

May 17, 1972

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1189

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside in order that amendment No. 1189 may be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1189 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 1189) as follows:

On page 31, line 1, following the word "missions," insert the following: "personnel of the Department of Agriculture."

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. The language of S. 3526 as now written would reduce the number of personnel of each of the agencies other than the State Department by 10 percent. This includes the Department of Agriculture, and in checking with the Department I find that presently the Department of Agriculture has a total of only 203 American citizens assigned overseas. The jobs conducted by those individuals fall into four categories:

One. The Foreign Agriculture Service has only 138 Americans overseas. These persons are engaged in market development and reporting on market opportunities and the competitive situation for agricultural markets around the world. Their main effort is directed toward export expansion programs that have helped to increase U.S. farm exports to record levels.

The second category is in Agriculture Research Service, with only 14 Americans assigned overseas. The personnel in this category are highly trained research administrators who supervise projects under the Public Law 480 program. These projects are of great value to the United States and the host country and are carried on at a minimum cost to the taxpayers.

The third category is in the Animal and Health Inspection Service—which is the one, frankly, that interests me the most—in which only 51 Americans are assigned overseas. The work of this agency is divided into two parts: First, guarding against the import of pests, diseases, and unfit food. Only 43 Americans are assigned overseas to perform this task. These officers protect American consumers from import into the United States of food products that do not meet U.S. standards for purity and wholesomeness.

These 43 Americans are responsible for overseeing the sanitary conditions in more than 1,000 meat packing plants which process meat for shipment into the United States. These plants ship more than 1 billion pounds of meat a year into the United States. The truth of the matter is that we need many more Americans performing this service to protect the U.S. consumer, not fewer. They protect U.S. agriculture and the food economy from the introduction of diseases and pests that do not exist in this country and would cause untold damage to U.S. plants and animals should they gain a foothold here.

There are only eight Americans engaged in research on marketing quality of U.S. products exported to Europe. This small number of market researchers are aiding in the development of equipment and techniques to deliver U.S. perishable commodities to major European markets. A large potential for expanded export trade in fresh fruits, vegetables, meats, and other perishable depends on the development of improved delivery methods.

The reduction in force proposed by this section could result in the removal of 20 Americans from any of these functions. It could result in the elimination of all research activities of the Department of Agriculture overseas under Public Law 480 and other programs designed to increase our export markets. Or it could result in a reduction by one-half of the size of the present inspection program carried on by the Department of Agriculture to insure that products coming into our country are pure and wholesome.

I am sure that this is not the intention of the committee, and therefore it is my feeling that the personnel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture should be exempt from the personnel reduction order by section 504 of this act.

Therefore, it is my hope that the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment. I strongly feel that the personnel of the USDA should not be included in the reduction order by section 504 of S. 3526.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, coming from an agricultural State as I do, I am, of course, very sympathetic to the point the Senator from Oklahoma is making. There are one or two observations I should like to make.

The bill as reported does not impose a 10-percent cut in the overseas personnel of each agency. The categories which are mentioned on page 98 of the report are simply illustrative of the numbers involved. In other words, it was our intention that it be an overall cut, to be allocated among all the agencies in accordance with the executive department's own priorities. I had assumed—as I do now—that if the executive branch used good judgment, it would not harm one of the most important and essential parts of our foreign activities, agricultural exports and other such activities carried out abroad by the Department of Agriculture.

The Senator from Oklahoma certainly is right in drawing attention to this. As I said, I am very sympathetic to his proposal.

I might point out as background why

this provision section 504 was put in the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that that entire section of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SECTION 504. PERSONNEL REDUCTION

This section requires that by June 30, 1973, the total number of U.S. government personnel assigned abroad, other than personnel of the Department of State (including reimbursable personnel carried on the Department's rolls), members of the Armed Forces not assigned as attaches or to military aid activities and volunteers in the Peace Corps, be reduced by at least ten percent from the current levels. In addition, the amendment places a worldwide ceiling of 6,000 on the number of State Department personnel (including reimbursable personnel assigned to the Department) who can be stationed overseas at any one time.

According to the recent information available to the Committee, there are some 26,000 U.S. personnel overseas under the jurisdiction of diplomatic mission chiefs. Of this total, State Department personnel engaged in regular Department related activities number 3,409 or about 13 percent. If to this total are added those carried on the Department's rolls as reimbursable personnel, those whose duties actually are in behalf of other agencies such as A.I.D., U.S. Information Agency, and others, the State Department total increases to 5,809—but even this amount represents only 22 percent of the total.

By comparison there were:

5,047 AID personnel;
4,650 Defense Department personnel (excluding members of the Armed Forces);
8,372 Peace Corps personnel;
1,069 USIA personnel;
1,527 other Executive Branch personnel, including Justice, Agriculture, Commerce, HEW, NASA and EXIM Bank.

In other words, for every State Department employee overseas there are four more employees from other government agencies. This situation indicates that our overseas missions have developed into miniature foreign policy establishments, drawn along the lines of Washington itself. Those Executive Branch agencies (other than State) which have a foreign-policy input in Washington—ranging from the Department of Defense to the Department of Agriculture—also have their representatives overseas, the only difference being that the representation is on a smaller scale.

This provision would begin to reverse this situation and start to reduce the number of government employees overseas to a more manageable level, while at the same time enhancing the power of the State Department to regain better control over our missions abroad.

This mandatory reduction reflects the Committee's concern over the proliferation of government personnel abroad. It recognizes that some reductions have been made in the last several years, but believes that substantially greater reductions could be made which would result in the more efficient and effective conduct of foreign affairs. This reduction should also have a favorable impact on the government's fiscal condition and our balance of payments problem.

The Committee views the ten percent reduction required as a minimum figure and expects that serious efforts will be made to reduce the overseas bureaucracy much further. The Committee will follow the implementation of this directive closely and expect to give careful study to the results during consideration for authorization legislation for FY 1974. In addition, the Committee

S 8068

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 17, 1972

will expect the Department of State to provide a detailed justification in the FY 1974 presentation material of all U.S. personnel in each U.S. mission abroad to which 50 or more Americans are assigned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall read just parts of it:

According to the recent information available to the Committee, there are some 26,000 U.S. personnel overseas under the jurisdiction of diplomatic mission chiefs. Of this total, State Department personnel engaged in regular Department related activities number 3,409 or about 13 percent. If to this total are added those carried on the Department's rolls as reimbursable personnel, those whose duties actually are in behalf of other agencies such as A.I.D., U.S. Information Agency, and others, the State Department total increases to 5,809—but even this amount represents only 22 percent of the total.

By comparison there were:
5,047 AID personnel;
4,650 Defense Department personnel (excluding members of the Armed Forces);

These, of course, do not include any of the people in the Army or other Armed Forces—

8,372 Peace Corps personnel;
1,069 USIA personnel;
1,527 other Executive Branch personnel including Justice, Agriculture, Commerce, HEW, NASA and EXIM Bank.

In other words, for every State Department employee overseas there are four more employees from other government agencies. This situation indicates that our overseas missions have developed into miniature foreign policy establishments, drawn along the lines of Washington itself. Those Executive Branch agencies (other than State) which have a foreign-policy input in Washington—ranging from the Department of Defense to the Department of Agriculture—also have their representatives overseas, the only difference being that the representation is on a smaller scale.

We have had many reports from ambassadors in the field that their respective establishments are larger than necessary. Some of them said to me that they could do a better job if they did not have so many people cluttering up the embassy. They do not like to go on record as saying that. Being in the executive branch, it is not healthy for them to say it directly, but they have not hesitated to say it to me and to other members of the committee.

The purpose of this amendment was not to eliminate 10 percent of the Agriculture's personnel abroad or 10 percent of the personnel of any specific agency. It is to be an overall cut. So I would not have anticipated, if they used any judgment at all, that the Agriculture's personnel would be substantially effected. It may be that we have not studied every individual spot in Agriculture.

But at any rate, in order to clarify the situation, and because this is a relatively small item compared to the ones I have mentioned, I would be prepared to accept this amendment. As I said to the Senator from Oklahoma, I would not accept an amendment intended to completely delete the whole 10-percent reduction, because I think it is entirely justified by the record that was made. But on Agriculture I would, because I think it is fundamental, and those people have a direct responsibility quite different, in my

view, and much more fundamental, than in a number of these cases I have just read.

I would expect, for example, that we could do without some of these military aid and military attachés, many of whom are in countries where there is no military problem for our country. As I remember, even in a country like Costa Rica, where the country itself does not even have an army, where we have no real business having them, we still have some military aid personnel.

Of course, those assignments are pleasant, with a minimum of duty, a maximum of leisure, and an opportunity to enjoy of nice climate. We have a surplus of military manpower, and they like to have a place to send them. All agencies like to have nontaxing assignments abroad. I mean this is not new, and I would not expect the military to be any different than the personnel in any other agency.

But I think Congress should try to control the proliferation of this type of activity. We know all the difficulties that have arisen out of the war; we seem to feel we have to keep up these over-large establishments in many countries. There are some countries that are important, that obviously ought to be staffed adequately, but there are a lot of them that we believe are overstaffed in accordance with legitimate needs. This provision was just intended to say to the executive branch, "You use your best judgment in cutting down. But you must cut it down 10 percent." This could not be properly interpreted as a direction to cut down each agency by 10 percent. Mr. President, I am willing to accept this amendment, exempting the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am opposed to the reduction of the overseas work force of the Department of Agriculture as proposed in S. 3526, the Department of State-USIA authorization bill.

There is no question that some cuts can be made in the number of U.S. officials currently serving overseas, but I oppose making such cuts across the board, without an examination of the particular value of each department or agency.

Few areas could offer a clearer example of where cuts should not be made than exists with our foreign agriculture aides. I speak from personal experience, both as Governor and as a U.S. Senator.

U.S. agriculture attachés have helped officials of the State of Oregon in opening doors and creating demand for Oregon agricultural products, particularly in the Far East. I do not want action taken that would hinder the further activities of these officials.

During my 8 years as Governor of Oregon, I led two trade missions, one to the Far East and one to Germany, in an effort to develop new markets for Oregon products, and to make contacts for other exchanges of products and material. Not only were the agriculture attachés very helpful at the time, but they were active in followup efforts to create new markets for agriculture products from Oregon.

The farmers of my State shipped \$25

million worth of wheat last year, and most of it went to Japan, which has become U.S. agriculture's best wheat customer. Wheat consumption in Japan has more than doubled in the last decade or so. I think it is fair to say that this dramatic increase by a traditionally rice-eating nation toward wheat consumption was aided greatly by market development programs spearheaded by USDA personnel in Japan. The same can be said of soybeans, feed grains, citrus, tallow, and other U.S. farm products. Japan is now a billion-dollar-plus agriculture customer of ours. Similar programs in other countries have been responsible for agriculture's other gains, but the competition has become fierce.

I will not belabor the obvious point that recent gains in foreign sales of U.S. agriculture products assist in our balance of payments. During a time when our balance of payments is in such a precipitous state, I question the wisdom of cutting out personnel who have been very active in an area contributing heavily to positive gains in U.S. balance of payments.

Added to the problems of increasing competition from other agriculture-producing countries have been the severe setbacks caused by the west coast dock strike. This forced Japan and other Pacific basin countries to turn elsewhere for commodities they needed. I know from conversations with agriculture growers and shippers in Oregon last fall that both Canada and Australia increased wheat sales to Japan during the strike. I need not point out that these countries are not going to hand back on a platter our share of those markets. We are going to have to compete for it, and cutting the staff of the men who will help makes no sense to me at all.

We must have an aggressive marketing program to recapture this business lost during the dock strike, and we must set goals for increasing our agriculture sales in the future. I recall a few weeks ago, when I was preparing testimony to give in support of the wheat and wheat foods research and promotion bill, finding out that consumption of wheat in the United States had shown a marked decline in recent years. This has been accompanied by an increase in per acre yield of wheat. Efforts must be made to increase markets for our wheat crops, as well as our other agriculture crops. Foreign sales are an important facet of any market increase, and to do this we need all the help we can get overseas.

At a time when we can look at an all-time high for agriculture exports—\$7.8 billion in the last fiscal year—we should look for ways to add to this, and not cut back in an area where such positive gains can be shown.

Last week, I solicited a letter from the State department of agriculture in my State of Oregon. I know the talented men of this State agency have been committed to improving agriculture sales overseas for Oregon products, and I was interested in what they thought of this planned cutback.

I shall quote one paragraph from a letter from Mr. Jay Glatt, administrator of the agricultural development di-

May 17, 1972

vision. Jay Glatt is a man respected throughout the West as someone who has worked actively to promote foreign agriculture sales.

As a result of this past dock strike it is now more important than ever that we maintain a man-to-man and day-to-day contact with our major overseas customers. The Agricultural Attaches and Foreign Agricultural Service provide that necessary liaison for overseas agricultural market development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Glatt's letter be reprinted at the conclusion of these remarks.

This daily contact and followup plays a vital role in establishing and maintaining our foreign markets, and we must not cut back personnel in an area that makes these gains possible.

Naturally, my remarks today have been directed to the need to restore the Agriculture Department personnel, but I would be remiss if I were to focus exclusively on the Federal efforts to foster greater foreign agriculture sales. To do so would be to overlook the invaluable efforts of the private businesses, associations, and cooperatives in the Northwest that have been active—and even superactive—in promotion of foreign sales for Oregon and Washington agriculture products. In wheat, in grass seed, in feed grain, and in numerous other areas, businessmen have established their own people-to-people contacts, and generated much business.

While these commendable efforts in no way detract from the need to restore the Federal manpower, I do want to point out that private efforts, coupled with an active State program, offer a valuable three-pronged approach to increasing foreign agriculture sales in conjunction with Federal manpower.

In conclusion, I urge Senators to support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON). The amendment would restore the segment of our foreign U.S. Government personnel that has done much to help the U.S. farmer in many ways, and to assist in showing a hefty surplus to our balance of payments.

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

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Salem, Ore., May 12, 1972.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: It has been called to our attention that Senate Bill 3526 dealing with 10% reduction in overseas personnel of the U.S. Government, except State Department, is out of committee.

We seek your concern as to the effect this has on agriculture, particularly at a time when we are in the process of recovering from the effects of a nearly disastrous dock strike.

As a result of this past dock strike it is now more important than ever that we maintain a man-to-man and day-to-day contact with our major overseas customers. The Agricultural Attache and Foreign Agricultural Service provide that necessary liaison for overseas agricultural market development.

Soon we will be into the harvest of a new crop with the potential, as in wheat, of being of bumper proportions, which must be moved in an orderly manner or will be sub-

ject to costly delays in export supply and deterioration of quality.

This crop, for instance, represents a \$65 million farm value in Oregon alone, of which 85% is traditionally sold into export.

We bring this to your attention because of your concern in export markets both when you were Governor and now as Senator.

We appreciate your attention to this Senate Bill as it is vitally important that overseas agricultural personnel be maintained.

Sincerely,

JAY GLATT,

Administrator, Agricultural Development Division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock noon. After the two leaders or their assistants have been recognized under the standing order the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Brock) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes. At the conclusion of the period for the transaction of routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, on which there is a time limitation of not to exceed 1 hour. The unfinished business, S. 3526, in the meantime will be temporarily laid aside. Upon the disposition of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill the Senate will return to the consideration of the unfinished business, S. 3526.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I wish to state that there could be a rollcall vote on the adoption of the conference report tomorrow. I have no indication of such at the moment, but Senators should be alerted to the possibility thereof.

Moreover, there could be rollcall votes

on amendments to S. 3526, the unfinished business, during the afternoon tomorrow; and Senators understand that tabling motions are in order at any time and that a vote on a tabling motion with respect to any amendment can be had quickly, tabling motions being nondebateable. Senators, I repeat, ought to be alerted to the possibility of rollcall votes tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:05 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 18, 1972, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 17, 1972:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

George P. Shultz, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Robert E. Adamson, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Frederick H. Schneider, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Nels C. Johnson, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Evan P. Aurand, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas Patrick Nelady, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

Robert L. Yost, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Burundi.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 17, 1972:

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

The following-named persons to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for terms expiring May 11, 1975:

David R. Derge, of Indiana.
Jewel LaFontant, of Illinois.
William C. Turner, of Arizona.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Nominations beginning Richard J. Bloomfield, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, and ending John Stern Wolf, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 7, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 1972.

25 May 1972

Scott amendment No. 1203 sent to:

DCI Walters Colby Karamessines

Houston Coffey Fisher

May 24, 1972

It is all further complicated by the fact that there is no doubt some busing proposal will be adopted and that proposal is likely to raise even more serious constitutional and practical problems.

Nothing will be accomplished by defeating the report and a major education bill will be lost in the process. I hope, therefore, that the conference report is adopted. If my vote is needed, I will support it. If not, I will vote "no" as a protest against the conference modification of the Senate busing amendment.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the conference report on S. 659, the Higher Education Act of 1972. I believe this legislation represents one of the greatest steps we have taken in the educational field and certainly it is legislation which is sorely needed.

This conference report represents far more than individual amendments aimed at improving our existing system. This measure, if enacted, will establish a new type of Federal assistance to educational institutions, in that it will provide the necessary assistance, without allowing the Government to interfere with the institutions' independence of action.

The key provision of this bill is a new program of grants for needy college students. These grants will provide a maximum \$1,400 annual subsidy to every needy college student, minus the amount his family can reasonably be expected to contribute toward his education. This Government contribution to his education would be reduced gradually, according to his family income level, until it would disappear at the \$13,000 income level. This bill would continue funding the present student grants, low-interest direct loans, and work-study pay proposals.

One of the most innovative features in this bill is a new type of college operating subsidy, also called a "cost of education" grant. These funds are distributed to educational institutions based on the number of federally assisted students enrolled, and additional funds would also be allocated to institutions based on the number of their graduate student enrollment.

This bill also authorizes: A National Institute of Education, which will finance educational research at all levels of schooling.

Immediate aid to those educational institutions which are in the worst financial shape by authorizing \$40 million to be spent over the next 2 years.

Funds to finance reforms in education.

The establishment of a student loan marketing association, designed to expand Government-backed private loans to students by buying up loan paper from banks and other lending institutions.

I believe this is one of the most comprehensive approaches to educational assistance which has been considered by the Congress in the last decade, in that students may now have a choice of which schools they wish to attend, regardless of their economic condition. This legislation will make it possible for them to select a school of their choice

without being wholly influenced by their economic plights, and at the same time, colleges would be competing for these students, who would be bringing additional Federal funds for their particular institution. I believe this will expand the educational opportunities for needy students and at the same time create pressure on these institutions to continually upgrade their facilities and their curriculae.

It is significant that the Carnegie Commission on Education has characterized this bill as the most important piece of legislation to be brought before the Congress since the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. We must have a modern education system to meet the demands of this society, and an educational system that will provide assistance for those students who are meritorious, deserving, and capable of pursuing a college-level work. I believe this bill goes a long way toward meeting these needs. I commend the chairman of the Education Subcommittee and the other members of the Labor Committee for their diligence and perseverance, in being able to report and carry through the legislative process, to this stage, this important legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 3:30 having arrived, the Senate, under the previous order, will proceed to vote on the conference report on S. 659, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr.

HANSEN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE). If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 185 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Aiken	Dole	Randolph
Allen	Dominick	Roth
Allott	Eagleton	Saxbe
Baker	Ellender	Schweiker
Bayh	Ervin	Scott
Beall	Fannin	Smith
Bennett	Fulbright	Sparkman
Bentsen	Griffin	Spong
Bible	Gurney	Stafford
Boggs	Hollings	Stennis
Brock	Hruska	Stevens
Burdick	Jackson	Stevenson
Byrd	Long	Symington
Harry F., Jr.	Magnuson	Taft
Byrd, Robert C.	McIntyre	Talmadge
Cannon	Metcalf	Thurmond
Chiles	Miller	Tower
Cook	Montoya	Tunney
Cooper	Pastore	Williams
Cotton	Pearson	Young
Cranston	Pell	
Curtis	Proxmire	

NAYS—15

Buckley	Hughes	Muskie
Case	Inouye	Nelson
Gambrell	Javits	Packwood
Gravel	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Hart	Mondale	Weicker

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Mansfield, against.

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Hansen	Mathias
Bellmon	Harris	McClellan
Brooke	Hatke	McGee
Church	Hatfield	McGovern
Eastland	Humphrey	Moss
Fong	Jordan, N.C.	Mundt
Goldwater	Jordan, Idaho	Percy

So the conference report was agreed to. Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at this time I would like to pay particular tribute and to express my personal thanks to my colleagues who were of such great assistance during both the development of S. 659 and in the conference recently concluded.

Initially, I would like to thank the junior Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) for the excellent and conscientious way he fulfilled his responsibility as ranking minority member of the subcommittee. Moreover, without his help there could not have been a conference report.

May 24, 1972

I should like to pay particular thanks to Senator RANDOLPH for his valued assistance. The new division of adult and vocational education can be directly attributed to his efforts. Indeed the assistance found in this bill for small colleges is due to JENNINGS RANDOLPH's strong advocacy of their cause.

During the conference Senators STAFFORD, SCHWEIKER, and BEALL were of great help as were Senators WILLIAMS and CRANSTON.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to pay a special tribute to those conferees who fully supported the education provisions of S. 659 but who had to oppose the bill because of moral consideration. Senators JAVITS and MONDALE were indeed architects of the bill. Senator JAVITS time and again used his great skill and knowledge to help create solutions and resolve problems. Senator MONDALE made an immense contribution by the role he played in developing the remarkably imaginative emergency school aid program portion of the bill. Senators KENNEDY and MONDALE together developed the Indian education portions of the bill, which is a very real tribute to the work done by our former colleague, the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Finally, these remarks would not be complete if I did not pay tribute to the fine, thoughtful, and creative work done by Steven J. Wexler, the Education Subcommittee's counsel, and Richard Smith, the subcommittee's associate counsel. Roy Millenson, the minority staff director, likewise contributed to the development of this remarkable bill. And it fell to Blair Crownover of the Legislative Council's office to put together and make coherent sense out of the many, often very complicated decisions of the conferees.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of amendment No. 1203 by the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) which will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 30, line 19, strike all through "(b)" on line 6, page 31, and insert:

"STATE DEPARTMENT CEILING

"SEC. 504."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, there is a limitation of one hour on the amendment, the time to be equally divided between and controlled by the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT). Who yields time?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield myself 10 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Is it the intention of the distinguished minority leader to have a rollcall vote on the pending amendment?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, it is; and I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield again?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to order at this time the yeas and nays on the following amendments, with one show of hands, with the understanding that no Senator's right to modify his own amendment is prejudiced by virtue of the action taken on the amendment by ordering the yeas and nays. These are amendments on which we already have agreed to time limitations. The amendments are as follows: amendment No. 1201 by Mr. BAKER, amendment No. 1176, by Mr. DOMINICK, amendment No. 1174 by Mr. BROOKE, amendment No. 1196 by Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, and the amendment by Mr. PERCY, the number of which I do not have.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on each of the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. This does not include the so-called Church-Case amendment?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. It does not.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I do not intend to use my full time. I hope I can be through in 10 minutes, more or less, and therefore we may come to a vote rather shortly, if not too much is said by other speakers.

Section 504, subsection (a), requires a 10 percent reduction in the number of Federal civilian employees in foreign countries. Specifically excluded from this cutback are State Department employees, Peace Corps volunteers and leaders, and other Federal employees who are assigned to the Department of State on a reimbursable basis. In addition, the Senate acted last week to extend this exemption to employees of the Department of Agriculture. Section 504 also requires a 10 percent cutback in members of the Armed Forces detailed as military attachés or to military assistance advisory groups or military aid missions. The cutback will apply against overseas strength as of July 1, 1972, and must be realized by the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 1973.

The total number of personnel under the jurisdiction of diplomatic mission chiefs amount to 26,000. After excluding employees to which the cutback does not apply, some 11,800 personnel are subject to the cut. A cutback against a base of 11,800 personnel means that almost 1,200 positions must be cut before June 30, 1973.

I am not against cutbacks for programs that are overstaffed. Substantial reductions in overseas Federal employment have already been effected—about 20 percent since 1967. Perhaps there is more fat to cut. My point is simply that some of the programs affected by this across-the-board cut are under the jurisdiction of other committees of Congress, and that these committees should have the opportunity to consider the value to the United States of these programs and the personnel who staff them. Some of these programs are vital to our national security and cannot be effectively operated if they are reduced. I assume the very same reasoning was behind the action of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who voted to exclude State Department personnel from the cut and instead placed an overall ceiling on these other employees.

I hope my remarks have made it clear why I cannot support section 504 as written and why I have proposed an amendment which would strike section 504(a).

Summarizing, then, the Committee on Armed Services, for example, has a very great interest in these military missions and in the military personnel involved. The Committee on Appropriations, of course, has an interest in this matter. Yet, the Department of Agriculture has received an exemption; the Committee on Foreign Relations has added an exemption to a number of personnel under its jurisdiction, but has not yet applied the same exemption elsewhere.

So that we are proceeding without regard to the committee system, it seems to me. We are proceeding without regard to the actual needs in accordance with our national security position and without regard to the views of those committees which have not had an opportunity to act or to consider this matter.

Therefore, I hope that my amendment will be adopted. The effect of the amendment will be to prevent the loss of 1,200 employees, many of whom are in vital positions and in positions of extreme importance to the security of the United States.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The other day, in dealing with the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), I covered much of the basic material and information on this subject. I hesitate to take the time of the Senators to repeat it, but I will just cover the highlights.

This is a problem of long standing, going back particularly to the height of the cold war a few years ago. According to the most recent information available to the committee, there are some 26,000 personnel overseas under the jurisdiction of diplomatic mission chiefs. Of this total, State Department personnel engaged in regular department-related activities number 3,409, or about 13 percent.

If to this total are added those carried on the Department rolls as reimbursable personnel, those with duties on behalf of other agencies—that is, the USIA and

May 24, 1972

Approved For Release 2005/01/05 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600110023-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8405

others—the State Department total increases to 5,809. But even with these additional amounts, this total represents only 22 percent of the overall total. What we are talking about here is primarily to bring about a modest reduction in the number of other personnel such as of AID, which has 5,047, and of the Defense Department which has 4,650, excluding members of the Armed Forces of course. Then there are others—USIA, and other agencies—

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. Senator, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does this cut apply to nationals employed by agencies in those foreign countries?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator think it should?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot get even this much through—at least I do not know whether I can get this through—but the Senator can see that opposition to any cut anywhere is quite evident. These MAAG missions have nice positions—very suitable for those wanting an assignment having few duties. For instance, in Costa Rica there is a MAAG mission, even though Costa Rica does not even have an army. But it is a nice climate there for the officers to enjoy. We can find that all over the world. That is all in the world it is. There is no excuse at any time to have them there.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree with the Senator and would like to support his position, and I shall; but what disturbs me in some of these countries is that an American cannot be hired because we have to hire a national instead. The point I make is that in the military installations where the wives of Americans really want employment and need it, they cannot be hired because we have agreements with foreign countries that they have to be nationals who are hired. I am only hoping, and ask whether this cut would apply to nationals being hired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This does not cover army installations.

Mr. PASTORE. I just gave that as an example.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is an example. I have been told that we have an agreement with the Germans to hire only nationals. I do not think that applies to it. However, I am not really informed on that point. I do not think it is, though. But the story I have heard is exactly as the Senator has stated. I think, in Germany, they do have an agreement with the German Government not to allow wives of American soldiers to be employed. But I do not believe that that is the case with the Embassy itself.

Mr. PASTORE. The embassies do hire nationals?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They do, but not really to the extent that the military does.

Mr. PASTORE. I would hope the Senator, at some other point, would give some thought to that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator sees how difficult it is for the committee to recommend any kind of cut at any level.

The main situation here is that we have tried to reduce employment and our presence abroad. We should try to

bring back our personnel. This is a very modest cut in numbers. As I have already told the Senator, the State Department itself has only 13 percent of the overall total. The others are in agencies such as Agriculture, Commerce, HEW, NASA, Export-Import Bank, USIA, and so forth.

Mr. President, I do not want to labor the point. I put these figures in the Record the other day. This is a very modest effort to try to save a little money and, to be frank about it, to reduce the numbers. We believe it in no way will involve the services.

I have had ambassadors tell me that they would be better off if they did not have so many people. I especially remember our former Ambassador to Rome saying that to me. I am reluctant to quote him, but I do not think he will mind. Ambassador Reinhardt said to me, "We have so many people here I would feel better if we had a reduction."

There may have been some excuse for these large missions back in the 1950's, but surely, if the President—and I hope he is as successful as he seems to be—is making progress for reducing tensions in the cold war and trying to establish better relations—this reduction is consistent with that.

Mr. President, I do not believe I need to say much more about it. The issue is clear. It is a simple effort to try to save a little money by reducing nondiplomatic members of diplomatic missions in these countries. It does not affect the military soldiers, and so forth, but only the MAAG missions in many countries, which have no duties of any consequence.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself one additional minute simply to point out that if the argument of the distinguished chairman of the committee were to apply here, it indicates there is no need to have these MAAG missions and no advisory groups in a lot of places all over the world. He cites one, Costa Rica. I suppose that is intended as a sort of reductio ad absurdum which indicates that every country is about the size of Costa Rica, which is far from the fact.

The Senator's argument would better apply if he were to try to do what I suspect he would like to do, and that is to abolish all these programs. It seems to me that he is trying to abolish them piecemeal—to take a little bit of the meat-ax here and another there. Ten percent is an arbitrary figure. I do not know in whose mind it was fostered, but it is not the figure based on any special research. It is one of the figures we take out of the air. It has no special basis except that the Senator does not happen to agree with the programs.

Now, Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I might point out, inasmuch as the Senator makes a point about military aid, that 95 percent of our military assistance goes to 10 countries. We have MAAG missions in 46 countries. At least 36 countries are very marginal; yet we have a substantial number of MAAG missions. I do not

blame the MAAG people or the military. These are nice posts. The social conditions are ideal. They have a minimum of duties to perform. There are good golf courses there and tennis courts. Especially in Latin America, it is very pleasant. It is exactly like the fight we had about the Spanish bases. They would not give up the bases for anything. They have absolutely no use, probably because they are obsolete, but they want to keep the bases. I do not blame the military who want to keep them. But the facts are that here, 95 percent of the military aid goes to 10 countries, and only 5 percent to 36. Yet we have substantial personnel still abroad.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, before yielding time to the Senator from Mississippi, I should like to point out again that what the Senator is really saying is that he does not think much of the programs. I believe that the Armed Services Committee should have something to say about that. I also believe that other Senators should have something to say about it, rather than to have the Foreign Relations Committee simply arbitrarily say, "We do not like the programs. We do not think they amount to much," without providing any proof or any evidence. They say, "we just do not like the whole thing."

He implies they are soft, cushy jobs.

Many of these jobs involve people in frontline activity. Many are undertaken in extremely unpleasant conditions. They are not soft, cushy jobs at all. They are jobs which are representative of the adherence to duty and to country and to devotion to our obligations, which do not deserve the epithets applied to them.

Now I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN).

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I presume that the amendment offered by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee could be complied with without causing serious damage to any of our Government agencies. However, I do not know. In this instance we are called on to vote for many things that we simply do not know about. And I do not believe that we can vote intelligently on new provisions in this legislation.

I would call attention to title VI of this bill which establishes a study commission relating to foreign policy. If we make these decisions for ourselves, assuming that such commission is authorized and is a replica of the earlier Hoover commission, we make the decisions in advance. And I do not see why we would need the commission. However, if we need the commission, I think we should wait until we get the report and the recommendation of that commission before taking steps to do things which perhaps we are not qualified to do without the report and the recommendations of that commission.

I do not say that the proposal of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT),

May 24, 1972

could not be complied with. I presume that it could. However, I do not know. And for that reason I would rather wait until we get more accurate information on just what the effect would be before reporting that part of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum at this time and ask unanimous consent that the time be deducted equally from both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, just to be very quick about this, the provision in the bill would strike 10 percent of all Americans who are employed in foreign countries, we will say, by the Armed Services or the Department of Defense or the CIA.

I do not know the extent of the hearings held on this matter by the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not fully understand why they excepted the Department of State, although there seems to be a special provision in the bill.

My attention was called to this matter a few days ago. We had some work done on it with reference to the CIA. However, I did not understand that this amendment was going to be called up this afternoon. Otherwise I would have been compelled to ask for time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Mississippi yield for a clarification on that point?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.
Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, with respect to the CIA, they are on the State Department payroll, and there are a number of them. They would not be affected. I want to make that clear.

Mr. STENNIS. That is not a large number at all that are involved. That is special, anyway.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that in general those that are connected with an Embassy and not on its payroll are a very small number, I would think.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I say this on my responsibility, I do not believe that any agency of the Government has a cleaner bill of health than the CIA when it comes to civilian employees. Year after year I have personally checked, along with others, under the present Director there has been a steady decrease over the years in the number of civilian employees. At a time when most all of the others were going up year after year these were coming down some.

I just strenuously object here without any hearing or anyone looking into this

matter, and certainly without getting the full picture to putting a provision in an amendment in another bill that arbitrarily cuts it down 10 percent.

I warn against such action. I just do not know what the consequences might be with reference to such a reduction. As I say, I seriously warn against it. I know that this agency has a splendid record.

Now, with regard to the armed services as a whole—and I mentioned this to some of the staff members the other day—I think we will have to ask Congress to give us jurisdiction to set the salaries and the total number of employees here at home as well as abroad. We make a yearly judgment of some kinds as to the number they can employ. But that shows my attitude and willingness to work on it. That would take some time. However, to just come here now in this way is a serious matter. Why not make it 10 percent now or next year some time; or that this must be done regardless of consequences. I have no doubt that we would have to come back if this proposal should become law, and take care of many situations at the very best.

In keeping with all of our rules of the Senate and our customs, what kind of system is it to come in here on an extraneous matter and just reduce by 10-percent employees of this type all over the world? It is not within reason, practice, custom, or within the rules of the Senate.

This is a jumped-up affair with 30 minutes to a side, to argue a matter on which no hearings have been held. There is no record to refer to; there are no estimates from anyone. There is no staff work that has gone into the heart of this matter. These matters are very difficult to get into.

Tomorrow morning first thing on the agenda is an effort to get something before our committee to further reduce the ceiling on our men in the military service. I especially have been working on that myself for the second year. We made those reductions last year, not due just to the Vietnamese drawdown. We made some; they complied, and we are making some more. I will recommend that, first thing in the morning.

But just to come in here now and say "10 percent period" on these civilians overseas is unfair and contrary to the way in which we have always considered matters here.

Mr. President, I have a few prepared remarks with reference to the CIA. I am not saying that some reduction could not be made, although in spite of these close examinations, we have not had any inclination to make a recommendation. The way these matters are handled now, we have not made recommendations in the last few years. Jurisdiction is exclusively within this committee, just as the Committee on Foreign Relations has its exclusive jurisdiction, and this matter has been looked after.

I think that with just as much reason one could say 15 percent or 5 percent, as far as the basis for the consideration. I would like to ask the Senator from Arkansas what reason the Senator applied to the CIA, or all the rest of

them, that have the same level of 10 percent? What was the logic behind using 10 percent for all of them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite wrong in saying it is 10 percent for each of them. It was an overall cut. For the Senator's information, I have already stated the major agency involved is AID with 5,047. These are people administering the AID program, which I know the Senator is now very fond of; he did not used to be such an avid supporter of foreign aid, but he is now. That is the No. 1 agency.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will pardon me, the Senator is using my time. I would like to finish my statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield to the Senator on my time if he will permit me to comment on what he said about hearings.

Mr. STENNIS. On the Senator's time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We had extensive hearings on the question of personnel in our foreign establishment. I beg to differ with the Senator that this is not under the Department of State or the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator's committee does not have jurisdiction over aid—military aid—except in Vietnam and Laos. The major part of it is not under the Senator's committee. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations to deal with aid, both military and economic. The No. 1 agency, of course, that would be affected by this is the foreign aid program.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield, I was not making a point about the foreign aid program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said there was no jurisdiction here. We are not affecting military people in the Armed Forces. We are affecting those assigned to the embassies, and they are under the jurisdiction of the Department of State and not the Department of Defense. They are there and they are cluttering up many of these embassies where there are minimum military programs; 95 percent of all military aid goes to 10 countries, yet you have these MAAG's in 46 countries. Look at a country like Iran with 247 military attachés, because it is a very nice place to be. We have no military activities there ourselves. It is a relatively peaceful and quiet place. There is no excuse for that kind of overstaffing.

Mr. STENNIS. Did the Senator make an estimate of how many would be reduced in Iran?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not by category. It was a very modest 10-percent reduction and the administration does not have to take any out of Iran if it does not want to. It can take that entire cut out of AID if the administration wants to.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator have any hearings, any record, or estimate as to how many should be reduced in Paris, London, Frankfurt, or any other place? Are there any facts the Senator can stand on except this generalization?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We do not here say that there has to be a reduction of 224 from Iran. We feel the President should

have some discretion. A great many of these places are overstaffed with Americans at great expense to the American taxpayer and they are rendering no essential services. The AID program is the largest one and second are the military attachés at embassies around the world where there is nothing critical going on.

Take places like the Philippines, Taiwan, and in Paraguay. I imagine 10 military people there. It is a nice country that has not been to war in I do not know how many decades. It is isolated in South America. I do not know what you have so many military people there for. I would say 10 percent would be minimal there. It probably should be much higher, but this discretion is left in the hands of the administration. If I were to put it the other way the Senator would say that I am tying the hands of the administration. We say it is an overall cut and it does not have to come from any one country or agency.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield with respect to Paraguay for a brief observation?

Paraguay had one of the worst wars in the history of the century, and it may be the reason they have not had one for several decades is the presence of American advisers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's view that we should pay for keeping peace in Paraguay; that we are keeping this mission up to maintain peace in Paraguay? That never has been put up before. I thought it was supposed to be in the interest of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not mind the Senator oversimplifying himself, but I would not want him to oversimplify my position.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield my remaining time to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit again to the membership—and may I please have their attention—the fact here is that there are no basic figures. No hearings went into this matter. No estimate was made as to by how many it should be reduced. Therefore, I say the 10 percent is an arbitrary figure.

We have many people employed by the CIA—I just thought I should bring this out if we are going to have it understood—that are so-called undercover employees. I am referring to the CIA. Do we want to stop that? I do not believe we do. Although I do not really believe it needs to be reduced, if it does, management being human like anyone else, it needs to be done after the facts are known, not before they are known. Who can say on the floor now, without any scintilla of evidence, that at least 10 percent of all the undercover men employed by the CIA should be taken off? I do not believe anyone can say it. It just shows what we are going into.

On these MAAG programs, if there is one employee there who is not needed, that is one too many in my book, and I do not want that employee paid. I am not trying to protect any of them, but I warn you now that this is a very serious matter. I know that to carry out this provision would seriously impair some of the most delicate and important work going on in the Department I am talking about, and I know of other matters it would impair within the military. That is about all I can say under the law.

I do not believe the Senate really wants to act without some of the facts before they really accept the story that is involved in this amendment. I have already said I am willing to do anything I can, on a scale much broader than this, that will bring about an annual accounting and responsibility for civilian employees employed by the military, whether they are abroad or here at home, and I would be willing to have the right kind of survey made of the CIA. They are not immune. It just has to be handled somewhat differently.

I shudder at what I call arbitrary action as to the Central Intelligence Agency, not based upon fact, but based upon someone's fancy. It does not even rise to the dignity of being an estimate. There is not even an estimate here that 10 percent could be cut from this group.

So I submit this matter on the facts to those who are here, and on the unproven facts of those who are sponsoring this reduction. I hope the Senate will vote for the amendment merely to stop it until there is a further look and an estimate can be made.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

With regard to the evidence, of course Senators have not had time, nor really any reason, to read the hearings, but the hearings are 834 pages long. Much of it is taken up with this matter. There are pages giving country-by-country employment, with numbers, and so forth.

I ask unanimous consent that pages 8 and 9 of the report be reproduced in the Record for the information of the Senate.

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

NUMBER OF CIVILIAN AGENCY PERSONNEL OVERSEAS UNDER JURISDICTION OF DIPLOMATIC MISSION CHIEFS, DEC. 31, 1971 (ACTUAL EMPLOYMENT)

	State												AID	
	Total, all agencies		Total		Direct		Reimbursable		Direct hire including PASA		Contract		United States	Foreign
	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign		
Africa.....	5,141	3,523	867	1,495	490	675	377	820	545	656	391	168		
Near East, South Asia.....	2,747	5,707	934	2,226	431	707	503	1,519	398	1,296	173	448		
East Asia, Pacific.....	6,007	10,963	1,181	2,099	604	853	577	1,216	2,086	3,486	412	2,476		
Latin American Republics.....	5,168	5,097	1,136	1,808	670	879	466	929	692	1,193	338	632		
Europe.....	2,751	4,906	1,691	2,864	1,214	1,722	477	1,142	12	1				
Total.....	21,814	30,196	5,809	10,492	3,409	4,866	2,400	5,626	3,733	6,632	1,314	3,742		

	Peace Corps												Agriculture	
	USIA		Staffs		Contract		Contract		Staffs		Contract		United States	Foreign
	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	Volunteers	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States		
Africa.....	152	613	100	86	2,946	21	137	13	7	2				
Near East, South Asia.....	199	1,433	72	41	913	8	192	15	31	1				
East Asia, Pacific.....	277	1,582	50	65	1,747	25	127	26	27					
Latin American Republics.....	220	672	89	117	2,373	22	89	59	211	5				
Europe.....	221	909			6			72	76	15				
Total.....	1,069	5,209	311	309	7,985	76	545	185	352	23	117			

	HEW												NASA	
	Commerce		Staffs		Contract		Justice		Staff		Contract		United States	Foreign
	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign		
Africa.....			5		6		1		2				85	351
Near East, South Asia.....		2		9	3	10	25	2						
East Asia, Pacific.....	6	22	1		2	1	46	11	1				659	
Latin American Republics.....	19	16		10	2	13	84	2	3				91	317
Europe.....	29	60	3	36	18	52	135	18	13	1			311	529
Total.....	54	100	11	55	31	76	291	33	19	1	488	1,856		

May 24, 1972

NUMBER OF CIVILIAN AGENCY PERSONNEL OVERSEAS UNDER JURISDICTION OF DIPLOMATIC MISSION CHIEFS, DEC. 31, 1971 (ACTUAL EMPLOYMENT)—Continued

	Transportation			Treasury		ABNC/AEC EPA/Ex. Im.		GSA/HUD	Int./Labor	NSF/Smith. TVA/VA	
	CG military	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign	United States	Foreign
Africa.....		2				2	10			1	
Near East, South Asia.....		3	1	3	1						
East Asia, Pacific.....	25	40	7	31	26	11	45	14	4	25	277
Latin American Republics.....		10	10	21	2	2	2				
Europe.....	3	71	10	93	10	47	292	7		4	
Total.....	28	126	28	148	37	62	349	21	4	30	277

¹ Excludes staffs of the Department of Defense and other elements, public disclosure of which is prohibited.

