

properly, as a matter of comity with the House of Representatives, has had conferees appointed, and I thoroughly agree with that. It is our duty to do so.

But I think it would be deceptive if I did not state, having been so importantly concerned with the bill for myself and the major cosponsors, Senator SPONG of our committee, Senator STENNIS, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and Senator EAGLETON, that the House version is very, very different, of a totally different order of construction, and different in every conceivable way from what the Senate passed, and therefore I would not wish the bill to be referred to conference without emphasizing that point, that the two proceed on completely diverse principles.

Every Senator should know that, and we should not have some impression that this is just a bill that can be taken to conference and somehow reconciled in the normal way between the two Houses. Deep questions of principle as to the powers of Congress are involved. We have to do our best to wrestle with them, but I thought it was appropriate to spread this well on the record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I, of course, completely agree with the statement of the Senator from New York. The Senate will note that I reached down and put two of the principal sponsors of the bill, although they are relatively new members of the committee, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), on the conference committee, and I have no doubt that the Senate conferees will be very strong in support of the Senate version of this legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very pleased that the Senator raised this point.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

(The following colloquy, which occurred during the consideration of the National Science Foundation Act Amendments, are printed at this point in the RECORD by unanimous consent:)

#### THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today, I made a brief comment on the President's veto of the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. This bill has had a great deal of comment today, and the veto message has had some comment. I should like to add mine.

First of all, I believe that the action of the President is uncalled for, was indefensible, and is not in the interests of the American people.

I noted with considerable interest what the President had to say in his veto message. He said:

This Administration is second to none in its concern for America's health, education and manpower program needs. From the very beginning we have consistently proposed and supported desirable programs in both the health research and health service areas, and we will continue to do so.

That is in his veto message today.

My answer, Mr. President, is that this is bunk—pure and simple bunk—and the American people know it.

President Nixon has failed to fulfill his promise to provide adequate health care for all. He has vetoed much needed legislation and impounded millions of dollars appropriated by Congress for health programs. He has slashed funds for the Nation's hospitals and made little effort to meet the critical health manpower crisis and ordered cutbacks in Federal spending for medical research health programs. Supposedly, all of this is in the name of economy. I think it would take a good deal of geometrical gymnastics to be able to justify cuts in health services in light of the health needs of this Nation.

What has the President vetoed in the present measure? For example, the President, in this appropriation bill, vetoed occupational safety and health measures. The Senate bill provided \$10,793,000 over the budget. Surely, that money is needed. The President vetoed the mental health appropriation. The committee had recommended \$238 million more than the budget. He vetoed the psychiatric training funds. He vetoed funds for the staffing of community mental health centers, despite the fact that we are in a drug addiction epidemic in this country and that these mental health centers are vital to the treatment of drug addicts.

He vetoed the funds for the construction of community mental health centers; and every community in this country, with few exceptions, is begging for this assistance. He vetoed funds for narcotics addiction and drug abuse control. The Senate bill provided \$28,702,000 over the budget. Is there any Member of the Senate who believes that we do not need that money for narcotics addiction and drug abuse control?

He vetoed funds for alcoholism prevention control; mental health programs for children; regional medical programs—which, by the way, have been authorized for years and which are desperately needed throughout this country.

He vetoed hospital construction. The Senate bill included \$112,200,000 for the construction of hospitals. Everybody knows that we need these hospitals. We need them desperately. We have thousands of hospital beds that do not meet Federal standards. The Federal Government is in violation of the law. The President of the United States has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution. That means he is supposed to do something about the law—this law and order administration.

He has vetoed funds for comprehensive health services. The Senate bill included an additional \$20 million for the kind of programs that are needed for comprehensive health centers in rural America and urban America.

He has vetoed funds for the migrant health program; maternal and child health; National Health Service Corps; venereal and other communicable disease programs; lead-based paint poison-

ing prevention, which has taken its toll of children in this country; and programs for occupational health.

These are just a few. That is what the President did, in the name of controlling inflation.

