovered a vaccine to wipe out polio, don't you think more could be done in the way of research to cut down the death toll of cancer and heart disease?

Answer: I certainly do, and I'm glad you brought this up.

All of us have been thrilled by the great boon to mankind developed by Dr. Salk. We have proven that disease can be conquered - by research. But research is costly and time-consuming. Every year we let go by without putting our full support behind such efforts means that many more men, women, and children must die because of our neglect.

All of us share, I'm sure, in the expression of gratitude extended to Dr. Salk by our President during the past week. I cannot help wonder, however, if Dr. Salk, as a research scientist, wouldn't be more appreciative of us showing our gratitude in a more realistic way. His achievement should inspire us to greater research efforts in related fields, particularly for cancer, heart disease, and mental health.

Citations and commendations are all very well, and in this instance certainly deserved. But there could be no greater honor paid Dr. Salk than for the President to announce he was sufficiently impressed with what can be done by research to

loosen the purse strings of his Budget Bureau a bit and recommend expanded instead of curtailed medical research to the Congress.

In the midst of all our justified jubilation over Dr. Salk's accomplishment, is it too much to ask that the Administration reappraise its entirely inadequate budget recommendations for medical research?

Unfortunately, President Eisenhower's budget for Fiscal 1956 recommends only \$74 million for medical research in five key medical programs - only about half of the \$140 million recommended by the professional Advisory Councils in these fields who are appointed to advise on these programs.

Instead of just honoring men like Dr. Salk with public commendation, we would be doing humanity more good by taking their advise in private on what must be done to conquer other diseases.

I regret that President Eisenhower and his Administration have reduced by 35% the Advisory Council recommendation for medical research in cancer, cut by 46% the recommended research in heart disease, and slashed by 42% the amounts recommended as needed for work in mental health.

The \$140 million recommended by the Advisory Councils included \$34 million for new construction of medical research facilities. Yet the President's budget includes no funds for

construction of new facilities for medical research, although hospitals and universities in 37 states have submitted estimates of research construction needs totaling \$32,694, 569.

Congress should take a broader look at these needs, and let the inspiration of Dr. Salk's great work guide them in going forward with other medical research needs.



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