² Includes short-term contract workers.

Source: Department of State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are two pages giving the number of civilian agency personnel overseas under jurisdiction of diplomatic mission chiefs as of December 31, 1971, and the actual employment agency-by-agency.

The Senator says there is no evidence; that there is nothing on it at all. This is about as complete as one can get.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table of those employees in embassies who are reimbursable by agencies, which are not affected by the provisions of this bill. I ask

that it be inserted in the RECORD simply to show the detail with which this matter has been studied.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

REIMBURSEMENTS TO THE SALARIES AND EXPENSES APPROPRIATION

The salaries and Expenses Appropriation is reimbursed each year for a variety of services provided to other U.S. Government departments and agencies overseas and in Washington. The principal service is the provision of administrative support for U.S.

Government programs at Foreign Service posts. Departmental staffs and facilities are available to meet such common administrative requirements as personnel services, accounting and fiscal services, motor pool, maintenance of office and residential space, pouch and communications facilities, and security services. Costs of these services are shared by all participating agencies in accordance with the degree of participation at each foreign service post. The procedures and methods for determining total costs and the amount to be reimbursed by each agency were developed jointly with the major participating agencies and is accepted by all agencies as the basis for reimbursement.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE—REIMBURSEMENTS TO THE SALARIES AND EXPENSES APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEAR 1971, SUMMARY

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Reimbursement source	Positions		Amounts	Reimbursement source	Positions		Amounts
	Americans	Locals			Americans	Locals	
Agency for International Development.....	678	1,128	\$22,446	Other State appropriations—Continued			
Agriculture.....	29	84	1,444	Acquisition and construction of foreign buildings.....	45	905	\$7,005
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	58	2	1,720	Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act.....	52	1	1,080
Commerce.....	23	37	990	Peace Corps.....	84	239	3,450
Defense Intelligence Agency.....	29	469	8,453	Section 637b, Foreign Assistance Act.....	116	48	3,967
Military assistance advisory groups.....	71	284	3,632	U.S. Information Agency.....	402	1,314	20,281
Other military departments.....	68	263	5,508	Miscellaneous agencies.....	1,858	1,057	61,428
Other State appropriations:				Total.....	3,546	5,831	142,841
Contributions to international organizations.....	33		1,427				

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this table shows that the major part of the people employed for the CIA in miscellaneous agencies will not be affected by the provision in the bill.

These are persons on a reimbursable basis who will not be affected.

So this provision does not cut out everybody. As I have said, there is flexibility left in the administration to apply the cut where they think it will be most appropriate. I think that is the best way it could be approached by the committee.

The simple question is whether or not we wish to maintain this overblown establishment which has grown up in a period of warfare and crisis and time when we were not so stringently involved in deficits both domestic and international. So it is a very simple proposition. I submit it is in the interest of the country to attempt this modest reduction more in accordance with our capacity and more in accordance with the needs of the foreign countries in which we have these establishments.

Mr. SCOTT and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield my remaining 3 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this reduction expressly exempts the Department of State, and then there is a proviso in another section that relates to and mentions the Department of State, but my information is that it does not make much difference to the Department of State, according to the way this provision is written. We just do not know. It is another illustration of just how uncertain this provision is.

Going back to the CIA for a minute, I emphasize that while I cannot go into exact numbers, it is a fact that the CIA has already reduced its overseas employees by about 20 percent since 1967. I ask Senators to listen to this. These are facts. I mentioned awhile ago that we have reduced those numbers, but I did not have the figures in my hand that I do now. There has been a systematic year-by-year reduction that I knew about when it was happening, as did the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young). It has been a 20-percent reduction in the last 5 years, since 1967. What other agency can say that? Most of them have been going up.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, briefly.

Mr. YOUNG. This reduction would adversely effect the CIA. During this same period the CIA has been assigned additional problems and programs some of which I am not free to discuss. I may say at this time that the CIA has been far more accurate in analyzing the situation in Southeast Asia than has any other intelligence agency.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

I want time to make this point. I ask for attention. Any further reduction beyond this 20 percent would, in my judgment, seriously impair programs that are vital to our national security, such as the maintenance of the worldwide communications network. There have been no hearings on that. No one can challenge these statements about the reductions that I cite as a matter of fact. I give my judgment as to what could be the consequences to the worldwide communications network. That is not just a term. That is something that is relied on every hour of every day and every night. The President of the United States, now in conference in Moscow, relies on information coming through that network.

So let us stay our hand here until the facts are better known.

I yield back such time as I have.

May 24, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, if that is satisfactory to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, just 1 minute for a comment here. I do not wish to leave the record as if I did not know better than that this would not affect the CIA operations in Laos or elsewhere. They do not run those big operations under the embassies. This affects only those personnel assigned to the diplomatic missions, and most of them are not any such thing. They operate Air America in Laos, for example, and everything else, completely outside, you might say, the umbrella of the embassy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does affect initial assignments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those assigned on a reimbursable basis to the embassy are not affected. They are exempt.

There are 1,858 Americans in miscellaneous agencies, a number of which I am quite sure are not affected whatever. It does not affect the National Security Agency. These are nonintelligence agencies.

All I want to do is set the record straight, that I am not agreeing, by my silence, with these statements of the Senator from Mississippi that we do not know anything about it, that we had no hearings, and that there is no basis whatever for this provision. This matter has been discussed for several years, and we have had many pages of record. Our hearings run to 800 pages, and much of that is concerned with overstaffing of the agencies.

This is the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not blame the Senator from Mississippi; there is no reason for his committee to go into the staffing of an embassy. It is not his business, and the fact that he is surprised by this and was not aware of it is not surprising. There are a lot of things that come out of other committees that I am not aware of, either, until they come to the Senate floor.

The fact that the Senator has not dealt with it does not mean that the committee has not dealt with it in depth and I think the evidence is here. I wanted to put the record straight on that matter. I have cited a few of these figures. I could cite a number of them, but I think anyone would admit that we have too many people in some of these MAC missions. However, the main matter, I would assume, which is left to the administration, would be the AID missions.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi. Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Director Helms to me dated May 18, in which he said:

After reviewing the implications of this provision, I have concluded that it would seriously impair the effectiveness of this Agency in carrying out certain programs having a vital bearing on the national security.

Now, if that means anything, and it means something to me and I believe to every one of us familiar with these oper-

ations, I am saying we are trifling in the dark here with our national security.

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

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1972.

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to tell you of my very serious concern over certain provisions of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972 (S. 3526) which is now pending before the Senate. Section 504 (a) of this legislation imposes a ten percent reduction, by 30 June 1973, in the total number of Executive Branch personnel (other than those of the State Department, certain military categories, and the Peace Corps) serving overseas.

After reviewing the implications of this provision, I have concluded that it would seriously impair the effectiveness of this Agency in carrying out certain programs having a vital bearing on the national security. As you are aware, this Agency has in recent years undergone significant reductions in both money and manpower. In fact, since 1967 there has been a reduction of some 20 percent in Agency overseas positions affected by this provision, with no reduction in our increasing responsibilities and commitments, many of which are in support of other Federal agencies.

In these circumstances, and in view of the present world situation bearing on U.S. national security, I urgently request your assistance in securing for this Agency an exemption from Section 504(a) of S. 3526.

Respectfully,

RICHARD HELMS,
Director.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me say once more, this does not require the President to cut one single man out of the CIA. The only reason in the world why he would do that would be if the President, in his judgment, said these are surplus. It does not require one single man or woman be taken out of the military attaché offices.

I only cite these as examples which the President has the flexibility and the discretion to apply the cut to. I assume the larger share of the cut would be in the AID missions, because that program has been cut back, not as drastically as it ought to be, but it has been cut back. That has been the trend for a number of years.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Would he except the CIA?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want the RECORD to indicate that I understood this would do what the Senator from Mississippi says it would. It would not do it. It would require the President's judgment.

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator except the CIA?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surely if the Senator thinks that is important.

Mr. STENNIS. Well, we have prepared an amendment here that would do that, and I ask the Senator to support it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I accept it, and I ask unanimous consent to—well, I cannot do that, because it is the Senator's amendment. I would not mind doing it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I do not have any time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from Mississippi will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I will accept the exemption for the CIA, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will.

Mr. SCOTT. No, I do not think that is the way to do it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, section 504 of S. 3526 requires a 10-percent reduction in the number of Federal civilian employees in foreign countries. Specifically excluded from this cutback are State Department employees, Peace Corps volunteers and leaders, and other Federal employees who are assigned to the Department of State on a reimbursable basis. The cutback will apply against overseas strength as of July 1, 1972, and must be attained by June 30, 1973.

The figures provided in the committee report—page 98—indicate that the total number of personnel under the jurisdiction of diplomatic mission chiefs amount to 26,000. With the exclusion of State employees, reimbursables carried on State's roles, and volunteers from the Peace Corps, to which the cutback does not apply, some 11,800 personnel are subject to the cut. This means that approximately 1,200 positions will have to be cut before June 30, 1973.

The personnel subject to the cut would come from a number of executive agencies and departments such as Justice, Agriculture, Commerce, HEW, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the Export-Import Bank and others. I am not personally familiar with many of the programs which would be affected but I do know that the Department of Justice has slightly over 300 officials overseas connected with law enforcement, including drug control activities, and with the Department's Immigration and Naturalization Service. I would seriously question the merit of taking cuts in these activities.

Rather than the indiscriminate reduction that would be mandated by section 504, I think the more proper and orderly approach would be for the committees having substantive jurisdiction over the various overseas programs to examine their programs for excess fat and make cutbacks where indicated.

Accordingly, I strongly support Senator Scott's amendment which will strike the indiscriminate cut contained in section 504.

I have two additional problems with this section and they both stem from the fact that overseas personnel of the Department of Agriculture would be included.

First, I question the economic wisdom of cutting back the overseas work force of a segment of the economy that contributes almost one-fifth of the country's total exports, and consistently makes a net favorable contribution to the balance of trade and the balance of payments.

Agricultural exports last fiscal year totaled \$7.8 billion, going to more than 150 countries. In this situation, the total American personnel ceiling for USDA overseas is 203 persons, 43 of these people are officers protecting the American consumers from import into the United States of food products that do not meet

May 24, 1972

U.S. standards for purity and wholesomeness. They protect U.S. agriculture and food economy from the introduction of diseases and pests that do not exist in this country and would cause untold damage to our plants and animals should they gain a foothold here. If you cut this area you take your chances on African Swine Fever and dirty food.

There are 138 people engaged in market development, negotiations to lower and remove trade barriers, reporting on market opportunities and competitive situations throughout the world. These people spearhead export expansion programs that have helped to increase U.S. farm exports to record levels of \$7.8 billion.

That brings me to the second difficulty with this bill. Is the authorization for the State Department and the USIA the place for this body to reduce the number of employees of the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Justice?

If it is, indeed, necessary to decide whether to eliminate some positions in agricultural market development and in U.S. consumer import protection, then it seems to me it should be done in the context of agriculture and consumer affairs rather than foreign affairs. The same holds true for all other Federal agencies and programs not specifically included within the scope of S. 3526.

I hope this amendment will be approved.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time which I do not have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STAFFORD). All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) is paired with

the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON).

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote, "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 186 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken	Dominick	Schweiker
Allen	Edwards	Scott
Allott	Ervin	Smith
Baker	Fannin	Sparkman
Beall	Griffin	Stafford
Bennett	Gurney	Stennis
Bentsen	Hollings	Stevens
Boggs	Hruska	Taft
Brook	Jackson	Thurmond
Buckley	McIntyre	Tower
Cotton	Miller	Weicker
Curtis	Packwood	Young
Dole	Saxbe	

NAYS—32

Bible	Fulbright	Nelson
Burdick	Hart	Pastore
Byrd	Hughes	Pell
Harry F. Jr.	Inouye	Proxmire
Byrd, Robert C.	Javits	Randolph
Cannon	Magnuson	Roth
Case	Mansfield	Spong
Chiles	Metcalf	Symington
Cooper	Mondale	Talmadge
Cranston	Montoya	Tunney
Eagleton	Muskie	Williams

NOT VOTING—30

Anderson	Gravel	Mathias
Bayh	Hansen	McClellan
Bellmon	Harris	McGee
Brooke	Hartke	McGovern
Church	Hatfield	Moss
Cook	Humphrey	Mundt
Eastland	Jordan, N.C.	Pearson
Fong	Jordan, Idaho	Percy
Gambrell	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Goldwater	Long	Stevenson

So Mr. SCOTT's amendment (No. 1203) was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up the amendment I have sent to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEY). That will take unanimous consent because the question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Sen-

ator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), No. 1200.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I do hope that this unanimous consent will be granted. It has to do with narcotics and it is very important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be in order and that the time be limited to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my understanding is that there will be no rollcall votes, although I cannot fully guarantee it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think there will be any need for a rollcall vote. I will explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How will the time be divided?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, no one is in opposition to this amendment that I know of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Give it to the minority leader.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that the 10 minutes time be equally divided between the distinguished minority leader and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment as follows:

S. 3526

On page 32, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

SEC. 507. Chapter 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to international narcotics control, is amended by striking out section 481 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 481. INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL.—It is the sense of the Congress that effective international cooperation is necessary to put an end to the illicit production, smuggling, trafficking in, and abuse of dangerous drugs. In order to promote such cooperation, the President is authorized to conclude agreements with other countries to facilitate control of the production, processing, transportation, and distribution of narcotic analgesics, including opium and its derivatives, other narcotic drugs and psychotropics, and other controlled substances as defined in the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-513). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized to furnish assistance to any country or international organization, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for the control of the production of, processing of, smuggling of, and traffic in, narcotic and psychotropic drugs. The President shall suspend economic and military assistance furnished under this or any other Act, and shall suspend sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act and under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to any country when the President determines that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances (as defined by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlaw-

CC: CA
OPP B

S 8465

May 25, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

amendment deals with the problem of fishermen, primarily the fishermen on the west coast.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement I made when I submitted this amendment, so that it can be understood in context by the people who will be reviewing this RECORD on the other side.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill and submitting an amendment to another bill designed to assist Alaska fishermen who are faced with economic ruin as the result of restrictions imposed upon them in their domestic commercial fishing by prohibitive Federal or State restrictions.

The bill I am introducing today authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to purchase these fish from any legal entity which first, owns fishing equipment; and second, engages in domestic fishing as its usual occupation. The catches of fish which may be purchased are those which the owner is prevented from selling by restrictions related to a deterioration in the quality of the aquatic environment which were imposed on or after January 1, 1971 by any State or Federal agency and which, in the judgment of the Secretary, impair the economic feasibility of any type of domestic fishing.

The Secretary is authorized to buy such fish at the fair market price in the area at the time of purchase. The "fair market price" is a term of art widely used in the law and easily determinable. Such fair market price must be evaluated in the specific locality, that is the specific town or city at which the catch is sold. The price must be determined as of the specific date of sale. Thus defined, these terms will provide the Secretary with practical guidelines for enforcement.

The total amount of such purchases in any calendar year from any one eligible owner may not exceed 50 percent of its gross earnings from domestic fishing operations. The Secretary is then authorized to dispose of these fish in any legal manner he deems appropriate. Any such purchase must be subject to the condition that the eligible owner assign to the Secretary any right he may have to recover damages for the act or omission resulting in the imposition of such Federal or State restrictions. The Secretary is also empowered to prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Finally, amounts not to exceed \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 1973 and \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1974 are authorized.

Mr. President, this bill is specifically designed to alleviate a problem facing many small fishermen in southeast Alaska. It is the result of mercury pollution levels found in halibut by the Food and Drug Administration. This finding has resulted in a determination that halibut above a certain size may be dangerous and unfit for human consumption. Because of this finding, the industry has been unable to sell halibut over a certain size, such size varying depending upon the area of the ocean in which the halibut was caught. This problem has had devastating economic effects throughout southeast Alaska.

On October 8, 1971, the Subcommittee on Oceans and Atmosphere of the Senate Commerce Committee held hearings in Petersburg, Alaska, on this subject. At these hearings, the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and I were present. A large number of representatives from various fishing groups and governmental agencies were also present and testified before us. A report of these hearings is contained in report No.

92-41, which has just recently been printed. I believe that the need for this legislation is amply demonstrated by the testimony of the many witnesses who appeared and described in detail their personal accounts of the economic devastation they face as a result of this FDA determination.

For example, the situation facing the Petersburg Cold Storage Co. is typical. The Petersburg Cold Storage Co. is owned by 170 individual shareholders. It serves one of the small southeast Alaska towns which is directly affected. It was founded in 1926 by a local group of fishermen and merchants handling fish products, primarily halibut. It has operated successfully and has produced roughly 125,000,000 pounds of halibut, a yearly average of 3,000,000 pounds. Yearly ranges have been from 1 to 5 million pounds. The replacement value of the plant alone is \$1,500,000 and it has an insurable depreciated value of \$1,029,000. It employs 20 to 60 people per season. The average employment for a 12-month period is 28. The annual payroll runs about \$400,000. Normally, they would have 20 to 30 halibut vessels outfitting in Petersburg at times other than the normal seining season. However, as a result of the mercury pollution level, last year only two vessels fished for halibut in the area immediately surrounding Petersburg. In a pool of 13 fishermen in nearby Kake, Alaska, in 1971 not a single fisherman indicated he felt he could economically fish for halibut, given the present restrictions. The same fishermen indicated that they felt that they did not believe that they would be able to fish in 1972 either.

Of course, solutions other than this bill are also being sought. However, even though it is not at all certain that a level as low as 0.5 part per million is necessary or even practical, I believe that one solution that must be considered is embodied in this bill. I urge that my colleagues give it their most serious attention.

Mr. President, the amendment I am introducing today attempts yet another solution to this problem. This amendment is identical to S. 875, a bill I introduced a little over a year ago. This amendment would provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as the result of prohibitive Federal or State restrictions imposed on domestic commercial fishing. It would also authorize grants from the Secretary of Commerce to enable any eligible owner to meet the usual business expenses he was prevented from meeting as a result of these restrictions. Under the bill, if a fisherman accepts reimbursement, he automatically authorizes the Federal Government to file suit in his behalf against those who polluted the waters. Any amount collected in excess of the initial reimbursement and court costs would be turned over to the aggrieved fisherman by the Government which initiated the suit. Although it is reasonable to expect this method of reimbursement will ultimately be self-supporting, such a status will probably not be achieved for several years. Accordingly, my amendment appropriates \$4 million for operation of the program during the first year and \$5 million for each of the 4 succeeding years.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask my good friend and neighbor, the Senator from Washington, whether he has reviewed this amendment and if it is acceptable to him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I stated earlier, I have. I am sure that Senator SPONGE, Senator HATFIELD, who has handled some of these hearings, and I will accept the amendment at this time; because I say again that it is germane to this bill. It does not deal with our international problems with Ecuador and Peru, but it is germane to the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. I am indebted to the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have not exercised the parliamentary privilege of moving to reconsider. I do not think we will have to do that, but I do want it open so that if other Senators wish to discuss it a little or perhaps wish to move to reconsider and then discuss it, they will be able to do so. But I am almost positive that there will be no problem about these two amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be laid aside temporarily, that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate at this time, and that the Chair recognize the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1201

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the pending business is the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk read as follows: On page 26, line 15, strike out all of section 205.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a time limitation of 1 hour for debate. Who yields time?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, on my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may utilize.

Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment to strike a section of the bill S. 3526 which I believe is unwise and goes far beyond either the intent or the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. It is a provision which would

S 8466

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 25, 1972

prevent the U.S. Government from providing any assistance to foreign governments in the field of information. It applies to all Government agencies, prohibiting any of them from directly or indirectly preparing or assisting in preparing for dissemination, or disseminating, information of any kind for, on behalf of, or in the name of a foreign government.

The committee was apparently concerned about the activities of the U.S. Information Agency in Southeast Asia. These activities were begun during previous administrations. USIA assisted the information services of the governments of the Indochinese States and Thailand. But the Agency has testified that they have discontinued this effort and that present USIA policy is that such activities should be the responsibility of the governments concerned. To the extent that the bill is directed against USIA operations in Southeast Asia, it addresses a situation which no longer exists.

However, it will have an adverse impact on other agencies and activities which promote American domestic and foreign interests and which should be continued. Since World War II our Government has provided information assistance to foreign governments as a constructive and relatively inexpensive part of foreign policy. In addition, of course, it has served our own domestic policy interests when other governments were in a position to communicate to their people matters about which our Government was concerned, or which were matters of international policy, such as the current efforts on narcotics control and ecology.

In post war Europe we provided advice and, in some cases, media materials to governments which received Marshall plan aid and which supported our foreign policy objectives. Following the Marshall plan period, the United States on occasion responded to requests of a small number of developing nations for assistance with their own information program. This assistance was carefully tailored to provide support for our overall foreign policy goals and was designed to encourage a stable and peaceful political evolution. It was provided only for limited periods of time and for limited objectives.

The sweeping language of section 205 would either prohibit or seriously impair the further dissemination of information which is now routinely passed between Federal agencies and foreign public and private agencies to serve mutual interests in such fields as welfare, commerce, and security. In reaching well beyond the intent of the original Informational and Cultural Exchange Act, section 205 would prohibit or impair the further dissemination of information dealing with the following areas of concern to our Government, both domestically and as they relate to foreign policy:

A. NARCOTICS

Section 205 would prohibit dissemination of information to foreign public agencies for further dissemination of information concerning detection, controls, seizures, and prosecutions which have a direct impact on our domestic drug prob-

lem. Foreign narcotics control activities such as the preparation of training materials based on United States-supplied information for use in police antidrug divisions, would be seriously hampered. Further, Federal agencies would be prohibited from disseminating information received from a foreign country for the purpose of apprehending or extraditing for that foreign country a fugitive drug pusher who has sought refuge in the United States. It would seem that such a prohibition would also be contrary to treaty obligations.

B. FAMILY PLANNING

Section 205 would also prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign public agencies and impair the use of information by foreign private agencies concerning methods to achieve planned population growth and advanced methods of curtailing uncontrolled birth rates.

C. POLICE MATTERS

Section 205 would prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign police agencies for further dissemination concerning international crimes and criminals, extradition matters, and law enforcement techniques. Such prohibition would also appear to be an abrogation of U.S. treaty responsibilities.

D. ECOLOGY

Section 205 would prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign public agencies for further dissemination concerning violations of environmental protective agreements, management of natural resources development, and techniques to help minimize or redress ecological damage.

E. EDUCATION, INCLUDING PEACE CORPS CONTRIBUTIONS

Section 205 would prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign public agencies for further dissemination and impair the dissemination of information to foreign private agencies which are designed to improve the effectiveness of educational systems.

F. HEALTH

Section 205 would prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign public agencies for further dissemination concerning international health problems, epidemics, and other indigenous health problems in foreign countries, and the overall use and development of medicines and techniques in improving the health of populations.

G. COMMERCE

Section 205 would prohibit the U.S. Travel Service from providing information to foreign public agencies and impair its effectiveness with foreign private agencies for the further dissemination of information, materials, texts, and photos designed to encourage travel to the United States.

There are many other illustrations falling into such areas as disarmament goals, atomic energy, military aid, insurgency, agricultural affairs, international money matters, and international law, which could also be affected by this provision.

I doubt very much that the sweeping language used in section 205 would have been favorably reported by the Senate

Foreign Relations Committee had the points I have touched upon been covered in hearings before that committee when this legislation was being considered. I am unaware of the depth of the committee's hearings on this matter.

Clearly, section 205 goes beyond the scope of S. 3526, which I understand to be an authorization measure for the Department of State, USIA, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Peace Corps. Moreover, the ramifications of section 205, as I have illustrated, are clearly outside the purview of the Information and Educational Exchange Act.

In addition to the above, this bill would have one other undesirable result. The second section requires attribution by the particular Government agency of any product it disseminates overseas. I have already indicated how this requirement could impair the effectiveness of our Government's cooperation with foreign private agencies on matters concerning our commerce, health, and welfare.

The requirement that attribution be placed at the beginning of the material would seriously diminish the effectiveness of materials which this Government might want to have distributed abroad and would require new printing of those which we do attribute, either by a specific Government agency or the U.S. Government in general, either at the beginning or the end of the document. The bill would apply to all material distributed, including copies of historical documents, political science tracts, information about law enforcement, international police work, ecology, health and population control, and travel service promotion. These are things which obviously the U.S. Government has no interest in hiding, but whether the specific attribution may be printed in the right place or say exactly the right thing and can be accomplished within the time established in this bill, which would be the time of passage, is difficult to ascertain and it could result in unnecessary and unwarranted expense to the Treasury.

In one special respect this provision could have a most undesirable effect on USIA's operations. USIA assists foreign television producers who want to come to the United States and make films about our country. The Agency lends its studios, provides stock footage as desired, and facilitates travel, interviews, and filming by the foreign television crews. Many of these products are valuable in correcting distortions about life in the United States which are so prevalent abroad.

Mr. President, as evidence of the distortions and a description of some of the work USIA is doing to correct them, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the series by Mr. Merrill Panitt, editor of TV Guide, which recently appeared in that publication.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE). Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, Mr. Panitt's analysis is startling, but that his report is all too true is confirmed by any

May 25, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

of us who have had an opportunity to see how our Nation is represented on television screens in other countries. I think we would all agree, indeed foreign visitors to the United States do agree, that the best remedy for some of the false impressions people overseas have about our country is to expose more of the broad reality of life here to television viewers abroad. That is what USIA, with its programs of facilitative assistance to foreign television producers, is trying to do. The problem posed by this bill, however, arises from the fact that in most instances foreign television networks are Government owned and Government operated. If the bill passes with this restrictive provision, a question could be raised whether USIA would be able to continue to give the foreign government television networks the help that they request from the Agency.

Mr. President, it is for these reasons that I offered the pending amendment.

At this time, I reserve the remainder of my time.

EXHIBIT 1

WITH FRIENDS LIKE THESE—ON TELEVISION,
SOME OF AMERICA'S TRADITIONAL ALLIES DO
NOT ALWAYS ACT THE PART

(By Merrill Panitt)

There used to be a catchy headline in an advertisement for a halitosis remedy. "Even your best friends won't tell you!"

Our best friends, the Belgians, the English and the French, aren't a bit bashful. They tell us. Often. On television.

Usually, they tell us by running news films or public-affairs programs, from American networks, that dwell on our problems. Sometimes it's a matter of giving air time to American dissidents such as James Baldwin, Norman Mailer, Stokely Carmichael and Abbie Hoffman. Occasionally they send their own camera crews to the United States to cover a big news story—such as the Attica prison riot.

Whatever is wrong with us, we don't keep it a secret. And our friends are only too willing to pass our troubles along to their viewers.

We asked David Attenborough, director of programming for the British Broadcasting Corporation, whether he thought Americans were paranoid about being criticized on European television.

"I don't think you're paranoid at all," he said. "What we're dealing with is a problem which is a universal problem. It faces us about every country and every activity you can think of." Whereupon he related the complaints of British industrialists and trade unionists who told him that the BBC was "grossly distorting" the situation of labor relations because it only reported strikes and strike threats.

"It seems to me," he said, "that television's job is not to report the average, but to report the significant. It is particularly important to us in the country to report the significant in the United States. Partly because we are so close, but partly because, as that article says [TV Guide, "Through a Glass—Very Darkly," by Robert Musel, Oct. 2, 1971], what is happening today in the United States is going to happen in five years' time in this country."

"I don't know whether it's true or not, but we do reflect a great deal of what happens in the United States. Certainly if you look over the past few years, many of the things that have happened—the student movement, the drug situation—both of these were seen earlier in the United States than here. Hippies, the love generation. I knew about them first from reports from America."

"Of course we report racial troubles. Of course we report student troubles. Of course

we report Vietnam. But if that's all we reported, then you would have a real cause for complaint."

"But what do we see of America? What we see overwhelmingly is Apollo. We've devoted a tremendous amount of time to Apollo flights and Houston and we've gained knowledge of the way Americans indulge in bad image and small talk but organize themselves technologically. Last night we had a program on the 6th Fleet. It seemed to me to demonstrate America's concern and responsibility and how much money you are spending on NATO. We also see a great deal of America on the fringes—things like The Mary Tyler Moore Show represent a certain aspiration in the American character. So does Ironside. All these things together form an amalgam."

All of what Attenborough says is true, of course, but then there's no way to avoid covering an Apollo flight, to avoid giving viewers the sight of men walking on the moon. And NATO is very much Britain's business too, so it behooves BBC to tell its audience what's going on in the Mediterranean east of Gibraltar. There is also some question as to whether Mary Tyler Moore's appealing smile and Raymond Burr's ability to stare down a criminal outweigh the damage wrought by giving American dissidents television time and free rein—and a great deal of encouragement—to attack the basic structure of American society.

After Robert Musel's Oct. 2 article appeared in these pages, BBC used it as the subject of a television panel discussion during which it was brought out that critical programs on such subjects as American unemployment, pollution, sex and marriage, draft evasion, black power and student disorders, all within a period of a few months, did indeed give Americans the impression that British television was slightly biased against them.

Still, said Attenborough, "I and my colleagues, and I believe a great number of British people have profound admiration for the way in which America not only talks about freedom of speech and freedom of reporting, but actually sticks to it. And even when—the going is tough—as it certainly has been during the past two or three years, you say, 'Look, we meant it. We meant that reporting during the Vietnam war is free and open as far as is humanly possible.' And there are very few other countries—as I know personally to my cost—where you can say that."

As elsewhere in Europe, television in Britain, especially news and public-affairs departments, is populated largely by young, left-leaning intellectuals who somehow feel it is their mission to denigrate the American civilization. They scoff at American "materialism"—while in Britain, as throughout Europe today, there appears to be just as much preoccupation with flashy automobiles, comfortable homes and convenience appliances as there is in America. They become indignant over American "racism"—while their own growing racial difficulties are handled with typical British reserve, and politicians win re-election by advocating a halt to black immigration.

This youthful bumptiousness is most evident on a few panel and "magazine" programs, the latter being quite popular in Europe and the model for such American public-affairs programs as *60 Minutes*. In fairness it should be noted that British television generally has a tendency to snipe—whether at the United States or at any other country. This tendency has been described rather accurately, as "bitchiness." It makes for lively, fascinating television.

On panel and talk shows, participants also snipe at their own country and at each other. British television interviewers are sharp and probing. They will not permit their questions to be turned aside and they frequently display anger. One told the man he was interviewing: "Will you please answer the ques-

tion, for once!" The man he was interviewing was the Prime Minister.

Most knowledgeable Americans believe that as a matter of over-all policy, British television is by no means anti-American. Nor are the majority of producers and editors who work for BBC or the independent commercial organizations. There certainly are, however, enough of them who either dislike America or whose politics involve criticizing America, to make British television—on frequent occasions—a source of frustration and anger for Americans in the audience.

What effect all this is having on British viewers is impossible to measure. Without doubt, however, they are getting a distorted picture of our society if they depend entirely upon television for their information about America.

In Belgium the picture of America one sees on television depends largely upon where one is sitting—in Flanders to the north or Walloon to the south. The Flemish speak a kind of Dutch, much as Americans speak a kind of English. The Walloons speak French. Each group has its own separate and distinct television network operating under the aegis of the Belgian government.

The Flemish network has strong central control, straightforward news reports with no editorial comments, a number of variety programs with jolly, fat Ed Sullivan in charge, and quite a few American programs run with the original sound track and Flemish subtitles.

The Walloon network permits more local autonomy and gives its producers more or less *carte blanche*. It imports a number of programs from France, and when it runs a program from the United States or Britain or any other country, it is carefully dubbed into French. The news sometimes includes a few editorial asides. An example:

The day Rap Brown was wounded and captured in a New York holdup attempt, the newscaster explained that early reports did not make it quite clear how Brown's capture occurred. "But then," he added, "it often happens that black militants in the United States are shot by police in circumstances that are not clear."

Belgians pay about \$19 for their annual television licenses and the money goes directly to the government, which decides how much of it will be necessary to run television for a year. Sometimes it is more than the license-fee income, sometimes less. Technically the government has no voice in programming and a law forbids censorship.

Both networks, however, are extremely cautious about domestic politics, leaning over backward to be fair to all parties. There is little investigative reporting or criticism in covering the government. It is said that there are three political parties in Belgium—conservative Liberal, conservative Social Christian and conservative Socialist—for Belgium is a business-oriented country, welcomes foreign investments (United States investment there is about \$1.2 billion; and is a strong NATO supporter).

Belgian networks have adopted a unique method of making certain that all shades of political thought are represented in the news departments. Each news job is assigned a point value—an editor might be worth three points, a reporter one. Each political party is assigned a total number of journalistic points depending upon the party's strength in parliament.

Still the French-language network does seem to reflect thinking a bit more to the left than the parliamentary statistics would suggest. The Social Christians now are the ruling party, with the Liberals to the right and the Socialists to the left. If the Social Christians are the center party and if they have more journalistic points than the others, why are there so many leftists in the news department? We put that question to Emile Heneval, director of news and current-

S 8468

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 25, 1972

affairs programming for Radio-diffusion-Television Belge (RTB), the French network.

Henceval explained that the general population is more conservative than the young journalists who come out of the universities and go into television. "RTB has great difficulty in recruiting young journalists who have conservative opinions," he said. "There are hardly any."

"But there is a strong and active left-wing minority even among the Social Christians, and the young ones are attracted by that. If a young Social Christian has one journalistic point, he represents the left wing of the Social Christians, even though the general tendency of the party is center. And one always recruits young people."

Then, we asked, is the general picture of America filtered to the Belgian people through these young leftist journalists?

"That is too dramatic, too general a statement," Henceval said. "The majority of young journalists who represent this movement [a critical current toward United States policy] are just as critical of Russia. But it is not the same. . . . Toward the United States one is very critical but very friendly. If you ask young journalists whether they want a month in America or a month in Russia, they'll all choose the United States."

While there is less editorial criticism of America and there are fewer programs about offbeat—and down-beat—aspects of our country on the Flemish network, the news reports do not paint a bright picture.

"It is only natural," said Lode Van Uylven, news director of Belgische Radio on Televisie (BRI), "that Vietnam and racial conflict and demonstrations get more time on the air than anything else. That's the nature of news. Our sources are mainly the American networks. Whatever they put on the air themselves, we get over here."

The director general of the French language network, Robert Wangermee, insisted that the bad news from America was not really all bad. "What we appreciate from American television is liberty of spirit, of self-criticism about the problems of America," he said. "This is very important, that most of the criticism is coming from the United States."

Some Americans living in Belgium say that the French-language network there seems to follow the attitudes of television in France. That would seem to be true if only because so many programs that appear in Belgium—including public-affairs shows—originate in France. This French influence would also be felt, for the same reason, in other Francophone countries.

Belgium, however, has fallen slightly behind in adopting the new French television attitude toward America. In France, America is doing pretty well.

There are some lapses, but generally we found French television almost pro-American compared with some of the other European countries we visited.

This is an about-face from treatment of the United States by French television during most of the De Gaulle regime. At that time, television news was all but the property of the administration. When a cabinet member was to make a speech, however minor, one of his flunkies would call a network news chief and demand that the speech be covered. It was covered.

Television program heads had their antennae up for clues as to what their editorial positions should be. De Gaulle was highly critical of the United States. So was French television.

Although many suspect that the antennae are still up, television news, we were told by the news and special-events chiefs of France's two networks, is now absolutely free. The networks themselves do not criticize the French government, but they do cover opposition

political rallies that find fault with President Georges Pompidou and his administration.

Aside from a treatment of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" which was less than complimentary, and a program on group psychology freaks which offered a strangely warped view of how Americans relieve their tensions, the past two years have been relatively free of openly gratuitous slams on French television.

There still are, however, complaints from Americans living in France about what they see as an overly critical attitude toward us, and some have been especially touchy about television reports from the First Network's New York correspondent, Emmanuel de la Taille. Asked about this, De la Taille admitted that he probably was being influenced by the highly critical attitude of the American media to which he is constantly exposed.

So criticism of America still is to be found on French television, but on the whole it has been reasonable and thoughtful. Pierre Desgraupes, news and public-affairs head of the First Network, related a revealing anecdote. It seems the former Soviet ambassador to France was unhappy because French television spoke very seldom about the Soviet Union but quite often about the United States. One day, over lunch, he voiced his complaint to the director general of French TV and to Pierre Desgraupes.

Desgraupes replied that if the Russians made it as easy for him to get a camera crew into Moscow as the Americans do to get a crew into New York, the Soviet Union would be spoken of often too.

After the Russian left, Desgraupes' boss told him: "You know, you won't make it any easier for us to get a crew into the Soviet Union by telling him that."

"Why not?"

"Because you speak a lot about the United States, but you know—and he knows—that everything you say is critical."

We asked Desgraupes if he was making a conscious attempt to balance all the bad news from America with programs that established some sort of balance. He said he was trying, but it was difficult. He even felt compelled, at one time, to produce a program that explained American news-gathering methods, and American freedom of information, to the French audience.

Doesn't France have freedom of information?

"In Europe generally, but especially in France," Desgraupes said, "there is less of a tendency toward the sort of fair play, the sort of criticism that exists in the United States. If we were to criticize trade unions, they wouldn't accept this the way trade unions do in America. If we were to criticize, say, funeral directors, we'd have a letter from their trade union the next day telling us we had put the honor of their profession into jeopardy. Americans accept criticism much more easily than Europeans."

We heard this in other countries too. America has a journalism all its own, a tradition of exposing wrong-doing or unfairness wherever it appears. American readers—and viewers—have become accustomed to this criticism of the Establishment, as has the Establishment. This is not true in most of Europe. The ground rules of journalism are simply different. Some Europeans look upon our self-criticism as a sign of weakness. More, we believe, see it as a basis of American strength.

As in other countries, most of the young people who go into news in France lean to the left. Desgraupes said they were relatively easy to control. The real problem, he said, was directors, many of them Communists, who come and go in television and are almost impossible to control.

The Second Network in France has presented a great many programs on aspects of America rarely touched by other European broadcasters—social security, life in a mid-west community, education, old age. This network appears to be more interested in why

things happen than merely what is happening. So far as America is concerned, this results in more balanced programming.

News and special events are headed by Jacqueline Boudier, a respective news executive, who doesn't care what here newsmen's politics are so long as they are neutral and objective when they're working.

What is objectivity? we asked.

"Honesty," she replied. "You can't always be objective. But you can be honest."

French television's new—and more balanced—treatment of the United States may or may not have something to do with the results of two recent polls. One showed that 59 per cent of those polled said that America is the country that interests them most, the country they most wanted to visit. China was second with 20 per cent.

The second poll showed that the attitude of all Frenchmen polled toward the United States was generally favorable, with those most favorably inclined toward us being in the 19-29 year-old age group.

Which may indicate that everybody in France didn't believe everything they saw on television during the De Gaulle years.

HOW LEFTIST INFLUENCE ON DUTCH TELEVISION OFTEN RESULTS IN A TWISTED VIEW OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Merrill Panitt)

The Dutch are a tolerant people. When the Puritans were hounded out of England for their religious beliefs, they found safe harbor in Holland for the time it took to prepare their voyage to the New World. When last summer's hippies in Europe found themselves unwelcome in many countries, they turned their bare feet toward the friendly ambience of Amsterdam, where many of them still are to be found living on barges tied up along the city's celebrated canals.

Dutch television is tolerant too. There is a deliberate effort to give air time to the entire gamut of political, religious and social beliefs, an effort which through an odd circumstance results in somewhat more criticism of the United States than would seem to be absolutely fair in that tolerant country. The Dutch television structure is such that there is lively competition to attract young, leftist viewers. Nothing is more sure-fire in appealing to this audience than taking America to task for its various sins.

Television time, a total of about nine hours a day on two networks, is pro rated—according to the number of members they have—among associations that represent various political, religious and social beliefs. The more members, the more time on the air. Membership involves subscribing to a television magazine published by the association. Programming is financed from funds provided by a \$20 annual license fee on each television set and by advertising income from commercials that precede and follow each newscast. The money is divided among the associations which in order to fill their air time, produce their own programs or buy them from foreign sources. They share common studio facilities and transmitting equipment. The associations have found that there is little inclination on the part of middle-aged and old people to switch from one association to another. But young people are susceptible to change, and they will join a different association if it appears to represent their views better than the old one did. Their views generally are leftist views.

It is only natural, then, for the associations to compete for the attention of the young leftists in the hope of gaining them as members and thus winning more time on the air. At very least the associations feel compelled to keep the young people they already have from switching affiliation. This is known in Dutch television as "protecting your left flank."

Two associations make no bones about being left-oriented. One is VARA, which has

May 25, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

more than 400,000 members and is therefore entitled to an "A" classification and all the time on the air a Class A association enjoys. VARA represents the Socialists, who are now led chiefly by the New Left. (There are 14 parties in Holland and the Socialists are the largest party with 23 per cent of the vote in the last election. It is in opposition, however, because the government is a coalition of five minority parties.) The other leftist association is VPRO, which has under 250,000 members and is classified "C," which entitles it to considerably less time than VARA. VPRO is a far-out Protestant organization known for its satire. It has drawn the fire of conservative Protestants who complain that some of its programs take the form of obscenity bordering on pornography.

VARA did a program on Angela Davis implying that she could not get a fair trial in the United States. It also did one featuring an interview with Chicago 7 attorney William Kunstler, during which the Dutch interviewer Pier Tania deliberately fed Kunstler questions worded to bring out the most poisonous anti-American propaganda the attorney could produce.