Yet, the same administration sent Congress a defense budget that has billions added to it. I am not for wild cuts in the defense budget. I happen to believe in prudent reductions. I have even taken on Democratic candidates with respect to this issue. But, Mr. President, this country is not going to be caught up in the flames of inflation because the education and the health of the people are taken care of. That is pure, unadulterated bunk.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the President of the United States wants to go to the country on this issue then I am ready to join the battle. He has recruited another man "full steam ahead for George." I was going to hold off for about a week but I am entering the fight right now to be of help to the people of this country. This is an unconscionable veto.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, the educational needs, and taking care of the health and welfare of the people of this country, if we do not do it, we will have more inflation—

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It will cost more, right?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so right. By the way, the Senator from Washington has been a lifesaver for the American people. I am happy he is in the Chamber now because he and his companion on the minority side, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), have both rendered great service to this country as the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee that brings this bill to us.

Mr. President, if President Nixon cares about the health of the American people, he would have signed this legislation.

If President Nixon had cared about the dilapidated and poorly equipped hospitals in this country, he would have signed this legislation.

If President Nixon had cared about the education of the handicapped and of mentally retarded children, he would have signed this legislation.

I defy the President to show us where this legislation will bring inflation.

Mr. President, do you mean to tell me that we cannot take care of the mentally retarded children in this country? Do you mean to tell me that we should not be taking care of the handicapped. Good God, if we have to make cuts in these fields, we should get out of here.

If President Nixon really cares about building libraries, providing vocational education and funding vocational education programs, he would have signed the legislation.

If he really wants to declare war on drug abuse and alcoholism, it will take more than prayers in the White House—important as that is, and I support that—it takes money, too.

I accuse this administration of failure to act on the verbal commitments to the American people. That is political hypocrisy. It is unbelievable that the President would claim his administration is second to none in caring for the health and welfare of the people of this country when his record is riddled with vetoes and cutbacks.

The slogan of the administration is, as I said the other night, "No, no. Go slow. Not now. Veto." That is it. Put it down there as a kind of litany.

The only thing that has not been cut back in this administration is the number of professional P.R. men. They have added them all on, so anxious are they to publicize this administration's false claims of excellence.

So I say, fire one of those P.R. men so that we can feed a hungry child. I say cut back on the number of budget cutters so that we can build another hospital.

I say, come clean with the people and admit that we are neglecting many of those most in need.

I though President Nixon would sign this bill. I have not said a word about it because I did not believe that, at least in this election year, he could be so callous, so indifferent—and so foolish.

Mr. President, I have had 9 minutes to speak here. Never have I used 9 minutes of my life for a more worthwhile purpose.

There is no defense that the President of the United States and his aides can make for this veto. None.

I ask this administration to bring its economists up here and prove to us that this bill adds to inflation. For every nickel of inflation, I will show you, Mr. President, a life that is saved. For every dime of inflation, Mr. President, I will show you thousands of children who will be educated.

This country needs a crash program for education.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL).** The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is all I need.  
Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for his request?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I object. Nine minutes. Go ahead.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by the very thought that I would have enough ideas to exceed the Senator from Minnesota by 1 minute. I have enough good ideas to exceed him indefinitely.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota was out of the Chamber earlier today when we passed the continuing resolution providing for all of these services of which the Senator complains. Therefore, we will go ahead in accordance with the previous decisions made up to now as to the funding of each of these programs.

I also would like to say, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from

Minnesota has spoken of his enthusiasm for his friend, the candidate, that his friend the candidate has submitted only four bills to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare dealing with mental retardation and education and all the other matters for which tears of compassion flowed so unrestrainedly down the face of my friend from Minnesota. On not one of these has the Senator from South Dakota asked for a hearing. This represents the concern of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN).

Talk is cheap. Talk is being indulged in cheaply. But, on the floor and in the committee, the Senator from South Dakota has failed the people of this Nation. He has failed to carry through with his resplendent but non-responsive promises.

Mr. President, when the President vetoed this bill—and I support most of the programs in the bill—he gave his reasons.

I might point out in mentioning the reasons, that this administration has done more in the field of mental health than any previous administration—and will do more.

This administration has done more for education than any previous administration—and will do more.

This administration has done more for veterans, for the working people, for job creation, and for the entire secondary and college education programs—and will do more.

This administration recommended for the first time construction and rehabilitation aid to private schools in this country—and will do more.

This administration is prepared to put that record against all the promises and all the easily voiced complaints which are designed to appeal to emotion and to delude the voter who runs and reads, perhaps too carelessly or too quickly, the actual record made by this Congress.

The President points out in his veto message:

Because this is currently an open-ended program, this Congressional inaction could require a later supplemental reaching as high as \$3.5 billion. By increasing the face amount of the bill on the one hand and failing to place a limitation on payments for social services on the other, the Congress has produced a budget overrun that could exceed \$5 billion.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota says he challenges the President to show him how that contributes to inflation.

