Mechanisms for Information and Understanding

Q. Can we talk a little about the mechanisms
that Congress has for playing the part in the
field of foreign policy? What are the resources
Congress has really to understand the problems
of foreign policy, compared to the Executive
Branch which has the State Department and its
missions overseas, and so on?

A ST

A. This is where the Congre s is really at a less, so to speak. Where it is at a disadvantage in its role in foreign policy. I know, for example, as one member of the Fereign Relations Committee, that I never feel that I have the information in depth that one really needs in the thorough and comprehensive discussion of critical foreign policy issues. We do not have the contacts with our Embassies overseas, except speradically. These Ambass dors are Ambassadors of the President of the United States and not ambassadors of the Congress. The Executive can limit the sources of information, and even information itself by calling it Executive Privileged Information, or Secret Information. Congress, however, is it's own worst enemy in this matter. We've refused to properly staff our respective committees. I do sincerely believe that by bre king up the full committees on foreign

relations and foreign affairs into the subcommittees which we do, and then really putting together an effective staff of a considerable number of trained professional people, that we could do a better job in the field of foreign policy. Of course, we have the Library of Congress to call on, it's very good, the Legislative Reference Service extremely able, good and competent people. We, as individual Senators and Congressmen can call upon our friends in the academic profession. They're very helpful, the same people that may advise the Executive Branch. We can call upon these great centers of study, international study, such as at Harvard and Yale, Princeton and Columbia, California, Minnesota -- other places where we can look -- ev gry great University has one. But, again, it gets right down to the fact that we don't have full time for this. We're Senators. We're not State Department officials. And just about the time I find myself becoming thoroughly immersed and involved in some watter of foreign policy, I find that the price of hegs dips out home and that there's trouble out on the farm front, or the small business people can't get their leans from the Small Business Administration.

Committees -- A Super Committee?

Q. Well, Senator, would you comment some on
the role that the Committees play? There's
the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the
committees that do with the Armed Services.

What kind of a role can Congress play through
its Committees, either in influencing or
affecting foreign policy?

A. This is the mechanism that we have of really influencing foreign pelicy, or of making it, and by the fact that it is the mechanism, it also requires some survey and study as to whether it is an adequate mechanism. You see, my personal feeling is that the Committees are so compartmentalized, departmentalized, that the scope of fereign policy and its interrelationship is not properly understood in the Congress. New maybe I don't make myself clear on this. What I'm getting at is that military pelicy, which is within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee-I speak now of the Senate--as so basically mied into our over-all foreign policy, that to have the foreign relations committee doing one thing and the armed services committee doing another thing, and then thirdlyk having the Atomic Energy Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has so much to dowith our nuclear weapons policy, still conducting

2

wther hearings, and all of them jealeusly guarding their separate jurisdictions, has a way of limiting the effectiveness of the Congress. Don't misunderstand me. I believe that we must have people in Congress studying the role of atomic energy and nuclear power, nuclear weapons in foreign policy, and the whole subject of peaceful uses of atomis energy, but today your foreign policy struggle with the Seviets is on the econemic front, the trade front -- and trade 9s a matter of the Senate Finance Committee -- it's on the normal diplomatic front, the negotiating front around the conference table, 7 security, it's on the information and propaganda front, it's on the military fromt, and they all work together in synthesis and therefore, it seems to me that some way or another, the Congress will alternately have to design for itself some everall joint National Security Committee that will act as a coordinating and synthesizing or harmonizing group for the many special committees that we have in the Congress. Take this special committee now on outer space -- this affects our foreign policy. It maybe it will affect it more in the days to come than any other one committee of Congress. So what I'm really suggesting is that just as we have a national security council at the Executive

Defense and so forth, that we maybe need a

National Security Joint Committee of the Congress,
which will act as a synthesis or a coordinating
group between the many committees of Congress.

This maybe could be done by including on that

National Security Committee the Chairment and
the ranking minority member of each of the
separate committees. I have the intention,
by the way, to make such a proposal. I've
never advanced it before. Maybe this is as
good a place to do it as any.

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.