When VARA covered the funeral of prisoners killed in the Attica riot, the interviewer was Pier Tania again. He began the program with this statement:

"American blacks may demonstrate and bury their dead, but American society stays unmoved. There is a growth of poverty, discontent, violence. The black leaders are saying that the black civil war has already started. Attica is a political case. While authority over 1200 black prisoners. Criminals, yes, but also colored people who never had a chance in American society."

He supported this contention with interviews of three mourners at the funeral, one of whom obligingly told Tania: "We feel that America is one big Attica; one big concentration camp. America is a prison, a slave camp for black people. We can't stay here and we can't leave here. We are enslaved here. We're not robbing, we're expropriating money from the thief himself. We're taking what belong to us. Were going to get the person who created this violence—known as Richard Milhous Nixon and Company, known as the United States Government."

For whatever consolation it may provide, VARA has described the Soviet Union as "even more indigestible than the United States."

VPRO, the satirical Protestant association which is just as far left as VARA, has been disowned by many Protestants who object to its sexual permissiveness and its political radicalism. One of its most virulent slams at the United States recently was a musical program titled "Carte Blanche," which featured an American black and two American Indians who live in Holland. Much of it was racial material, with lyrics such as "Niggers hanging from the trees, swinging in the breeze" used to describe current conditions in the United States. Said one American who once spent several years in the Soviet Union, "I never saw anything worse on Moscow TV."

In its preview of the current season, VPRO promised to deliver a number of satirical attacks on the United States, including burlesques of the Chicago 7 trial and interviews with unsuspecting Southerners who respond to friendly Dutch interviewers in good faith and then become the object of ridicule when the film is shown by VPRO.

These two organizations make no attempt to balance their anti-American material, but say it is up to the more moderate associations to provide balance. Among the more moderate ones is KRO, the Catholic group, which is left of center and which is the vanguard of efforts to force acceptance by the Vatican of artificial birth control and of marriage for priests.

KRO has presented many programs, from American sources and from its own production teams, which show positive aspects of the United States. In recent months it broadcast the ABC documentary on Mayor Charles Evers of Fayette, Miss., and a documentary on police work in Kansas City, Mo., which presented policemen as neither villains nor heroes, but men doing an often difficult but always necessary job. But it also offered its viewers programs on anti-Vietnam demonstrations. Lieutenant Calley and the My Lai massacre, and the Pentagon Papers.

TROS is an association more concerned with entertainment than politics. Significantly, it is growing more rapidly than any other group. NCRV represents the traditional, conservative, Reformed-Church, small-town segment of Dutch society. The largest association, AVRO is somewhat to the right of center it brought "The Selling of the Pentagon" to Dutch TV. It also telecast a friendly documentary on the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean.

None of these associations is permitted to broadcast news. That is the prerogative of NOS, an umbrella organization which has no members but which is awarded 40 per cent of all television time for news, sports, some other types of programs, and the presentations of associations which have under 100,000 members and therefore no right to regular time segments of their own.

As an example, we watched a program broadcast during NOS time as a joint effort by three small church groups—IKOR (Inter-church Consultation for Radio and TV Matters), CVK (Convention of Churches) and RKK (Roman Catholic Church Association). The program was *Kenmerk*, a weekly information program about the church and society, which was offering a two-part series on American use of "chemical warfare" in South Vietnam. The first part had to do with chemical defoliants. That program began with a shot of a map of Europe with Hitler in an inset making a speech. Then the narrator said: "Thirty years ago we divided the world into good and evil, on one side the Nazis, on the other side the Allies and the Dutch. Then the world was divided into the Communist world on one side and we and the Americans on the other. Then the Americans streamed into Vietnam."

The program showed defoliated forests, women and children war victims, bombs being released from planes, and interviews with a Dutch biologist and a Communist Vietnamese doctor. Twice during the program, shots of war victims—fleeing refugees and crying children—had as musical background a male choir singing "Glory, Glory, Hallelujah."

The second part of the series had to do with nausea and tear gases. It presented a film history of chemical warfare, including atrocity film from World War I, which showed chlorine gas victims. Somehow the gases used in Vietnam were equated with the deadly chlorine gas of the First World War.

It was explained that this was a church matter because all this material was being delivered to the bishops meeting in Rome.

News reports as presented by the umbrella organization, NOS, are free of editorial comment. NOS does no editorializing and the associations do no news. But the associations do offer comments on the news, and it is in these commentaries that bias often emerges, for even in the moderate organizations there are leftists in key positions. Holland's most respected news analyst, G.B.H. Hiltermann, appears on television for AVRO, the largest association, and also writes for a leading weekly magazine. In his view, the associations are "completely run or governed or even tyrannized by the New Left."

Hiltermann is no conservative. In Holland, a social-welfare state which is neither completely free enterprise nor completely so-

cialist he is middle of the road. In America, he says, he might be a very liberal Democrat, or even a very, very liberal Republican.

He says all of the broadcasting associations are under leftist influence. "You are forced. You must be progressive. You must agree that something new is coming. You must find new ways. It is fashionable. Maybe it is because this country has for so long been a fairly rigid colonial power. Now that anything is permitted, we are just like Denmark. All of a sudden we are the most revolutionary, the most open, the most crazy society in Europe. The boys with the longest hair are in Holland, the girls with the hottest hot pants are here. This is a country in terrible turmoil. We have all these revolutionary young people trying to find out if our inherited values have some meaning. I'm not against that. The trouble is we have no Establishment, no government, no authority which is still secure in its own position, which can stand. That is the problem."

Hiltermann insists that newspaper circulation figures and popular votes in elections prove that only a minority of the Dutch favor the left. But the left is in control of television, and the United States, as the supercapitalist state, is a sitting duck for television pot shots.

"When I was 18 or 19 years old," he says, "I too thought that society was something alien and different and even hostile. At the university we were saying that one day we would have another world, and we would have ideas and discussions and we would plan a better world. And so I think that as a student maybe I too was thinking of blowing up the world."

"But then the world was strong and the Establishment was strong. I don't think that the attitude and the mentality of the younger generation and the atmosphere even in this country is basically wrong. I do think that it is something that will pass over. When they grow up they will change their opinions. The main thing is that the Establishment is weak, so the left is far more effective now. And then there's the mass media. Just think, if you're young and you have long hair and you've something crazy to say or do—you'll be on television. Just give the word! There is no balance, no counterweight, no counter-influence."

Hiltermann said that the young people one hears from in Holland are leftists but in addressing students at universities, especially engineers, he has gained the impression that the majority of students are not inclined toward the left.

"You must notice in the United States that this left minority can extend a great influence, and the world has constantly been shaped by minorities. The Russian Revolution was not made by a majority. And a convinced and passionate and eagerly working minority can convince a people of quite a lot of things, especially if they are in control of communications. That is the danger."

At the headquarters of the organization that broadcasts all news reports in Holland, the deputy head of NOS television programs, Harry Hagedorn, said he didn't know—or care to know—the political views of the men who read the news.

"Our job is to report all opinions and viewpoints. We want to have critical people working for us, but not activists."

He admitted that Dutch television was critical of the United States but that the criticism comes out of true friendship. He also said he believed viewers were getting a balanced picture of the United States.

However, when he first visited America, he said, "I was surprised to find poor white people. Here in Holland we always thought that poverty had only to do with black people. We thought they were treated badly and so they were poor. I saw that there were white people who were poor too."

S 8470

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 25, 1972

We asked Hagerdorn whether Dutch television criticized the United States so often because America is a capitalistic nation. "It may also be," he replied, "because we have problems in our country and it's very nice to look at other people who also have problems."

Ratings are a deep secret in Holland, where only a few top executives see the figures. The most popular program most weeks is *Peyton Place*. Next comes *On the Buses*, a British situation comedy. American programs occupy about 31 hours a week—some 18 per cent of all television time. Among the programs are *Lucy*, *The Brady Bunch*, *Alias Smith and Jones*, *Mission: Impossible*, *Bonanza* and *Nancy*.

Most of them have much higher ratings than the current-events programs that emphasize a negative view of the United States. Still, it is annoying and frustrating for an American to see his country's faults exaggerated, or at least dwelled upon until they overshadow our accomplishments.

J. William Middendorf, America's Ambassador to the Netherlands, put it as diplomatically as possible: "One of the trends I've seen since I've been here has been a tendency for quite a few television programs to take America out of context. They show a part of America that does exist, but to someone who doesn't have the shared experience with America that those over 40 in the Netherlands have had either during the war or after it—to such an outsider selecting a few programs about America without looking at the over-all picture, he might get the impression that America is made up of nothing but illnesses. I would hope that there would be more of a balance possible."

"I don't say this as a criticism of all of Dutch television. I say this as a criticism of a very small part of it. One tends to remember the few negatives—and the few negatives do stick in your mind—at least those that don't seem to be at all balanced."

The Ambassador said he was chiefly concerned with the effect of these programs on the younger generation in Holland who might get the idea that America is just "kind of a sick place."

American observers agree that the Dutch people have a much more positive attitude toward America than their television does. One mitigating factor may be the fact that the source of each critical program is known. Says James Everett, an American public-relations man who also is general manager of an English-language newspaper distributed in Benelux countries, "They tell you this next program is presented by a leftist organization, so you sit back in your seat and can discount it. Labeling prejudices tends to take the sting out of them." The Dutch are used to considering the source of the programs they watch on television.

Not long ago one of Holland's former leading industrialists, now a consultant well-qualified to analyze socio-political conditions, was commissioned to do a private report on Dutch attitudes toward the United States. Here are some of his comments:

"The [extreme radical] complex embraces a very small section of the young people. Their somewhat wanton anarchy is rejected by most young people, but their sociocritical ideas have become the common property of the younger generation. Also older people have been led to thought and have become uncertain. Dismayed by overpopulation [Holland is the most densely populated industrial nation in the world], frustrated by a worldwide moral and religious crisis, made radical by their powerlessness in regard to all sorts of problems, their own and international, they are confronted evening-in and evening-out by the often glib and emotional radicalism of the TV commentators...."

"The virtues inherent in social criticism are at present the monopoly of the political left in Holland (and in Europe). This means

that the leftist parties can find in the United States an ideal target, a self-evident bogey, directed at the maintenance of the established position of institutions such as the army, capitalism, big business, etc., and thus opposed to renewal, anti-intellectual, violent, against participation, etc."

"The illustrated self-criticism of the United States which is obtainable everywhere supplies ample and damaging material to strengthen this latter picture."

AN EVIL PLACE RUN BY EVIL MEN

(By Merrill Panitt)

Sweden has the most blatantly anti-American television this side of the Iron Curtain. We were introduced to it one quiet Sunday evening in Stockholm, when an English lesson appeared on our hotel-room screen.

It featured a man, a boy and a sketchbook. The man asked, "What is this?" and held up a drawing of a pretty girl standing in front of the Eiffel Tower. "That's easy," said the boy. "She is French."

"What is this?"
Picture of a happy boy bundled up against the snow. Background: the Kremlin. "That's easy. He is Russian."

"What is this?"
Picture of a fat, ugly man chewing on a huge cigar. He was wearing a big cowboy hat, an aloha shirt, and shorts revealing hairy legs. Draped from his shoulders were two cameras.

"That's easy. He is American."
It is the contention of many of those working in Swedish television that the medium should not just inform, it should educate and mold public opinion, it is molding public opinion against America.

Take educational television, directed toward school children. Among the treats enjoyed by first- to fifth-grade youngsters was a two-part atrocity film from North Vietnam showing the alleged results of American bombing.

Recently geography books were distributed to children to be used as texts for in-school telecasts. The cover of the book on the Soviet Union bears an innocuous picture of the Kremlin. The cover of the book on the United States is a picture of unhappy black children behind a fence.

"On Swedish television," says Lars Winburg whose business takes him to the United States on occasion, "America is an evil place run by evil men with evil intent."

News from America, had enough usually in its original form, is edited to make it appear worse. Thus film footage on the Selma, Ala., march was edited to show only blacks walking, and whites jeering from the sidelines. There were no pictures of the whites who joined in the march. In coverage of our last national election only anti-Administration candidates were interviewed.

American civil-rights legislation is rarely, if ever, mentioned. (School textbooks, printed in 1960, don't cover the subject either.) Dollar imperialism is one word, like damn-yankee. Our technological and space achievements are shown, but commentators dwell on the question of why is it that Americans can go to the moon if they can't solve their problems on earth.

The death of Whitney Young, head of the National Urban League, went unnoticed on Swedish television. So did the efforts of NAACP director Roy Wilkins to combat efforts by black separatists to have separate facilities on college campuses. But Stokely Carmichael is a fixture on Swedish television, and the Black Panthers are given so much time that many Swedish people believe it is the only American organization that speaks for blacks.

When Ralph Abernathy, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, arrived in Sweden and appeared at a press conference, he was promptly labeled "Uncle

Tom." He told the reporters that to judge from Swedish media, the Black Panthers were Black America. "Look," he said, "there are more people at my Sunday sermon in Atlanta than there are Black Panthers in all of the United States." No Swedish newspaper, or television newscast, carried the quote.

As for Angela Davis, it has long since been concluded that she will be found guilty—if the Americans bother to bring her to trial. The Swedish plea is that she be given political asylum outside the United States.

There is a mild joke about Sweden having stereo television—two channels on the left. Actually, many people refer to Channel 2 as the Red Channel, because it's not easy to separate the news from the editorial comments there, and Channel 2 has even more of a tendency than Channel 1 to edit news to fit what the men in the news departments like to believe.

Who are the men in the news departments? According to a leading Channel 2 television producer who asked not to be identified, "It is a floating, seemingly intellectual, unreal people who are the basis for recruitment into the news department. They are not only left, they're professionally left—slightly anarchistic."

"I don't know how the people here at Channel 2 vote, but I would say very many of them are to the left of the party in power [which is left of center]. I doubt that the political pattern is representative of the people in general. If you have a conglomerate of intellectual and young—very, very young—staff at Channel 2, it will stand more to the left. That means that the attitude toward America is not only based on the Vietnam war but it reaches a little deeper to the fact that America is a capitalistic country."

Sweden is a welfare state, with the state owning transportation, communications and the nation's largest iron mine. Other businesses operate under the private-enterprise system. Taxes are extremely high. A family man earning \$10,000 a year must pay more than \$4,000 in taxes to support state health, education, pension, housing subsidy and other welfare measures. While many necessities of life are covered by welfare, the average family can afford meat only once a week. There is concern in the government about "tax fatigue."

Sweden, incidentally, is experiencing unemployment and inflation problems. Taking into account thousands of people working on emergency government projects, the total unemployed figure runs to about 3.1 per cent of the 3.9 million working force, which is critically high by Swedish standards.

Television is government chartered, with each set owner paying a license fee of \$40 a year. For this he has two channels of television on the air each evening and educational television for his children during the day.

The preoccupation with what is going on in America, and what America is doing wrong in international relations, is almost to be expected. There are eight million Swedes in Sweden, about 12 million people of Swedish descent in the United States. Over a period of 50 years, about a quarter of Sweden's population emigrated to America. And the Swedes themselves boast, "We are the most American nation outside of America."

Dr. Lef Carlsson, a leading political commentator and head of the cultural department of the newspaper Svenska Dagbladet, is also a member of the Royal Control Board of the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation. We asked him whether the Swedish people were getting a balanced picture of the United States through their television. His reply: "Not quite, I'm afraid."

In straight news, such as a speech by President Nixon, he said, the people usually do get objective news.

May 25, 1972

"In one certain sense, however," he said, "the picture is unbalanced. Some phenomena in American life have been stressed out of all proportion—such as the Black Panther party, the black-power movement, even the antiwar movement. If the Swedish public were to create their picture of the American social scene in its broadest sense from Swedish television—as of course the Swedish public must do in most cases—there is a risk that they must overlook the central fact that there are important developments in the United States other than the Black Panther party, that there are indeed political thinkers other than Eldridge Cleaver.

"My fundamental impression," he said, "is that these extreme and marginal phenomena—important as they are—are given in Swedish television a role out of all proportion to what they in reality are."

Dr. Carlsson said some of his personal friends who are television producers have radical leanings and would be proud to admit it—especially the young ones, and there are a great many young ones.

"I have the impression," he said, "that there is emerging a new type of TV journalists, who have the honest and honorable conviction that it is their duty to do the good thing, the head the good forces of the world. To knock the United States. To play Americans down and help what they regard as the true cause of the American people, the American people being more or less unconsciously identified with the black community of the United States and the student population. They are presenting what I regard as a distorted picture of the United States but of course they regard it as a true picture of the United States. They present this obviously distorted picture because out of very serious convictions they think that this is the right thing to do."

It is also the right 'thing to do, by their standards, to offer viewers a three-part propaganda series from Cuba, propaganda films from North Korea and North Vietnam, even material from the Argentine underground.

The Soviet Union, on Swedish television, is pictured as an essentially peaceful nation, with such episodes as the marches into Hungary and Czechoslovakia classified as "exceptions." In contradiction to this picture, the Soviet Union is, however, attacked vigorously on these "exceptions," as well as on its lack of intellectual freedom, treatment of the Jews and persecution of writers such as Solzhenitsyn. Other members of the Soviet bloc come in for criticism too on matters of personal and intellectual freedom.

Still, if anyone kept score, the U.S. would undoubtedly win the "most often criticized by the Swedes" prize.

Journalists in Sweden are protected by a press law which forbids interference with their creative efforts. An American reporter told us that the worst job in the country must be that of a managing editor: "He can't manage because of the labor laws. [It's almost impossible to fire anyone.] And he can't edit because of the press laws."

These laws also apply to television, and one television director sued the director general of Swedish broadcasting because some scenes had been cut out of one of his programs. The film director won the case in a lower court, but much to the relief of broadcasting executives, a higher court reversed the decision.

By law, television programs must be "impartial." Hakan Unsgaard, the head of Channel 1, cited this law several times when he questioned him as to whether he thought Swedish television was being fair to the United States. In effect he said it was fair because the law said it had to be.

He made much of the fact that they get most of their material about the United States from American networks. If there is more emphasis on problems than anything else, that is perfectly natural in news coverage, he said.

Unsgaard is a member of a group that supervises the journalism school in Stockholm. "Within the last two or three years," he said, "graduates of the school have had the idea that they not only have to describe what's happening in the old who, what, when, where, why tradition, but they also have an ambition to change the society by their writing."

He also made the point that there is an interaction among the various media. "You have in the Swedish press and radio and in books, the debate about the United States, especially about the United States in Vietnam. That, of course, is also reflected in Swedish television programs. If the press is critical of America, television is likely to be."

The press is critical of America. It is almost a competition to see who can paint the most unfavorable picture.

There was the celebrated case of Glanton Dowdell, an American black who jumped bail on savings-bond forgery charges and fled to Sweden. There he became a public hero on television and in the press by claiming that he was being persecuted because he was a labor leader and that he would be killed if he returned to the United States. An American attempt to extradite him failed. Finally a Swedish paper sent a reporter to Detroit was no labor leader, that he had a long police record that his story was ridiculous. The paper printed the facts, but it might just as well not have because it kept right on referring to Dowdell as a labor leader who was being persecuted by the United States.

An American took the paper's editor to lunch and asked why, if Dowdell had been proved a fraud, he still was being described in news stories as a persecuted labor leader. "Because," he replied, "any editor who did not handle the stories that way would lose his credentials as a radical in the Stockholm journalistic 'community.'"

The American expressed amazement. "Are you saying to me that it's more important to you as a journalist and editor to be considered a good radical than to be correct in what you report?"

Answer: "Yes."

This kind of thinking is difficult for most Americans living in Sweden to understand. Some of them call television stations after particularly insulting and inaccurate programs and try to set the record straight. They find few people interested in facts.

"If this country were to be a book," one exasperated observer said, "it would have to be written by Lewis Carroll or Joseph Heller. It's all either 'Alice in Wonderland' or 'Catch 22.'"

Oddly enough, polls show that there still is a great reservoir of good will toward America in Sweden. Asked where they would want to live if they had to leave Sweden, more Swedes picked the United States than any other country. But there is, perhaps, something ominous in the fact that a larger percentage of Swedes over 25 than under 25 wanted to live in the United States. Television may be having its effect on young people.

At least that is the contention of many Americans in Stockholm. One, Gunnar Rasmussen, who heads Pan Am Airways in Sweden, says he has seen a change in attitude toward him and his family since the current anti-America kick started in about 1966.

"I'm certain this television propaganda is having a big influence in changing their opinion of America," he said. "Over the 11 years I've been here I have seen the change. And the opinion that some of the youngsters have of us is absolutely unbelievable."

James Everett, an American public relations man, spent a number of years in Sweden, where his two teen-age daughters were happy that they spoke the language so well they could pass as Swedes in school. "They were almost ashamed of being American," Everett said. "To be an American in

Sweden, living in a Swedish environment, is like being a Negro in a WASP community. That may be a bit harsh, but you do have that feeling there."

The problem is a serious one. American Ambassador Jerome H. Holland does a great deal of traveling and speaking around Sweden and is considered by Americans there to be our strongest asset in countering the leftist propaganda. But because this brilliant diplomat is black and holds high government office, he frequently is accused by the leftists of being an "Uncle Tom." He scored well in two television appearances (Swedish TV felt it had to balance those appearances later by running what amounted to a Soviet bloc documentary-film festival), but the job of restoring American prestige will be long and difficult—especially among the young who have neither close familial ties with America nor personal knowledge of America's role in two European wars.

We were told that things are not as bad now as they were before the major withdrawals of American troops from Indo-China. We were told that Sweden's unemployment and inflation problems were centering the attention of the media more and more on her own problems rather than those of the United States. We were told that we had arrived during National Vietnam Week (Slogan: "Get U.S. out of Vietnam") and that it was an unusually mild one—only three or four television programs on the subject during the entire week.

It is good to be told that America is being treated more kindly these days on Swedish television. But to these eyes there still seems to be quite a way to go before anything resembling balance is achieved.

TO LET EUROPE SEE US AS WE ARE

(By Merrill Panitt)

Anti-Americanism is a fact of life in Europe. The bias is quite evident on television and there is little doubt that presenting a negative picture of America is a labor of love for young leftists with access to the medium.

According to Jean-Francois Revel, the middle-of-the-road socialist whose "Without Marx or Jesus" proposes new guidelines for leftist thinking, there are two varieties of anti-Americanism and both of them share a single function: to explain failure.

"For the anti-American of the right, the decline of his own country has been caused by the inordinate increase of American power; that increase has been made possible by the decline of the other great powers. For the anti-American of the left, the absence, or the failure, of socialist revolutions is what must be explained, and the invention of a foreign scapegoat provides a much-needed balm for the ego of the left, which has been bruised by so many defeats and betrayals. American 'imperialism,' therefore, is as good an excuse for disappointed socialism as for frustrated nationalism."

According to Donald Wayne, an American editor now in London writing a book on European anti-Americanism, it is no new phenomenon. He says one of the worst periods was in the 1920s, when Europeans thought of us as a predatory people who invented Prohibition and gangsterism, made money out of World War I, and then tried to collect our war debts.

"The only Americans they saw were tourists," Wayne says, "and the tourists came over here and misbehaved. The attitude of the Europeans was: 'Look at these people. They have no culture, they're barbarians, and they have everything. And look at us. We have culture, we have status, we have background and we have nothing.'"

During World War II, Wayne says, American GIs were resented because they didn't belong and didn't want to be in Europe. In England, during that war, the British had a saying that the Americans had three faults: "They're overpaid, oversexed and over here."

Now, says Wayne Europeans feel that

America is in economic trouble because of the Vietnam war and we expect Europe to help pay the bills for it. Among other things, they also blame us for the hippies who invaded Europe and the drug problem they now face.

Whatever the causes, the effect is criticism of America and Americans in all media, and especially on television, where young leftists find various means of spotlighting our real and imagined failings. We are also the victims of what Joseph Luns, former foreign minister of the Netherlands and now chief of NATO, describes as "selective indignation." Somehow, he says, "people get terribly excited about a Greek soldier putting a bomb under the car of his commander and feel he shouldn't be executed, but the fact that 110 young people have been murdered at the Berlin wall by the GDR [German Democratic Republic] apparently makes no impression. No attention is paid when China wipes out an independent country, while the Free Angola Committee looks under every stone and sometimes under nonexistent stones."

There is a definite tendency, we were told by news chiefs in Britain, Sweden, Holland, Belgium and France, for young people who espouse leftist political causes to go into television news. Many of them feel it is their mission to educate as well as inform their viewers, and, America being capitalistic, some of the "education" takes the form of discrediting America.

Certainly they do not have to look far for material that shows this country in a bad light. Film from American network newscasts—of antiwar demonstrations, racial disorders, strikes, every one of America's problems—is available throughout Europe by plane or satellite on a daily basis. That is the nature of news. "The same thing is true of us," says Ray Scherer, NBC's London correspondent. "We cover Northern Ireland, and the stuff that gets on the air is the rough stuff. If there's something fairly peaceful or something that involves their Parliament, it's hard to get it on. We try, but it's hard to get it on." Good news is no news.

Then, too, there are the network public-affairs programs that analyze America's troubles for American viewers. These are offered for sale abroad. On foreign screens, far from the daily routine of normal life in America, viewed by eyes that cannot possibly place those problems in an accurate perspective, these programs spotlight an America in the throes of dissent and confusion.

A case in point is the Vietnam war, seen on European screens just as it was here—filmed by American network teams for American audiences personally concerned with what American soldiers, their sons, were doing. Only rarely did European television organizations feel it necessary to assume the expense and trouble of sending their own camera teams to Vietnam to film the war from the perspective of non-participating Europeans.

Americans, influenced largely, we believe, by what they saw on television, eventually turned against the war. But until relatively recently, Gallup polls showed more than half of the American people supporting it. Europeans saw and were influenced by the same coverage, but they were not involved in the controversy—the two-sided controversy—over the war that was raging in America. When antiwar demonstrations started, Europeans were first puzzled, then angered, over our continued presence in Vietnam.

In sharp contrast to our continuing compulsion to tell the world all that is happening in America, the Russians maintain a wall of silence. It is all but impossible for European broadcasters to obtain spot-news footage from the Soviet Union or the Soviet bloc. Documentaries that present anything but wildly laudatory descriptions of life and production under Communism are unavailable. If a broadcaster wants to cover an aspect of the Soviet Union, the Russians will do it

for him—or it won't be done. Only good news is released, and, we were told by a number of news chiefs, even that comes in so late as to be useless.

Yet the Russians are losing ground among leftists, chiefly because they do not dare to turn their cameras—and permit foreign newsmen to turn their cameras—on every facet of what is happening in the Soviet Union. If their system is superior to that of the Americans, the young leftists are asking, why don't they let us see it as the Americans let us see theirs?

And cameras or no, wall of silence or no, the bad news seeps out. The Soviet economy is a shambles, production is shaky, creative thought is stifled. Today's young leftists in Europe are not satisfied with theory. They want to see practical application of theory—and in the case of the Soviet bloc today, the theory of communism is not working well. All this doesn't make the young European leftists like America more than the Soviet Union, but it does make them respect our country more.

What appears to be our great weakness abroad—continued publicity about America's troubles—has turned out to be our strongest asset. No matter how loudly or how often American dissidents shout on European television about loss of freedom in the United States, the newscasts every evening prove they are wrong. Our freedom of information is real and apparent, and the point is driven home every time an American demonstration appears on a European screen, every time a Presidential hopeful condemns the Administration.

Like most Americans, we have wondered about all the downbeat news featured on the evening newscasts. We have been concerned about the effect of all this negative information on our own people and on people abroad who might see it—especially people who are not accustomed to American-style self-criticism in their own journalists' treatment of their own countries' problems.

There obviously is no simple answer. But we do know that in America, television exposure of black demands for equality have—at very least—contributed to the tremendous strides toward equality made by black Americans during the past decade. Television brought us student demonstrations for participation in college administrations. At least some of those demands have been satisfied. Television coverage of the war in Vietnam undoubtedly influenced our entire Nation's attitude toward that war. And it is evident that television exposure of the dangers of pollution helped bring about government action to curb pollution.

Thus, while it is not pleasant to look at bad news—and all the subjects mentioned above appeared on our screens as bad news—the broadcasting of that news does help bring about change. The ability to change is one of the basic strengths of our democracy. Television speeds change.

As for the effect of our bad news on Europeans, we have recently discussed the subject in detail with Americans overseas and with executives in charge of television news in Britain, Sweden, Holland, Belgium and France. And we are more than ever convinced that daily proof of our freedom of information appearing on European screens—in contrast to Soviet censorship—is definitely helping to reduce Soviet influence there.

All this does not make us any more popular in Europe, nor does it convince the young leftists on television that our system is to be admired, but it does make them shrug in resignation when one asks about Russia, and it does bring the statement from many of them that "Russia is hopeless." As a result they turn to other brands of socialism as practiced by Mao and Tito, to the philosophy of Marcuse, or even to the new leftist theory that the working man has made more prog-

ress in America than anywhere else and that the freedom, the culture and the technological ability of America make it the only possible place where a socialist world revolution could begin.

The anti-Americanism evident on television in some countries, the criticism of America evident in others, is a cause for concern, we were informed, at the "highest levels of our Government." Only on Swedish television does there appear to be real animosity toward the United States. In the other countries we visited, there were varying degrees of bias shown—frequently in some places, rarely in others. But the inescapable fact is that in each country there are a great many leftists in television who, even if they don't like Russia, abhor capitalism and want to show America in the poorest possible light. So far, at least, this leftist sentiment in television news departments does not represent the thinking of the majority of viewers in those countries.

It is important that these viewers respect the United States. One cannot hope, considering the fact of the Vietnam war and the international moves we have had to make to strengthen our economy, that Europeans would love us or be pro-American. Anti-Americanism, according to many experts, runs too deep for that. But there are good reasons why it is desirable that they respect us.

International relations once were based entirely upon military and economic requirements. Diplomats conducted their negotiations in private on the basis of those requirements. This is no longer possible. A new requirement—public attitude—has been added. Sometimes it is possible for leaders to manipulate the public attitude—but not always.

It might have been advantageous to open relations with mainland China five or 10 years ago, but the American public was not ready. Its attitude was such that our leaders continued to oppose China's entry into the United Nations.

Visits by Soviet leaders Brezhnev and Kosygin to other countries have as one of their purposes the fostering of good will among the people of those countries.

Certainly it makes it easier for us to negotiate with the leader of a country if he knows his people are favorably disposed toward us—or that they at least respect us.

Today television, as the most pervasive communications medium, can be used as a tool for creating or destroying good will toward the United States. It may be that American entertainment programs seen on European television are helping us. Our travel and antipollution documentaries certainly show up on the positive side.

The United States Information Agency offers what it terms "facilitative assistance" to European TV camera teams interested in positive aspects of America. In the case of countries with meager television budgets, we sometimes offer small monetary grants to help them cover American medical research, engineering developments or whatever subject interests them. The budget for this is small, however, and not too much can be done.

Perhaps the most important result of this program is to give foreign television news specialists an opportunity to see the United States for themselves, to observe at first hand the America they have been talking about on TV. To many it is a revelation. On the whole, European news and public-affairs specialists go back home after visiting America with a much more balanced picture of our country. And they are more likely to present their viewers with a more balanced picture.

The USIA also produces some film for television which its offices overseas offer without charge to European television broadcasters.

By far the most effective material available to Europeans is in the form of network pub-

May 25, 1972

lic-affairs shows and documentaries which are offered for sale abroad by the networks. Some of these treat American problems—"The Selling of the Pentagon," "Hunger in America," specials on the Attica prison riot, and similar programs. The networks also turn out many positive programs, but in most cases it is the negative ones that make the best programming because they are newsworthy and controversial. It is therefore easier to sell the negative ones to foreign broadcasters whose budgets permit them to buy only a few programs from our networks.

Suggestions have been offered on how to make the more positive network public-affairs programs available to European television. One is to provide USIA with sufficient funds to buy foreign television rights to a number of American network public-affairs programs. The film then could be made available as complete programs or as source material, segments of which could be used in programs produced by Europeans.

Another suggestion is to provide some sort of tax relief for the networks if they would agree to turn over foreign rights to at least some of their public-affairs shows to the USIA.

Certainly some means must be found to provide positive programming about America to European broadcasters without charge. The advantage of using network programs is that they would be free of any stigma of propaganda.

American companies with major investments in Europe might also consider the wisdom of sponsoring documentaries about America for use on our own networks and for distribution overseas without charge. Bell Telephone did this with a program titled "It Couldn't Be Done," which has been seen in some 129 countries, to good effect. If a program is interesting enough to be shown on American television first, it is less likely to be considered propaganda by foreign broadcasters.

It goes without saying that bad news is unfortunate, as are programs that reveal negative aspects of our country. But for our own good, for the sake of our own change and progress, we must continue to examine and criticize our faults. And we cannot, even if we would, prevent this negative information from going overseas for it is shining proof of our freedom, of our desire to change and to improve our society.

All we can hope to do is to present a more balanced picture. To make certain that the positive is shown along with the negative. To let Europe see us as we really are.

AMERICA OUT OF FOCUS: HOW—AND WHY— EUROPEAN TELEVISION DISTORTS OUR IMAGE (By Merrill Panitt)

As seen in television news and current-affairs programs in much of Europe, the United States of America is a horrifying country.

It is seen as imperialistic and warlike, bent on dominating Southeast Asia and the emerging countries of Africa, which it is preparing to exploit.

It is described as a place where blacks live in near-slavery, despite the admirable efforts of the only organization that represents them—the much-persecuted Black Panthers.

It is alleged to be plagued with poverty because capitalists want it that way. The threat of poverty helps them exploit workers.

It is pictured as forcing millions of young people, concerned about Vietnam, crime and pollution, to turn to hard drugs.

It is projected as a corrupt, dangerous place where walking on the streets—anywhere and everywhere—is an invitation to be robbed and/or murdered.

The impact of all this on viewers is so strong, so pervasive, that even loyal Americans working abroad confess that each time they are scheduled to go home on leave they

experience real fear about what they will find there.

"Imagine," they say, "what effect this distorted picture has on Europeans who have no frame of reference, no background of life in America to balance what they see on television."

More important, perhaps, imagine a future in which our leaders must deal with a new generation of European leaders conditioned to believe that our system is no longer viable, our national morality is despicable and our people are disunited.

The picture is not entirely black. Our comedy and variety-entertainment shows picture a happier America, and our Western shoot-'em-ups, are generally accepted as pure fiction—even if there is some doubt about crime programs. (A Polish television executive, it is reported, was taken to task for not being anti-American enough. He promptly satisfied his bosses by scheduling *The Untouchables*.)

There are also such inescapable news events as the Apollo flights which present America and its society in a more favorable light.

Finally, there are signs that in a few countries, at least, those in control of television realize that they may have gone too far—or permitted their subordinates to go too far—in presenting a malignant view of the United States. Now and then there are efforts to counter the preponderance of negative news and current-affairs programs by showing positive aspects of the apparently ailing colossus across the Atlantic.

In the past two and a half years, Americans in France have witnessed a near about-face in television's once venomous attitude toward their country. But they still were pleasantly surprised recently when a newscaster discounted a tirade about American injustice from Angela Davis's sister, Fania, by carefully pointing out that Angela Davis has so far been extended every possible right provided by the United States Constitution.

That sort of balance is certainly an exception in Europe today. And the reality of television news and current affairs abroad is such that even if there were a conscious effort on the part of television officials to be fair to the United States—and we cannot find too much evidence of that—it would be extremely difficult to do so. Here are some of the reasons:

1. Much of the American news that reaches European television screens is bad news. Ed Murrow said, "Good news is no news." A Dutch television executive prefers: "When the garbage is collected it isn't news." Whatever definition one chooses—or invents—the fact remains that unless an event or happening is unusual, it isn't news. And more often than not, an unusual event means bad news.

American journalism has a muck-raking tradition. More than any other people, we dote on self-criticism. Our television, our newspapers, our literature, our art, all reveal the nature of our discontent with the way things are. Whether this self-criticism is a major factor or a minor one in America's growth and power is a subject for philosophers to determine. Certainly, however, it has not hampered our progress.

While there is some self-criticism in European countries, nowhere is it such a basic characteristic of journalism as in the United States. Nowhere is muckraking present to the degree it is in American journalism. Our television news programs, like our newspapers, are concerned with what is wrong with our government structure, our leaders, our prisons, schools, roads, automobiles, race relations, traffic systems, pollution laws—every facet of our society. In Europe, there is much less emphasis on exposing what is wrong, much more satisfaction with the status quo.

The difference between a French journalist and an American journalist, it has been said,

is this: the American will dig up a scandal, write the story, and print it. The French journalist will dig up the story and tell you about it over dinner.

Not long ago French Premier Chaban-Delmas made a walking tour of Nanterre, a deplorable slum bordering Neuilly, one of Paris's most exclusive and expensive suburbs. The hovels of Nanterre are made of discarded oil cans, and the inhabitants, most of them foreign laborers, cook their meager meals over open fires. Journalists made a big thing of the Prime Minister's visit and his statement that something had to be done. But there was little mention of the slum until the Prime Minister's visit. He made it news—really news, because unlike America, where politicians seek out troubled areas, Europeans prefer to find unhappiness farther from home.

While American newsmen dig for trouble and bring it to the attention of the public, European newsmen are more likely to confine their reporting to what has happened. Because European viewers are not conditioned to a great deal of self-criticism in their own countries, American self-criticism—always evident on their screens—has great impact on them. To them, America is a morass of unsolvable problems, whereas their own countries—according to the same channels that dwell on American troubles—are relatively trouble-free. A little unemployment here and there, growing resentment against laborers imported from Portugal, Turkey and Northern Africa, some difficulty over rising taxes, but generally all is well.

2. Europeans are avidly interested in news of America. In the five countries we recently visited—England, Sweden, the Netherlands, Belgium and France—interest in America was exceeded only by each country's own national news.

This is understandable. America is where the action is. Decisions affecting the peace of the world are made here, as are decisions involving world trade. Our music is international, as is our literature, our dance, our art. Technological advances, more often than not, originate in America.

So do troubles. Pollution is certainly nothing new to Europe, whose rivers have turned up millions of dead fish at various times throughout the past couple of centuries, and whose cities are just as smoggy as ours. But our communications media started talking—and worrying—about pollution before the European media did.

Whether it be pollution, racial strife, student unrest, crowded roads, technological unemployment or anything else, Europeans see in the news of American woes a portent of many of the very problems that will be affecting them in a few months or a few years.

America, too, is the bulwark against the Russians. She came to Europe's aid twice in major wars and can surely be counted on to do so again if the need should arise. Many believe that General de Gaulle pulled France out of NATO because he was absolutely certain that in the event of trouble, the United States would have to come to France's aid—whether France was in or out of NATO. That left De Gaulle free to play a lone hand in world politics and build his own armed forces any way he wanted to.

After World War II the United States played a major part in the rebuilding of Europe. American taxpayers paid for some \$9 billion in nonmilitary foreign aid in just the five countries we visited.

What happens in America, then, and what happens to America, are of vital interest to Europeans. That is why their television carries much more news of the United States than any other foreign country.

3. Most of what appears on European television about the United States originates at ABC, CBS, NBC or PBS. A few countries maintain permanent correspondents in Washington and New York who are on hand

S 8474

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 25, 1972

to cover the top news events and to offer commentary. Occasionally special camera teams are sent to the United States to do specific programs. But day in and day out, the bulk of American material for European evening news programs comes from our networks and is delivered by plane or by satellite. Network current-events programming—from "The Selling of the Pentagon" and "Hunger in America" to "Who Invited Us?" and "Attica"—appears either in original hour-long form or as film segments of European programs.

In Holland, for example, film from "Who Invited Us?" the controversial PBS documentary on American incursions into other countries, was used in a program titled "America the Beautiful." A Dutch television magazine ran this description of it: "Clips from film archives, quotes from politicians, authors and military men. Fragments of movies and TV commercials telling the story of the myth and the reality of 'God's own country' which is always the subject of admiration, disgust, illusions, dreams and nightmares in ever-changing form. Genocide and slavery were the roots of America's riches. Poverty is nowhere as aching as it is in America."

What we consider to be a story of interest only to Americans on tonight's network newscast will, if it's big enough or exciting enough, usually turn up on the air in a dozen European countries later tonight or perhaps tomorrow. Whether it be an anti-war demonstration, a prison riot, a politician's attack on the Administration or any other news—and it's generally bad or it wouldn't be news—the film will appear. Seen by foreigners, it will be out of context, free of the balance and perspective provided by living in America and knowing what normal life here actually is.

In the words of Pierre Desgraupes, chief of news and current-affairs programming at the largest of the two French networks, we Americans are the "victims of our own virtue." It is our cherished—and greatly envied—freedom of information that may be exaggerating our troubles in the eyes of many Europeans, leading them to believe we are a nation on the brink of disaster.

But while it may make us its victims, this virtue also is our most effective weapon against the Soviet Union in European communications. Even the most bitter critics of America throw up their hands in disgust at the rigid control of news exercised by the Russians. Newscasters describing an Apollo launch take delight in pointing out that the Soviets release censored film or tape on a launch only after it has gone off successfully, while the Americans permit live coverage.

Asked why they don't run as much material about the Soviet Union as they do about America, European news chiefs reply that it's impossible, the Russians insist upon supervising all filming, and that is unacceptable to the news chiefs. As for what the Russians themselves offer, it's mostly parades and events of little news value.

The contrast between the American and Russian approaches to news is evident on European television. Despite the image distortion inherent in revealing—out of context—our most critical problems to the world, nothing stands out more clearly and more lastingly than American freedom of information. This, we were told by television news executives in each country we visited, is our strongest asset.

Whether this is an intellectual exercise or not remains to be seen. Is the message of the freedom of our communications media enough to outweigh the detailing of America's problems night after night on European television? The answer may be in the fact that even though they are thoroughly familiar with all that is wrong with America, the great majority of Europeans,

young and old, keep insisting in public-opinion polls that, given their choice of any country other than their own, they would prefer to live in the United States.

4. The final reason why balance and fairness in treatment of America is all but impossible today in the countries we visited is the political thinking of the men engaged in television news and current-events programming there.

There is a tendency for young people to hold political views further to the left than those of the majority of a country's voters. There also is a tendency for those interested in communications arts—drama, literature, painting, television, news—to hold political views further to the left than those of the majority of a country's voters.

In Britain, France, Sweden, Holland and Belgium, young people are in the majority in television news and current-affairs departments. Most of them lean to the left. They freely admit this as do their superiors.