If the Senator will get out his little adding machine, he can convince himself that \$5 billion over the budget contributes to inflation, because \$5 billion adds to the deficit, it adds to the debt, and it increases the cost of everything the Senator's constituents buy. It even increases the cost of everything the Senator from South Dakota buys, because while the public is not buying his ideas, he, too, has to go into the marketplace and buy his goods and he would have paid more than under this bill.

The President points out:

No program has higher priority than continued expansion of the purchasing power of all the people.

That—

We have cut inflation in half, but spending such as this bill would require would clearly undermine that progress.

We have reduced Federal income taxes by 26 percent for a family of four making \$10,000 a year but spending such as this would undermine that progress.

We have achieved conditions in which the purchasing power of the average production worker with three dependents has gained four percent in one year, the best increase since 1964, but spending such as this would undermine that progress.

Now the President pointed out that in the budget request he submitted a proposed increase of \$2.1 billion for HEW. Not a reduction, Mr. President. One would think, from what the Senator from Minnesota has said, that we have turned our backs on the poor, the needy, the underprivileged, and the deserving of this country.

We did not turn our backs. We turned and faced them, and we faced them with a proposal that we would spend \$2.1 billion more than we had spent before. However, Congress, seeing a good thing, promptly added to it \$1.8 billion on top of that. It is not the good things to which the President objects. It is the unwise things which have been added to the good things which undermine the purchasing power of the dollar.

So the President proposes that the line items in the bill should not, in the aggregate, exceed the budget request. And this could be accomplished either by revising the recommendations for each of the items, or by including a general provision in the bill which would limit spending to this overall aggregate amount.

The President proposes that Congress put a ceiling on this program and the other programs and that we protect the purchasing power of the average working man in this country.

One cannot get up and say, "I am for giving all of the people of this country everything they want, and I do not want to make them pay any taxes." One cannot do it. He can argue that on the stump, but he cannot make sense while he is arguing it. He can only hope that the person listening will be moved before he thinks. However, that is underestimating the intelligence of the American people. They do think, and they know that when we spend more than we have, we have to pay for it in the end. The voter is the one who pays, and he knows that.

I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that his friend the candidate, if he is really interested in these programs, he should have asked for hearings. If he is really interested and means what he says, he ought to come in here and propose the \$6,500 guaranteed annual income for every family in this country and put one-half of the people in the United States on the welfare rolls, which is what that would do.

He would see how far he would get.

The Senator even proposed a defense cut of \$4 billion, and he was voted down by the Senate by about 4 to 1. If he cannot cut it by \$4 billion, how does he expect to put half of the people on the welfare rolls. The Senate will not let him do it. That is why he remains away from

the Senate on necessary business—necessary indeed. Necessary for the country that we legislate without that kind of assistance, necessary that we not be asked to put half of the people in this country on the welfare rolls, necessary for the safety of the country that he not testify on these various bills he stuck in.

No, Mr. President, if we really want to help the people of this country, do not put on them a burden of inflation so heavy that, while they think they are reaching for goodies, their backs are broken by the endeavors, the meaningless endeavors, of those who have loaded them with the purported goodies in the first place.

Let us do what we can afford to do. Let us do more than we have ever done before. Let us exceed our record in the general welfare area by doing more than has ever been done before. But let us not burden the people of this country with so heavy an inflationary load that their taxes will take away from them that with which they have been able to buy goods in the marketplace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Colorado has 21 minutes remaining on the bill. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has been consumed.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this has been an enlivened and heated debate, if I might say so. I would like to get back on the bill if I can.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, would the Senator from Colorado yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I, too, want to get back on the bill. However, I could not sit here and listen to a recital of what happened on the HEW bill without standing up and saying something.

The Senator from Pennsylvania says that this administration has done a great deal more than has ever been done before in the field of health, education, and welfare.

If we had followed for the last 4 years the President's budgets in the field of health, education, and welfare, we would have been back where we started 5 years ago. So we have added to it. The Senate passed a ceiling on this bill on social services. The House would not accept it. I did not hear one word from the White House about the House of Representatives not accepting that. And that is undoubtedly, I think, what the Senator from Minnesota was talking about—health, education, part of the welfare, rehabilitation, and those things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I could stand here all afternoon and give budget figures that were lower than the year before. Surely, these came out with little increases. The increases were added here by the Senate and voted for by most Republicans, but not by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, when Mr. Nixon gets up and makes his acceptance speech, he will say piously, "I did all this for the people."

