

Since, with mounting vituperation, Peking has been accusing Moscow of coming into "an unholy alliance" with the United States, the Soviets can well conclude that they might as well have the advantage—and not just the epithets—of such an alliance.

Such an alliance alone could really secure the peace and neutrality of Southeast Asia. It would, of course, require a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war, as a result of which the independence of both North and South Vietnam could be guaranteed.

Why is a United States-Soviet Asian security alliance a rational potential? Because an expansionist Red China is a peril to both the United States and Russia and only by acting together can that peril be securely countered.

COSTING HUMAN LIFE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there are many wonders in the new world. Our Nation has discovered the secrets of the atom and has embarked on the conquest of space. It has achieved a rate of national income higher than ever before in the history of mankind. The great driving force in this growth has been our national marketplace where goods produced by man's ingenuity are exchanged in a system of free bargaining to meet his needs and his desires.

The early economists claimed that supply creates its own demand. In the years of the great depression our Nation learned that it was possible to overproduce, indeed, industrial capacity might be left unused for years. Happily we have passed beyond that era.

Continued inflation tells us that today we are in an age of excess demand. Many of the goals of our Nation have no price-tag. Our efforts to achieve these objectives are not subject to the restraints of the law of supply and demand. We believe in peace with justice for all men. We believe in national security and freedom; a decent standard of living under our unique competitive system of free enterprise for all our citizens. We seek a better education for all of our children and for the children of all the earth. There are many other such items, including our foreign-aid program which expresses our hopes that other free nations may share in this bounty through their own productive efforts. We are on the brink of an age of demands no longer based solely on the psychology of the marketplace—and this fact casts a long shadow over our entire economic system.

We build missile and military equipment because in these dangerous times we are assured we cannot afford not to have them. As technology expands we believe we cannot afford not to go into space. We are on the threshold, I believe, of a similar economy for our Nation's health. What value can we place on human lives? My distinguished colleagues from the State of Washington have introduced legislation to expand the benefits of the discovery of the artificial kidney. The cost of treatment by this process is estimated at \$7,000 to \$10,000 per annum; quite beyond the purse of most of our citizens. I understand that there may soon be other such discoveries that will permit a full life for those whose store of hopes would otherwise be exhausted.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I suggest that the political and economic implications of these discoveries require serious deliberation in this Chamber. I am gravely concerned over the implications of changing technology on our free competitive enterprise economy. How can these costly benefits be shared by our citizens without succumbing to a system of total domination of our system of production and distribution by government? If we cannot afford not to consider the health of our people, we cannot afford not to consider the health of our body politic. I will not succumb to the sophistry that the well-being of one is incompatible with the well-being of the other.

My friend, the distinguished Nobel Prize laureate, Dr. Joshua Lederberg of Stanford University, has written an eloquent statement of this problem which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COSTING HUMAN LIFE—A DILEMMA OF MEDICAL PROGRESS

(By Joshua Lederberg)

This year's news is and will continue to be full of the trial runs of new medical machines which are a turning point in the joining of medicine and technology. For several years, the artificial kidney has been a technical success, but a soul-ache for being out of reach of many whose lives might be sustained by this scarce and costly mechanical substitute.

The artificial heart is now moving inevitably to a level of practical utility. No matter how discouraging the early trials of recent weeks, we must think of the policies needed to cope with the eventual success of this machine.

At first thought, such an advance appears to be an unmitigated blessing, but power does not come to man without matching responsibilities, and this applies especially to a power for life and death. As is often the case, the worst perplexity comes from a technological imbalance. At this point it appears likely that machinery that could save the lives of at least 100,000 Americans a year could be perfected by 1970. But we will then face several cruel dilemmas, during the "heart gap." The first machines, by the mere postponement of a personal doom, will be miraculous blessings. But it is certain that within our present framework of political decision, confusion about automation, and technical organization, the machines and the clinical skills needed to apply them will be pathetically scarce for several years thereafter. How to choose the few percent that should receive the benefit may not be the worst dilemma. It is equally certain that the early versions of the heart might prolong life, but will leave alive many cardiac cripples, irrevocably tied to their machines. The worst stage of the gap will be the period when on a large scale the machine saves life, not livelihood—a "plastic heart", rather like an iron lung, being the fount from which the patient cannot long depart. Such a gap could well last 10 or more years, say from 1970 to 1980, at an economic cost of the order of \$100 billion.

It has been suggested that plastic hearts not be used until they give livelihood as well as life. The suggestion flies in the face of human nature as well as medical ethics, especially where there is substantial hope of future improvement that will alleviate the

burden if the patient can only be sustained a few years longer.

This problem and its possible remedy, e.g., a more explicit push for industrial technological support—are part of larger issues of human and social responsibility. Reason and compassion join in utilizing every useful economic resource can forestall death. On this argument, mechanical machines—substitutes for failing human organs—will become our predominant industry. Medicine indeed does take a great part of our gross national product. It is new here is the availability of increasingly expensive opportunities just because sophisticated technology is brought to bear on medical problems. Our arms budget high for quite comparable reasons—we cannot afford not to invest several billions of dollars each for an advanced air or missile, but only because that costly technology has made it available. The human issues—like the shift in age composition and its impact on family life are no less perplexing, nor are the implications for order of ever more poignant demonstrations of the use of wealth. The public arouses private conscience that are the root of democracy must start somewhere.

Should we not have begun yesterday start thinking of human biology as one of the main sectors of political responsibility?

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT BERT H. HUMPHREY ON THE RETURN OF THE UNIVERSITIES IN HELPING TO BUILD A BETTER WORLD

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am unanimous consent that a brilliant speech made by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at a convocation at Temple University in Philadelphia, Pa., on June 16, 1966, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

ADDRESS BY HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 16, 1966

Two years ago this nation launched a kind of war—the war against poverty; not only poverty of the purse, which is enough, but poverty of the spirit, which is worse.

In one way or another, we Americans have been fighting poverty throughout our history. Indeed, it has always been the American dream to create a society in which each man would have unfettered opportunity to himself and his family to something better.

Yet it was not until this century that government played a real part in the struggle. Those who in the past held industrial and political power long rejected any government intervention on behalf of the poor.

Their attitude was not unlike that of Anatole France had flayed in Europe with bitter irony:

"The law, in its majestic equality, favors the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to die of hunger."

The tide began to turn with Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, and in strong with Franklin Delano Roosevelt the social and economic advances of the Deal.

It is on these beginnings that we are living today.

THE POOR NOW VISIBLE

"The poor of the earth," says the Bible, "hide themselves together."

And, here in America, they were so hidden in urban and rural slums that all too easy, even for men and women of