"Left" can mean anything from a middle-of-the-road member of the Socialist Party to Communist, Maoist or anarchist. Whatever their beliefs, the United States represents many of the things they like least—capitalism, the war in Vietnam, racial unrest.

They are not particularly happy with what's going on in their own countries—or in the Soviet Union, for that matter—but for one reason or another it is usually easier, and safer, to criticize the United States.

Obviously there is less difficulty in analyzing someone else's faults than one's own. For years we told the British how to solve their colonial problems. Only a few weeks ago Sen. Ted Kennedy informed them that they ought to withdraw from Northern Ireland. The further away a problem is, and the less we know about it, the easier it is to solve.

It probably would not be fair, in the case of most of the live countries we visited, to describe television news and current-events criticism of the United States as clearly intentional anti-Americanism. But slanted documentaries, one-sided film editing, editorial asides during news programs, ridicule, half-truths and outright lies are evidence of at least a bias against America.

The form of bias is different, as is its intensity, in each of the five countries. In France, it was just barely evident, a far different situation from the one that obtained at the height of the De Gaulle regime. After France, in order of increasing bias against America on television, we would list Belgium, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and—most biased of all—Sweden.

We have listed four major reasons why it would be difficult for European television news and current-affairs programs to present a completely well-balanced picture of America to their viewers. Difficult or not, it could be done. At least there might be a more equitable balance between the positive and negative aspects of the United States if more European television executives were inclined to make an effort in that direction.

Some of this bias is, perhaps, understandable. We are big and rich and strong. We have undoubtedly made some mistakes in our international relations, as have most nations. But our mistakes receive more attention than theirs. Now we seem to Europeans to be getting our comeuppance in Vietnam and in our economic situation. It is always satisfying to see the big fellow in trouble. Dwelling on his troubles—out of frequently proclaimed friendship—makes interesting television.

But some of the bitterness evidenced on home screens in the countries we visited could have serious consequences. A generation brought up on television programming that presents a distorted picture of the United States could cause serious trouble in the

future. Public opinion today is a tremendously important factor in the conduct of foreign affairs, perhaps as important as military and economic considerations.

That is why bias shown against the United States on European television, a medium of unequalled emotional impact upon its audience, is causing serious concern in the highest circles of the American Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the pending amendment would put the Senate on record as saying: "Yes, we think it is perfectly proper for the U.S. Information Agency to serve as the mouthpiece of foreign governments and to propagandize foreigners in the name of, and on behalf of, private corporations."

In this fiscal year the USIA admits to a budget of nearly \$2 million for propaganda aid to the Thieu government. And I suspect that this is only a small fraction of the total cost. If Senators want the United States to continue to be the mouthpiece for General Thieu's government or any other government, they should vote for this amendment. If Senators think the United States should let other governments speak for themselves to its own people, they should vote against the amendment.

The members of the Foreign Relations Committee do not believe that our Government should be the handmaiden of every foreign government and U.S. corporation operating overseas by underwriting their propaganda for their own people.

The provision approved by the committee, which the Senator from Tennessee's amendment would strike, simply says that no Government agency shall, without specific authorization:

First. Prepare or disseminate propaganda for, on behalf of, or in the name of, a foreign government; or

Second. Prepare information for distribution abroad unless it bears the name of the agency involved.

How, may I ask, does the Senator from Tennessee's concept of the proper role for the USIA abroad fit in with the so-called Nixon doctrine? Somehow, while I never have had a clear explanation of the Nixon doctrine, I thought it had something to do with becoming less involved in the affairs of other nations, especially internal affairs. This involvement of turning out propaganda for foreign governments or under the imprimatur of U.S. corporations, is nowhere authorized in the Smith-Mundt Act. And I believe that the authors of this basic statute would be the first to protest the perversion of the act, if they were here with us. The committee provision, which the amendment proposes to delete, serves to have our overseas information program devote its original purpose of telling the truth about the United States.

The kind of practices, that were never contemplated under the Smith-Mundt Act and have been revealed in recent years, are broadly described in the committee report:

May 25, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8475

In recent years the Committee was warned of U.S. Government agencies:

Preparing informational materials which have been attributed to foreign governments, such as in the case of Vietnam and Laos;

Funding by the Government of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty with no attribution to the U.S. Government;

Distributing general propaganda materials without attribution to the Government, as in the case of the comic book, "El Desengañio," dealing with urban terrorism, and distributed throughout Latin America; and

Preparing for and attributing informational materials to private U.S. companies overseas, such as in the case of an investment brochure recently prepared for and attributed to Texaco-Gulf in Ecuador.

I continue to quote from the report:

These practices are deceptive and serve to undermine the basic tenets of the Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948—an Act whose fundamental purpose was and still ought to be to inform the people of other countries about the United States.

The examples of unattributed material prepared by this or that Federal agency, of covert funding of radio broadcasts to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, of propaganda prepared by a Government agency and then attributed to a foreign government—all of this indicates how far we have strayed from the basic purposes and goals set forth in the 1948 Information Act.

We require foreign governments to identify the propaganda they put out in the United States. The very least we can do is to require our own propaganda agency to do likewise when it operates in foreign countries.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I urge Senators to approve the policy recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee. Anyone who votes for the amendment should be under no illusions as to what he is endorsing.

He is endorsing a policy which says:

First, that our Government can do abroad things that we would never allow foreign countries to do here;

Second, that we should continue to be the mouthpiece for the Thieu government—or do the same for the Greek, Brazilian, or Haitian governments, if the executive branch sees fit to do so; and

Third, that it is proper to use the taxpayers' money to publish propaganda tracts abroad for, and in the name of, private U.S. corporations.

I hope that the Senate will not endorse such a policy.

I urge the Senate to defeat this amendment. The sort of practices it would condone go deeply against the traditions of our free and open society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point certain information supplied to the committee by the USIA bearing on this issue.

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

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, AUTHORIZATION HEARINGS, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 1972 FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973

USIA Response to SFRC Requirement—item 20 (excerpts).

Please describe in detail all services rendered by the USIA to, or in behalf of, foreign governments in FY 1971, thus far in FY 1972, and proposed for FY 1973, including the estimated costs of the services to each country.

Following are explanations of abbreviations used in the responses on countries in the East Asia/Pacific area:

JUSPAO—Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office (Saigon).

GVN—Government of Vietnam.

CORDS—Civil Operation and Rural Development Support (Joint AID/MIL/State/USIA organizations in Vietnam).

PSYOP—Psychological Operations.

VIS—Vietnamese Information Service.

RLG—Royal Laotian Government.

GKR—Government of the Khmer Republic (Cambodia).

RTG—Royal Thai Government.

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC (IEA)

Introduction

In fulfilling its overseas mission, USIA has been charged with responsibility of working with host country information programs where necessary to achieve our goals. However, USIA's standard operating policy, as stated in an instruction to all overseas posts in 1971, is that we do not provide assistance to host country governments' internal or external information programs. In support of overall U.S. foreign policy objectives in Southeast Asia, USIA has currently made exceptions to this policy for the Government of the Khmer Republic (Cambodia) and the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam.

In recent years, assistance and services had also been provided to the Royal Thai Government and the Royal Lao Government. Such support to the first government was terminated on May 21, 1971, and to the second on July 1, 1971.

Cambodia (Khmer Republic)

Fiscal Year 1971

In an effort to assist the GKR to improve Radio Cambodia, USIA provided a radio engineer on temporary duty to survey the condition of the radio facilities and make recommendations for and initiate emergency improvements. This service cost to the USIA was about \$33,000, of which approximately \$15,000 was for test instruments and ground antenna materials (from USIA surplus stocks), and transmitter tubes.

In addition to the above monies for the radio improvement project, about \$3,000 in USIA funds was also used for printing 160,000 posters and 1,000,000 leaflets designed and distributed by the GKR.

Fiscal Year 1972

The GKR initiated a plan for reinforcing its radio coverage in northwestern and southern Cambodia through expansion of facilities at Battambang and Kompong Som. Two transmitters to be used in this project are being procured by the GKR under the Commodity Import Program financed by AID. Technical supervision for the installation of the transmitters is being performed by a USIA radio engineer on non-reimbursable detail to the Department of State. Cost to the USIA is approximately \$50,000, which includes the salary of the engineer and expenses related to his function.

USIA plans to authorize JUSPAO in Viet-Nam to transfer one 10-KW radio transmitter (as well as two non-operable transmitters for spare parts) to the GKR to replace one of its Phnom Penh transmitters which is reported

to be in failing condition. The three items of equipment originally were turned over to JUSPAO by the U.S. Navy in 1970 after their extensive use in airborne transmitter aircraft. Current value of the transmitters is estimated at \$1,000. This disposition of used equipment of minimum value, excess to USG needs in Viet-Nam, is believed to be the best utilization of it in view of the GKR's problems in keeping its national radio on the air.

In addition to supporting the radio project, USIA funds were used to procure motion picture raw stock, valued at \$150, for the GKR production of a documentary film for domestic use in Cambodia.

Fiscal Year 1973

USIA plans to continue to provide a radio engineer on non-reimbursable detail to the Department of State to supervise the completion of the two GKR transmitters at Battambang and Kompong Som about April 1, 1973. Cost to the USIA is estimated at \$38,000. USIA has no other plans for providing any assistance to the GKR.

Laos (Royal Lao Government)

Fiscal year 1971

USIA funds estimated at \$36,700 were for three issues of Current Scene magazine, paper for the Lao Photo Sheet, production of 19 reels of motion pictures, and support for RLG cultural teams. Two used USIA vehicles in excess of our needs were donated to the Lao Information Service, with current value estimated at \$400 each.

Fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973

All programmed advice and assistance to the host country information apparatus have been terminated, but the post intends to continue to be responsive to specific requests for advice.

Thailand (Royal Thai Government)

Fiscal year 1971

USIA-funded equipment in the estimated amount of \$56,416 was provided to the RTG. Equipment included 43 used vehicles (value \$22,000), 88 film projectors (\$22,968), 46 portable generators (\$7,084) and miscellaneous audio-visual items (\$4,364).

In addition, USIA funds estimated at \$63,500 were for two regularly-issued magazines (Horizons and Seripharb), posters, training materials, and recordings of materials for radio use.

Fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973

As in Laos, all programmed advice and assistance to the host country information apparatus have been terminated, but the post intends to continue to be responsive to specific requests for advice.

Viet-Nam (Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam)

Fiscal year 1971

USIA-funded services provided to or on behalf of the GVN totaled approximately \$2,560,700. This amount covered the estimated costs of advisory assistance unilaterally to the GVN's Ministry of Information and indirectly to the Vietnamese Information Service by support of joint USG-GVN programs through CORDS.

American salaries (for 26 advisors and support personnel).....	\$832,000
Media support (periodicals, pamphlets, product evaluation, etc.).....	705,000
Operational expenses (foreign service allowances, local personnel salaries, and pro-rated housekeeping and overhead costs).....	1,022,000
Spare parts for motion picture projectors to the GVN.....	1,700
Total	2,560,700

S-8476

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 25, 1972

Fiscal Year 1972

USIA-funded services provided to or on behalf of the GVN was estimated at \$1,901,000. This figure is expected to be revised downward by a minimum of \$500,000 by the end of the fiscal year, but we are unable to determine the exact figure at this time. There has been a steady reduction of USIA-funded advisors and support personnel during the fiscal year, and by the year's end the number will be zero.

American salaries.....	\$588,000
Media support.....	522,000
Operational expenses.....	786,000
Used office furniture and equipment to the GVN.....	5,000

Total 1,901,000

Fiscal Year 1973

USIA-funded services to or on behalf of the GVN will have ceased. The only USIA officer involved in any service will be one AID-funded advisor supervising the execution of an AID-funded contract to train GVN radio technical personnel. This project, scheduled for completion during the first half of FY 1973, is a carry-over from FY 1972 to facilitate the technical operation of the GVN's new high power radio network.

As in Laos and Thailand, although all USIA programmed advice and assistance to the host country information apparatus will have ceased, the post intends to continue to be responsive to specific requests for advice.

Services rendered by VOA technical activities

Philippines

VOA regularly employs two GOP radio technician trainees for a one-year period. Salary costs are paid by VOA.

Estimated cost:	
Fiscal year 1971.....	\$1,500
Fiscal year 1972.....	1,800
Fiscal year 1973.....	1,800

Thailand

The Thai Government shares use of the VOA Bangkok station and pays its proportionate share of the power cost. The remaining direct costs of the GOT transmissions are paid by VOA.

Estimated cost:	
Fiscal year 1971.....	\$8,700
Fiscal year 1972.....	9,200
Fiscal year 1973.....	11,000

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR WEST EUROPE (IWE)

IWE/USIS has rendered no program services, other than radio transmission service described below, to the countries of Western Europe in FY 1971, or thus far in FY 1972, and proposes no such services in FY 1973.

However, as in most USIS country programs, copies of much of our material output is provided host country officials and ministries for informational purposes. Accordingly, some of the content of USIS materials may find their way into host country reporting or information output.

Services rendered by VOA technical activities

Greece

VOA presently provides the Greek Government substantial airtime on the Thessaloniki facilities free of charge. When the Kavala station becomes operational (replacing Thessalonika), VOA will provide the GOG airtime on the medium wave transmitter and exclusive use of one shortwave transmitter free of charge.

Estimated cost:	
Fiscal year 1971.....	\$18,000
Fiscal year 1972.....	18,000
Fiscal year 1973.....	46,000

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR LATIN AMERICA (ILA)

ILA/USIS has rendered no major program services to the governments of Central and

South America in FY 1971, or thus far in FY 1972, and proposes no such services in FY 1973.

During FY 1972, however, some facilitative assistance was given on request to the following governments:

1. In Colombia, USIS Bogota has provided occasional technical advice to the Press Office of the Colombian President on TV techniques and presentation.

2. In Bolivia, USIS has provided suggestions to the Bolivian Government on publicity for its economic emergency plans.

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR NEAR EAST AND NORTH AFRICA (INE)

Morocco

VOA provides Radio Rabat up to 300 weekly transmitter hours over the Tangier transmitters free of charge. The present rate of usage by Radio Rabat approximates the maximum provision.

Estimated cost:

Fiscal year 1971.....	\$61,000
Fiscal year 1972.....	57,000
Fiscal year 1973.....	65,000

USIA Response to SFRC Requirement—Item 21. (Excerpts.)

For FY 1971 and FY 1972 please list any publications which USIA produced or helped to prepare, editorially and/or financially, but which were distributed without attribution to the agency or the U.S. Government. Also list all publications produced for, or in behalf of a foreign government, the number produced and the cost of each publication.

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC (IEA)

Vietnam

Development of non-attributed Psyop materials by JUSPAO field development division FY 1971 combined through phase-down first quarter FY 1972. JUSPAO shipped these printed materials to GVN Information Service, distributed at reader level.

A. Pamphlets: Following pamphlets developed and ordered by JUSPAO from RSC Manila during FY 1971. Some deliveries extended into first quarter FY 1972. Costs calculated at 75 cents per one thousand impressions.

Title	Number copies	Cost
Growing Up in Fire Fight.....	130,000	\$4,680
Appeal to Blood Donors.....	12,000	63
Pre-Natal Care.....	26,000	230
Brother Hai and Village Co-Op.....	200,000	4,200
New Faces in Vietnam.....	100,000	10,200
Face to Face Communications (9 manuals).....	450,000	4,987
One Image Two Lives.....	300,000	3,375

	Number of copies	Cost
Mr. Ba and People's Self-Defense	520,000	\$5,025
My Project.....	100,000	2,400
Mr. Ba and Phoenix Program.....	113,000	1,097
Corporal Nam Defends Outpost.....	200,000	4,350
VIS Handbook.....	20,000	105
Vietnam Magazine Color Covers for Pilot Model.....	5,000	90

B. Periodicals: Fiscal year 1971: Huong Que (Rural Spirit) farmers' magazine, 12 issues, cost \$188,000, Copies 500 thousand each issue.

Long Me (Mother's Heart or Motherland) Magazine supporting amnesty program, 6 issues, Cost \$50,200, 200,000 copies each issue.

Weekly Psyop community development newspaper Ngay Nay (Vietnam Today). Format single sheet, two pages, shared by JUSPAO and GVN Ministry of Information. JUSPAO printed 300 thousand each issue numbered 26 through 34 and 50 and 51, Cost \$20,000, Total 3.3 million copies.

Fiscal year 1972: Huong Que (Rural Spirit) Farmers' Magazine, 3 issues Cost \$47,200, Copies 500 thousand each issue.

Long Me (Mother's Heart or Motherland) Magazine supporting amnesty program, 2 issues, Cost \$16,800, Copies 200 thousand each issue.

Weekly Psyop community development newspaper Ngay Nay (Vietnam Today). Format single sheet, two pages, shared by JUSPAO and GVN Ministry of Information. JUSPAO printed approximately 150,000 of issues numbered 11 and 18 through 21. Total 1.2 million copies, Cost \$7,000.

C. Other Fiscal year 1971: JUSPAO printed covers for Ministry of Information question and answer series Peoples' Information Program. 36 small covers, 50 thousand copies each, cost \$2,000 each issue.

64-page Annual Report in co-operation USAID and Ministry of Foreign Affairs—attributed MFA. Four thousand copies, Cost \$500.

Fiscal year 1972: 64-page Annual Report in cooperation USAID and Ministry of Foreign Affairs—attributed MFA. Four thousand copies, Cost \$500.

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR LATIN AMERICA (ILA)

USIS programs which has assisted in the production of publications for or in behalf of host countries:

Bolivia—Post produced bi-monthly *Progreso* (dealing with socio-economic development) published under the auspices of the Bolivian Development Corporation. Preparation of materials and editing done by USIS. Financing shared with Development Corporation. (Circulation: 10,000 bi-monthly.)

Colombia—At the request of the U.S. military mission USIS printed 10,000 copies of a cartoon book for the Colombian Armed Forces. (Cost: \$471.53.)

USIS programs which have produced or assisted in the production of materials distributed without attribution to USIS or the Agency.

Bolivia—Post presented 10,000 copies of Agency produced cartoon booklet, "El Desengano," on urban terrorism to Ministry of Information for distribution without attribution to USIS.

Dominican Republic—In FY 1971 post arranged for printing of a C. P. Snow article dealing with the population problem. Reproduced in Spanish by the Agency's Regional Service Center in Mexico and distributed by the Dominican National Council on Population and Family.

Ecuador—Post produced four pamphlets totaling 15,000 copies dealing with the contribution of foreign private investment in the petroleum sector to host country progress. Attributed to and distributed by Texaco-Gulf. (Cost: \$500.)

Post produced one pamphlet, 4,000 copies, of an English language tourist guide. Attributed to the BNC and the Taxi cooperative. Distributed by the taxi union. (Cost: \$200.)

Post produced one pamphlet, 2,000 copies, for the International Transport Federation. Attributed to and distributed by the local Transport Workers Union. (Cost: \$100.)

Paraguay—Post assisted financially and editorially in the production of the Journal of the Association of Paraguayan English teachers. Three issues published annually. Distributed free and without USIS attribution but BNC Director's name appears on masthead. (Cost: \$525).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I might add that this affects all Government propaganda agencies. All suffer from a lack of credibility on the part of the recipients of the propaganda.

Mr. President, I am very doubtful that the USIA has any substantial effectiveness because most knowledgeable people recognize that its output is not straight information and certainly not objective.

I think the theory of an official infor-

May 25, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8477

mation agency should be that people are not like sheep—although some are—and are not so stupid that they can be hornswoggled by propaganda, propaganda for which we are unwilling to take responsibility. If we are going to put information out, at least we should identify the fact that our Government is responsible for it.

The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would result in allowing us to put it out without assuming responsibility for publishing it. I think this is a very sorry practice. There is one other analogy I think of.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

In my State it is against the law to put out propaganda in a political campaign without attribution. It is against the law to put an advertisement in any newspaper or magazine without carrying the name of the person who is responsible.

If we were to adopt the Senator's amendment we would be, in effect, authorizing a huge U.S. Government agency to put out propaganda without taking responsibility for it. I do not know how much further you can pervert and distort the mission for our information program that was envisaged by the Smith-Mundt Act.

That is the issue. I see no reason to belabor it. In view of the fact that there are only three or four Senators in the Chamber, there is no point in belaboring it. I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time and come to a vote. I have no doubt the Senator has a majority. I am under no illusion that with the support he has he will prevail. I am prepared to yield back my time if the Senator is prepared to yield back his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I am almost ready to yield back the remainder of my time. I might say now for the advice of our colleagues in the Chamber that I do anticipate asking for the yeas and nays and I hope we will have a sufficient number of Senators present to order the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Very good. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, on the matter of the prediction of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Senator from Tennessee has the votes to carry the amendment, I hope he is as good a prophet as he is an adversary. I have no such assurances.

I would like to make a few brief remarks and then I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President I understand the concern of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in this regard. The so-called propaganda aspects of the USIA program have been called into examination and account by the Senator's committee and described extensively in public forum.

However, I think the necessity for this amendment, and the concern of the Senator from Tennessee is that section 205 of the bill goes far beyond the concern described by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas. Section 205 of the bill would amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 which is permanent legislation pertaining to the responsibilities of the U.S. Information Agency for carrying out international information activities. According to the committee report, the purpose of the 1948 act is to inform the people of other countries about the United States. This is in line with the purpose clause of the 1948 act which is "to promote understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world—strengthen cooperative international relations."

Mr. President, the principal purpose of section 205 as I understand it is to more closely conform USIA's information work overseas to the objectives of the 1948 act through certain restrictions on the preparation and dissemination of information abroad. I defer to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which has legislative jurisdiction over the operations of USIA on whether such statutory guidance is necessary or desirable.

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

Mr. BAKER. I yield.
Mr. FULBRIGHT. This would not prohibit any of that propaganda. It is the sly under cover approach that we are dealing with. We give Turkey millions of dollars they can use to put out their own propaganda under their own name. What the committee is getting at is misrepresentation that is engaged in by our doing it without attributing it.

There is nothing in here to prevent the United States from flooding Turkey with all kinds of propaganda as long as we take the responsibility for it. We think it unwise to refuse to take responsibility for what it put out. There is nothing here to prevent them from putting out propaganda about dope, heroin, or anything else, as long as they take the responsibility for putting it out.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the chairman for those additional remarks. But that touches the point that concerns me because section 205 is so broad that anything related to the act would pertain to this section or any other law.

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BAKER. So, I am concerned that it applies not only to the 1948 act, which this bill seeks to amend, but an entire range of other acts.

While I subscribe to the sterling virtues of disclosure, whether in politics or in foreign policy, I suggest that we have in this bill unintentionally extended this section to other bills that we are not concerned with now.

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

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator give an illustration of what he means? I do not know what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. BAKER. I refer to the efforts of the United States to secure control of narcotics traffic between Turkey and the United States. That is not covered by this bill or by the 1948 act; but to be able to say that the guidelines we prepare for them must carry a disclaimer that they are prepared by the United States would destroy the effectiveness of the program to discourage traffic in drugs between Turkey and the United States.

Another example would be family planning. Family planning is carried on by private agencies and religious institutions, more often than not, and only recently has the Government gotten into that field. But in traveling through India last fall I saw placards and billboards on the way to New Delhi and on the way out of that city, that were there largely because of the efforts of private institutions. The information had been disseminated by the Federal Government.

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

To have such signs in foreign lands carry a disclaimer that they are provided by the U.S. Government would destroy the effectiveness of such programs in my view.

Another example would be in the field of health. Much of our health work is done on a voluntary of nongovernmental basis. The effect of this provision would be to attribute to the U.S. Government the efforts of private agencies or religious agencies, or those in the health field.

I really do not quarrel with the laudable purposes that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations made about the so-called propaganda efforts, but I do quarrel with the effect on a half dozen other functions that technically are not concerned with the 1948 act and would have concurrent jurisdiction by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish to make this additional point. The distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas spoke in the opening portion of his rejoinder of our efforts through propaganda to prop up the Thieu regime in Southeast Asia. If my information is correct, and I believe it is, the testimony of officials of the USIA before the Committee on Foreign Relations was that there is no such effort made by the USIA in Southeast Asia.

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

My information is and the testimony was that the Thieu regime is not involved in this nor is USIA. That is not the issue before us.

I intend to reserve the remainder of my time until we can have a brief quorum, and then I think I will be in a position to yield back the remainder of my time.

I conclude by saying I feel that the sweeping scope of section 205 is far beyond that which we want to deal with in-

S 8478

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

May 25, 1972

this bill and that it is going to have serious and unintended effects upon the future policy of the U.S. Government, and private, religious, and philanthropic organizations throughout the country. Therefore I have prepared the amendment which I offer at this time.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum, to be charged against my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents of the Senate, the Senator does not have enough time to suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator will have to ask unanimous consent to have time taken out of the other side. If both sides yielded back their time, he could suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

I suppose I cannot do that under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the only way the Senator could do that would be for both sides to yield back their time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time, but I need to check one point first.

I ask unanimous consent that I may ask for a short quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes of my time to the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) eliminating section 205 from the bill.

The bill under consideration would make it impossible to use covert psychological warfare of a nonattributed or falsely attributed nature in support of military operations.

Overt psychological warfare would be affected in these particulars:

It would degrade assistance to other countries in contingency operations.

It would affect the preparing and dropping of leaflets attributed to the country, but prepared by the United States.

It would hamper making radio broadcasts to warn the populace.

It would degrade U.S. military aid to underdeveloped countries in assisting military of the host country in civic action projects.

It would degrade assistance to allies in these categories:

The printing of NATO safe conduct passes and leaflets for distribution by allied aircraft.

The development of psychological warfare materials and campaigns that would utilize allied resources for production and dissemination.

U.S. technical aid to allies could not include participation of U.S. personnel in training or advisory roles in units producing psychological warfare materials.

It would restrict the effectiveness of participation in disaster relief operations.

This section of the act which the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would strike out would inhibit our international work in police matters, in health, in travel promotion, in ecology, in family planning, in travel publicity, and in countless fields we cannot foresee today.

I believe this issue has not been given the thorough study which would be appropriate before it is enacted into law. It has many ramifications which we would regret were we to do so.

In this day of constantly expanding international contacts, many parts of our Government are in frequent communication with public and private counterparts overseas. This section would inhibit the free flow of information among them—a communications link which is vital to a stable international order and to specific U.S. interests.

We would not wish to cut down on the flow of information to help control the frame in dangerous drugs, to advise others on the population explosion, to advance international communication on crime, or to disseminate new knowledge in the many fields in which the United States is a world leader.

I am particularly disturbed by the way in which this section would inhibit the dissemination of information developed by the U.S. private sector. As I understand the section, it would require that any private book, English teaching text, film, or other medium which may be translated or reprinted by a U.S. agency for further dissemination abroad must carry the U.S. agency's name at the beginning. This may be practical in some cases, but in others the private U.S. author or publisher may wish the overseas product to be identical to the original.

Mr. President, I believe this section, section 205, should be eliminated from the bill. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would do that, and I support his amendment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BAKER. Has the Senator from Arkansas yielded back his time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has yielded back his remaining time.

Mr. BAKER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER). All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER). On

this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL) is paired with the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON). If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 27, as follows:

[No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Allen	Curtis	Roth
Allott	Dole	Saxbe
Baker	Dominick	Schweiker
Beall	Ervin	Scott
Bennett	Fannin	Smith
Bentsen	Griffin	Sparkman
Bible	Gurney	Stafford
Boggs	Hansen	Stennis
Brock	Hollings	Stevens
Buckley	Hruska	Talmadge
Byrd	Jackson	Tower
Harry F. Jr.	Jordan, Idaho	Weicker
Byrd, Robert C.	Long	Young
Cannon	Packwood	
Chiles	Randolph	

May 25, 1972

S 8479

NAYS—27

Bayh
Burdick
Case
Cooper
Cranston
Eagleton
Fulbright
Hart
Hatfield

Hughes
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy
Magnuson
Mansfield
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale

Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Spong
Symington
Tunney
Williams

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken
Anderson
Bellmon
Brooke
Church
Cook
Cotton
Eastland
Ellender
Fong
Gambrell

Goldwater
Gravel
Harris
Hartke
Humphrey
Jordan, N.C.
Mathias
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Miller

Montoya
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Percy
Ribicoff
Stevenson
Taft
Thurmond

So Mr. BAKER's amendment (No. 1201) was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BURDICK) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 15097) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 15097) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF FISHERMAN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART). Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 7117, the amendment of the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7117 to amend the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967 to expedite the reimbursement of United States vessel owners for charges paid by them for the release of vessels and crews illegally seized by foreign countries, to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the collection of claims against such foreign countries for amounts so reimbursed and for certain other amounts, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, may I inquire, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor and has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished majority leader—

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will not mind, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill on this side to reply.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished majority leader what the further business of the Senate is for today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as the Senator knows and the Senate knows, after discussing the matter with the distinguished minority leader on yesterday, we agreed to a resolution which would free the Senate at the close of business today, on a recess basis, until noon of Tuesday next. In other words, we get the extra day because of the condition of the Calendar.

As to the pending bill, H.R. 7117, two amendments have already been added by Mr. TOWER and Mr. STEVENS. I do not know how much more time it will take because it is under a limited time basis.

Would the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) indicate whether he thinks there will be a rollcall vote on final passage?

Mr. JAVITS. I have no idea. It should not be necessary. I do not think the amendment I will propose is that critical, but I cannot tell. It will all depend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. Following disposition of H.R. 7117, we will then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 768, S. 3607, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission. That bill will be handled by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the Joint Committee. There will be a rollcall vote on final passage of that bill.

When that is disposed of, we will go out until noon on Tuesday next.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an amendment will be offered by the two Senators from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), as well as

the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER); but I believe we can agree on it, and if we can, there should be no need to take very long or to have any yeas and nays votes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. We discussed in committee that the additional \$500,000 might not be necessary. That is a question that can be debated each way.

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to hear that. This has reference to the atomic cardiac pacemaker, which is of considerable interest to everyone. The budget request was for \$1 million. The pacemaker is powered by nuclear fuel, as the Senator knows. I think this development is very important, and the full \$1 million should be authorized as well as appropriated later on.

Mr. PASTORE. We have seen the model, and I will say that I felt strongly that maybe we should make it \$1 million. I think we should have it, because of the importance of this instrument.

Mr. SCOTT. I think so, too, and I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT OF FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7117, to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to expedite the reimbursement of U.S. vessel owners for charges paid by them for the release of vessels and crews illegally seized by foreign countries, to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the collection of claims against such foreign countries for amounts so reimbursed and for certain other amounts, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 11; on page 4, line 5; and on page 5, line 1, strike "8" and insert in lieu thereof "9".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have these amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment. At the time the bill was prepared, we did not take into account the enactment, last December 23, 1971, of Public Law 92-219, which already added a new section 8 to the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967.

This amendment will make the amendment of this bill become section 9, to follow the enactment of last December 23, 1971. It is a technical amendment. I urge its adoption and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART). The question is on agreeing to

May 25, 1972

the amendments en bloc of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 24, insert the following: after the word is "country" insert ", if any." and on page 4, line 1, after "1961" insert "unless the President certifies to the Congress that it is in the national interest not to do so in the particular instance."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Washington (Mr. Magnuson) for not having had the opportunity to show him this amendment in advance, but I think if he will be kind enough to give me his attention, he will see the situation in a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York ask that these amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, Mr. President, I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator's amendment would allow—I have been over in Appropriations with HEW and I did not get here until just now—the discretion to be in the President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it would allow the final discretion to be with the President. If he certifies to Congress that the national interest is an overriding consideration he can waive the application of the provisions of the law. I think the principal is a good idea, provided that it is only charged to the specific AID program of the country that seizes boats.

The State Department pointed out that if there is an allocation to that country for foreign aid, then this provision would effect that country. However, if there were not, then it should not hurt anyone else.

The first part of my amendment says "if any." In other words, it is charged against their allocation and only their allocation of foreign aid, if there is any.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, if there was foreign aid, we would still charge it against them.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. Mr. MAGNUSON. And if there was not, it would be at the discretion of the President?

Mr. JAVITS. It comes out of whatever specific funds there are for the country, yes. But it does not reduce the foreign aid funds for other countries or other programs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a new way to approach it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am not through yet. I want the Senator to get the whole picture in reply to his question.

Another thing that the administration is concerned about is that if they are actually in negotiations with a given country about this very vexing matter—and I think the countries who seize U.S. boats are wrong—it may be very unwise

and counterproductive to dock them, say, \$50,000 in the midst of negotiating effort to work out the whole problem. So, by providing that the President could certify to Congress that in that particular instance he does not think it is the best thing to do in the national interest, then we avoid that impasse. That is the purpose. That is not all they want. However, that is all I think they ought to get.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New York used the words "if they are in negotiations." They have been negotiating for years on this matter. Nothing ever happens. Every time they seize about 15 tuna ships, the State Department and all of the Presidents, including this one, sends a troubleshooter down and he negotiates with them. The last one was Finch. He set me an exchange of cables stating that he thought he was getting some place. But nothing happened.

This has gone on and on. I could put in the RECORD a long list of the negotiations we have had with them.

Then a State Department man by the name of Meyer went down there.

Mr. JAVITS. He is still in charge of Latin American affairs for the Department of State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was still the same as it always has been. We have to take some kind of action with these people. They have now induced Brazil to have a 200-mile limit.

I was in Peru 8 years ago and talked to them. I spoke to the President of Peru and I asked him how he arrived at 200 miles. He said that he did not arrive at that figure, that our country did, the United States.

I asked him how that was. He pulled a dog-eared document out of his desk that stated that during World War II President Roosevelt had proclaimed a neutrality zone of 200 miles around South America. That was the basis of it. I guess that many Presidents have many documents that they keep in the bottom drawer. We have to get something done.

I am not saying that Finch and these people are not trying to do something about this. However, they never seem to be able to reach the point where they can stop the thing. We have reached a point where we are paying out quite a bit of money on this.

Mr. JAVITS. I know that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It encourages them to make their fines larger because they know that the fishermen will ultimately get paid. However, it takes time to do this. The fishermen are usually working on a pretty tight budget. I have known fishermen who have gone to the bank and borrowed money while waiting for the State Department to get a check back to them.

So, due to the fact that the Senator from New York wants to join us in this matter and help us out, maybe we can try this new method and let us see what happens.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to make these points.

I agree with the Senator about negotiations. I really mean seriously that the President in all integrity must certify

to Congress—and this is no light matter—that the national interest is of overriding importance. It ought to be a critical matter and not merely the fact that someone is down there trying to work it out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I would be willing to take the amendments to conference.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc of the Senator from New York.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment reads as follows:

On page 6, line 3, add the following sections:

SEC. (7). That section 4 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 is amended—

(a) by inserting immediately before "by a country" a comma and the following: "or vessel of the United States or its gear damaged,"; and

(b) by inserting before "In accordance" the following: "or such vessel or its gear damaged".

SEC. 8. The first sentence of section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after "vessel of the United States" a comma and the following: "or damage to such vessel or its gear,".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 7(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(a) The Secretary, upon receipt of an application filed with him at any time after the effective date of this section by the owner of any vessel of the United States which is documented or certificated as a commercial fishing vessel, shall enter into an agreement with such owner subject to the provisions of this section and such other terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate. Such agreement shall provide that, if such vessel or its gear is damaged as a result of the action of a vessel operated by the government of such country or any other activity of such government (on the basis of rights or claims in territorial waters or the high seas which are not recognized by the United States and when there is no dispute of material facts with respect to the location or activity of such vessel at the time of such attempt), or if such vessel is seized by a foreign country and detained under the conditions of section 2 of this Act, the Secretary shall reimburse—

"(1) the owner of such vessel for actual costs, except those covered by section 3 of this Act, incurred by the owner arising out of damage to his vessel or gear by such country, or during the seizure and detention period and as a direct result thereof, as determined by the Secretary, resulting (A) from any damage to, or destruction of, such vessel or its fishing gear or other equipment, (B) from the loss or confiscation of such vessel, or its fishing gear or other equipment, age fees or utilities;

"(2) the owner of such vessel and its crew for the market value of fish caught (A) be-

Senate, in Vote, Gives Fulbright Another in a Series of Rebuffs

By JOHN W. FINNEY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 25—The Senate, by a vote of 42 to 27, today rejected an amendment that the Foreign Relations Committee had put in a State Department-United States Information Agency budget bill prohibiting the agency from distributing unattributed propaganda abroad.

By itself the issue was not significant, but in a Senate where the committee and its chairman have been normally upheld, the vote symbolized the increasing isolation of Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the committee.

Earlier this month the Senate overturned, by a vote of 57 to 15, a \$45-million reduction that the committee had made in the U.S.I.A. budget in retaliation for the agency's refusal to supply information to the committee.

Then yesterday the Senate, 38-32, rejected a 10 per cent reduction that the committee had proposed in personnel, other than from the State Department, assigned to overseas posts. The Senate was acting on a motion by the Senate Republican leader, Hugh Scott, a committee member.

At least to some Democratic members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the defeats administered to Senator Fulbright appeared to be part of an Administration strategy to divide and weaken the committee by isolating and embarrassing the chairman.

The Administration no longer appears to be attempting to thwart Senator Fulbright in the committee, where he usually can prevail. Rather the White House appears to be waiting for the issue to come to the Senate floor and then marshaling its forces against the Senator.

Signals Have Been Called

Aides in the office of Senator Scott acknowledge that the White House has been calling the signals on what amendments to offer to overturn the position of the Foreign Relations Committee.

On the Senate floor, the Administration can rely upon the inattentiveness of the Senators and anti-Fulbright prejudice to build up a vote against the committee chairman.

During the debate today on the motion offered by Senator Howard H. Baker Jr., Republican of Tennessee, for example, less than half a dozen Senators were on the floor to hear Senator Fulbright's defense of the committee's position. This position held that it was deceitful and improper for the United States Information Agency to distribute unattributed propaganda in foreign countries.

As a result, most Senators reached the floor unaware of the issues and were voting more on the basis of the personalities that were offering or opposing the amendment. Senator Fulbright is the first to acknowledge that this works to his disadvantage in a Senate where considerable personal hostility has built up against him.

The series of recent setbacks have discouraged Senator Fulbright, who is becoming reluctant to take the lead in opposing the Administration if the committee and in turn the Senate will not support him.

The Talk of Cloakroom

The defeats of Senator Fulbright have also become the talk of the cloakroom. After one recent vote, for example, S. J. Kimmitt, the secretary of the Democratic majority who has close ties with the anti-Fulbright faction in the Senate, was overheard telling a Fulbright aide: "Well, I see you lost another one."

Normally a committee rallies to the defense of its chairman on the Senate floor. But for the last month, Senator Fulbright has been left alone on the floor to defend the committee bill. At times he has also found some committee members, such as Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, the ranking Republican voting against provisions that they supported in committee.

As a result, Senator Fulbright deliberately has delayed pushing ahead with the planned study of multinational corporations, for example, until he can get the committee to go on record in favor of \$110,000 for the investigation.

Then this week, when a military aid bill was before the committee, he refrained from proposing any reductions, letting the Senate majority leader, Mike Mansfield, take the initiative.

When the State Department today wanted an amendment offered giving the President discretionary authority on the use of foreign aid funds to pay the fines of American fishing boats seized by Latin American countries, Senator Fulbright demurred, telling a colleague: "Why should I offer it? It will just be beaten."

Senator Fulbright's discouragement has reached the point that he is now raising the possibility in private conversations that perhaps he should retire when his present term expires in 1975 if President Nixon is re-elected and if it appears he cannot be effectual in his role as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Peace Corps, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14734, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOR U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14734) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the U.S. Information Agency, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, HAYS, FOUNTAIN, FASCELL, MAILLIARD, FRELINGHUYSEN, BROOMFIELD, and THOMSON of Wisconsin.

EXEMPTING THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE ON H.R. 14734 FROM CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House appointed on the bill H.R. 14734 not be bound by the restrictions of clause 3, rule XX.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of what this exemption is, please?

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has combined in a single bill three authorizations which passed the House as separate bills:

H.R. 13336, the authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, passed the House April 12, 1972;

H.R. 14734, the authorizations for the Department of State and the United States Information Agency, passed the House May 17, 1972; and

The House this afternoon has passed H.R. 14149, the Peace Corps authorization.

All of these authorizations are included in the bill passed by the Senate May 31.

The Senate took H.R. 14734, the State Department and U.S. Information Agency authorizations, struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted the text of their omnibus bill, including the au-

thorizations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Peace Corps, and asked for a conference.

Technically, these two authorizations might be considered nongermane to the House bill which authorizes funds only for the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency. I have requested that the House conferees not be bound by the rule on germaneness.

The problem is getting all three of the authorizations which have passed the House and passed the Senate to conference.

The purpose of my unanimous-consent request is merely to make it possible for us to take the three House bills to conference so that we can consider them and the omnibus Senate bill at the same time.

I believe this will conserve the time of the House and expedite the completion of our work.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JUNE 12

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. In response to the request of the distinguished minority leader, we have completed the legislative business for this week, and I intend to ask to go over to Monday.

Monday is District day, but there are no bills from the District Committee. We have scheduled H.R. 10792, the SBA loan ceiling, which will be called up under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Also H.R. 12846, the Armed Forces drug treatment program, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week H.R. 14370, State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act, with a closed rule and 8 hours of debate. That is the revenue-sharing bill.

Also the Labor-HEW appropriation for fiscal year 1973 and the Interior appropriation for fiscal year 1973.

On Wednesday we will observe Flag Day, which is customary, and on Thursday the President of Mexico will address a joint meeting of the House and Senate here.

Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Louisiana tell the House, is there a distinct possibility or not for a session next Friday?

Mr. BOGGS. Well, I would say there is a possibility. I do not want to rule out a

session next Friday. If both appropriation bills are not considered, there would not be a session next Friday, but the plan is to call up both of them so at this time I just do not know.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Next Friday is a third Friday.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct. It is an eligible Friday.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the report of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUGGESTED USE OF POW'S AS SHIELDS IS REPREHENSIBLE AND MISCHIEVOUS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in a post-California primary interview over NBC, one of our colleagues suggested that General Giap of the Government of North Vietnam take 700 of our POW's and place one each in 700 city squares throughout North Vietnam—and that this tactic would certainly force us to stop our bombing of North Vietnam.