I would like to have the television cameras turned around behind the President so that they would see the papers and see what he really did. They would see that he vetoed the measure and would see all the other things that he has not been doing for the neglected people.

(This marks the end of the colloquy which occurred during the debate on the National Science Foundation Act Amendments and which by unanimous consent was ordered to be printed in the Record at this point.)

#### INTERIM AGREEMENT ON LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE WEAPONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, statements have appeared in the press in recent days to the effect that the Soviet Union "lied" to the United States, on the number of submarines which the Soviet Union had "under construction" at the time the President signed the interim agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive arms. Quoting from one press story, reporters were told that—

The Soviet Union claimed to have 48 Yankee class submarines, while "firm intelligence" puts its strength at only 42.

The implication of this statement is that the U. S. negotiators relied on this claimed Soviet strength and thus gave the Soviet Union an artificially strong position from which to bargain, and that our representatives were deceived and unaware of the facts.

The facts are as follows:

First. Dr. Kissinger at a press conference in Moscow on May 26, had the following colloquy:

Dr. KISSINGER . . . The base number of Soviet submarines is in dispute. It has been in dispute in our intelligence estimate exactly how much it is, though our intelligence estimates are in the range that was suggested.

Question: 41 to 43?

Dr. KISSINGER. I am not going to go beyond what I have said. It is in that general range. The Soviet estimate of their program is slightly more exhaustive. They, of course, have the advantage that they know what it is precisely.

Second. Dr. Kissinger at a press conference in Moscow a day later, May 27, stated in answer to a question:

Because of the difficulty of the fact that some of the Soviet boats have 12 missiles and some have 16 missiles, the Soviet argument was that they had 48 submarines under construction with 768 missiles. Our assessment was less. The figure we adopted is 710, if you consider new missiles, and 740 if you add in the 30 of the older missiles that they have on submarines.

In either event, if they want to get up to the ceiling of 950 modern submarine-launched missiles, they have to retire 30 of the old submarine-launched missiles plus 210 of the ICBMs.

(The foregoing statements are printed in the hearings of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, at pages 102 and 107.)

Third. The President and the American negotiators were fully informed that the Soviet Union claimed that 48 submarines were—deployed or—under construction. They also knew that our intelligence estimates were that the number under construction was in the range of 41 to 43 or 44.

Fourth. U.S. intelligence estimates have now firmly fixed on the figure of 42 new Soviet submarines deployed or under construction, according to our criteria as to when construction begins.

Fifth. The explanation for the confusion that arises from the difference in U.S. estimates of the number of submarines deployed or under construction and Soviet statements, is a different view as to—that one does not know at—what precise point in the assembly process one can assert that construction begins.

Sixth. I am satisfied after a full briefing that there is no evidence that the United States was deceived with respect to the number of Soviet submarines deployed or under construction at the time the interim agreement was signed by the President.

#### STRATEGIC EQUALITY AND AMERICA'S SAFETY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in addressing ourselves to the interim agreement on strategic offensive arms signed by the United States and the Soviet Union, I believe all of my colleagues share a common central conviction: That this agreement and those which may follow are of vital importance to the future well-being of America. Because this is so, many of us now find it imperative that, in ratifying this agreement, the Senate of the United States meet its constitutional responsibility and give the advice without which our consent becomes mere acquiescence.

I have found a most revealing lesson in reviewing this country's recent approach to the limitation of strategic armaments. You might recall, for example, that in the midsixties it was widely predicted that the United States had such an imposing lead in strategic arms that the Soviet Union would not even attempt to catch up. When in subsequent years it appeared that the U.S.S.R. was, in fact, determined to do precisely that, many people predicted that Moscow sought no more than something called strategic parity, defined in terms of generally equal numbers of major intercontinental strategic systems. And now, in so short a time, we find that the Soviet Union has surpassed this Nation, not by small but by substantial margins, in numbers of ICBMs, in numbers of submarine-launched nuclear missiles, and by an enormous margin in the total throw-weight of their offensive weaponry.

This is the situation which confronts us and which must be in the forefront of our deliberations on this agreement. We must ask ourselves whether it can be a matter of indifference that the balance of strategic power has altered so sharply in this short period. And we must ask whether the Senate, as a responsible coequal branch of this Government, wishes to enshrine the existing disparity



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)