Because the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey) is a personal friend and once served in a military capacity, I do not want to believe what I have heard and seen.

This is a horrendous suggestion by a public official of the United States or of any civilized nation. The rationale is specious as well as mischievous.

Our military personnel now incarcerated by the North Vietnamese Government have never been considered or treated as prisoners of war under any international treaty, agreement or understanding. They have been treated simply as hostages. At best, their treatment has been wretched and nefarious.

No nation has ever waged a more vicious war of terror and aggression against another people than North Vietnam is waging against the people of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. No military authority has ever treated captured military personnel more inhumanely. The Nazis baked political prisoners in ovens and made lampshades from human skins, but they complied with international rules of warfare respecting cap-

tured military personnel. They never suggested using POW's as hostages or shields.

The commanding general of the North Vietnamese military needs no suggestion from a Member of the Congress on how to mistreat captured military personnel or cause agony and worry to their families and loved ones at home.

I strongly wish that a mutual cease fire could be adopted, that the fighting, bombing, shooting, and killing could stop, the war ended, and peace prevail. This will require the initiative, resolve and action of both sides. Perhaps it can be achieved soon; but in the meantime the suggestion that POW's be used as shields is barbarous.

Actually our POW's would be safer in the city squares than in camps or prisons near military targets. Placing POW's near military facilities would be an heinous and explicit violation of the Geneva Conventions.

We as Members of the Congress and human beings interested in the humanitarian treatment of other human beings should be urging compliance rather than violations of the Geneva conventions.

The wives and families of our POW's and our MIA's have every reason to be shocked and angered by this suggestion. I trust the gentleman will retract his suggestion. I am confident he never intended the barbarous implication of his remarks.

Let us urge both sides to mutually cease fire and negotiate a peace so that all killing, terror, apprehension, and agony of servicemen, civilians, and their families can be ended so that all peoples can live in true peace with freedom.

The President's proposal for peace seems to be the best and most generous proposal yet offered.

Using prisoners of war in such a diabolic way would violate every rule of law and international agreement. This use of prisoners would violate every tenet of humanitarian treatment of human beings.

His premise is a mischievous misrepresentation of the purpose, policy, and practice of our present bombing in North Vietnam. The targets are military, not city squares. Cities are not being bombed. Although accidents and mistakes can and do occur, especially during war, we are scrupulously avoiding strictly civilian structures and civilian personnel.

Our targets have military value—surface-to-air missile sites; ammunition and fuel storage dumps; transportation and logistics systems; powerplants; marshaling yards for tanks, weapons, and trucks; and concentrations of troops and fuel supplies.

We have taken extraordinary precautions to warn their government, their people, and their suppliers of our objectives and targets. We have been extraordinarily successful. We all know that if our bombing was hitting civilian structures or injuring civilian personnel that the North Vietnamese Government would supply the world media with plenty of documentary photographs and I am confident they would find some newspaper or television network to publish the photos for all of America and the world to

see. But this has not happened. And although I wish that the bombing, mining, shooting, and killing were not occurring, I am grateful that our objectives are military and not civilian. I wish also that the objectives, policies, and practices of the North Vietnamese were the same.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McDONALD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this special order today, because there was not sufficient time allotted during the debate on the Higher Education Act conference report.

If time had been allotted to me today to make my remarks they would have been basically in agreement with those made by our distinguished minority leader, GERALD FORD.

I voted against the conference report because the so-called antibusing amendment would have no positive effect on the busing problem within my congressional district, and as was pointed out by Congressman FORD, experts have suggested that it may have no effect on busing whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I quote an article and editorial of May 18 and 19 of the New York Times:

The Amendment (Broomfield) would delay for up to nineteen months, pending all appeals, any Federal Court orders requiring busing to achieve racial balance. On that basis, it does not prohibit busing necessary for school desegregation. It merely adheres to the Supreme Court's ruling that it is proper for the Lower Courts to order busing to achieve integration but not to create racial balance.

The Broomfield amendment was also changed in conference so that it applies only through 1973.

The full impact of conference committee changes in the House antibusing amendments is described in the article in the May 18 New York Times:

The compromise would also permit Federal money to be used for busing if this was sought by local officials, and it would allow Federal officials to encourage busing under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The conferees basically accepted the Senate language outlawing busing only if it endangered the health of pupils or required them to be sent to inferior schools.

The liberal New York Times editorial described the conference action as follows:

The Conference compromise, which closely resembles the earlier Scott-Mansfield Amendment, is designed to do as little harm as possible. Its liberal authors would undoubtedly agree that it serves no constructive purpose in its own right; rather, it is a shield for saving the college campuses without actively sabotaging school integration.

For all of the above reasons stated, I opposed the conference report.

PART III—CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I insert the third and final excerpt of the study on the various children's allowances proposals all over the world. The charge that these programs spur the birth rate is one which I believe to be groundless, based on Canada's experiences. I submit your special attention to the section entitled "Impact on Birth Rates" in this study:

IMPACT OF BIRTH RATES

OTHER MEASURES

Table 3 provides a comparison of the expenditures for children's allowances in terms of both total social security expenditures and the GNP in each of the five countries under consideration. The definitions set forth in a 1967 study¹ by the International Labor Organization (ILO) were used to update the expenditures for 1966, 1967, and 1968 as far as possible.

TABLE 3.—EXPENDITURES FOR CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL SOCIAL SECURITY EXPENDITURES AND OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT, FIVE COUNTRIES, 1966-68

Country	Expenditures for children's allowances					
	As percent of total social security expenditures ¹			As percent of gross national product		
	1966	1967	1968	1966	1967	1968
Canada ²	12.7	11.2	9.3	1.0	1.0	0.9
France	25.3	24.5	24.5	3.7	3.6	3.6
Sweden ³	8.2	8.2	6.8	1.3	1.3	1.2
United Kingdom	5.7	3.6	5.9	.4	.4	.7
West Germany	4.3	3.5	3.2	.7	.6	.6

¹ Social security expenditures include administrative expenditures but generally exclude those for government employee programs, industrial occupational pension plans, and benefits under private medical care insurance plans. The data used here, except as otherwise noted, are defined as in "The Cost of Social Security" (International Labor Organization), 1967.

² Children's allowances include family allowances and youth allowances but exclude the schooling allowances of the Province of Quebec. Social security expenditures exclude housing, education, and agricultural price support programs.

³ Children's allowances for 1967 estimated.

Source: Data for children's allowances: Canada—Department of National Health and Welfare, Annual Report, Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1968, pp. 127-128; France—Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances, Statistiques et Etudes Financières, pp. 406-417; Sweden—1966 from Social Security in the Nordic Countries, 1966 (Statistical Reports of the Nordic Countries, No. 16, Copenhagen, 1969), and 1968 from the Swedish Embassy, Washington, D.C.; United Kingdom—Annual Abstract of Statistics, 1969; West Germany—Der Bundesminister für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, Arbeits und Sozialstatistische Mitteilungen, July 1969, pp. 209-211. Data for social security expenditures: Canada—Department of National Health and Welfare, Social Security in Canada, 1969, p. 77; France—same as children's allowances; Sweden—1966 and 1967 from Social-Nytt, No. 5, 1969, p. 17, and 1968 from the Swedish Embassy in Washington, D.C.; United Kingdom—Annual Abstract of Statistics, 1969; West Germany—same as children's allowances. Data for gross national product: International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics, March 1970.

In 1968, the results relate favorably to the data in table 2. France is well ahead of the other countries with about one-fourth of all social security outlays going to children's allowances. Except for Canada, the other countries rank in the same order as they did in relation to average earnings: Sweden, the United Kingdom, and West Germany.

For Canada, the proportion of total social security expenditures directed toward children's allowances—9.3 percent—indicates relatively low total expenditures rather than high children's allowances. This point is borne out by the GNP figure, which is considerably lower for Canada than for the other countries. Still, expenditures have risen substantially with the maturing of the Canada and Quebec pension plans and the lowering of the retirement age year by year.

Except for the United Kingdom, national outlays for children's allowances account for a declining proportion of total social security expenditures as defined and calculated by

Footnotes at end of article.

Bill file

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8611

batten down the hatches against change, or even the exploration of change.

In a day of exploding knowledge and better informed people, the bigot reads history and economics, sociology and science, in terms of what has been—rather than what is, or what could be.

The bigot waits in the snug harbor of some America Past—bombarding every landing party of the present or the future. Bigotry attacks from every direction, and the future is in jeopardy whenever critical examination is thwarted or blocked whether it be from the right, left or center.

Anyone who limits inquiry for the sake of his own cluster of causes is a dangerous foe, and the bigot constantly stands in the pathway of progress.

Conformity is the second danger. Conformity arrives in drab, protective clothing. Whispering, rather than shouting, rarely making headlines or drawing attention of any sort.

Conformity argues its case with a variety of spurious reasons: prudence—good taste—"no sense in rocking the boat". But conformity is no less deadly than bigotry when, in its quiet fashion, it reduces honest dissent, divergence and difference within society. It is a state of mind which is deadening to free inquiry and to education upon which all growth ultimately rests.

We should protect non-conformity which leads to the ceaseless seeking of the Why of things, not merely the so-what of things. And you can be a non-conformist who still respects the opinions of others and does not violate decent procedures.

The third danger is Fear. A common retort of the Fear-mongers when their works are condemned, is to insist that there are indeed things to fear. They are right, of course.

There are causes of anxiety and concern in our world today. We live in a period of human history where the race is between civilization and catastrophe. We are called upon for wisdom and leadership unmatched in the past. We can provide leadership only out of a quality of mind which is open, and exploring, and free and sensible.

No one can provide this leadership out of fear. The fear-mongers would sow a whirlwind of panic.

Most of the fears they would post in our nightmares are vague and diffuse. Fears about hidden enemies so secret that we can't hope to see them. Fears about ideologies so insidious that they are said to infect Presidents and Supreme Court Justices, Members of Congress, teachers in our neighborhood schools, and professors in our colleges.

Those are the panic-born fears that Fear-mongers would peddle, while keeping the silence of the dead about the true dangers in our society—the dangers of smugness, and indifference, and complacency.

So, mount your chargers, because whatever your role in helping to meet the challenges of our time, you must expect to come up against bigotry, conformity and fear. I'm sure that you've already faced them—in your personal lives, and at a very early age. But you've all persevered. And in so doing you won over some of those who had doubts, and fears, and reservations about deaf people.

As you leave Gallaudet, you will be severely tested in the most vital quality that any college can encourage—your individuality and how you can fit into, and help make this a better world.

You are more formally entering a society in which you can trade your individuality for togetherness; your freedom of mind for conformity; your common sense for panic or pessimism.

There will be many pressures to do so. It will be easy to give in. Some of you might, but if you do you will default on the highest promise that is yours. But I know that you will not take the easy way.

That is why your parents, your home

states, and the Federal government has made such a deliberate investment in each of you. That is why Gallaudet was established and became a national responsibility. As you know, only too well, Gallaudet is unique.

But again, you are all pretty typical of all 1972 college graduates because the public and private contribution towards the expense of these educational programs far exceeds the tuition and fees paid by students. On that count, Gallaudet only differs in the degree of that Federal support.

Along with other members of the Congress, I have been happy to be in a position to be of some assistance directly to Gallaudet; to assist the special programs on your campus at the elementary and secondary levels that are about ready to come into full bloom and that are setting a pace for the whole nation to follow; and recently, we've moved Gallaudet into an area of leadership that has been too long neglected—continuing education programs for deaf adults. We hope that program too will have an impact in communities all over the nation.

We want to do more, not just on the Gallaudet campus, but all over our nation. Right now there are three special pilot programs for the deaf underway at Community Colleges in Seattle, St. Paul and New Orleans. If the initial results of these efforts hold up, it is obvious we should have many more such programs in local communities across the land.

This brings me to a very personal challenge that I feel all of you graduates face. Historically it was the hearing who decided what was best for the deaf, and then did it. Granted, it was good that something was done.

Yet that was a very paternal, patronizing way of doing things. The fact that some successes resulted means that such an approach was not all wrong. But, it was not all right either.

The deaf can't be content to be told what they should do, and how they should do it, by their hearing brethren. The deaf must not only ask, but demand a voice in the private and public agencies concerned with deaf people.

As college graduates, you have an extra responsibility to carry the ball for your brethren. You must become active and involved citizens in your home communities—in civic and community affairs, and yes—in politics.

You must demand a voice in these decisions concerning programs for the deaf, and you must fight to see that the right decisions are made.

The right decisions that establish good programs to meet the needs of the deaf, and the right decisions in the perennial efforts to secure adequate funds to support those programs.

In closing, might I say again that it is you who have honored me by inviting me to be a participant in your graduation ceremonies. I know that feeling is shared by all of my colleagues from the Congress who are also here today.

It has been a special pleasure for me because I view each of you as a notch above the average college graduate. You have had special challenges in your lives. Each of you met those challenges head on, you persevered and overcome, and that speaks highly for each of you.

That confirms that fact that each of you has those qualities that our nation needs for our future, and that the future of our nation can be a better one.

My congratulations to you all—we wish you well.

Senator MAGNUSON was awarded a doctor of laws, honoris causa, by Gallaudet College and the following citation was presented during those ceremonies:

CITATION OF WARREN G. MAGNUSON ON BEING PRESENTED THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS, HONORIS CAUSA

Senator Warren G. Magnuson is one of the great statesmen of American political life. Representing the people of the state of Washington in the United States Congress for the last thirty-five years, the Senator has proven his concern for the "little man." He has been a knowledgeable and influential advocate in the fields of environmental protection, health care, bio-medical research, voting rights, air safety, and consumer protection. Bringing his considerable experience and expertise to bear on these problems, he has authored major pieces of legislation and has become identified as the "father of the consumer movement." Senator Magnuson, who ranks fourth in seniority in the United States Senate, has several key committee assignments, including chairmanship of the Committee on Commerce. He is a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and Chairman of its Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education and Welfare. In this capacity, he introduced and guided through the Senate the Act testablishing direct medical care to private citizens living in rural and urban poverty.

Continuing his interest in the neglected groups in American society, the Senator recently has sponsored the appropriation of funds for continuing education services for deaf adults in the United States. Deaf people have not often had a more effective champion than Senator Magnuson. We are pleased to recognize him today, not only for his services to the deaf, but for his broader contributions to the quality of life in the nation.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 9669. An act to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9669) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

S 8612

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments to the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and remain in a temporarily laid-aside status until the amendments proposed by the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are disposed of.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

In accordance with the previous order, the following amendments are to be considered in the following order:

Amendment No. 1202 of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), on which there is a time limitation of 30 minutes.

Amendment No. 1196 of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.), on which there is a time limitation with the vote to occur not later than 12:15 p.m.

Amendment No. 1209 of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), on which there is a time limitation of 1 hour in the event he wishes to call up that amendment.

The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1202

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1202.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 27, after line 24, insert the following:

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 303. (a) The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the cooperation and assistance of other relevant Government agencies including the Department of State and the Department of Defense, shall prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report on the international transfer of conventional arms based upon existing and new work in this area. The report shall include (but not be limited to) the following subjects:

(1) the quantity and nature of the international transfer of conventional arms, including the identification of the major supplying and recipient countries;

(2) the policies of the major exporters of conventional arms toward transfer, including the terms on which conventional arms are made available for transfer, whether by credit, grant, or cash-and-carry basis;

(3) the effects of conventional arms transfer on international stability and regional balances of power;

(4) the impact of conventional arms transfer on the economies of supplying and recipient countries;

(5) the history of any negotiations on conventional arms transfer, including past policies adopted by the United States and other suppliers of conventional arms;

(6) the major obstacles to negotiations on conventional arms transfer;

(7) the possibilities for limiting conventional arms transfer, including potentialities for international agreements, step-by-step approaches on particular weapons systems, and regional arms limitations; and

(8) recommendations for future United States policy on conventional arms transfer.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and an interim report

shall be submitted to the Congress not later than six months after such date.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act requires the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—ACDA—to prepare a comprehensive report to the Congress on the international transfer of conventional arms from producing to recipient countries. I want to thank Senators BOGGS, CASE, HART, HUMPHREY, PROXMIRE, and SCHWEIKER for their cosponsorship of this amendment. The amendment spells out a number of topics that should be covered by this report, including the problems and possibilities of international agreements regulating and limiting the transfer of such weapons and recommendations for future U.S. policies in this particularly vital and sensitive area of arms control. Let me outline my reasons for offering this amendment.

In recent years there has been tangible progress toward controlling the testing, emplacement, and transfer of nuclear weapons. The most recent significant development is the United States-Soviet agreement announced Friday which limits the race in numbers of offensive and defensive nuclear missiles. It is important to continue to seek a fuller measure of nuclear arms control consistent with our national security requirements, but it is equally important to begin to explore seriously ways and means of reducing and regulating the massive international traffic in conventional armaments. Although all the wars occurring among the developing countries since World War II have been largely fought with foreign supplied weapons, little national or international attention has been given to the control of this traffic. Yet, the greatest danger to world peace may well lie not so much in the sudden outbreak of nuclear warfare between the superpowers, as in the step-by-step escalation of a local war fought with conventional weapons into an international war fought with nuclear weapons.

While there are no precise figures on the total magnitude of the traffic in conventional arms, all the estimates point to massive and growing dimensions. The total annual value of transferred weapons is estimated to be around \$6 billion. Researchers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology collected data for 52 developing countries for the period from 1945 through 1968. They estimated that during that period these countries acquired from foreign sources more than 8,000 combat aircraft; over 2,000 military transport aircraft; nearly 4,000 trainer aircraft; 1,300 light transport, observation, and liaison aircraft; 1,500 helicopters; nearly 14,000 tanks; 9,000 armored personnel carriers; 3,000 armored cars; 300 warships; nearly 500 landing ships and landing craft; and over 900 patrol craft.

The same study estimated that for these countries merely to maintain constant force levels by replacing this equipment as it wears out, their annual demand would be on the order of 850 aircraft, 500 tanks, 400 armored personnel carriers and armored cars, and 45 naval craft. These figures represent only a part

of the total transfer of arms and military technology; they do not take into account small arms and ammunition which are the basic weapons required by insurgent groups, artillery, or the costs of transferring military expertise.

The expense of arming small countries is prodigious. The U.S. military assistance programs currently run around \$1.5 to \$2.5 billion annually. The Soviet Union also bears substantial costs and has expanded its military transfers to the developing world during the past decade. Even China, a comparatively much poorer country, has been a major source of military supplies for Pakistan. It is more and more difficult to ascertain benefits to these programs commensurate with their material, political, and human costs. Thoughtful Americans, for example, are increasingly questioning the traditional rationale for our military assistance programs.

They ask: Do the grants or the credit sales of military equipment by this country to developing nations help to defend incipient democracies against internal threats or do they alter the internal balance of power within these countries in favor of indigenous military elites? Do our military assistance programs help to stabilize regional balances of power or have they provided smaller nations with the capability to project their limited power beyond national boundaries and hence the means for aggression? Do military assistance programs reduce the likelihood of American involvement in local wars in developing countries by enhancing these countries' self-defense capabilities or do they provide the links and rationale for U.S. involvement where intrinsic American interests do not exist? Do such programs give the United States leverage over the military policies of its allies and customers and hence some power of restraint or do they make us the hostage of these countries as our honor becomes entangled with their military performance? Are our gifts used in ways consistent with our purposes in extending the aid or are they ultimately employed in ways quite different from those we intended?

The same questions might well be asked by Soviet policymakers. One sees very little evidence that the Soviet Union has acquired any tangible rewards from Indonesia or the United Arab Republic commensurate with the massive military aid programs it has extended to these countries. Nor can one discern any special benefits China has received from its military aid to Pakistan. The arming of developing countries has not led to any changes in the international balance of power. It does, however, carry within it the inherent threat of superpower confrontation as recent events in Southeast Asia so well illustrate. It may not have caused any wars that might otherwise have not taken place, but it certainly has made the wars in such places as Southeast Asia, South Asia, and Nigeria more bloody and destructive. The main results of the massive arming of developing countries have been stalemate and an increased level of international tensions.

I believe that it would be the beginning of wisdom for both superpowers to en-

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8613

gage in negotiations leading toward the regulation and limitation of supplies of military weapons to other countries. President Nixon, in his address to the Soviet people, spoke of the responsibility of the superpowers "of practice restraint in those activities—such as the supply of arms—that might endanger the peace of the developing areas." I very much hope that the Soviet Union will heed this call. At the same time I believe that we must look to our own part of this responsibility by developing an American policy toward the international transfer of conventional arms. I believe that the report required by this amendment would provide, in broad outlines, the basis for such a policy. And I believe that an expression of congressional interest in this subject and a public document of our intent will not only strengthen our Government's efforts to make progress toward limiting arms transfer, but may stimulate other governments—including the Soviet Union—to declare their intentions as well.

I am aware that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has prepared and sponsored a number of studies on the subject of conventional arms transfer. I am also aware that the United States has called for greater attention to this issue at the Geneva-based Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. But there is nothing yet approaching a cohesive set of American policy objectives, nor, to my knowledge, has the United States presented any specific proposals for limiting conventional transfer at any international forum.

The lack of progress in this area is partly a reflection of the many difficult and complex considerations that require the attention of our diplomats and executive departments before an American policy can even be formulated. Let me give some illustrations of the considerations which ACDA must grapple with in preparing the report required by this amendment.

What would constitute a reasonable level of military assistance to smaller countries? Obviously, these countries do have legitimate internal security needs, and some, like Israel, whose right to existence has not been acknowledged by her neighbors, also have legitimate external security problems. It would not be wise to stimulate the growth of many costly and inefficient arms industries in the developing world at the expense of economic progress by restricting the external supplies of weapons to levels below those required to meet legitimate security requisites. At the same time, the superpowers should halt the practice of aggressively peddling arms and emphasizing security threats to potential recipients that exist more in the imaginations of the donors than in the perceptions of their clientele.

What categories of weapons are most susceptible to international agreements? For example, a beginning might be made in sophisticated and conspicuous equipment such as warships, which could provide an impetus for further international cooperation dealing with other weapons systems such as the Limited Test Ban Treaty helped provide the psychological

atmosphere which contributed to later agreements on nuclear arms.

What forums are appropriate for negotiations on the transfer of conventional arms? For some categories of weapons bilateral agreements between the superpowers may be enough to impose a reasonably satisfactory degree of control. For other weapons, a multilateral conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva may be a more appropriate negotiating body.

What possibilities exist for limitations on arms supply to specific geographical regions? Would the countries within these regions have to initiate such limitations? Would an arms limitation agreement require a great power accord to underwrite it, for example, a neutralization agreement such as the one proposed by several Southeast Asian countries?

What can be done about the vast quantities of weapons that are considered obsolete by the superpowers? As the superpowers introduce more modern aircraft, ships, and small arms, the weapons these replace are often given to developing countries as military assistance instead of being scrapped. This practice tends to make the level of assistance linked more closely to the rate of weapons development in the donor countries than to the actual security needs of the recipient countries. Perhaps international agreements could be reached on the disposal of obsolete equipment.

How can middle-sized arms suppliers be induced to cooperate in efforts to reduce the traffic in weapons? This is a particularly difficult issue because the middle-sized suppliers incur fewer political risks from their activities than the superpowers, and may achieve significant economic benefits both in balance-of-payments terms and in support for maintaining profitable levels of production of more sophisticated weapons.

Other problems exist. How can we more effectively prevent the retransfer of weapons from our aid recipients to countries or groups whose interests may be entirely different from our own? Would the collection of statistics on conventional arms movements by the U.N. as proposed by several member governments facilitate greater international appreciation of the size and growth of this traffic?

There are no simple answers to these and the many other questions that must be considered when reassessing our policies toward the arming of smaller countries. But, we begin to examine these questions and formulate specific policy proposals. This is why I am asking for a report from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency containing policy recommendations. A vote for this amendment is a request for a thorough evaluation of the policy options on conventional arms transfer open to this country. It is an exercise in responsible congressional participation in foreign policy. Certainly we can all agree that this would be a better and safer world if the number of instruments of coercion were reduced. And all can agree that the vast material and monetary resources we and other countries pour into weapons could be better used to enrich the quality of our lives and societies.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I think the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Delaware is excellent. I certainly will support it. It is an area in which the Arms Control Agency has authority; but, so far as I know, it has never undertaken such a comprehensive review of conventional arms.

Hopefully, in view of the ending of the war in Vietnam, there will be great surplus there and elsewhere in the world.

I think it is an excellent amendment, and I would be pleased to accept it. If I had thought of it in committee, I would have offered it there. I congratulate the Senator for bringing it up. I think it is a worthwhile and timely amendment. We should encourage them to make a thorough review and a comprehensive report on the status of conventional arms all over the world. We ourselves have done a great deal in distributing the arms. It is our responsibility, I think, to review the situation. So I would be very glad to take the amendment and I certainly assure the Senator I will support it as hard as I can in conference because it is a good amendment.

I am prepared to yield back my time if the Senator from Delaware wishes and we can vote on his amendment at once.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the Senator for his kind comments.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). All time on this amendment has now been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1202 of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1196

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consideration of amendment No. 1196 by the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, Jr.) now recurs under the previous order.

The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment as follows:

On page 30, delete lines 12 through 18.

The language sought to be deleted is as follows:

REPEAL OF RHODESIAN SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

SEC. 503. (a) Section 10 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as added by section 503 of Public Law 92-156 (relating to military procurement authorizations for fiscal year 1972), is repealed.

(b) Section 11 of such Act is redesignated as section 10.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be taken out of either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

S 8614

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the pending amendment would keep the law as it is now insofar as the importation of chrome from Rhodesia is concerned. Last year the Senate and then the House of Representatives passed legislation which said that if a strategic material is being imported from a Communist-dominated country, the President could not prohibit the importation of that same strategic material from a non-Communist country.

The Senate adopted that provision and the House approved it by a vote of 251 to 100. The Foreign Relations Committee in the Foreign Relations Act of 1972 now seeks to eliminate that provision. The pending amendment which I have introduced would keep the law as it is.

Mr. President, it seems to me appropriate that if the United States finds it necessary to import a strategic material from a Communist-dominated country—which in this case is Russia—the same material should not be prohibited from being imported from a non-Communist country.

The situation that the United States found itself in—and the reason the legislation was enacted last year and became effective January 1 of this year after having been signed by the President—was that up to that point 60 percent of all the importation of chrome came from Communist Russia. That is another way of saying that the United States became dependent on Communist Russia for this vital raw material. And when the Congress considered the matter, it reached the conclusion that that was not a very logical situation to permit to exist.

I do not know why the Committee on Foreign Relations wants to repeal an act which just became effective this past January. Nevertheless, it has been proposed that this provision be repealed.

I want to emphasize that when the roll was called in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, taken together, representatives from 46 of the 50 States supported the provision which subsequently became law. So this is not a regional matter; it is a national matter. It is not a State Department matter; it is a national defense matter. Does the United States want to continue to be dependent on Communist Russia for a vital war material? That is the issue.

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

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? If no one yields time, time will run equally against both sides.

Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I will take only a very few moments at this time. We have colleagues, I suspect, coming into the Chamber who wish to address themselves to this question.

Before I proceed I ask unanimous consent that the legislative director of my staff, Mr. Robert Bullock be permitted to join me on the floor during the course of this discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to make two or three points quickly as we recapitulate the issues in connection with this question.

Considering where we are today some 8 or 9 months since the Senate acted on this question last October 6, it is vital that we have a look backward at what has happened in the wake of that Senate action. During the debate in October last year one of the points that was made repeatedly in this Chamber was that we should at least hold off with Senate action for about 30 days until the British and the Rhodesians could complete their negotiations, which were even then underway. They had been negotiating off and on for a considerable length of time to try to reach a compromise on their impasse in regard to the status of the Ian Smith government in Rhodesia, in its relationship to the United Kingdom, and most important of all, its proposals for effecting a transition into independence with an accord that would spell some hope for the 95 percent or more black Africans in Rhodesia's population.

The Senate in its wisdom chose not to suspend any action until those negotiations were over. In fact, we acted even as the talks between the British and the Smith government were reaching a climax. The result, in hindsight, is now very clear: The moment the Senate took the action it did, that vote was transmitted by the news services to Rhodesia, at which point we have the testimony of both Governments that it froze and hardened the Rhodesian Government's negotiating position. The upshot of it was that out of those talks came a less than equitable compromise. The Rhodesian government of Ian Smith was emboldened to resist even more firmly the pressures for compromise and its firmness in resisting them was triggered in large measure, we are told, by the action of the U.S. Senate on the sanctions.

I have just returned from a conference on the Isle of Jersey this month with our British contemporaries, many of our Canadian contemporaries, and an assortment of experts on Africa. The purpose of the conference was to examine the status of many African questions now, but the point made to me personally by leaders of the Labor Party in England and by the leaders of the conservative government, was that the bargaining in a realistic sense once the Senate took its action withdrawing from sanctions against Rhodesia; and the substance of this judgment is borne out now by the Pearce Commission report.

The Pearce Commission was set up to assess the consequences of the agreement

that was reached between the British conservative government and the Ian Smith government in Rhodesia. What the Pearce Commission concluded after long, tortuous, and everyone agrees, fair hearings, was that the terms of the hardened agreement were unacceptable to the 95-percent-black population in Rhodesia. What this meant in very blunt terms is that the Senate of the United States, by its action in withdrawing its full participation in sanctions against Rhodesia, contributed to the sabotage of efforts to negotiate an equitable compromise between Rhodesia and Her Majesty's government in London.

That is a serious charge, Mr. President, but it is a charge that the Senator from Wyoming alone does not make; it is a charge contained now in the record of the history of those times that we are now privileged to examine in hindsight.

My petition here today is that the Senate soberly reconsider what it did. The British petitioners, the African petitioners, and the United Nations petitioners, too, request that action. They ask for one more chance to look at the question. Again and again, those persons coming out of Rhodesia and those who are more widely versed in connection with the entire vast continent of Africa are saying that the prospect of a violent settlement of these questions in that part of the world is greater now in the wake of the continued impasse in Rhodesia than before. I would be the first to point out that the United States single-handed cannot solve all the problems of the world, but we have influence and what we do and say makes a great difference to people all over this globe, and it makes a particular difference to people in Africa. I would stress that what looms even larger than it did last October is a second implication involved in the action that this body is now being requested to take.

That is the role of the United States itself in the United Nations, and the role of the United Nations as man's only remaining hope of something just a little bit better for our world.

Let me spell out why the U.N. looms very large this morning as we share our thoughts on this troublesome problem. At the point away back in 1966 when relations between Great Britain and Rhodesia had reached their crisis, when it appeared at that time as though the only likely recourse was a shoot-out in Rhodesia, the United States interceded as an honest broker and begged the British not to take a precipitous position; begged the Rhodesians not to respond in a precipitous way, and said, "Let us give it one more chance." We urged that the issue be taken to the United Nations, where it had not been lodged until that time. Partially at our behest, through our persuasion as the honest broker in that dispute, the question was turned over to the U.N.

My friend from Virginia has often reiterated his strong support of the United Nations. I have reiterated mine. That is why I think it is important that we look at the U.N. role in this question and what is at stake, because by the judgment of the United Nations, a program of sanctions was ordered against Rhodesia.

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8615

A program of sanctions, in the modern world with modern communications, is always a complication. As we well know, there were numerous asserted violations of the sanctions once they were imposed by the United Nations; but, even so, it was a serious enough matter that the Ian Smith government still today squirms under the worldwide question mark that is thrown over the legitimacy of that regime by this official U.N. sanctions program, and Smith is still striving to get out from under the program.

It is also well to note that even the Republic of South Africa, even Portugal, two nations that might have been expected to be more or less sympathetic with the Rhodesian question, have not formally acted to break the sanctions program.

The irony of it is that the United States of America, one of the principal architects of the original document that came out of San Francisco at the end of World War II, the United States within whose boundaries this great international body is lodged, the United States which at its own initiative persuaded the British to turn this matter over to the United Nations rather than go to the next stage, which could have been force, which both sides feared—the United States became the one member of the United Nations which, by the action which this body initiated, formally and openly broke faith with a United Nations commitment.

That, Mr. President, is what our country is going to be on the line for. That is the judgment that we shall have to account for as we stand before the bar of history when we profess in our rhetoric and in our profuse oratory about how we believe in the U.N. and how important it is that the U.N. succeeds. I say here it is going to take a great deal more than rhetoric to reestablish our own integrity in the U.N. It is well enough to say we pay more than anybody else in the U.N., but you do not buy principles with dollars; you support principles with the integrity of your deeds. That is why the whole question of the U.N. is a paramount issue here as this body debates this question today.

The United Nations has been in a low state for the past few months, for many complicated reasons. The big powers have been on the front pages and the front line, trying to resolve the differences of the world. But, Mr. President, let us not be the one that gives up the last ray of hope for collective action through an organization of all of the nations, not just some of them. We have committed a great deal of that faith.

We now have a new Secretary General of the United Nations. The United Nations is now seeking to get off the ground again, in its effort as peacemaker and honest broker; in efforts to resolve the differences of man around the world. This is an hour when a constructive action in this body, reinstituting the good faith of the Senate of the United States in our commitments under the Charter of the United Nations, would be a veritable shot in the arm to that sometimes beleaguered body in New York.

Mr. President, that is the case that I wanted to make this morning in these

brief remarks and to say that we are being judged all over the world by where we stand now. We are being judged in black Africa as to the sincerity, as to the credibility of our oral commitments to equality among all peoples around the world; by these same black Africans who predominate in that vast continent—we are not talking about a minority; they are the majority; they are the majority; they are the minority only in a few governments—who are looking to us for some flickering gesture at the very least to give them some hope for following our lead.

President Nixon is in foreign lands today—has been for over a week—leading in an effort to ease the tensions of the world. The President has scored some breakthroughs in China, in the East, and still more breakthroughs in the trip to Moscow, and now in Iran, and today he goes to Poland. But I say, Mr. President, the world is round. It is not flat. It is not elongated. It is round, and a part of that round is the second largest continent in the world, the continent of Africa. And we are being judged in Africa today.

So I say, Mr. President, that I think it is of the utmost importance that, without risk, without compromising the security of this country, without contravening in any way the President's heroic efforts to bring peace in the world, but, in fact, complementing them and implementing them, this body would do well to rejoin the United Nations in its action in enforcing sanctions against the Government of Rhodesia for the duration of the judgment of the U.N., which until now at least has been conditioned on the negotiating efforts between the British Government and the Rhodesian Government to work out a livable compromise of their differences.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am glad to yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, perhaps I might be accorded the privilege of sort of wondering aloud at some of the comments made by the Senator from Wyoming.

He has mentioned the rhetoric of this debate. I would agree that it has wandered far afield on occasion. But when he begins to talk about the United Nations, about a consistency of philosophy and a consistency of position, perhaps I might be permitted a response, and perhaps even an evaluation of the consistency of that remarkable body.

There is not a Member of the Senate or a Member of Congress who does not hope that the United Nations will play a role in creating a greater chance for peace in this world. But if they are going to do that, they are going to have to develop a consistency of philosophy, a consistency of position, a consistency of integrity as well as this Nation, and this they have not demonstrated.

When one talks about the United Nations and its right to impose sanctions, it should be remembered that a part of

the United Nations Charter says that body shall not interfere in the affairs of another nation, it shall not determine the form of government of any nation. Yet that is exactly what they are attempting to do in this particular instance.

It has the perfect capacity to recognize and create all kinds of nations if it likes them, if it wants their vote in the United Nations. But if it does not like them, as it apparently does not like Rhodesia, it does not recognize them, it just says, "We are going to impose sanctions on you and keep you from existing."

I marvel at the people in this country who talk about integrity of principle, and who say that the United States should not be a world policeman. I agree with that. But then what are they doing meddling with Greece? What are they doing coming before Congress and saying that we should not have any relationship with Greece because that nation does not fit their own personal standards of majority rule?

Look at the utter hypocrisy, the sheer, rank hypocrisy of the United Nations in the instance of Taiwan. They did not happen to like the country of Taiwan. They happened to decide they wanted to play the power game, so they chose a big guy over a little guy, and said, "We are going to bring Red China into the United Nations, and at the same time we are not going to give the 14 million people on that island representation; we are going to throw them out." What a bunch of garbage there is in that position. Consistency? It is not consistency, it is hypocrisy, pure and rank.

Talk about the equality of all people. That is an objective we all share. I guess you can say that the people of Eastern Europe are equal in terms of the degree of slavery they suffer. But where were these people who speak out for equality when the people of Poland, the people of Hungary, or the people of Czechoslovakia sought their own freedom? Where were they then?

You see, it depends on whose ox is being gored. The shoe does not seem to fit on both feet. There is no consistency of position here. It just depends on which side you are on. You do not like Rhodesia, so you say, "impose sanctions," and then you plead and cry about wanting to increase trade with Eastern Europe and with the Soviet Union.

I do not think that is an unfair objective. I think trade can create an interdependency that will enhance the prospect of peace. But let us be honest about it. People who talk about one country and one standard should apply that standard around the world, or they should shut up.

I do not think the people of this country are being treated honestly. I do not think they are being treated honestly in the United Nations, and I do not think they are being treated honestly by some of our political leadership, who have the remarkable talent to select those areas where we are going to have principles and to select other areas where we will not have principles.

If there is any kind of principle in this country, if we are going to meddle in the affairs of men and nations, if we are

S 8616

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

going to say, "We are not going to deal with your country because we do not like your form of government," then let us talk about dictatorships wherever they exist. Let us talk about inequality wherever it exists. Let us be honest about it, and have a common and consistent approach to that particular problem.

But do not come to me and say, "Well, we do not like dictatorships, but we will accept some because they are liberal and we will not accept others because they are repressive," or whatever derogatory term they want to use about them. Are they dictatorships or are they not? Is there equality or is there not?

Does a Russian Jew have equal treatment? Does a Russian Baptist have equal treatment? Does a Russian Catholic have equal treatment? Does a Russian black have equal treatment? Does a Ukrainian have equal treatment? Does someone in Czechoslovakia, or Hungary, or Poland, or Rumania, or Bulgaria, or Albania? Are they equally treated? Are they?

If we are going to say, as I think we should, that it is for the people of a country to determine their own destiny, that it is not for this Nation to try to impose its will, that this is a consistent principle which we are going to adhere to, it would require that that principle apply in all areas, not just in Eastern Europe, not just in Vietnam or Asia. It would apply in Rhodesia and Africa as well.

But let us decide which angle we are going to take. Let us decide where the consistency is, where the principle is, where the integrity is, and then let us adhere to it. And I would be perfectly willing to do that. You see, I happen to agree with a lot of those people in this country who have been critical of our actions in Southeast Asia, in one instance, when we say we have got to make a decision whether an action we take is in our national self-interest first, because this Nation cannot really be the guardian of the peace if it is not strong, and if we destroy ourselves, we are not going to be very effective in saving anyone else.

Where is the American self-interest in this particular question? I think it is fair to ask. Is it in our self-interest to leave ourselves totally at the whim and wish of one nation, the Soviet Union, for our supply of a terribly strategic material like chrome? Is it? Or should we not have an alternative source of supply?

Is it in our national interest to pay double the world price for chrome? Because that is what happened the day we put the embargo on. The world price went up by two, and the American housewife, the American consumer, the American defense industry, and the American taxpayer are paying the difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BROCK. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Tennessee 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BROCK. The American taxpayer pays for the policies of the Government that decided it wanted to impose its will upon other governments. What is the real difference between military inter-

vention and imperialistic intervention by an economic device? It is the same thing. It is an imposition of will, an infringement upon the free process.

I happen to think that our national interests are very much at stake in this particular matter. I happen to think the United States cannot afford to be dependent upon the Soviet Union for its sole source of chrome. I happen to think the U.S. taxpayer, the U.S. consumer, has a right to expect his Government to allow him to buy any material he wants, any place he can, at the best price he can possibly buy it for. If that means we can buy it in Rhodesia or Canada or South Guam, I do not care. But to say otherwise is to violate his freedom, and that is not the prerogative of this body. It is not the prerogative of this body to infringe upon the free process of Americans wherever they be and whatever activity they want to undertake, so long as that activity does not infringe upon the rights of others.

We have a basic question before this body. The question is whether or not this country is going to be consistent, whether it is going to be impartial, whether it is going to have integrity of principle, or whether it is going to play the game of catering, catering to a few in the intellectual world or in the press who say, "We want to select whom we are going to deal with. We are going to select those people we want to associate with. We are going to make the American people pay for it whether they like it or not."

Well, it is wrong. I support the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. McGEE. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I respond to the Senator from Tennessee by way of making sure that the record stands correctly in accord with at least the best facts on which we can lay our hands.

First, in regard to the allegation that we are meddling in the internal affairs of another government, an independent government. Mr. President, I challenge that, as a matter of fact. Southern Rhodesia is a part of the British Empire. Rhodesia has not been set up legally as an independent entity. That is what part of the negotiations are all about. It is a member of the British Empire by international law. We did not interfere in Rhodesia. The British requested that this matter be turned over to the United Nations. We are a member of the United Nations. We are participating as a member of that collective body that has voted to take collective action on the sanctions question. This is no meddling in the internal affairs of an independent nation.

Part of the problem is how to bring about the legal transition of Rhodesia, a member of the empire, into some kind of status of independence, and that is basically Britain's question. This phase of it she sought to turn over to the United Nations, as many colonial questions have been, in the hope of finding a solution to it.

The second fact that needs to be kept clear on the record has to do with the Soviet Union and our dependence on it for chrome we need. Let us set that record straight. First of all, the President

of the United States happens to have believed that our security was enough at stake to go to Moscow. The President of the United States believes that we can negotiate a deescalation of the tensions of the world by dealing with the Russians, not by fighting them or by isolating from them at the moment.

Let me say to the Senator that, in addition, the Senator no doubt is aware of the fact that since our dialogs here last October, the trade figures for last year, 1971, are now a matter of record and have been submitted to the President by the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Last year, the imports of chrome from the Soviet Union fell almost by half. In 1970, almost 2 years ago, we were importing 58 percent of our chrome from the U.S.S.R. Last year we imported 36 percent from the Soviet Union. Where did we get the difference? Our imports from Turkey last year—and may I submit that Turkey is an ally of the United States—were 39 percent.

I think we ought to lay to rest the factor of where we are getting our chrome, even in terms of its price.

We ought to remind ourselves, as well, that this body, after our action last fall, passed S. 773. That measure authorizes the disposition of 1,300,000 tons as excess to our chrome ore strategic stockpile. That in itself should remind us that there is no great sense of urgency in national security and defense needs, if, by the best judgment of those whose responsibility it is to maintain that stockpile—and by the judgment of the Armed Services Committee we passed this release of 1,300,000 tons—we can afford to do that without risk to this Nation. I agree with that.

What it does put back into perspective is the issue of the sources of our chrome ore. Some of our chrome ore, Mr. President, is coming from the Soviet Union, from whence it has come for a good many years. It is coming even more from Turkey now. For that reason, I sought to inject these modifications of the suggestions that were being made by the Senator from Tennessee.

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

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

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee such time as he desires.

Mr. BROCK. Let me say, first, that there is no Member of this body for whom I have greater respect, affection, and regard, in terms of protecting our national interest, than the Senator from Wyoming. I know of his integrity and his ability in this matter. We happen to be thoroughly in disagreement on this issue, and I respect him for that as well.

But let me point out that when we are able to release some chrome from our stockpile, it is because we have alternative sources of supply, because the Senate authorized the purchase of chrome from many sources.

If we did not have alternative sources of supply, if we were totally dependent, as the Senator's position would leave us, on the Soviet Union, then we could by no

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8617

means have any confidence that we should reduce our stockpile of chrome.

Second, why do we buy chrome from Turkey? One reason is that the Soviet Union jacked up the world price so high that it made it possible for inefficient producers to get into the market, and we can begin to see higher prices elsewhere. As a matter of fact, we were paying double the world price because the Soviet Union put it there, and we had no choice but to buy chrome there.

With respect to the President's trip to Moscow and the fact that the Senator believes the President went to Moscow because he had confidence in our ability and our strength to negotiate with the Soviet Union from a sincere position on both sides, I think the President's trip to Moscow was one of the greatest steps toward peace in my lifetime, and I support the President in his effort. But I point out to the Senator from Wyoming that the President did not go to Moscow and sign a treaty which turned over to the Soviet Union the responsibility for our collective defense. He did not ask the Soviet Union to defend America. He did not ask them to put their missiles in front of our shores to protect this country from attack. He went over there to negotiate an arms limitation on both sides, so that neither would fire at the other.

What the Senator from Wyoming is asking us to do is to put our defense in their hands, at their disposal; because if we are dependent, in fact, upon the Soviet Union at some future date because of his amendment, if we are dependent upon them as the sole source of chrome, then he is saying that we might as well put our entire collective security at their disposal and say, "Protect us from harm." The Senator obviously knows that we are not going to do that sort of thing. That is why I think it is terribly dangerous for this country not to afford itself of any source of supply we must have in order to maintain our security.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator for his further development of this matter.

I would hasten to add two things. The first is that this administration has endorsed my position. The President of the United States has said that they approve of this section of the bill. This is the same President the Senator has been alluding to, who went to Moscow, and he is not about to let our defenses down.

I certainly agree that anything we might reduce is on a quid pro quo basis. It is negotiated. That is the only sensible thing. But let me add to that what the release of the stockpile really represents. 1.3 million tons is being authorized in this pending legislation. What is coming in from Rhodesia in the so-called new source of supply if the present rate continues for the full year, will be 50,000 tons. The Senator cannot tell the Senator from Wyoming that that was the reason for our releasing 1.3 million tons from our own strategic reserves. The real reason is, if I may point out, this was recommended by the President even before the issue came up a year ago.

We have enough reserves left excess to the stockpile, 2.2 million tons, to meet the defense needs for 20 years

at the present time, according to the emergency stockpile board. We have enough for 2 years if diverted totally for commercial use without touching the basic stockpile. Keeping this record straight and in perspective, the amount of ore we will be getting from Rhodesia by letting down our sanctions and giving away a principle, sabotaging United Nations policy and calling into question our own commitment to the United Nations, injuring our image in a vast continent where we hope to improve our relations and protect our flanks if need be, and would amount to about 50,000 tons from Rhodesia. That is the anticipated sum for this year. The President has endorsed this proposal of mine to resume sanctions with our Government officially pledged to full compliance. I say to my good friends from Tennessee it begins to look like a pretty thin case to argue that our strategic interests are at stake.

Mr. BROCK. With regard to the President of the United States, I could say that he can be wrong, too.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming says that we want to set the record straight, and I think it is a good thing to do. It is important that we set the record straight.

The expert on the stockpile situation is the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), who is the chairman of the Stockpile Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. He will be here in a few minutes to discuss the stockpile situation.

But I will say at this point that the record will show the Senator from Nevada stated last year, in debate on the floor of the Senate, that his subcommittee and presumably the Armed Services Committee as a whole, would not recommend the release of this stockpile of 1.3 million tons were the proposals which I made last fall to be rejected. It was because of what Congress did last year that the Stockpile Subcommittee recommended the release of 1.3 million tons from the stockpile.

The stockpile today has roughly a 3-year supply of chrome. There are probably some Senators who do not believe in a stockpile. Maybe they would say to take it all out. But the purpose of the stockpile is to protect the United States in the event of an emergency.

It has been concluded that the United States needed a 3-year supply in the event of an emergency. That is approximately what the United States has today.

As I say, the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) will be here shortly to give the exact figures. The figures I have given are close to being the precise figures.

The Senator from Tennessee raised several important points. One is that the United States has no business interfering in the internal affairs of another country. That is what it is doing.

Whether Rhodesia should be dependent on Great Britain, a colony of Great Britain, or whether it should be independent of Great Britain, is a matter to be decided by those countries. The United States has no business getting involved in that. We have been involving our-

selves in too many things all over the world. Certainly we have no business getting involved in that matter, as to whether Rhodesia should be independent of Great Britain.

The fact is that the only thing Rhodesia is doing is what the United States did in 1776, seeking their independence—

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I do not say on the floor of the Senate whether they should have independence, but I think they should have the right to obtain that independence if that is their desire. I do not think the United States should seek to prevent that from being done.

The able Senator from Tennessee raised another point about the cost of this material having been substantially raised as a result of unilateral action by the President of the United States some years ago.

You know, Mr. President, Congress never put these sanctions on. It was done unilaterally by the President. As a result of those sanctions, the price has skyrocketed. It is affecting jobs all over America.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegram from William J. Hart, director of District 19 of the United Steelworkers of America. The telegram is sent from Tarentum, Pa. It reads:

Once again I urge you to oppose repeal of the Byrd amendment as contained in section 503 of S. 3526. This matter is of great concern to the specialty steel industries and as a consequence is directly involved in the continued employment of United Steelworkers of America members.

So, Mr. President, that is another reason why the action taken by Congress last year should not be overturned. There are many jobs at stake.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) mentioned my strong support for the United Nations. That is correct.

I came back from Okinawa in the Pacific in May of 1945 at the time the United Nations was being formed. I felt it would be a world organization which would make it unnecessary for persons like myself in future years to have to be sent into battle on foreign soil in far-away areas.

I had great hopes for the United Nations, but I must say that it has not lived up to those hopes. It is a different United Nations today from what it was then. There were 51 members at that time, all with long-established governments. Today there are 131 member nations, very few of which have a history of established governments.

But, be that as it may, my concern is for the United States. That should be our foremost concern. We certainly want to help the United Nations if we can but I, for one, do not want to put the affairs of this country in the hands of the United Nations.

Mr. President, just why an effort should be made here to repeal a law which passed and became effective only in January is not entirely clear to me.

You know, Mr. President, under existing law, the President can prevent the importation of chrome from Rhodesia.

S 8618

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

All he has to say is that we shall not import any chrome from Russia and then, under the terms of existing law, it will be impossible to import chrome from Rhodesia.

It is obvious, however, that if we do not need chrome ore, the President would do just that. He would say that it is not necessary to import chrome from Russia. Therefore, under the law it is not possible to import chrome ore from Rhodesia.

So there is a means under the present law to uphold the action of the United Nations if this is what the Government wants to have done. We do not have to change the law. It can be done under the present law.

The President signed this into law last December. So I do not know why we have all of this concern about the United Nations being so heavily involved.

The sanctions were put on unilaterally by the President of the United States, President Johnson, some years ago. And the only time that Congress has had an opportunity to express itself on this issue was last fall. Both the House and the Senate then voted to make it possible to lift the sanctions insofar as this one strategic material was concerned.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). The Senator from Virginia has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, Jr. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would like to respond to my good friend, the Senator from Virginia and cooperate with him and try to get along until the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) gets here. We have a commitment with him regarding his speech. I want to respond to some of the points raised by the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I think we ought to keep the record clear on where the steelworkers of America stand on this issue, since the Senator from Virginia raises that point.

During the debate last fall we submitted the testimony of Mr. Abel, the president of the United Steelworkers of America. The president of the United Steelworkers of America said that under no circumstances have the steelworkers of the United States endorsed the Byrd amendment. Mr. Abel said they believe in the United Nations and they want the record to be straight. Nor does Mr. Hart, Mr. Abel went on to say, speak for the steelworkers. Mr. Hart, a member of the executive board, speaks for himself. The steelworkers go on record as stressing the fact that American jobs are not at stake with regard to this issue. And we believe that is one of the important facets of American policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, that stresses once again, as this

matter comes up for a vote, that they want to make it clear that the steelworkers go on record as being in favor of the sanctions imposed against Rhodesia.

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

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., September 29, 1971
Hon. GALE W. McGEE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McGEE: Recently the Senate debated a provision of the Military Procurement Authorizations Act, 1972 (H.R. 8687), reported out by the Senate Armed Services Committee, which would permit the United States unilaterally to breach the United Nations' embargo against Rhodesia for the purpose of importing chrome ore or chromite. Because of the official social and racial injustices perpetrated by the Rhodesian government against its citizens, the UN applied the economic solution of an embargo until such time as that government through negotiations would correct such indignities. The impact of the embargo, as far as chromite is concerned is that the American ferroalloy producers have increased their purchases of Russian chrome ore from a level of 33 per cent in 1966 to a level of 58 per cent in 1971.

During the floor debate on your amendment to delete this morally indefensible section and to maintain the embargo, Senator Harry Byrd (Va.) read a telegram from a Mr. William Hart, who specifically identified himself as a member of the executive board of the United Steelworkers of America, in support of the effort to destroy the effectiveness of the embargo. Let me assure you that his telegram neither was endorsed by the executive board of nor does it reflect the position of the Steelworkers.

The United Steelworkers of America supports the intent of the embargo and its continuation. We feel that as a nation, and in conjunction with other nations, we must be socially concerned about basic human justice and, if need be, sustain an economic price for that conviction. Furthermore, this is one of the few occasions on which the United Nations acted as the moral conscience of the world. Its effort, therefore, should continue to have the support of this country if the purpose of a United Nations organization is to be meaningful. To break the embargo on this item will surely lead to a breaking of the embargo on other items.

Arguments on the floor indicated that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had previously rejected this measure; that fully three years before the embargo we were already importing almost 40 per cent of chromite from Russia (49 per cent in 1963); and that there is a governmental request to release 1.3 million tons of chrome from the strategic stockpile, thereby belying any charge of strategic shortage of this mineral.

However, as regards to the threat of job loss in the specialty steel industry in Pennsylvania or elsewhere, it is in no way affected by the importation of chromite from Russia. Our problem in that industry is due to the inordinate levels of specialty steel imports from Japan and Europe and not to the source of chromite imports. To correct the specialty steel trade imbalance we have supported steel quota legislation and/or voluntary agreements. However, the importation of chrome ore from Russia does not aggravate the importation of specialty steel. It certainly did not do so in the three years prior to the embargo.

The ferroalloy industry is also beset by ferroalloy imports. We have supported their contention before the Office of Emergency Preparedness for quota relief. But the relief was to be directed against ferroalloy imports, for

example ferrochrome, and not the ferro ores, for example chromite, upon which the industry depends. The lack of access to Rhodesian chrome ore fields does not affect the volume of chrome ore imports. The fact that some ferroalloy producers own properties in Rhodesia should not sway the United States decision to maintain the embargo.

Our problems, therefore, in the specialty steel industry and the ferroalloy industry can be solved by quota controls and not by breaking the Rhodesian embargo on chrome ore. We hope that this untimely and socially indefensible provision of H.R. 8687 will be dropped either in conference or by further action by the Senate. The price of human dignity should not be measured in terms of the cost of chromite in the United States market.

Sincerely yours,

I. W. ABEL,
President.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from John J. Sheehan, legislative director of the United Steelworkers of America.

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

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1972.
Hon. GALE W. McGEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McGEE: The United Steelworkers of America has maintained that upholding the United Nations embargo against Rhodesian chrome ore does not affect jobs of American Steelworkers. The recent release of excess chrome from the strategic stockpile further indicates that it is not necessary for the United States to continue to violate the embargo.

A February 22, 1972 article in the *American Metal Market* stated that, "Uncertainties continue to surround the Rhodesian chrome ore picture with respect to prices and supplies moving to the United States . . . The Rhodesian government has controlled the production and sale for all mines in Rhodesia since the sanctions were imposed by the United Nations. At the present time, the Rhodesian government has not indicated to Union Carbide how much ore will be available in 1972 [except for] an immediate shipment of about 20,000 tons of ore." Such uncertain circumstances would seem to place in question any assertion that the opening of Rhodesian imports would provide insurance against a real or potential crisis.

Surely we do have some commitment to prevent political exploitation of minorities and we should express that commitment through economic sanctions rather than ultimately being involved, directly or indirectly, in bloodshed.

We, therefore, support and urge your support of Section 503 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972 (S. 3526), which would rescind the previous action of Congress which resulted in a breaking of the embargo.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. SHEEHAN,
Legislative Director.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Steelworkers legislative appeal under date of May 30, 1972.

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

CHROME ORE IMPORTS

The issue of the United Nations-sanctioned embargo of Rhodesia, as it applies to chrome ore, will again be before the Senate very shortly. The debate which has swirled about this issue has brought to the fore many

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8619

claims of undue hardship to the American specialty steel industry and threats of job loss to American steelworkers.

As the union which would be directly affected by this alleged adversity, let me again emphatically state that the United Steelworkers of America fails to see any credence in these claims. Furthermore, we have always supported the embargo in the past, and we support its reinstatement now.

A number of points concerning competition on the affected marketplace must be made clear:

(1) *Voluntary Trade Restraints*—On May 6, 1972, the White House announced that new import accords had been reached with the Japanese and European steel producers. These agreements are designed to prevent any further erosion of the domestic steel market by imports, explicitly including the specialty steel market (which is the market sector affected by chrome ore). In other words, our domestic production of specialty steel, for domestic consumption, will not be adversely affected because of different prices of chrome ore from different sources.

(2) *Price to the American Consumer*—A picture has been painted by some that the American consumer is being gouged because of the removal of the Rhodesian supply as a competitive factor. *Barron's* magazine, for example, states in its May 29, 1972 issue that the "sanctions cost United States consumers of stainless steel an estimated \$100 million per annum. . . ." The inference is that the cost of Russian chrome ore rose dramatically after the imposition of the embargo, with a resulting \$100 million windfall being charged off onto the American consumer. But State Department figures reveal the following:

U.S.S.R. CHROME ORE IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Year	Tonnage	Percent of total U.S. chrome ore imports	Value
1969	299,000	57	\$7,800,000
1970	409,000	58	13,700,000

With the dollar value of over half of the imports being at the amounts listed in the above chart (\$7.8 and \$13.7 million), it is inconceivable that excess profits on the Soviet imports or even on the total imports could be \$100 million.

Prices may indeed be somewhat higher for non-Rhodesian ore. But we find no assurances from Rhodesia from which to gauge what we might expect from them in the future. A February 22, 1972 article in the *American Metal Market* stated that, "Uncertainties continue to surround the Rhodesian chrome ore picture with respect to price and supplies moving to the United States. . . . The Rhodesian government has controlled the production and sale for all mines in Rhodesia since the sanctions were imposed by the United Nations. At the present time, the Rhodesian government has not indicated to Union Carbide how much ore will be available in 1972 [except for] an immediate shipment of about 20,000 tons of ore." Such uncertain circumstances would seem to place in question any assertion that the opening of Rhodesian imports provides any panacea for American consumers.

(3) *Steel Market Fluctuation*—The rapid increase in price of USSR chrome after the imposition of the embargo has been exploited as an example of the loss of competition in the market. But another factor must also be considered. The period of this price increase coincided with boom years in the world steel market. That market has now deflated, and so has the Soviet price of chrome ore (down 15 per cent from the 1971 price).

(4) *Reliance Upon the USSR*—In the years of 1969 and 1970, we did in fact import the

majority of our chrome ore from Russia. In 1971, however, Turkey became the leading importer at 39.4 per cent, with the USSR falling back to 35.8 per cent—almost its pre-embargo level.

We feel that the economic arguments against the embargo are unfounded. But more important, we feel that the Rhodesian embargo must rest on its own social, not economic merits. This nation owes a deep moral commitment to the objectives of that embargo.

We, therefore, support and urge your support of Section 503 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972 (S. 3526), which would rescind the previous embargo-breaking action of Congress.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the suggestion has been made repeatedly here that somehow the Steelworkers have copped out on this question, because they are concerned about jobs. The United Steelworkers of America point out that American jobs are not at stake. They are not concerned about jobs. They are concerned about the higher principles that are involved. They do not see that any jobs are affected by the sanctions on chrome from Rhodesia. The jobs may be Rhodesian jobs, but they are not jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I think this ought to be spread on the Record as part of the true perspective of where the Steelworkers, who theoretically would have the most at stake in the Senator's proposal, stand. They support a return to this program of sanctions.

Mr. President, I return once more to the reminder that the President of the United States has endorsed this approach because this approach is simply another one of the facets of the international policy to help strengthen the American hand. It was his emergency board that made the decision, with all due respect to the Armed Services Committee, that 1.3 million tons of chrome were in surplus. Yet, my friend, the Senator from Virginia, and the Senator from Tennessee, would have us believe here that by the purchase of 50,000 tons of chrome from Rhodesia, we justify the release of 1.3 million tons from our stockpile. That is nonsense. No one who can examine the implications of that statement can believe it. It says that we have more chrome in the stockpile than we know what to do with, and by releasing the excess we are insuring ourselves of enough for our entire defense and domestic needs for 2 or 3 years ahead, besides what remains in the stockpile, which is far more.

The decision says that chrome is not in any critically short supply.

It further says that the price of ore is set in the world market and not in the machinations that go on in terms of Rhodesia.

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

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of today, entitled "Atoning on Sanctions" be printed in the Record.

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

ATONING ON SANCTIONS

The Senate will get an opportunity, probably today, to start pulling the United States back from a violation of international legal obligations and the United Nations Charter. It will vote on Senator Gale McGee's bill to repeal a 1971 provision that had the effect of breaching sanctions twice invoked against Rhodesia's white minority Government by the U.N. Security Council.

Prospects for repeal improved greatly with a strong declaration of support from the Administration, which made no fight against Senator Harry F. Byrd's 1971 amendment. In a letter to Mr. McGee, Acting Secretary of State John N. Irwin demolished arguments for the Byrd amendment, particularly the charge that by barring Rhodesian chrome imports the United States left itself dependent on the Soviet Union for strategic material.

"There was no chrome shortage last year and there is none now," Mr. Irwin said. In fact, there are 2.2 million tons of excess top-grade chrome ore in the strategic stockpile. Months before Mr. Byrd submitted his amendment the Administration had asked Congress for permission to sell off 1.3 million tons—sufficient to supply this country's total chrome requirements for eighteen months or to meet defense-related needs alone for fifteen years.

The United States imported more chrome in 1971 from its ally, Turkey, than from Russia. The Administration also refutes the rumor that Russia itself is violating the sanctions and reselling Rhodesian chrome to this country. Tests of Soviet ore by the Bureau of Customs have produced no evidence of this whatever.

When Congress passed the Byrd bill it seemed probable that Britain would soon settle the Rhodesian problem with the white regime, making sanctions academic. But Rhodesia's black majority rejected the settlement and Britain perseveres with the sanctions. By passing the McGee repealer, Congress can bring the United States back into line with most of the international community and restore its traditional position in support of the United Nations, the rule of law and majority rule in southern Africa.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) is the chairman of the Stockpiling Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of September 30, 1971, the Senator from Nevada said:

We have 4.4 million tons in the stockpile. We held hearings on that and determined that we should not release it.

They did not release it until this legislation was enacted last fall.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be taken equally from each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

S 8620

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), chairman of the Stockpile Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding to me.

I wish to comment on the repeal of the Rhodesian sanctions on chrome ore since I was personally involved last year as the chairman of the Senate's Stockpile Subcommittee.

As we all know, section 503 of S. 3526, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972, provides for the repeal of the Rhodesian chrome amendment—the Byrd amendment—enacted last year as section 503 of the Military Procurement Authorization Act. In order to put the issue in proper perspective, the following review may be helpful in connection with the Rhodesian sanctions provision.

The Byrd amendment, enacted last year as section 503 of Public Law 92-156, provides, in effect, that the President may not prohibit the importation into the United States of a strategic commodity unless imports of such commodity from Communist-dominated countries are also prohibited by law. In practical effect, the section would permit U.S. imports of chrome and other strategic and critical materials from Rhodesia despite the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia and the U.S. Executive order enforcing the U.N. sanctions.

CHROME AND ITS USES

The principal commodity affected by the Byrd amendment is chrome. "Chromium is one of the top strategic metals and in 1939 along with three other metals, it was the first to be designated for stockpiling"—Mineral Facts and Problems, Bureau of Mines Bulletin 650, 1970 edition. The U.S. consumption of metallurgical grade chrome was 911,000 tons in 1970, the bulk of it going into stainless steel and other types of high performance steels.

There is no adequate replacement for chromium in the manufacture of these steel products. About 10 percent of the domestic production went directly into military and defense applications—but a large percentage of chrome is devoted to other essential applications. In the electric power generating industry, stainless steel is required to steam turbine blades because of its corrosion and heat-resistance properties. Stainless steel is essential for many transportation uses, in addition to its application in jet engine components. Industries where cleanliness and sanitation are critical also use substantial quantities of stainless steel because of its corrosion resistance—it does not chemically react with other materials to which it is exposed and hence will not contaminate those materials. Hospitals, food-processing facilities, and pharmaceutical production are examples. Household appliances and kitchen tools also use chrome—but in 1968 only about 5 percent of U.S. chrome usage went for these purposes, according to U.S. Bureau of Mines data.

NATIONAL SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

There are important national security considerations involved in our current reliance on the Soviet Union for the bulk of our national needs for chrome. There is no domestic production of chrome ore. The only domestic source for chrome comes from disposals from the U.S. stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The Soviet Union was the source of nearly 60 percent of U.S. chrome imports in 1969 and 1970. The Russians supplied more than 40 percent in 1971. The other major suppliers were Turkey and South Africa.

It would defeat the very purpose of the stockpile if the United States were to rely on it as a major source of chrome in the future, as it has in recent years. While there is currently a surplus of chrome in the stockpile, the surplus is not large enough to meet our needs for very long.

"POLITICAL" CONSIDERATIONS

Like other minerals, chrome must be mined where it is found. With the exception of Turkey, all of the other major sources of metallurgical grade chrome ore are located in countries which the United States may have moral or political differences. Rhodesia and South Africa are both under the control of governments which practice discrimination against blacks. The Soviet Union, of course, discriminates against Jews and many other racial and religious groups. The United States, to put it plainly, would cut off its nose to spite its face if we refused to buy chrome produced in countries whose policies we do not agree with.

THE ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

As the dominant world supplier of chrome, the Russians have driven the price from a presanction level of about \$25 per ton to a 1971 high of more than \$61 per ton. Witnesses from the American Iron and Steel Institute testified before Congress that this increase in the price of chrome cost U.S. consumers of stainless steel more than \$100 million a year.

Foreign producers of stainless steel, some of whom have benefited from the Rhodesian sanctions—because they, in fact, bought lower cost Rhodesian ore in defiance of the U.N. sanction—have increased their penetration of the U.S. steel market. In 1971, imports of cold rolled stainless steel sheets accounted for 32.9 percent of the domestic supply, imported stainless steel wire for 48.3 percent of domestic supply, and imports of stainless wire rod accounted for 56.3 percent of the domestic supply. Imports at this level clearly have a serious impact on employment and production in the domestic steel and ferroalloys industries.

EFFECT ON RHODESIA

The enactment of the Byrd amendment last year, at best, has had only a token effect on the economy of Rhodesia. In the presanction era, chrome exports accounted for only 2 percent of Rhodesia's export trade. In 1964, for example, Rhodesia's total exports were valued at \$354 million, but only \$7 million came from chrome.

There is some reason to believe that the U.S. action in permitting chrome imports may not have benefited the Rhodesian economy at all. This is so because:

First, Rhodesia has never stopped producing or marketing chrome ore and the Byrd amendment did not make more chrome ore available on the world market than was available before its enactment. It only enabled U.S. firms to legally import chrome that would otherwise have gone, in secret, to other steel-producing countries.

Second, The Byrd amendment has helped produce a reduction in the world price of chrome ore. The published price of Russian chrome ore today is from \$7 to \$9 per ton lower than the 1971 price. The 1972 published Russian price is from \$52.82 to \$54.24 per ton, delivered to a U.S. port, down from \$61.50 in 1971—Rhodesian ore in 1972 is \$48.36 per ton, delivered to a U.S. port.

Third, This reduction in the price of chrome is likely to reduce the amount of foreign exchange received by Rhodesia for the sale of chrome ore, and the Byrd amendment will, therefore, not benefit its government.

EFFECT ON U.N. AND A RHODESIAN SETTLEMENT

The U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia can probably be regarded as a failure, regardless of what Congress does about the Byrd amendment. Economic sanctions have never been a particularly successful diplomatic weapon. The Rhodesia sanctions have been in effect almost 5½ years without, apparently achieving their objective. The sanction also have been frequently violated. More than 110 cases of sanctions violations have been reported to the U.N. Sanctions Committee, including 32 which deal with chrome.

Congressional action on the Byrd amendment, either last year or this, is not likely to affect the effort to reach a settlement between the United Kingdom and Rhodesia. The United Kingdom Government reached an agreement with the Rhodesian Government after the congressional passage of the Byrd amendment, but there is no evidence that the action of Congress had any effect whatsoever on the agreement. One of the features of that agreement called for appointment of a British commission which would attempt to determine the views of the blacks in Rhodesia with respect to the agreement. That commission, the Pearce Commission has completed its work in Rhodesia and was scheduled to submit its report to the British Government by April 30, 1972. The report, however, is not expected to be made public for a month or more, to allow the British Government time to review it. There is no sign that any action by Congress will affect the course of action with the United Kingdom and Rhodesia may take in the future.

It might also be noted that the U.N. sanctions were imposed by the Security Council and cannot be lifted without a vote by the Security Council and that the Soviet Union can veto the lifting of sanctions. I, therefore, recommend that the Byrd amendment be kept intact and that the section 503 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972 which provides for the repeal of the Byrd amendment be defeated.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Nevada for the excellent presentation

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8621

he has just made and the facts which he has brought out. I think it is very important that the facts be made available, and the Senator from Nevada, as chairman of the Stockpile Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, is in a unique position to present to the Senate the facts in this case, which he has just done.

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

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I may say that last year, when we were considering this matter, we had before us in the Stockpile Subcommittee a proposal to release or permit the sale of chrome from the stockpile on the ground that it was in excess.

The Stockpile Subcommittee held up that release, because we felt that we needed some source of supply other than from a Communist dominated country, and it was only after the Byrd amendment passed last year that the release of the chrome was agreed to by the Stockpile Subcommittee. And I may say for myself that we certainly would not have permitted the release of chrome from the stockpile had not the Byrd amendment been adopted by the Senate. If we were to go back to that position, it would be my position, certainly, that we make a mistake in not withholding from disposition from the stockpile of any of the chrome that we now have.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. That is a very important point the Senator from Nevada has made, and I am glad he brought it out at this point in the debate.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes to respond to a couple of points the Senator from Nevada has developed here.

The first is a repetition on my part of a point I made as we were discussing this question before the Senator from Nevada arrived to make his speech. It is simply that the best estimate that we can get from our own Government is that the rejection of these sanctions, or withdrawal from the sanctions on chromium, at the very most this year will bring in about 50,000 tons of ore. That is the estimate of our own agencies.

It is inconceivable to me that the release of 50,000 tons of ore by lifting the sanctions is going to permit even the Armed Services Committee to change its point of view, let alone the board that controls the strategic reserve, so that they would release 1,300,000 tons.

I think the Senator will recall with me that last year when we were debating this question, the decision had already been made by the board itself that that 1,300,000 tons was not needed with or without sanctions against Rhodesia, and that this action had been confirmed and has now been confirmed by the Armed Services Committee in releasing that 1,300,000 tons in exchange for the 50,000.

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

Mr. McGEE. I will on the Senator's time. I am trying to husband my time.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, that is simply not a fact. The Armed Services Committee released that ore on the basis that the Byrd amendment had been adopted. That amount would remain in the stockpile as of now had not the Byrd amendment been adopted. So this was not a decision of the Armed Services Committee independent of the Byrd amendment.

It is a fact that the administration did propose the release from the stockpile, and we went into the matter and did not agree with them.

Mr. McGEE. But the Senator is missing my point. That is my very point: It is not what the Armed Services Committee chose to do, it is how they equate 50,000 tons of chrome ore now, this year, from Rhodesia, as an excuse for releasing 1,300,000 tons, which the Senator said we could not release while the Byrd amendment was pending and until the Senate had acted upon it. That does not hang together for me, or I would think for others. You do not agree to the release of 1,300,000 tons because, through breaking the sanction, you make available 50,000.

But I wonder whether the Senator has taken into account the second factor; namely, that the whole stress has shifted dramatically in the last year, and that our importation from the Soviet Union, which was always a critical factor, amounting to nearly 60 percent—I believe 58 percent, according to the figures supplied us—in 1970, has dropped to 36 percent this year, according to the Bureau of Mines.

Where are we getting the new ore? Not from Rhodesia, in spite of the lifting of the sanctions. We are getting it instead from Turkey, an ally of the United States.

However, all of this is really a little bit beside the point. I want to turn to another point that the Senator from Nevada made: that there is nothing in the record to suggest anything happened because of the action of the Senate of the United States last October 6 when it adopted the Byrd amendment lifting sanctions. Again, earlier in the day I detailed with great care my own visit in England with the labor party members who are out of power but were the government at the time all this began, and with the conservative government which is in power now, and which is involved in the negotiations and had been involved in the negotiations last October.

The leadership of both parties made it undeniably strong that their negotiations hit a stone wall the moment the Senate of the United States took that action. I have since had occasion to talk with political groups on both sides in Rhodesia, the one group, the Ian Smith government, saying, "We jumped with joy the night we got the news of the Senate's action lifting the sanctions," and the other group saying, "We came apart, because that was the one remaining hope we had for an equitable solution."

The record is now clear. The Senator suggests that there has been a Pearce

Commission meeting and we are still waiting for the report. Well, I have the report. This is the Pearce Commission report. It was the subject of our conference earlier this month with the British parliamentarians, the Canadian parliamentarians, and all the African experts we could corral at that time.

What the report says is that the forced negotiation was inequitable and would be unacceptable, by their judgment as a result of their hearings, as a settlement in Rhodesia. I shall be glad to share this report with my friend from Nevada. That is the Pearce Commission study. But it says further that the role the U.S. Senate took last October 6 hardened and toughened the Rhodesian negotiating position, and the result was that the negotiations came up short of the kind of thing that would be acceptable to all the groups in Rhodesia.

I yield the floor, Mr. President. That is all I will take the time to say at this point.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. Let us go ahead with the colloquy, yes.

Mr. CANNON. Is it the Senator's position that we should seek, by our actions on the Senate floor, to assist factions of foreign governments in their dealings with each other? I do not see that at all.

Mr. McGEE. No, I agree.

Mr. CANNON. We did not seek such results initially, and should not now.

Mr. McGEE. No, the Senator is absolutely right.

Mr. CANNON. If we are going to reverse our position now, we would be getting right into the middle of negotiations again, as the Senator has suggested we were in the middle of them before.

Mr. McGEE. No, if the Senate stands on its position there may be no new negotiations. There is no reason for Rhodesia to negotiate.

But let me add this one factor that he leaves out. That is that our action was no interference in Rhodesia. Our role was as the middleman and the broker between Great Britain and one of its territories, a relationship that was seeking to negotiate a way to independence for another member of the old British Empire.

The British then took this matter to the United Nations, and our action on sanctions had nothing to do with backing the British; it had to do with living up to our responsibility, our commitment, if you will, in the United Nations.

The United Nations voted the sanction. Britain alone did not vote it. The United States alone did not vote it. The United Nations did, and we are a signatory member of that body. We did it in good faith. We followed through in good faith, and the Senate of the United States initiated the action that took the United States of America, as the only member of the United Nations, officially out of a commitment by the U.N. We formally broke our commitment. Nobody else broke it that way; we did it here.

Mr. CANNON. Well, Mr. President, I simply say that if we broke our commitment, we are one of many. There are

S 8622

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

many, many members of the United Nations that are completely disregarding the Rhodesian chrome sanctions against Rhodesia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I ask for half a minute more.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield the Senator an additional minute.

Mr. CANNON. As a matter of fact, Russia is a member of the United Nations, and we are buying Rhodesian ore from Russia, which is highly suspected of being shipped from Rhodesia to Russia and processed back to us at a higher price.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes. That charge has been made before, that the Russians are buying Rhodesian ore and smuggling it into the United States as Russian ore. The only one making that charge is one of the members of the steel industry, because they are trying to groom their own horse.

Our own Bureau of Mines, our own Government agencies, our own geologists have verified, upon examining the ore, that it is an entirely different ore, that it is Russian ore. I am not a great geologist. I do not know what those differences are. But they point out that Russian ore is superior in grade, that it has a different coloration, and that it has other characteristics which are identifiable, if one wants to be objective about it.

The Russians, in fact, are sending us less ore—almost half the amount they were sending us a year ago. That is the reason why it is important that we keep the record straight. Let us not plunge into this for the wrong reasons, with misinformation. That is the latest information that the Bureau of Mines of the Government of the United States has at its fingertips. It is a summary of what happened last year.

I say to the Senators who differ with me on this measure that I am afraid that what this is boiling down to is the powerful influence of two or three powerful corporations, multinational corporations, who have sought this for the importation of chrome. Labor does not want it. The U.S. steelworkers have said, "No go. We want to support the United Nations. Our jobs are not at stake in this."

This administration, the President of the United States, has endorsed this proposal. They believe that this is the way to go. I cite from the administration's statement on it.

We opposed the Byrd amendment last fall. We oppose it for many relevant reasons this year.

This comes at a time when the President of the United States has been in Russia, negotiating with the Russians, and is now on his way home by way of another Communist country, Poland.

I think we ought to quit dragging red herrings across the stage, because it is important that this area in Africa, which means so much to many people, including the United States, not be penalized.

I would add to this the role of other American business groups in Africa. While we take this step of lifting sanctions against Rhodesia, at the same mo-

ment we have prejudiced the activities of other American business interests in Africa. This endangers American business in over three-fifths of our African trade and two-thirds of our permanent investments all over independent black Africa. These are the interests, too, that require representation here by the actions of this body. What do we end up doing? We pass a measure that is of particular interest to Union Carbide, to Foote Mineral, and one or two other companies.

I do not mind trying to protect the American interests. But the larger American interest, the administration confesses and says to this body, is in the elimination of the Byrd proposal now.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The shift of our imports of ore from Russia—we have cut it almost in half and are now buying more chrome ore from Turkey, our ally, than from the Soviet Union—is a dramatic shift that occurred last year, according to our own Bureau of Mines.

These are factors, Mr. President, that I think require that we try to reverse an action many took in good faith last fall. The history of events since has suggested that this matter carries with it more complications and more problems than the small gains of 50,000 tons of ore that are coming in this year, if all the schedules are kept, from Rhodesia.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the economic consideration was raised that this is benefiting some big companies. This is not the fact. The benefit is to the consumers of the stainless steel products in this country.

This is at a time when the administration is trying to institute price controls, to get at the problem of inflation. The estimate is that \$100 million was saved by consumers last year by the removal and thus the lowering of the price, because the price has lowered very dramatically since the Byrd amendment was adopted last year. It is important to me if we can find areas in which we can reduce prices \$100 million, in effect, to the American consumer.

Mr. McGEE. I yield myself 1 minute.

In response to that, may I say to the Senator from Nevada that, indeed, the price of chrome ore on the world market has dropped 15 to 18 percent in the last year. It has nothing to do with the release of chrome ore from Rhodesia, 50,000 tons, when by the action of the Armed Services Committee we are preparing to release 1,300,000 tons from the American strategic stockpile. There was the great factor, that was the explanation for part of the drop in this price, as all the money markets in New York will confirm.

The second reason for the drop had to do with the shift of the market. Russian chrome is the highest grade chrome and commands a higher price

than most other sources on the world market. The shifting of the chrome imports from Turkey simply reflects that what Russia is producing and Turkey is producing and other countries are producing has satisfied the chrome market. This is what brought down the price of chrome some 15 percent.

It is relevant when one remembers the admonition from the United Steelworkers and from the AFL-CIO. Both organizations say, "If anybody has a stake in keeping the steel industry going, it is us. We find no relevance to the lifting of sanctions and importing chrome ore to our jobs or our chance for jobs. Our best chance lies in restoring the dignity of the United Nations, in not undercutting the President at this time, while he is underway with his mission to Europe and to Asia so recently."

So, Mr. President, I ask that the Senate reject the pending amendment of the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, what is the situation with regard to time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has 7 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Wyoming has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that, as a result of a technicality, when the distinguished Senator from Nevada yielded to him, he was yielding on my time.

Mr. McGEE. And I was yielding on my time. The Senator from Nevada was on the Senator from Virginia's time, and I was on my time.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. No. The response of the Senator from Wyoming was taken out of my time.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, if the time for my response was taken out of the time of the Senator from Virginia, I ask that it be taken out of my time instead. I apologize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute will be transferred.

Who yields time?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nevada made a very important point, in that the consumers of this country have been affected to the extent of \$100 million—\$100 million on an annual basis. That is a very significant point to me.

The Senator from Wyoming spoke of what Mr. Abel, of the United Steel Workers, sitting in his top office, thinks about this matter. But if one will talk to the Members of the House of Representatives who represent steel districts in Pennsylvania, who represent the steel workers themselves, as elected officials of this Government, he will find out how concerned they are about this matter.

One of the finest speeches I have heard in the House of Representatives was by Representative JOHN DENT of Pennsylvania, last October, when he was arguing the effect the ban on Rhodesian chrome had had on the jobs of the steelworkers of the United States.

I think it is fine to think about the situation in England and how it might

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8623

be affected by what we do or do not do in the U.S. Senate, but I think, first, we want to think about the United States, the people of our own country. I submit that we should not put this country in a straitjacket in regard to a vital defense material.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILES). Who yields time?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I will yield whatever time may be necessary to keep this about equal. How many minutes would that be?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would have to yield himself 3 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield myself, then, 3 minutes, in that circumstance.

We have been discussing here the consequences of our action to lift sanctions and what it means for the chance of some successful negotiation.

I did not add in my colloquy with the Senator from Nevada the fact that again and again groups who have to live in Rhodesia came before our parliamentary meeting there in British territory, from both sides, saying that this hardening of the position that our action induced on the part of the Rhodesian Government brings it dangerously close to the violent stage. If that unleashes itself in Rhodesia, it would be difficult to say how it could be stopped short of the Republic of South Africa. Therefore, it is imperative that we not, in even a small way, contribute by our actions to a sharpening, or a harshening, or a worsening of prospects to avoid a blood bath in all of southern Africa. Yet that is precisely what they fear. That is what has surfaced—but only a part of it has surfaced.

I quote now from a Johannesburg newspaper, in the Republic of South Africa, where they say that with the publication of the Pearce Commission Report reflected the negative consequences of the action of this body—the iceberg is not only blocking a settlement in Rhodesia but stating that a real hazard to peaceful settlement in all of black Africa is a real one indeed. Considering the source of that particular publication, I think it should lay stress on what has happened, in their judgment, in this regard.

I point out once more that neither the Republic of South Africa, which might be regarded as a friend of Rhodesia, nor Portugal, another friend, has formally violated the sanctions in any action by their governments, nor have they recognized the independence of Rhodesia. One might have expected them to do so, but they have not. They are obviously living up to their commitment.

I say once again that only the United States of America formally broke its commitment to the United Nations. That is a pretty serious charge in times like these, when the President of our country is seeking to heal the wounds of many nations.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I point out

that Portugal did report noncompliance with sanctions to the Secretary General of the United Nations. It appears in the U Thant report on sanctions, 1970-71.

I will point out also, since the Senator from Wyoming mentioned the defiance of the United Nations embargo, that the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, in a formal presentation, said that virtually every member of the Security Council has violated the sanctions.

Mr. McGEE. I yield myself 1 minute or 2 to respond to the Senator's comments. I must say that I misspoke myself in a technical sense in regard to Portugal, and I appreciate the Senator's correction.

The Portuguese Government never accepted the sanctions at the beginning. What I should have said was that the Portuguese Government has never taken that last step which should follow if they were believers; that is, that they recognized the independence of the Rhodesian Government. This they have not done. Neither has the Republic of South Africa, the point of it being that they still see this as competition within the British Empire—the British Commonwealth of Nations.

I should add to my friends from Virginia and Nevada that, of course, sanctions have not been perfect. Of course they have not been. There are 110 violations charged at the present time. But those violations have not yet been established. Obviously, some must take place.

The question is: Is the United States supposed to be as bad as the other guy, or is the United States supposed to be the leader in the world, trying to set a good example?

The total amount of ore to come in under the lifting of sanctions is still a mere trickle. For that reason, I think we should return to the sanctions program and restore American participation through the United Nations.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. McGEE. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support the position of the Senator from Wyoming. I think it is eminently sound, and for a wide variety of reasons.

The American people must be pondering the action we are considering today when we have our President just returning from the Soviet Union, who is talking about expanding trade, and expanding areas of cooperation with the Soviet Union. We have had trade with them on chrome ore already. The Soviet Union has lived up to its requirements in the past.

Here, in effect, we are providing a roadblock in what has been an area of successful trade in the past.

Thus, this does not make any sense in terms of what the President is trying to do regarding our relations with the Soviet Union. It also does not make any

sense from the point of view of the strategic position of the United States, which is more basic and more fundamental.

In reviewing the record and the testimony given before the committee, I have been impressed with the fact that the United States, with its present chrome reserves, has sufficient chromite on hand for some 40 years to meet our defense requirements. So it does not make any sense from the strategic position of the United States.

We have seen, with the action taken by the House and the Senate, that lifting the sanctions for the sake of chrome ore has been a vehicle to open up a wide variety of opportunities for trade with Rhodesia. The licenses granted under the provisions last year provide not only for imports of chrome but for 72 different items.

What we are effectively doing is opening up a wide variety of trading opportunities with Rhodesia at a time when they clearly have violated the fundamental Charter of the United Nations.

I think, Mr. President, that one of the fundamental difficulties with American foreign policy is that it has failed to live up to the kinds of values, the kinds of interests, and the kinds of concerns that we like to think are basic to our system and to what the American people desire.

When we violate the fundamental Charter of the United Nations, I fail to see why the United States, which stands for the principles of democracy and freedom for all the world, should be out there championing a violation of the United Nations Charter.

In summary, it does not make any sense from our strategic point of view, and it does not make any sense from the point of view of expanded opportunities for good relations with the Soviet Union. But the removal of sanctions against Rhodesia does violate the United Nations resolutions which the United States has agreed to. I do not want to see the United States in the lead of those countries which are violating United Nations resolutions.

I therefore hope that the position of the Senator from Wyoming will be sustained.

Mr. President, once again I wish to express my strong opposition to U.S. trade with Southern Rhodesia. For that reason I intend to vote against amendment No. 1196 offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia as an amendment to S. 3526, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972. As proposed, the Senator's amendment would delete section 503 of Public Law 92-156, thereby permitting U.S. industry to continue flaunting a United Nations ban on trade with Southern Rhodesian companies.

The issue at this time is essentially the same as it was last summer when, through a series of votes, the Senate failed to uphold the provisions of a United Nations resolution banning U.S. trade with Southern Rhodesia. America voted with other Security Council members in December 1966 to impose selective mandatory sanctions in response to

S 8624

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

the rebel Rhodesian regime's withdrawal from the British Commonwealth.

But we violated that resolution last year by withdrawing sanctions against Rhodesia. At that time it was a serious matter. Now it is even more serious, because this country can no longer claim that Rhodesian chrome is required in order to reduce America's dependence on chromite from the Soviet Union. Senate supporters of trade with Rhodesia insisted that, because the United States purchases chrome ore from Russia, American industry is threatened by relying on communism for a strategic material. Moreover, it was claimed that the jump in price of Russian chromite from \$58 per ton in pre-sanction days to \$71 per ton in 1971 was inflationary. It is unbearable, therefore, to those who supported the clamor for Rhodesian chrome, that the United States should continue its reliance on Russian sources. Yet, the President's current visit to Russia seeks not only to establish arms agreements, but also involves our nations' mutual concerns regarding trade. Where is the logic in halting shipments of chrome ore from Russia while at the same time we explore other trade possibilities with the Kremlin? If it is at all right for the Treasury Department to support American industry negotiations on a \$6 billion deal for liquefied natural gas from Russia what is so risky about a \$14 million deal for Russian chromite?

Mr. President, although I can appreciate the irritation of those who oppose our heavy purchase of Russian chromite because of the price, that argument is not ample justification for refuting America's pledge to support the struggle for human decency wherever it is made.

Southern Rhodesia's 250,000 whites are moving closer toward apartheid—the dehumanizing system of race hate that would enslave the Nation's 5.3 million black citizens. There is no reason for the United States to profit in the exploitation of black Rhodesians.

A full look at the issue of purchasing chromite from Southern Rhodesia makes it clear that arguing for Rhodesian chromite is a farce of the cheapest sort. Last July when the Senator from Virginia testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations—regarding the matter of Rhodesian chrome—he asserted that:

The United States today faces an imminent and serious shortage of chrome. This material is essential in the manufacture of such critical defense items as jet aircrafts, missiles, and nuclear submarines.

Yet, in those same hearings, State Department officials testified that the U.S. inventory of metallurgical grade chrome as of May 31, 1971, amounted to 5,344,000 tons. The Department verified that our stockpiles of chromite had thereby accumulated an excess of 2,244,000 tons.

In other words, the United States not only had no shortage of chrome ore, we enjoyed a substantial over abundance of this so-called critical, strategic material.

Clearly, it is no where close to the mark to insist that chromite is in serious shortage or that the manufacture of strategic materials is threatened. David D. Newson, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, told the Foreign Relations Committee last year that:

Approximately 10 percent of our chrome imports go to direct defense requirements.

That leaves the other 90 percent to be consumed in the manufacture of kitchen knives, automobile trimmings and for other consumer products.

What then, can be a justifiable excuse for permitting imports of Rhodesian chrome to enter this country?

I submit that there is no such justification. There is simply no reason why the United States should purchase chrome ore from Southern Rhodesia. Moreover, the Senate and the American public must understand the folly of the situation in which we have placed ourselves regarding imports of Rhodesian chrome.

Last week, on May 23, the Pearce commission reported that the terms of the proposed settlement of Rhodesia's 6-year dispute with Great Britain was rejected by the people of Rhodesia. As a result, Sir Alec Douglas Home, announced that Britain would continue its economic and diplomatic boycott of the white rebellious Rhodesian Government. Thus, in spite of U.S. action lifting the ban on trade with Rhodesia last year, Great Britain has steadfastly maintained sanctions against the rebel government.

The Foreign Relations Committee recognized the need to maintain sanctions against Rhodesia and refused last year to report out Senator Byrd's provision to lift the ban on trade with Rhodesia. But the Senate got an opportunity to vote on the issue anyway—because it reached the floor last September as part of the military procurement bill.

The Senate voted five times on that measure. In one instance, by a vote of 45 to 43, the Senate approved the Fulbright amendment authorizing presidential discretion in granting trade with the Government of Southern Rhodesia.

Ultimately, however, the Senate lifted the ban—voting 38 to 44 in favor of the Byrd amendment on October 6, 1971.

On November 1, the House accepted the Senate approved conference report by a 151 vote margin, and on November 17, 1971, the President signed the \$18 billion Military Procurement Act with the Byrd amendment included.

The administration took quick action. The Treasury Department on January 25, 1972 issued a general import license authorizing "imports of strategic and critical materials of Southern Rhodesian origin." Somehow that was interpreted to permit 72 different commodities including goose down, to enter American ports from Rhodesia.

With a license in hand—it was clear sailing for Foote Mineral Corp. They received a 25,000-ton shipment of Rhodesian chromite on March 20, 1972. Not to be outdone, the Union Carbide Corp. received a similar shipment days later. Now, I am told, other shipments are due in this country shortly.

Thus, last year, the Congress, apparently bought the argument that Rhodesian chrome is vital to our national defense and that we were running out of reliable sources for the material. But, on March 21, 1972, 1-day after the first shipment of Rhodesian ore docked at a Louisiana port—the Senate approved S. 773—a bill that allows U.S. in-

dustry to obtain chrome ore from our vast inventory of excess stock pile ore. Excerpts from Committee Report No. 92-698—describe the purpose of S. 773 and why disposal of the stockpile was proposed:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The proposed bill is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1972. It would authorize the disposal of approximately 1,313,600 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile and would waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

WHY DISPOSAL IS PROPOSED

The material to be disposed of is excess to stockpile needs. The total inventory of the material in the national and supplemental stockpiles as of October 31, 1970, was 5,390,373 short dry tons. The stockpile objective established March 4, 1970, is 3,100,000 short dry tons, leaving an excess of 2,290,373 short dry tons, of which 978,000 short dry tons were previously authorized for disposal.

As expressed in the report language "the material, chrome ore—to be disposed of "is excess to stockpile needs."

If the chromite in the stockpile is excess to our needs then why do we need to purchase chromite from Southern Rhodesia? Even more baffling is the following report language justifying the release of "stockpiled chromite:"

RHODESIAN ORE

At the time this measure was originally considered by the committee in April 1971, sanctions against Rhodesia precluded the importation of Rhodesian ore, formerly one of the principal sources. With the enactment of section 503, Public Law 92-156, the Treasury Department has granted a general license under the Rhodesian sanctions regulations authorizing imports of strategic and critical materials of Southern Rhodesian origin. In light of this, the committee believes that the release of metallurgical grade chromite from the government stockpiles will not be detrimental to the interests of national defense.

According to the report, stockpiled chromite can be released because we voted to lift the ban on Rhodesian ore and—

The release of metallurgical grade chromite from the government stockpiles will not be detrimental to the interests of national defense.

Who are we kidding? American industry consumes 900 thousand tons of chromite annually. We obtain that amount from the world market—without buying from Rhodesia.

Under the new authority permitting disposal of 1.3 million tons of stockpile ore—we would not need to buy chrome ore for 18 months. And even then, our remaining stockpiles of 4 million tons would sustain our defense needs for 40 years or more.

Mr. President, I submit that this Senate must not overlook these facts. The legislative history on his matter clearly shows that we failed to act properly on the merits of this matter last year.

The United States did not need Rhodesian chrome on March 29, 1971 when the Senator from Virginia introduced S. 1404, to lift the ban on Rhodesian trade. The Foreign Relations Committee knew that and refused to report the bill. The United States did not need Rhodesian chrome last September or October as the

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8625

Senate debated the Military Procurement Act. We demonstrated that at one point by voting against the Senator from Virginia. Predictably, the United States has still failed to demonstrate a need for chrome from Southern Rhodesia.

And so it is, that today we have one more opportunity to deny shipments of Rhodesian chrome or any other Rhodesian commodity from entering American ports. I can see no legitimate reason for continuing to admit chrome ore shipments into this country. All evidence shows that our national requirements can be and are being satisfactorily met from other sources.

Those who would insist otherwise can be motivated only by the insensitive claws of racism.

Supporting Rhodesian chrome imports lends support to the cruelly repressive doctrine of the white minority-ruled Rhodesian regime. Southern Rhodesia broke away from Great Britain in 1965 because it could not win approval of its national system to persecute over 5 million black Africans who deservedly seek to enjoy basic human rights and privileges. Even the British Government has reaffirmed its opposition to Rhodesia's repressive policies.

After the Senate's vote last October, it was believed that the Rhodesian premier, Ian Smith, had gained considerable leverage in his delicate negotiations to gain legal independence for the rebel government. But the Pearce Commission was obviously more impressed by the fervent expressions of rejection by African people than by the desire to reopen economic trade channels.

I am firmly opposed to trade with Southern Rhodesia as long as that nation persists with its inhuman racist policies. Bishop Abel Muzorewa, the African Methodist bishop, readily dispels any notion that sanctions are damaging to the welfare of black Rhodesians. In my talks with the bishop on May 4, I was deeply impressed with this one man's mighty conviction to stand up against the rigidity of the ruling Government. He knows that the terms of the Pearce Commission are a sellout of the African people. He also knows that the world's powers must be held accountable for their dealings with his country's rulers. If the United States is not prepared to do the right thing regarding Rhodesia, then we should do nothing—12,000 participants in last week's African American National Conference on Africa emphasized that the "right thing" can only be an end to America's complicity with the Rhodesian rulers whose distorted views violate America's pledge to seek human justice for all.

Congressman CHARLES DIGGS, the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on African Affairs, could not be more exact in saying that nothing gives African people greater concern than our position of mere lip service against the evils of apartheid and minority rule.

I believe that if we fail to replace sanctions against Rhodesian trade we will completely destroy any credibility we may have with other African nations and we will erode the faith of concerned

citizens—here at home—both black and white—who see our Nation increasing its support of countries that officially maintain racist policies.

It is time that we in the United States act to affirm the claim that all people must be granted personal rights, self-determination, and fundamental freedoms without regard to race.

It is clear that violating our United Nation's resolution to band trade with Rhodesia is totally inexcusable.

Mr. President, I shall vote to defeat the Byrd amendment, and I urge each Member of the Senate to vote against the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McGEE. This is all on the 3 minutes now, otherwise we are out.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am sure that our country would not directly pursue a foreign policy which would be a common, ordinary foreign policy. I think it is our dream—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes have now expired.

Mr. MONDALE. That we have something special, that we have higher standards in this country that would dictate—it would seem to me—a rejection of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.).

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said that this proposal would throw a roadblock in the way of trade with Russia. It would do no such thing. All the proposal says is that the United States can trade with Rhodesia as well as with the Soviet Union. It keeps Russia from having a monopoly. It does do that. I do not suppose anyone wants to argue that Russia should have a monopoly on things.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do we not also get chrome from Turkey as well?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. So, we do not have a monopoly with the Soviet Union.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. The bulk of the imports have been from the Soviet Union.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 1 minute has expired.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. President, this does not prevent the importation of chrome from Russia. It does not affect trade with Russia. It says that Rhodesia can also be traded with.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending amendment by the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.).

The bill before the Senate would deny the United States the right to import certain stockpiled minerals considered essential to our national defense from non-Communist nations but permit importation from Communist nations.

Mr. President, whether or not the Sen-

ate should agree to the amendment must be considered in the light of unavoidable consequences of its rejection.

From the standpoint of consequences, it is crystal clear that enactment of the bill without the amendment would benefit the Soviet Union and other Communist nations. A second consequence is that the United States might well become dependent upon the Soviet Union and Communist-bloc nations for a strategic defense material. Other adverse consequences relate to our domestic industry which, unless the amendment is agreed to, will be compelled to use inferior-grade chrome ore and pay almost twice the price of a superior grade of chrome available from the independent nation of Rhodesia.

Furthermore, it would seem that the motive underlying the pending bill is punitive in that it is intended to damage the economy of Rhodesia and eventually force that nation to alter its constitution.

Mr. President, let us sum up the consequences: First, the provisions of the bill would benefit the Soviet Union and Communist nations; second, they would seriously impair our national defense; third, they would impose unnecessary burdens on our domestic industry; and fourth, proclaim our intention to damage the economy of Rhodesia and help nullify the constitution of that nation.

Mr. President, it is reasonable to ask what the proponents of the bill as pending offer to justify these adverse consequences. Since the State Department is the chief proponent, the Department's positions are instructive. It is said that the American people and Congress are bound by the United Nations treaty to uphold a specific decision by the United Nations Security Council that Rhodesia constitutes a threat to world peace. Incidentally, the mere suggestion that Rhodesia is a threat to world peace is an absurdity. It is even ludicrous when suggested by an organization vested with a responsibility for maintaining international peace and security of nations.

Nevertheless, we are asked to believe that on the basis of this determination we are obligated to implement the Security Council's decision to impose economic sanctions against Rhodesia in order to suppress the supposed threat of that nation to international peace and security.

Mr. President, let us put aside the ridiculous and purely fictitious idea that Rhodesia is a threat to world peace, which is the basis for asserting United Nations jurisdiction and thus the basis for asserting the power to impose economic sanctions on that nation. Instead, let us turn to the more fundamental argument that the American people and Congress are bound by the United Nations treaty to "gee and haw" on command of the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. President, why should the people of the United States and this Congress be bound by the United Nations Security Council with respect to measures which we must take against other nations, including the use of Armed Forces? Does the Soviet Union feel bound by the same

S 8626

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

treaty to accept the dictation of the United Nations Security Council? It does not. Do Communist bloc nations feel bound in the same manner? They do not. Does Red China feel bound to obey the dictates of the United Nations Security Council? It does not. Why, then, should we feel bound when other nations do not?

Is it not true that the United Nations is now insolvent or at least on the brink of insolvency for the sole reason that the Soviet Union, Communist bloc nations and France refused to be bound by United Nations Security Council dictates in its so-called "peace-keeping" efforts in Nigeria?

It was almost 2½ years ago that the United Nations Security Council launched its great "peacekeeping" venture against Biafra. One result of that mission was the loss of 2 million lives in Biafra through starvation and malnutrition alone, apart from the casualties of battle. Close to 5 million people were uprooted and settled in refugee camps during the "peacekeeping" efforts of that monumental tragedy which eventually cost approximately \$594 million. Most of the casualties in this great "humanitarian" effort were innocent women and children.

Whether or not the United Nations war in Nigeria was justified is not the question. The question is whether or not the American people and this Congress are bound by a treaty which does not bind other member nations to the treaty.

Mr. President, the administration, through its State Department, takes the position that we should be bound by the determinations of the United Nations Security Council even though other nations are not bound. The reasons advanced for this position were clearly set out by Richard F. Pederson, Counselor of the Department of State, in a speech delivered before the United Nations Association in Stockton, Calif., on April 21, 1972.

In substance, the administration position is that the United States should be bound by Security Council decisions even in the matter of committing our Armed Forces. Further, that neither the United States nor any other nation has the right to veto or to avoid Security Council determinations including those to the use of our Armed Forces and those which call upon us to participate in economic boycotts against other nations.

The argument begins with the assumption that we must make the United Nations work as an instrument to maintain international peace and security. It is readily admitted on all sides that it has not.

The greatest obstacle to this goal, according to this argument, is the reluctance of member states to respect the authority of the Security Council—particularly among permanent members of the Council.

Therefore, it is argued, if we are to make the United Nations Security Council work, we must take advantage of and I quote:

Ad hoc pragmatic opportunities to make use of peace keeping arrangements as political circumstances permit.

Under present political circumstances, Communist nations have agreed to sanctions imposed against Rhodesia by the United Nations Security Council. Accordingly, we must take advantage of this political circumstance and follow suit because such opportunities, and I quote:

Are more important for the United Nations effectiveness than any other factor. It is contended that, it could well turn out that this is the only way for it—the United Nations—to continue to develop.

Mr. President, it boils down to a very simple proposition. The State Department is advocating the surrender to the United Nations of the sovereignty of the United States over decisions respecting the use of our Armed Forces and lesser measures such as economic boycotts and sanctions. In fact, the Soviet Union has been criticized by the State Department because it has not been able to persuade what the Department refers to as "a sovereignty-conscious and conservative Soviet Union," to surrender its sovereignty over decisions affecting the extent of the use of troops and armed forces and economic sanctions and the like which may be demanded by the Security Council.

Mr. President, it must be clear that there is a great contradiction in the positions of those who contend, on the one hand, that the President of the United States does not have the power to commit the Armed Forces of the United States in defense of this nation and the position, on the other hand, that the United Nations should have that power without the right of veto on the part of the Government of the United States.

It will be extremely interesting to compare the votes of those who insist on handcuffing the President in the use of our Armed Forces in Vietnam during the present process of disengagement and those who vote in support of the contention by the State Department and this administration that all such decisions should be vested in the United Nations without the right of veto by our Government or by Congress.

Mr. President, the issue presented by this proposed amendment is whether or not we are bound by the Security Council dictates in the imposition of economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The precedent to be established or rejected is one that involves the larger issue of commitment of our Armed Forces by the United Nations in actions around the world. A vote against this amendment is a vote for the proposition that we are bound by such Security Council determination. I urge that Senators reject that proposition by voting for the amendment.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute remains to each side.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, might I ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

Mr. McGEE. I could only yield for 10 seconds. I have 1 minute remaining, which is a slightly short time for me.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there is one issue here that has not been discussed very fully. It concerns the role of some of the multinational giant corporations. It leaves out Allegheny Ludlum and Union Carbide. It leaves out all of the other economic interests affected, all of which would benefit from this action. It likewise raises the prospect that the British themselves may lift their sanctions.

Mr. President, today this body votes on an issue which will test the faithfulness of this Nation to its commitment to the United Nations and to that organization's future importance and influence.

I am referring to an amendment which is being offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD. That amendment would delete section 503 from the State Department-USIA authorization bill. Section 503 would reverse action taken by this body last year which allowed us to import chrome ore and other strategic materials from Rhodesia in violation of sanctions imposed by the United Nations.

Rather than repeating the mistake we made last year, I strongly urge this body to give the United Nations a chance at survival. The organization has a new leader in Mr. Kurt Waldheim of Austria who assumes his post at a time when the U.N. is in very low status. Whatever slight hopes we may have of the United Nations becoming an effective organization must not be dashed by a repeat performance of last year. We must give the U.N. a chance rather than taking action which can only undermine both the organization and Mr. Waldheim.

There is one critical point which proponents of violating the U.N. sanctions have conveniently chosen to overlook in presenting their case. One of the complications associated with the action of the U.S. Senate last fall—and we warned of that danger during the debate at that time—was that we were taking action at a time when the British and Rhodesian Governments were in the midst of negotiations to arrive at an equitable settlement. All the direct reports from the Rhodesian capital, the morning after the Senate took its action, stated that the Smith government's attitude had hardened completely. The spirit of give and take which had marked the negotiations up until our action had been completely destroyed.

These reports were substantiated when I consulted with the leaders of both the British Labor and Conservative parties during my trip to the Isle of Jersey earlier this month to participate in the Anglo-American Conference on Africa. The leaders of both parties were adamant in reporting to me that the action of the Senate, coming when it did, hardened the Rhodesian Government position and resulted in a proposed settlement far less equitable than what everyone had hoped for. This, in turn, resulted in the predictable negative response the Pearce Commission received

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8627

in determining the sentiment for or against the proposed settlement. Just last week the Pearce Commission report was issued and the Commission rejected the proposal because a vast majority of the blacks, who comprise 95 percent of the Rhodesian population, opposed the settlement.

Again, I emphasize, this was a direct consequence of action taken by this body last October. We urged the Senate, last fall, to hold off on consideration of the Rhodesian chrome ore issue until the negotiations were completed. But the U.S. Senate chose to ignore this plea, and, as a result, we literally sabotaged any chance for a livable compromise to be worked out between the two governments. The British have announced they will continue to abide by the sanctions until a workable settlement can be ironed out and they are hopeful that we will do the same. It, therefore, becomes even more imperative that the U.S. Senate reserve the action it took last fall and vote to reimpose our observance of the sanctions.

Another point which is essential to a realistic assessment of the issues involved in the Senate vote today centers around our role in attempting to find a nonviolent solution to the British-Rhodesian problem in 1966. At that time, the British and Rhodesian Governments were on the brink of armed conflict. We goaded the British into going to the U.N. as an alternative to armed conflict—at least give the U.N. a chance to come up with an alternative to violence. We interceded as an honest broker. Now we have become the only country to formally break the sanctions. As a result, this issue becomes more than just honoring our commitment to the U.N. It has become a matter of honoring our own commitment in acting as an honest broker. Our integrity as an honest broker is at stake.

In light of these circumstances, it becomes all the more important that the United States detach itself from policies which convey the impression that we are prepared to put up with and profit from the exploitation of Rhodesian blacks. By continuing to violate the sanctions we are thus conveying this very impression.

The Senate vote also comes at a time when the President has completed his summit talks with the Soviet Union in Moscow. One of the primary purposes of the President's meeting was that of hammering out an agreement for expanding trade between our two nations. By tossing the outworn scare tactic of trading with a Communist nation into the arena of debate on the Rhodesian chrome issue, the U.S. Senate is only serving to undermine the President's efforts to seek a relaxation of tensions around the world.

The Senate is now in a position to restore our international leadership in the United Nations. Section 503 would return the United States to a position where it obeys international law and fulfills its obligations under the United Nations Charter. If we wish to see peaceful change take place in southern Africa, we will have to recognize that the sanctions program, for all of its inadequacies,

has had a detrimental effect on the Rhodesian economy. In spite of the known violations of the sanctions, the proponents of violating the sanctions against Rhodesia have yet to explain how the failure of other nations to enforce the sanctions releases the United States from its obligations in terms of the international law of treaties.

There have been allegations made by those who advocate we violate international law that our defense needs require that we not be dependent on Russian chrome to meet these needs. This is nothing more than a deliberate hoax. Events since the vote last October have served only to bear out the misleading innuendo and phoniness associated with this allegation. None of the chrome which is now being imported from Rhodesia is going into our strategic stockpile. Our national defense was never imperiled by our observance of the United Nations boycott. To further compound the phoniness of this issue, the Senate, on the recommendation of the Armed Services Committee, recently passed S. 773 releasing from the national stockpile 1,313,600 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite.

The critical point to keep in mind is that Rhodesian chrome is not going into the strategic stockpile. Government authorities have assured us that there are 2.2 million tons of excess chrome in our national stockpile. The 1.3 million tons proposed to be drawn out under S. 773 will meet our total defense and industry needs for 2 years, and our defense needs alone for almost 20 years.

It should be further pointed out that contrary to statements by proponents of our violating the sanctions, we actually imported less chrome ore from the Soviet Union in 1971 than we did from one of our allies—Turkey. The imports from Russia declined from 58 percent in 1970 to 36 percent in 1971, according to data from the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Imports from Turkey totaled 39 percent of our total imports in 1971.

It has been alleged that the Russian ore is really Rhodesian ore. From all the evidence available to us, this also appears to be nothing more than a fabrication. Russian ore is clearly different in color, substance, and character from Rhodesian ore and is of considerably higher grade. Authorities at the Department of Commerce and the U.S. Geological Survey find no evidence that Russian ore is really Rhodesian ore transshipped. Proponents of our violating the U.N. sanctions have brought forward no scientific proof to support this allegation.

Those who oppose the U.N. sanctions ignore a very important economic factor relating to other U.S. business interests exclusive of such companies as Union Carbide, Foote Mineral Co. and Allegheny Ludlum, in those African nations which are not dominated by white governments. Independent black Africa, which views our position on southern African issues as a test of our commitment to self-determination and equality, have been seriously disturbed by our violation of the sanctions. This has endangered our economic and political interests in those nations which account for

over three-fifths of our trade and nearly two-thirds of our investment in Africa. It would hardly be equitable to those American business interests which would be on the receiving end of economic retaliation on the part of those African nations because we were shortsighted in not adhering to the sanctions.

This brings me to another important point. I am very much concerned over the growing influence of multinational corporations on this Nation's foreign policy-making. In fact, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is so concerned about the growing number of incidents in this area that we will be holding hearings into that question in the near future. Yet, Foote Mineral Co. and Union Carbide have been very instrumental in pressuring for congressional approval of our violating the U.N. sanctions to serve the economic interests of these two companies. They have been very instrumental in distorting the truth and the real issues involved in our adherence to the sanctions. These two companies have been very instrumental in fabricating the case for our ignoring the sanctions. It is, indeed, a sad day when the U.S. Senate falls victim to a ploy as reprehensible as this and allows foreign policy considerations to be determined by two corporations who have significant holdings in Rhodesia. I can tell you right now that both Union Carbide and Foote Mineral Co. will have some tough questions to answer as to their role in the Rhodesian chrome issue when these hearings open.

To allow sanctions to be broken for some American corporations and not for others creates injustices and places the Government in the anomalous position of prosecuting fertilizer manufacturers. It is interesting to note that American tobacco companies have profited handsomely from the exclusion of Rhodesian tobacco from the British market by the sanctions program, yet I have not seen a proposal offered which would lift the sanctions on Rhodesian tobacco.

In conclusion, I would like once again to refer to the letter I received from John Irwin III, Acting Secretary of State, who outlined the administration's support for section 503 of the State Department authorization bill.

Mr. Irwin stated:

Repeal now would serve to make us less vulnerable to unfavorable international reaction. As a result of the legislation now in force, our international interests have suffered in other respects. In Africa, where our position on Rhodesia has heretofore been seen as a test of our commitment to self-determination and racial equality, our credibility has suffered. The depth of African concern has been particularly strong in some nations where our interests far outweigh those in Rhodesia. In the United Nations, we will face, with each shipment of chrome or other commodity, an increasing erosion of our position. While we have sought and continue to seek means of making the existing sanctions against Rhodesia more effective, and less liable to circumvention by others, our ability to do so is seriously limited by the legislation now in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I simply conclude by saying to my colleagues that

S 8628

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

I have heard of selling one's birthright for a mess of pottage, but never for a crock of chrome.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the amendment which we are about to vote on would leave the law as it is now and as Congress passed it last year.

Mr. President, I yield whatever time I have remaining to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, we have heard a lot about how this action would damage the results of the President's recent visit to Russia. However, it is very interesting to note that we have not heard one word from Russia that they have negotiated their policy toward the Soviet Jews. Yet we are dealing with that nation and buying chrome from them at the same time that we are trying to invoke a sanction against Rhodesia. The policy of Russia with respect to the Soviet Jews is equally abhorrent to me.

This is a very specious argument. It is an argument that does not hold water. We would save \$100 million here for the American consumers.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the United States must not forfeit its long-term interests in Africa for a few more boatloads of Rhodesian chrome.

Today I ask the Senate to reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. I urge its rejection, not out of blind repugnance toward Ian Smith's racist purposes, but as a matter of pragmatic national policy. Our continued purchases of Rhodesian chrome, which this measure would permit, is simply not worth the price we would have to pay in terms of our international position.

The State Department has quite understandably urged rejection of this amendment. The administration's reasoning is sound. To accept the Byrd measure would be to deny our country's international treaty obligations and to renege on our historic record of a 100-percent support for the U.N. Security Council. Moreover, it would mean a U.S. rejection of world peace through law at the time in which we are trying to construct such a framework.

These last few days have seen major breakthroughs in the development of world law. The United States and the Soviet Union have taken major steps toward substituting peaceful for military competition.

In no part of the world is there such a ground for peaceful competition among economic systems as in Africa.

Africa, itself, has not yet felt the curse of the "cold war." Hopefully it never will. The long battle against colonialism, however, continues. If the United States is to maintain its good relations with independent Africa, it must be an ally in this great crusade.

Rhodesia is a symbol of that struggle. It stands as a living memory to the centuries of European colonialism in Africa. Its racist policies stand as a sharp indignity to the people of that continent, an indignity which touches them daily.

Rhodesia is an indignity to the United States as well. Here is a country ruled by

less than 5 percent of its population, which sees itself as a part of the "free world." It longs for membership in the western non-Communist world. It especially seeks the economic and moral support of the United States. That support must be denied.

Today the Senate must take a firm position on the Rhodesian question. It must state to the Rhodesian people, black and white, that the United States will not sell out its principles for short-term economic gain. It will not forsake international law, its hope for peaceful development in Africa, even its essential belief in the equality of man just to get a better deal on chrome.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, once again the actions of this Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations appear to have been formulated in a vacuum.

I have reference to the committee's steps to restrict importation of chrome from Rhodesia and thus, restore the Soviet Union to a virtual monopoly position on sales of critical chromium ore to the United States.

The illogic of this move is deepened by the fact that on September 23 of last year during deliberations on the military procurement authorizations bill, the Senate decidedly rejected attempts to restrict U.S. purchases on this one vital element from this tiny African nation.

Moreover, because of crucial negotiations between Britain and Rhodesia which were pending at the time the Senate affirmed its support of ending purchase restrictions on chrome, I offered an amendment to delay implementation of section 503 until January 1, 1972. This amendment was accepted and, therefore, the section has only been in effect little more than 5 months.

It may be worthwhile to recount some of the reasons why we found ourselves in the predicament of having to support the most powerful Communist nation with chromite purchases at a price artificially controlled by the Soviets.

In late 1966, the U.N. Council, in which we hold the right of veto, imposed selective sanctions on Rhodesia. Later, the embargo became total.

Following the action by the United Nations, President Johnson ordered an embargo on trade with Rhodesia. This action was unilaterally taken by the President without allowing the Congress the opportunity to express itself.

Prior to President Johnson's decree, the United States had imported the vast majority of strategic chromite from Rhodesia. Since there is no domestic production of the metal in this country, this action and subsequent approval by our U.N. representatives of the Security Council embargo forced the United States to turn to the U.S.S.R. for about 60 percent of its chrome ore.

During last year's debate to permit the purchase of this single strategic commodity from Rhodesia, the Subcommittee on National Stockpile a Naval Petroleum Reserve found that, since Russia became the chief U.S. source of chrome ore, she had increased the price per ton from \$25 to \$72 on an increase of 183 percent.

We were being had.

Mr. President, in our zeal to show our disapproval of Rhodesia's declaration of independence from Britain and minority rule over a majority, we were in actuality perpetuating a far more inequitable situation in the U.S.S.R., the domination of a tiny Communist majority over some 240 million Russians.

Furthermore, the Rhodesia sanctions have proved to have little or no effect on her economic viability.

It is foolhardy to limit ourselves to purchases of chrome from the Russians when we can purchase the same ore at a lower price from an ally; especially, when the total sanctions against Rhodesia have had little effect in altering the policies which we disapproved.

There is a double edge to the sword of economic sanctions imposed on Rhodesia. Intended to topple the existing government, they also deprive the black Rhodesians of jobs and opportunity which results from trade. Once such sanctions prove ineffective for their political motive, they should be lifted so as not to prolong the deleterious effects on the general populace.

From practically ever angle the United States would be cutting off its hand to spite its face were the Senate to reinstitute restrictions on ore purchases from Rhodesia. We pay a higher price for the commodity when purchased from U.S.S.R. We create a dependency for strategic material. We harm the people of Rhodesia while doing nothing which alters the political structure of the country. By reinstituting a Johnson policy which seek to interpose ourselves in the internal affairs of another state, we perpetrate the same arrogant philosophy which sank us into our involvement in Southeast Asia.

In my judgment, there is no redeeming justification to support a renewed embargo on chromium imports from Rhodesia. Most importantly, Mr. President, there is no reason so compelling to justify our dependency for a strategic, defense material on a Communist-dominated state.

I hope the Senate again reaffirms its early position that when we have the option to purchase a strategic material from a free-world nation at a competitive price that there should be no legislated impediments to exercising the option when it would require us to purchase the same commodity from the Communists at an inflated rate.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the pending amendment to strike section 503 from the State Department-USA authorization bill. This section of the bill, as drafted, would undo the unfortunate action which Congress took last year in lifting the embargo on importing Rhodesian chrome into the United States.

Many of the issues raised during last year's debate are involved today. These arguments concern national security, our relations with the United Nations and Africa, and the basic question of whether the United States should implicitly sanction the continuance of the racially repugnant policy of the current Rhodesian Government. If these were the sole points under discussion, then I would expect

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

that the Senate vote today would reflect last year's tally.

However, I firmly believe that the Senate has an even greater obligation this year to oppose Rhodesian chrome importation. The political situation in Rhodesia is at a most sensitive point. A proposed British settlement with the Rhodesian Government has been rejected by the majority of the Rhodesian blacks who constitute 95 percent of that country's population. As a result, the future international economic policy toward Rhodesia, as well as the continued viability of the Ian Smith regime, remain open questions.

In 1966, a minority white government proclaimed its independence from British colonial rule, at a time when the British were attempting to work out a fair policy for permitting Rhodesia's black majority to participate in the political process of that country. The blatantly racist rule that has characterized that government during the intervening 6 years has been a dark blemish in the overall record of growth for African independence and majority rule.

The imposition of economic sanctions, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly with only two dissenting votes, has represented an effort by the world community to register its opposition to the continuation of the apartheid policy. Because of these sanctions, Rhodesia cannot now freely trade with the world community.

Last year's congressional action was a direct refutation of that international agreement. By stating that the United States can import chrome from Rhodesia, Congress violated a policy which our own Government had initially advocated and which the administration still supports.

It is of the utmost necessity that the United States respect its international commitments.

We should also be responsive to world opinion. The peoples and nations of Africa in particular have expressed deep concern with the recent American action in reopening trade with Rhodesia. It has been difficult, indeed, for our Government to attempt to explain to these governments why the United States has lifted the sanctions on chrome at the same time that it has encouraged self-determination and racial equality for all African people.

In addition, it should be clear that the United States and our Nation's businesses do not need Rhodesian chrome. The amount already in the stockpile, as well as that authorized for disposal in legislation approved this year by the Senate, would fulfill our domestic needs for about 18 months. And, according to the State Department, defense requirements amount to only 10 percent of our total domestic needs.

There are also available large amounts of chrome from other nations, including the Soviet Union. At a time when President Nixon is returning from that nation with the announced intention of opening up additional trade avenues with the Soviets, it seems counterproductive for the Senate to continue to place itself on record against the importation of chrome and related minerals from Com-

munist nations. Also, adequate chrome resources remain available from Turkey and the Philippines, allies with whom we maintain active and mutually beneficial trade relations.

In short, Mr. President, there exists no sound or logical purpose for the United States to continue to flaunt the United Nations' economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recognized that fact by recommending a halt to last year's resumption of trade. I hope that the Senate will agree to retain the committee's provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. GRIFFIN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER). If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. RIBICOFF (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN). If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. CANNON (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE). If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." I have already voted "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) is paired with the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND). If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) is paired with the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN). If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), is paired with the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH). If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the

Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) are absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is paired with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD). If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 193 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Allen	Cotton	Roth
Allott	Curtis	Saxbe
Beall	Dole	Schweiker
Bellmon	Dominick	Smith
Bennett	Ellender	Sparkman
Bentsen	Fannin	Spong
Bible	Gambrell	Stennis
Brock	Gurney	Taft
Buckley	Hollings	Talmadge
Byrd	Hruska	Thurmond
Harry F., Jr.	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Byrd, Robert C.	Long	Weicker
Chiles	Montoya	Young
Cook	Pearson	

NAYS—36

Aiken	Hughes	Packwood
Bayh	Inouye	Pastore
Boggs	Jackson	Pell
Brooke	Javits	Percy
Burdick	Kennedy	Proxmire
Church	Magnuson	Scott
Cooper	Mansfield	Stafford
Cranston	McGee	Stevens
Eagleton	McIntyre	Stevenson
Fulbright	Mondale	Symington
Gravel	Moss	Tunney
Hart	Nelson	Williams

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—3

Griffin, against.
Ribicoff, against.
Cannon, for.

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Hansen	McClellan
Baker	Harris	McGovern
Case	Hartke	Metcalf
Eastland	Hatfield	Miller
Ervin	Humphrey	Mundt
Fong	Jordan, N.C.	Muskie
Goldwater	Mathias	Randolph

So the amendment of Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., was agreed to.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NO. 1209

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 1209.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please state the amendments.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendments offered by Mr. PERCY

S 8630

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

(for himself and Mr. TUNNEY), as follows:

S. 3526

On page 3, line 10, insert "(1)" immediately after "(a)".

On page 3, line 14, strike out "two Deputy Under Secretaries of State" and insert in lieu thereof "an Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, an Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, a Deputy Under Secretary of State".

On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following new paragraph (2):

"(2) Section 2(b) of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2652), is repealed."

On page 4, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Section 5314(9) is amended by striking out 'or' before 'Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and'."

"(3) Section 5315(10) is amended to read as follows:

"(10) Deputy Under Secretary of State."

On page 4, line 24, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the amendment is under control. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I require. For the information of the Senate, I shall not use all of the time allotted to me, and probably will complete my comments in only 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered heretofore.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, at the present time the Department of State is headed by a Secretary and an Under Secretary. S. 3526 proposes changing the title of the Under Secretary to Deputy Secretary to reflect the fact that the No. 2 officer in the Department acts as the full deputy and alter ego to the Secretary.

The No. 3 position in the Department is now authorized to be either an Under Secretary for Political Affairs, as it is now, or an Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, as it has been at times in the past. With the increasingly complex nature of the foreign affairs process, the Department should have officers at the full Under Secretary level in both the political and economic areas. It has requested legislation authorizing such a position, a request that has the full support of the Office of Management and Budget. The amendment which Senator TUNNEY and I are offering would make this possible. We cite the following reasons in support of this amendment:

First, having economic affairs raised to the importance of political affairs would reflect the fact that the Department is increasingly concerned with the economic side of foreign policy and international relations.

Second, as an agency vitally concerned with foreign economic policy, and providing important support to the President's Council on International Economic Policy, the State Department should and wishes to play a major role in correcting present shortcomings in this field. For this an Economic Under Secretary would be a significant help.

Third, to play the role envisaged for him, the Department requires a man of

great skill, experience and stature, a man who is recognized and respected both within the Government and in the business community. Such an individual could not be attracted unless he were assured of a position, rank, and salary just below the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary. As we are aware, the current incumbent, Mr. Nathaniel Samuels, has resigned his position after more than 3 years of loyal and diligent service in support of this Government's efforts to strengthen its international economic position.

Fourth, while the Secretary and Deputy Secretary may from time to time become involved in economic affairs, the man in day-to-day charge of the Department's activities in this area should be able to deal himself with other Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers. This would be difficult without having the requisite rank in the Department.

Fifth, the negotiations that lie ahead in trade, monetary, and commercial matters are of such extraordinary importance to the United States that the Department of State should normally be represented by an official at the sub-Cabinet level as this would permit. Needless to say, the complex East-West trade issues that combine so many political and economic considerations will require a very significant Department of State input which such an official could provide. In addition, the chief economic official in the Department is the alternate Governor of the World Bank and of certain of the regional development banks. He often heads delegations to meetings of these institutions in place of the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the Governor.

I believe that this amendment will be an effective piece of legislation to strengthen our Government's team in the vitally important field of international economic relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of a letter dated May 31, 1972, from the Acting Secretary of State, John Irwin, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1972.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I write in response to your request for an explanation of the need for establishing the position of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

As you know, your amendment to S. 3526 would enable us to upgrade the importance of international economic affairs in the Department of State. At present the senior Department official exclusively responsible for economic and commercial matters is the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, at the fourth level of our organization. We wish to raise economic and commercial affairs to the third level, at which we now have an Under Secretary for Political Affairs.

The need for this restructuring derives from several pragmatic considerations arising from the Secretary's determination to give greater stress to our economic and commercial responsibilities.

First, is the problem of recruiting an outstanding authority to replace Mr. Nathaniel Samuels, who is resigning as our Deputy

Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, effective May 31. I have found that the possibility of our securing the services of a man of this stature will be very much enhanced if he can be assured a position at the full Under Secretary level.

Second, the negotiations that lie ahead in trade, monetary and commercial matters are of such extraordinary importance to the United States that the Department of State should normally be represented by an official at the sub-Cabinet level as this would permit. Needless to say, the complex East-West trade issues that combine so many political and economic considerations will require a very significant Department of State input which such an official could provide.

Third, the strengthening of the Department's economic organization will assure other agencies of the most authoritative level of cooperation in our common efforts to improve our balance of payments and to expand our exports.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that the creation of this position is consistent with the objectives of the Administration for the general organization of the Department of State.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

JOHN N. IRWIN, II,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues, I should simply like to point out that Secretary Irwin indicates that the Office of Management and Budget advises that the creation of this position is consistent with the objectives of the administration for the general organization of the Department of State.

Mr. TUNNEY and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. May I yield to my distinguished colleague from California?

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas wish to speak on this amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. TUNNEY. I have a statement in favor of the amendment, but if the Senator wishes to proceed, he may do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator does not mind, I would like to do so.

Mr. President, the committee considered and rejected a proposal to create a new Under Secretary position in the Department of State.

There is no need for a new position. The statute already provides for an Under Secretary position for economic affairs, if the President wants to designate a nominee as such. The position, by statute, can be designated as either "Under Secretary for Economic Affairs" or "Under Secretary for Political Affairs." It so happens that the present incumbent, U. Alexis Johnson, was designated as Under Secretary for Political Affairs. But over the years there have been a number of Under Secretaries for Economic Affairs—Thomas C. Mann, George W. Ball, C. Douglas Dillon, and William L. Clayton. There is nothing to prevent the President from sending up tomorrow the nomination of a person to be Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs—if he is willing to replace Mr. Johnson. Or, he can change Mr. Johnson's title to Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

I might point out that in addition to having this authority to designate the

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

existing Under Secretary position as one for economic affairs, there are now two other high-level positions in the Department dealing with economic affairs—a Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Mr. Nathaniel Samuels, and an Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, Mr. Willis Armstrong. So I think the Department's capacity—personnelwise—to look after our economic interests in foreign affairs is there, if the President chooses to emphasize this facet of the Department's work.

I wish to make one other observation. The Department of State is probably the most top-heavy department in the executive branch. This amendment would make it more so. The State Department has 17 positions at the Assistant Secretary level and above. Next in rank is the Department of Justice with 12 positions; the Department of Defense has only 10. The principal reason the committee rejected the Department of State's plan for additional top-level positions was because what the Department has now in the way of top level positions is so far out of line with other departments of our Government.

I urge that the amendment be rejected.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included as a part of my remarks a list of the number of top level positions, Assistant Secretary level and above, at other State departments.

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

NUMBER OF TOP-LEVEL POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY LEVEL AND ABOVE

State (17 positions): Secretary, Deputy Secretary (title to be changed by this bill), Under Secretary, Coordinator of Security Assistance (Under Secretary level), 2 Deputy Under Secretaries, 11 Assistant Secretaries.

Treasury (9 positions): Secretary, 2 Under Secretaries, 1 Deputy Under Secretary, 5 Assistant Secretaries.

Defense (10 positions): Secretary, Deputy Secretary, 8 Assistant Secretaries.

Justice (12 positions): Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Solicitor General, 9 Assistant Attorneys General.

Interior (9 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 6 Assistant Secretaries.

Agriculture (7 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 4 Assistant Secretaries.

Commerce (8 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 5 Assistant Secretaries.

Labor (8 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 5 Assistant Secretaries.

HEW (10 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 7 Assistant Secretaries.

Housing and Urban Development (9 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 6 Assistant Secretaries.

Transportation (8 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 5 Assistant Secretaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I yield the distinguished Senator from California such time as he may require.

Mr. TUNNEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and compliment him on his leadership in bringing this

amendment to the floor. I feel that it is a very important amendment.

Mr. President, I am certain that we all share the concern that America's economic interests should be accorded the same dignity abroad as her political interests. The passage of the Percy-Tunney amendment creating the position of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs will help insure that such importance is underscored for our economic affairs.

The State Department should be given the opportunity to play an important role in: First, elevating the priority of America's foreign economic affairs, and second, insuring that those matters are integrated as effectively and as smoothly as possible with other foreign affairs of the United States, creating the position of United Secretary of State for Economic Affairs will help the State Department to elevate that priority as well as to integrate these matters smoothly and effectively.

The creation of this position will also: First, help the department attract capable men to fill these positions related to economic affairs. As the Senator from Illinois has stressed, such individuals could not be attracted unless they were assured of the position, rank, and salary just below that of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary.

Second, this position will help enable the person responsible for economic matters to deal personally with other Cabinet and subcommittee officers. He will be assured of the position which will him to make the necessary personal contacts.

Third, the creation of this position will help the representative of the Department of State to deal with economic officials of comparable rank in foreign countries.

As some of us know who have had the opportunity to travel abroad and meet with officials of other nations, they put great stock, in many European countries, in a man's title and the position that he holds in his government. There is a very clearly defined pecking order, and we must have a person of substantial rank representing the United States when he meets with European officials and officials of other nations as well, who put such great stock on a person's position when there are negotiations.

Finally, and most importantly, it will help insure that the Department of State itself will be increasingly concerned with the economic and commercial implications of foreign policies of the United States.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Illinois in introducing this amendment which should be a significant contribution to the coordination and elevation of the economic side of our foreign policies.

I think the Senator from Illinois is to be congratulated for the extensive work he has done in this area, and for giving the Senate the opportunity to vote to make such a position available in the State Department. I personally feel that this amendment should be adopted. It would be most beneficial to the United States at this time when we are having great difficulties with our balance of

trade and great difficulties with our economy here at home, and need to promote exports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to my distinguished cosponsor. I think his comments certainly underscore the very important role that this position will have.

We have now come to a very unusual stage in our economic history. We are challenged as we have never been challenged before. We have the first trade deficit in the United States since 1888, and we have not had it for just one quarter, we had it in the last quarter last year and the first quarter this year. It now looks as if the trade deficit this year may be larger than last year, exceeding \$2 billion. Therefore, the role that the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs can play in the future is far more important than it has been in the past, and that is not meant to underestimate its importance in the past.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be divided between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas, as a member of the committee, I yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? Without objection, the order for the yeas and nays is rescinded.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from California. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker

S 8632

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1915. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 5199. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 255 and 124-C, dockets numbered 256, 124-D, E, and F, and dockets numbered 131 and 253, and of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma in docket numbered 251-A, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8116. An act to consent to the Kansas-Nebraska Big Blue River Compact; and

H.R. 13361. An act to amend section 316(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently signed the enrolled bills.

THIRTY-MINUTE RECESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess for 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to, and at 12:50 p.m. the Senate took a recess for 30 minutes.

The Senate reassembled at 1:20 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Spone).

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9580) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning the fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McMillan, Mr. Stuckey, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Broyhill of Virginia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) providing for a Joint Session of the two Houses of Congress on June 1, 1972, to receive such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Concurrent Resolution 625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 625, which was read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 625

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on June 1, 1972, at 9:30 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what time is the joint session to be held tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 9:30 p.m. tomorrow; June 1, 1972.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) was agreed to.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spone). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, are we operating on a time limitation at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not operating on a time limitation, and the pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Griffin), amendment No. 1200.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIFTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF LATE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Memorial Day, May 29, marked the 55th anniversary of the birth of this Nation's 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I simply wish to note the occasion in this fashion. It is a reminder of the legacy of this great man, cut down in his prime so violently, so cruelly, so senselessly. It is a legacy of ideas, designed to heal over wounds that had been left open to fester

in this Nation after years and years of inattention and unconcern. Even more, it is a legacy of inspiration and idealism that in my judgment will live as a monument to a man whose achievements unfortunately cannot be measured in years of service. An assassin's bullet made that impossible.

His achievements can and will be measured, however, by the hope he engendered for a better world, a world without fear, without suffering, without war, devastation and destruction. If mankind does reach these goals—and I pray that one day it will—it will be said then that along the way John F. Kennedy made a significant contribution.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is it in order for the junior Senator from Michigan to withdraw his amendment without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, at this time I withdraw my amendment, and I ask what is now the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question, the Senator from Michigan having withdrawn his amendment, is the Church-Case amendment, as amended.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, what now is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, amendment No. 1175. The amendment is on page 38 of the pending legislation, to strike out lines 1 through 12, inclusive.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the motion to be made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi there be a time limitation of 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho (Mr. Church).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me, I need only 1 minute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Idaho 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in view of the action that the Senate took by

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8631

existing Under Secretary position as one for economic affairs, there are now two other high-level positions in the Department dealing with economic affairs—a Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Mr. Nathaniel Samuels, and an Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, Mr. Willis Armstrong. So I think the Department's capacity—personnelwise—to look after our economic interests in foreign affairs is there, if the President chooses to emphasize this facet of the Department's work.

I wish to make one other observation. The Department of State is probably the most top-heavy department in the executive branch. This amendment would make it more so. The State Department has 17 positions at the Assistant Secretary level and above. Next in rank is the Department of Justice with 12 positions; the Department of Defense has only 10. The principal reason the committee rejected the Department of State's plan for additional top-level positions was because what the Department has now in the way of top level positions is so far out of line with other departments of our Government.

I urge that the amendment be rejected.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included as a part of my remarks a list of the number of top level positions, Assistant Secretary level and above, at other State departments.

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

NUMBER OF TOP-LEVEL POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY LEVEL AND ABOVE

State (17 positions): Secretary, Deputy Secretary (title to be changed by this bill), Under Secretary, Coordinator of Security Assistance (Under Secretary level), 2 Deputy Under Secretaries, 11 Assistant Secretaries.

Treasury (9 positions): Secretary, 2 Under Secretaries, 1 Deputy Under Secretary, 5 Assistant Secretaries.

Defense (10 positions): Secretary, Deputy Secretary, 8 Assistant Secretaries.

Justice (12 positions): Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Solicitor General, 9 Assistant Attorneys General.

Interior (9 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 6 Assistant Secretaries.

Agriculture (7 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 4 Assistant Secretaries.

Commerce (8 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 5 Assistant Secretaries.

Labor (8 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 5 Assistant Secretaries.

HEW (10 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 7 Assistant Secretaries.

Housing and Urban Development (9 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 6 Assistant Secretaries.

Transportation (8 positions): Secretary, Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, 5 Assistant Secretaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I yield the distinguished Senator from California such time as he may require.

Mr. TUNNEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and compliment him on his leadership in bringing this

amendment to the floor. I feel that it is a very important amendment.

Mr. President, I am certain that we all share the concern that America's economic interests should be accorded the same dignity abroad as her political interests. The passage of the Percy-Tunney amendment creating the position of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs will help insure that such importance is underscored for our economic affairs.

The State Department should be given the opportunity to play an important role in: First, elevating the priority of America's foreign economic affairs, and second, insuring that those matters are integrated as effectively and as smoothly as possible with other foreign affairs of the United States, creating the position of United Secretary of State for Economic Affairs will help the State Department to elevate that priority as well as to integrate these matters smoothly and effectively.

The creation of this position will also: First, help the department attract capable men to fill these positions related to economic affairs. As the Senator from Illinois has stressed, such individuals could not be attracted unless they were assured of the position, rank, and salary just below that of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary.

Second, this position will help enable the person responsible for economic matters to deal personally with other Cabinet and subcabinet officers. He will be assured of the position which will him to make the necessary personal contacts.

Third, the creation of this position will help the representative of the Department of State to deal with economic officials of comparable rank in foreign countries.

As some of us know who have had the opportunity to travel abroad and meet with officials of other nations, they put great stock in many European countries, in a man's title and the position that he holds in his government. There is a very clearly defined pecking order, and we must have a person of substantial rank representing the United States when he meets with European officials and officials of other nations as well, who put such great stock on a person's position when there are negotiations.

Finally, and most importantly, it will help insure that the Department of State itself will be increasingly concerned with the economic and commercial implications of foreign policies of the United States.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Illinois in introducing this amendment which should be a significant contribution to the coordination and elevation of the economic side of our foreign policies.

I think the Senator from Illinois is to be congratulated for the extensive work he has done in this area, and for giving the Senate the opportunity to vote to make such a position available in the State Department. I personally feel that this amendment should be adopted. It would be most beneficial to the United States at this time when we are having great difficulties with our balance of

trade and great difficulties with our economy here at home, and need to promote exports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to my distinguished cosponsor. I think his comments certainly underscore the very important role that this position will have.

We have now come to a very unusual stage in our economic history. We are challenged as we have never been challenged before. We have the first trade deficit in the United States since 1888, and we have not had it for just one quarter, we had it in the last quarter last year and the first quarter this year. It now looks as if the trade deficit this year may be larger than last year, exceeding \$2 billion. Therefore, the role that the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs can play in the future is far more important than it has been in the past, and that is not meant to underestimate its importance in the past.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be divided between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas, as a member of the committee, I yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? Without objection, the order for the yeas and nays is rescinded.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker

Bill file

S 8632

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1915. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 5199. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 255 and 124-C, dockets numbered 256, 124-D, E, and F, and dockets numbered 131 and 253, and of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma in docket numbered 251-A, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8116. An act to consent to the Kansas-Nebraska Big Blue River Compact; and

H.R. 13361. An act to amend section 316(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently signed the enrolled bills.

THIRTY-MINUTE RECESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess for 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to, and at 12:50 p.m. the Senate took a recess for 30 minutes.

The Senate reassembled at 1:20 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SPONG).

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9580) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning the fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) providing for a Joint Session of the two Houses of Congress on June 1, 1972, to receive such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Concurrent Resolution 625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 625, which was read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 625

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on June 1, 1972, at 9:30 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what time is the joint session to be held tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 9:30 p.m. tomorrow; June 1, 1972.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) was agreed to.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, are we operating on a time limitation at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not operating on a time limitation, and the pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), amendment No. 1200.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIFTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF LATE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Memorial Day, May 29, marked the 55th anniversary of the birth of this Nation's 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I simply wish to note the occasion in this fashion. It is a reminder of the legacy of this great man, cut down in his prime so violently, so cruelly, so senselessly. It is a legacy of ideas, designed to heal over wounds that had been left open to fester

in this Nation after years and years of inattention and unconcern. Even more, it is a legacy of inspiration and idealism that in my judgment will live as a monument to a man whose achievements unfortunately cannot be measured in years of service. An assassin's bullet made that impossible.

His achievements can and will be measured, however, by the hope he engendered for a better world, a world without fear, without suffering, without war, devastation and destruction. If mankind does reach these goals—and I pray that one day it will—it will be said then that along the way John F. Kennedy made a significant contribution.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is it in order for the junior Senator from Michigan to withdraw his amendment without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, at this time I withdraw my amendment, and I ask what is now the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question, the Senator from Michigan having withdrawn his amendment, is the Church-Case amendment, as amended.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, what now is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, amendment No. 1175. The amendment is on page 38 of the pending legislation, to strike out lines 1 through 12, inclusive.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the motion to be made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi there be a time limitation of 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me, I need only 1 minute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Idaho 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in view of the action that the Senate took by

May 31, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

a rollcall vote adding the addendum offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) to the original Church-Case amendment, it is no longer acceptable to the sponsors, and for that reason I will not oppose—indeed, I intend to support—the motion soon to be made by the Senator from Mississippi to strike the entire provision from the bill.

I think we will have an opportunity later, on a different bill, to take up the question of how the Senate should best proceed to try to bring this endless war in Southeast Asia to a conclusion; but under the circumstances, now is not the time.

I simply want the RECORD to make clear that I will not oppose the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to strike this language from the bill. I thank the Senator for granting me this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes of my time.

This amendment was filed for two reasons on my part. I am opposed to the merits of section 701, which undertakes to cut off the funds on a date certain with reference to military matters in Vietnam.

Additionally, at the time it was filed, it was just prior to the summit conference that the President was going to have in Moscow. Preliminary preparations and the atmosphere of preparations in Moscow and here were consuming the time, primarily of the governments, and I was determined that, so far as I was concerned, this section not be passed, if avoidable, during the pendency of those highly important matters. Now they have already occurred.

I want to say that I was very much impressed, as well as pleased, that the sponsors of section 701, after it has reached this stage, were willing to defeat this section. That includes the Senator from Idaho. I remember the Senator from Arkansas had some sentiments to that effect. I commend them and others of the same opinion. In fact, I think it is the overwhelming sentiment of this membership not to pursue this matter under the circumstances.

We still have the war on our hands. It is a serious matter. I am as anxious as others that it be concluded. There is merely a difference of opinion as to how it should be done. Section 701 has taken its final form.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1175 is now the pending order of business. Is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. If that amendment is adopted now, it will strike out the entire section, including the parts that have been amended. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am glad to yield back the remainder of my time, unless some other Senator wants to use some of it, and we can have the vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi is yielded back.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted "No" on the adoption of the amendment by Mr. STENNIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 14734, an act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 14734) to authorize appropriations to the Department of State and the United States Information Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas that the committee be discharged? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause of H.R. 14734 be stricken, and that the language of S. 3526, as amended, be substituted therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North

Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) are absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 194 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Aiken	Eagleton	Pearson
Allen	Ellender	Pell
Allott	Fannin	Percy
Bayh	Fulbright	Proxmire
Beall	Gambrell	Randolph
Bellmon	Griffin	Ribicoff
Bennett	Gurney	Roth
Bentsen	Hart	Saxbe
Bible	Hollings	Schweiker
Boggs	Hruska	Scott
Brook	Hughes	Smith
Brooke	Inouye	Sparkman
Burdick	Jackson	Spong
Byrd	Javits	Stafford
Harry F. Jr.	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Byrd, Robert C.	Kennedy	Stevens
Cannon	Long	Stevenson
Chiles	Magnuson	Symington
Church	McGee	Taft
Cook	McIntyre	Talmadge
Cooper	Mondale	Tower
Cotton	Montoya	Tunney
Cranston	Moss	Weicker
Curtis	Nelson	Williams
Dole	Packwood	Young
Dominick	Pastore	

NAYS—1

Mansfield

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Gravel	McClellan
Baker	Hansen	McGovern
Buckley	Harris	Metcalf
Case	Hartke	Miller
Eastland	Hatfield	Mundt
Ervin	Humphrey	Muskie
Fong	Jordan, N.C.	Thurmond
Goldwater	Mathias	

So the bill (H.R. 14734) was passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I

S 8634

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1972

move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the title of H.R. 14734 be amended so as to read "An act to provide authorization for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make appropriate technical corrections in H.R. 14734.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to H.R. 14734 and request a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. COOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator name a junior Democrat to serve in my place?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) be substituted for the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 3526 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PRINTING OF H.R. 14734

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of H.R. 14734 which passed the Senate earlier today be printed as it passed the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON VOTE

Mr. MILLER subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, I was absent for the votes on the Byrd Amendment No. 1196 to S. 3526 and final passage of H.R. 14734.

I wish to be positioned "aye" on both votes.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FULBRIGHT, SENATOR AIKEN, AND OTHER SENATORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) for his handling of the State Department-USIA authorization proposal. As always, his advocacy and great skill contributed to the overall success of the measure. In the end, this measure did not serve as a vehicle for congressional efforts concerning the war in Southeast Asia, but in no way, may I say, have those efforts been diminished—not as far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, not as far as the Senate is concerned.

There were many other issues involved in this proposal and it is well, indeed, that they were finally resolved. It was due in large measure to Senator FULBRIGHT's leadership that, at long last, the Congress retains the capacity to review the State Department and its many programs and policies from an authorizing standpoint. The Senate is deeply grateful.

The Senate is grateful as well to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) whose splendid cooperation and assistance was vital to the disposition of this proposal. As the ranking minority member he has joined consistently to aid the efficient handling of all such legislation.

It should be noted that many Senators contributed to the discussion on this measure over a long period. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) deserve commendation for their efforts. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) deserve equal praise. Their interest and concern about the tragedy in Vietnam is unsurpassed in this body.

Many other Senators should be singled out for their contributions and cooperation. The Senators from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) should be included, together with many other Senators.

To the Senate as a whole I wish to extend the thanks of the leadership for its action today achieved through the joint efforts of every Member of this body.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE ITS REPORT ON S. 3390

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations have until midnight tonight to file a report on S. 3390, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Richard G. Kleindienst, of Arizona, to be Attorney General, and other nominations.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard G. Kleindienst, of Arizona, to be Attorney General.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this debate will take some time.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). The Senator will suspend. The Senate will please be in order. The Senate will suspend until all Senators take their seats.

The Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending nomination be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations beginning with New Reports, on page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending nomination will be temporarily laid aside and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of nominations, beginning with New Reports, on page 2 of the Executive Calendar.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Norman C. Roettger, Jr., of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc, except the last one, on page 6 of the Executive Calendar, Lt. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nominations, except for Lt. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Chair now call up the nomination of Lieutenant General Forsythe?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. George Irvin

June 15, 1972

Approved For Release 2005/01/05 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600110023-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5713

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 277, nays 60, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—277

Adams	Gaydos	Nedzi
Addabbo	Gettys	Nelsen
Alexander	Gialmo	Obey
Anderson	Gibbons	O'Konski
Calif.	Goldwater	O'Neill
Anderson, Ill.	Gonzalez	Passman
Andrews, Ala.	Grasso	Patten
Andrews, N. Dak.	Green, Oreg.	Pepper
Annunzio	Green, Pa.	Pettis
Ashley	Gubser	Peysner
Aspin	Gude	Pickle
Aspinall	Hamilton	Pike
Badillo	Hammer-	Powell
Baring	schmidt	Preyer, N.C.
Barrett	Hanley	Price, Ill.
Begich	Hanna	Price, Tex.
Belcher	Hansen, Idaho	Pucinski
Bergland	Hansen, Wash.	Purcell
Bevill	Harrington	Quie
Biaggi	Hastings	Quillen
Biester	Hathaway	Rallsback
Boggs	Hawkins	Rangel
Boland	Hays	Rees
Bolling	Hechler, W. Va.	Reid
Brademas	Heckler, Mass.	Reuss
Brasco	Heinz	Riegle
Brinkley	Helstoski	Roberts
Brooks	Henderson	Robison, N.Y.
Brotzman	Hicks, Mass.	Rodino
Brown, Mich.	Hicks, Wash.	Roe
Brown, Ohio	Hogan	Rogers
Broyhill, Va.	Hollifield	Roncallo
Buchanan	Horton	Rostenkowski
Burke, Fla.	Howard	Roush
Burke, Mass.	Hull	Roy
Burleson, Tex.	Hungate	Roybal
Burlison, Mo.	Hunt	Runnels
Burton	Jacobs	Ruppe
Byron	Jarman	Ryan
Cabell	Johnson, Calif.	St Germain
Caffery	Johnson, Pa.	Sarbanes
Carey, N.Y.	Jones, Ala.	Schwengel
Carney	Jones, N.C.	Sebellius
Carter	Jones, Tenn.	Seiberling
Casey, Tex.	Karh	Shipley
Cederberg	Kastenmeier	Shoup
Chisholm	Kazen	Shriver
Clark	Keating	Sikes
Clausen,	Kee	Sisk
Don H.	Keith	Skubitz
Clay	Kemp	Slack
Cleveland	Koch	Smith, Iowa
Conte	Latta	Spence
Conyers	Leggett	Stanton,
Corman	Lent	J. William
Cotter	Lloyd	Stanton,
Coughlin	Long, Md.	James V.
Culver	Lujan	Steed
Daniels, N.J.	McClary	Steele
Danielson	McCullister	Stokes
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Stratton
de la Garza	McCulloch	Stubblefield
Dellenback	McDade	Stuckey
Delums	McFall	Symington
Denholm	McKevitt	Taylor
Dent	McKinney	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Macdonald,	Thomson, Wis.
Donohue	Mass.	Thone
Dorn	Madden	Tiernan
Dow	Mahon	Udall
Downing	Mann	Ullman
Drinan	Mathias, Calif.	Van Deerlin
Dulski	Matsunaga	Vander Jagt
Duncan	Mayne	Vanik
du Pont	Meeds	Veysey
Eckhardt	Melcher	Vigorito
Edwards, Calif.	Mikva	Waggonner
Ellberg	Miller, Calif.	Waldie
Esch	Miller, Ohio	Wampler
Evans, Colo.	Mills, Ark.	Whalen
Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Md.	White
Fascell	Minish	Whitten
Fish	Mink	Widnall
Fisher	Minshall	Winn
Flood	Mitchell	Wolf
Flowers	Mollohan	Wyatt
Foley	Monagan	Wylder
Ford,	Moorehead	Wylie
William D.	Morgan	Wyman
Forsythe	Moss	Yates
Fountain	Murphy, Ill.	Young, Fla.
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Frey	Myers	Zablocki
Galifianakis	Natcher	Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—60

Abbutt	Daniel, Va.	Mathis, Ga.
Archer	Davis, Wis.	Michel
Arends	Dennis	Mizell
Ashbrook	Derwinski	Pelly
Baker	Devine	Rhodes
Bennett	Dickinson	Robinson, Va.
Betts	Findley	Ruth
Blackburn	Flynt	Sandman
Bow	Ford, Gerald R.	Satterfield
Broyhill, N.C.	Goodling	Saylor
Camp	Griffin	Scherle
Carlson	Gross	Schmitz
Chappell	Haley	Schneebell
Clawson, Del	Hutchinson	Scott
Collier	Jonas	Smith, N.Y.
Collins, Tex.	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Colmer	Kyl	Teague, Tex.
Conable	Landgrebe	Thompson, Ga.
Conover	Mallory	Ware
Crane	Martin	Whalley

NOT VOTING—95

Abernethy	Griffiths	Patman
Abourezk	Grover	Perkins
Abzug	Hagan	Pirnie
Anderson,	Hall	Poage
Tenn.	Halpern	Podell
Bell	Harsha	Poff
Bingham	Harvey	Pryor, Ark.
Blanton	Hébert	Randall
Blatnik	Hillis	Rarick
Bray	Hosmer	Rooney, N.Y.
Broomfield	Ichord	Rooney, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	King	Rosenthal
Byrnes, Wis.	Kluczynski	Rousselot
Celler	Kyros	Scheuer
Chamberlain	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Lennon	Snyder
Collins, Ill.	Link	Springer
Curlin	Long, La.	Staggers
Davis, S.C.	McCloskey	Steiger, Wis.
Delaney	McClure	Stephens
Dingell	McDonald,	Sullivan
Dowdy	Mich.	Talcott
Dwyer	McEwen	Terry
Edmondson	McKay	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Ala.	McMillan	Whitehurst
Erlenborn	Mailliard	Wiggins
Eshleman	Mazzoli	Williams
Fraser	Metcalfe	Wilson, Bob
Frenzel	Montgomery	Wilson,
Fulton	Mosher	Charles H.
Fuqua	Nichols	Wright
Gallagher	Nix	Yatron
Garmatz	O'Hara	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Hall against.
Mr. Grover for, with Mr. Rousselot against.
Mr. McDonald of Michigan for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.
Mr. Hillis for, with Mr. Terry against.
Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Abernethy against.
Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Rarick against.
Mr. Frenzel for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Broomfield.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Collins of Illinois with Mrs. Abzug.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Link with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Celler with Mr. King.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Whitehurst.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Curliu with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Mailard.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Blanton.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Patman.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Randal.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Gallagher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 15417), just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bound RECORD of June 14, 1972, be corrected as follows: Page H5623, column 1, sixth full paragraph, please delete "Mr. Conte" and substitute therefor "Mr. Flood."

Same page, same column, please delete the 11th and 12th full paragraphs and substitute therefor:

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to say in addition to that, I would like to add my words.

Because of the experience with this problem in recent years with reference to lead-base poisoning, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) brought this up year after year especially for the last 3 years before the committee and is largely responsible for the making of these grants and the beginning of that program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR GENERAL DEBATE ONLY ON JUNE 20 ON PUBLIC WORKS, ATOMIC ENERGY, TREASURY, AND POSTAL SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order in the House on Tuesday next—clause 6 of rule XXI to the contrary notwithstanding—to have general debate only on the bill making appropriations for public

works for water and power development, the Atomic Energy Commission, and certain other agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and to have general debate only on the bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14734, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

Mr. **MORGAN** submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 14734) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the U.S. Information Agency:

CONFERENCE REPORT (HOUSE REPT.
No. 92-1145)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14734) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the United States Information Agency, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the House bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972".

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 101. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for fiscal year 1973, to carry out the authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States, and other purposes authorized by law, the following amounts:

- (1) for the "Administration of Foreign Affairs", \$289,453,000;
- (2) for "International Organizations and Conferences", \$188,263,000;
- (3) for "International Commissions", \$18,226,000;
- (4) for "Educational Exchange", \$59,200,000; and
- (5) for "Migration and Refugee Assistance", \$8,212,000.

(b) The Secretary of State is authorized to furnish, on terms and conditions he considers appropriate, assistance to Israel or another suitable country, including assistance for the resettlement in Israel or such country of Jewish or other similar refugees from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not to exceed \$85,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

(c) Appropriations made under subsection (a) of this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION UPON PRIOR AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENT

Sec. 102. Section 15(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State", approved August 1, 1956, as amended by section 407 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (22 U.S.C. 2680), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to, or affect in any manner, permanent appropri-

ations, trust funds, and other similar accounts administered by the Department as authorized by law."

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE AND UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Sec. 103. (a) (1) The first section of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2652), is amended to read as follows: "That there shall be in the Department of State, in addition to the Secretary of State, a Deputy Secretary of State, an Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, an Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, a Deputy Under Secretary of State, and eleven Assistant Secretaries of State."

(2) Section 2(b) of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2652), is repealed.

(b) The duties of the Under Secretary of State are transferred to the Deputy Secretary of State. The individual holding, on the date of enactment of this Act, the office of the Under Secretary of State may assume the duties of the Deputy Secretary of State. The individual assuming such duties shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this section.

(c) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section are effective July 1, 1972.

EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE PAY RATES

Sec. 104. Chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5313(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Deputy Secretary of State."

(2) Section 5314(9) is amended by striking out "or" before "Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "and".

(3) Section 5315(10) is amended to read as follows:

"(10) Deputy Under Secretary of State."

RETIREMENT ANNUITIES FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

Sec. 105. (a) Section 8331(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (H);

(2) by adding "and" at the end of subparagraph (I); and

(3) by inserting, immediately below subparagraph (I), the following new subparagraph:

"(J) an alien (i) who was previously employed by the Government, (ii) who is employed full time by a foreign government for the purpose of protecting or furthering the interests of the United States during an interruption of diplomatic or consular relations, and (iii) for whose services reimbursement is made to the foreign government by the United States;"

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on the first day of the second month which begins after its enactment.

(c) The amendments made by such subsection (a) shall not apply in the cases of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to the effective date established under subsection (b) of this section, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if such amendments had not been enacted.

MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1964

Sec. 106. (a) Section 3(b)(1) of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, as amended (31 U.S.C. 241(b)(1)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Subject to any policies the President may prescribe to effectuate the purposes of this subsection and—

"(A) under regulations the head of an agency (other than a military department, the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the Department of Defense, or an agency or office referred to in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph) may prescribe for his agency or, in the case of

ACTION, all of that part of ACTION other than the office referred to in such subparagraph, part thereof, he or his designee may settle and pay a claim arising after August 31, 1964, against the United States for not more than \$6,500 made by a member of the uniformed services under the jurisdiction of that agency or by a civilian officer or employee of that agency or part thereof, for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to his service; and

"(B) under regulations the Secretary of State, the Administrator for the Agency for International Development, the Director of the United States Information Agency, the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Director of ACTION with respect to the office of ACTION engaged primarily in carrying out the Peace Corps Act, and the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, may prescribe for their agencies or, in the case of ACTION, for such office, he or his designee may settle and pay a claim arising after August 31, 1964, against the United States for not more than \$10,000 made by a civilian officer or employee of such agency or office for damage to, or loss of personal property incident to his service.

If the claim is substantiated and the possession of that property is determined to be reasonable, useful, or proper under the circumstances, the claim may be paid or the property replaced in kind. This subsection does not apply to claims settled before August 31, 1964."

(b) Subsection (a) of this section is effective August 31, 1964. Notwithstanding section 4 of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, or any other provision of law, a claim heretofore settled in the amount of \$6,500 solely by reason of the maximum limitation established by section 3(b)(1) of such Act, may, upon written request of the claimant made within one year from the date of enactment of this Act, be reconsidered and settled under that section, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS

Sec. 107. Section 501 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 901) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) On and after the date of enactment of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972, no person shall be designated as ambassador or minister, or be designated to serve in any position with the title of ambassador or minister, unless that person is appointed as an ambassador or minister in accordance with subsection (a) of this section or clause 3, section 2, of article II of the Constitution, relating to recess appointments, except that the personal rank of ambassador or minister may be conferred by the President in connection with special missions for the President of an essentially limited and temporary nature of not exceeding six months."

TITLE II—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1973, to carry out international informational activities and programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 8 of 1953, and other purposes authorized by law, the following amounts:

- (1) \$194,213,000 for "Salaries and expenses" and "Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)", except that so much of such amount as may be appropriated for "Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)" may be appropriated without fiscal year limitation;

June 15, 1972

(2) \$5,036,000 for "Special international exhibitions" and "Special international exhibitions (special foreign currency program)", which amount may be appropriated without fiscal year limitation; and

(3) \$1,000,000 for "Acquisition and construction of radio facilities", which amount may be appropriated without fiscal year limitation.

PROVIDING CERTAIN BASIC AUTHORITIES

SEC. 202. Title VIII of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1471) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"BASIC AUTHORITY

"Sec. 804. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary, or any Government agency authorized to administer such provisions, may—

"(1) employ, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitable qualified United States citizens are not available (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary or such agency and the Attorney General), and such persons may be admitted to the United States, if otherwise qualified, as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 (a)(15)) for such time and under such conditions and procedures as may be established by the Secretary and the Attorney General;

"(2) pay travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States and their dependents to and from the United States;

"(3) incur expenses for entertainment within the United States within such amounts as may be provided in appropriations Acts;

"(4) obtain insurance on official motor vehicles operated by the Secretary or such agency in foreign countries, and pay the expenses incident thereto;

"(5) notwithstanding the provisions of section 2680(k) of title 28, United States Code, pay tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672 of such title, when such claims arise in foreign countries in connection with operations conducted abroad under this Act;

"(6) employ aliens by contract for services abroad;

"(7) provide ice and drinking water abroad;

"(8) pay excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad;

"(9) pay the actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities conducted under this Act;

"(10) rent or lease, for periods not exceeding five years, offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters abroad for employees carrying out this Act, and make payments therefor in advance;

"(11) maintain, improve, and repair properties used for information activities in foreign countries;

"(12) furnish fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad; and

"(13) pay travel expenses of employees attending official international conferences, without regard to sections 5701-5708 of title 5, United States Code, and regulations issued thereunder, but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary.

"TRAVEL EXPENSES

"Sec. 805. Appropriated funds made available for any fiscal year to the Secretary or

any Government agency, to carry out the provisions of this Act, for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, shall be available for all such expenses in connection with travel or transportation which begins in that fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed until the following fiscal year."

LIMITATION UPON PRIOR AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENT

SEC. 203. Section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1476) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this section shall not apply to, or affect in any manner, permanent appropriations, trust funds, and other similar accounts administered by the Secretary or such agency as authorized by law."

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION WITHIN UNITED STATES

SEC. 204. The second sentence of section 501 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1461) is amended to read as follows: "Any such information (other than 'Problems of Communism' which may continue to be sold by the Government Printing Office) shall not be disseminated within the United States, its territories, or possessions, but, on request, shall be available in the English language at the Department of State, at all reasonable times following its release as information abroad, for examination only by representatives of United States press associations, newspapers, magazines, radio systems, and stations, and by research students and scholars, and, on request, shall be made available for examination only to Members of Congress."

TITLE III—UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 301. The second sentence of section 49(a) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2589(a)) is amended by inserting immediately after "\$17,500,000," the following: ", and for the two fiscal years 1973 and 1974, the sum of \$22,000,000."

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 302. (a) The United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, with the cooperation and assistance of other relevant Government agencies including the Department of State and the Department of Defense, shall prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report on the international transfer of conventional arms based upon existing and new work in this area. The report shall include (but not be limited to) the following subjects:

(1) the quantity and nature of the international transfer of conventional arms, including the identification of the major supplying and recipient countries;

(2) the policies of the major exporters of conventional arms toward transfer, including the terms on which conventional arms are made available for transfer, whether by credit, grant, or cash-and-carry basis;

(3) the effects of conventional arms transfer on international stability and regional balances of power;

(4) the impact of conventional arms transfer on the economies of supplying and recipient countries;

(5) the history of any negotiations on conventional arms transfer, including past policies adopted by the United States and other suppliers of conventional arms;

(6) the major obstacles to negotiations on conventional arms transfer;

(7) the possibilities for limiting conven-

tional arms transfer, including potentialities for international agreements, step-by-step approaches on particular weapons systems, and regional arms limitations; and

(8) recommendations for future United States policy on conventional arms transfer.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and an interim report shall be submitted to the Congress not later than six months after such date.

TITLE IV—PEACE CORPS

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 401. (a) The first phrase of section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2502(b)), ending with a colon, is amended to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1973 not to exceed \$88,027,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act:"

VOLUNTARY SERVICE PROGRAMS

SEC. 402. Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 301 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501a), which relates to encouragement of voluntary service programs, is amended by striking out "\$300,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$350,000", by striking out "1971", and by inserting, before the word "fiscal" the word "any".

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 403. Section 12 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2511) is repealed, and the Peace Corps National Advisory Council is abolished, effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

CERTAIN ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 501. In addition to amounts authorized by sections 101 (a) and (b) and 201 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State and the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1973 such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law, or other nondiscretionary costs.

EXPRESSION OF INDIVIDUAL VIEWS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 502. Upon the request of a committee of either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, or a member of such committee, any officer appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to a position in the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, or any other department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States Government primarily concerned with matters relating to foreign countries or multilateral organizations, may express his views and opinions, and make recommendations he considers appropriate, if the request of the committee or member of the committee relates to a subject which is within the jurisdiction of that committee.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

SEC. 503. Chapter 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to international narcotics control, is amended by striking out section 481 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 481. INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL.—It is the sense of the Congress that effective international cooperation is necessary to put an end to the illicit production, smuggling, trafficking in, and abuse of dangerous drugs. In order to promote such cooperation, the President is authorized to conclude agreements with other countries to facilitate control of the production, processing, transportation, and distribution of narcotic analgesics, including opium and its

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

June 15, 1972

derivatives, other narcotic drugs and psychotropics, and other controlled substances as defined in the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized to furnish assistance to any country or international organization, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for the control of the production of, processing of, smuggling of, and traffic in, narcotic and psychotropic drugs. The President shall suspend economic and military assistance furnished under this or any other Act, and shall suspend sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act and under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to any country when the President determines that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances (as defined by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

"SEC. 482. AUTHORIZATION.—To carry out the purposes of section 481, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President \$42,500,000 for the fiscal year 1973, which amount is authorized to remain available until expended."

TITLE VI—STUDY COMMISSION RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 601. It is the purpose of this title to establish a study commission which will submit findings and recommendations to provide a more effective system for the formulation and implementation of the Nation's foreign policy.

COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY

SEC. 602. (a) To carry out the purpose of section 601 of this Act, there is established a Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy (hereafter referred to in this title as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the following twelve members:

(1) four members appointed by the President, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) four members appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate (one from each of the two major political parties) and two from private life; and

(3) four members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives (one from each of the two major political parties) and two from private life.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise employed by the United States Government shall receive \$145 a day (including traveltime) during which he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the Commission. A member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States Government shall serve without additional compensation. All members of the Commission shall be reim-

bursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 603. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate the organization, methods of operation, and powers of all departments, agencies, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the United States Government participating in the formulation and implementation of United States foreign policy and shall make recommendations which the Commission considers appropriate to provide improved governmental processes and programs in the formulation and implementation of such policy, including, but not limited to, recommendations with respect to—

(1) the reorganization of the departments, agencies, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch participating in foreign policy matters;

(2) more effective arrangements between the executive branch and Congress, which will better enable each to carry out its constitutional responsibilities;

(3) improved procedures among departments, agencies, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the United States Government to provide improved coordination and control with respect to the conduct of foreign policy;

(4) the abolition of services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of foreign policy; and

(5) other measures to promote peace, economy, efficiency, and improved administration of foreign policy.

(b) The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report to the President and Congress, not later than June 30, 1974, containing the findings and recommendations of the Commission with respect to its study and investigation. Such recommendations may include proposed constitutional amendments, legislation, and administrative actions the Commission considers appropriate in carrying out its duties. The Commission shall cease to exist on the thirtieth day after the date on which it files the comprehensive report under this subsection.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 604. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of any such subcommittee, or any designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this title. Each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to the extent authorized by law, to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 605. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) The Commission is authorized to procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at GS-13.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 606. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the House bill and agree to the same.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,

WAYNE L. HAYS,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,

DANTE B. FASCELL,

WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,

JOHN SPARKMAN,

WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.,

FRANK CHURCH,

GEORGE D. AIKEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14734) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for the United States Information Agency, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendments struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the House bill, and the House disagreed to the Senate amendments.

The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the House bill, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the House bill and the Senate amendment to the text of the House bill. The committee of conference also recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the House bill.

The differences between the text of the House bill, the Senate amendment thereto, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES FROM THE SOVIET UNION

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of \$8,212,000 for migration and refugee assistance and the appropriation of \$85,000,000 for assistance to Israel and other suitable countries for the resettlement of Jewish or other similar refugees from the Soviet Union.

The House bill authorized \$93,212,000 for

June 15, 1972

H 5717

migration and refugee assistance, of which \$85,000,000 was intended for Israel.

The House receded.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

The Senate amendment contained separate provisions authorizing the appropriations for the Department of State to remain available until expended, and for the United States Information Agency without fiscal year limitation, with the exception of the amounts appropriated for USIA salaries and expenses.

The House bill contained similar provisions in a single section.

The House receded.

LIMITATION UPON PRIOR AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENT

The Senate amendment contained two separate sections, applying to the Department of State and the United States Information Agency respectively, to assure that permanent appropriations under which payments are made directly from trust funds and other similar accounts in accordance with existing statutory authority are excluded from the application of section 407 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971.

The House bill contained one section applying to both agencies.

The House receded.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION FOR GRIEVANCE BOARD

The Senate amendment contained an open-ended authorization for appropriations for salaries and expenses of a grievance board as envisioned in the section of the Senate amendment dealing with Foreign Service grievances.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

DEPUTY SECRETARY, UNDER SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

The Senate amendment established the positions of Deputy Secretary of State and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, abolished one position of Deputy Under Secretary of State, and raised the number of Assistant Secretaries of State from 11 to 12.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment eliminating the increase in the numbers of Assistant Secretaries of State.

BUREAU OF NORTH AMERICAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF SOUTH AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The Senate amendment established a Bureau of North American Affairs and a Bureau of South American Affairs, each to be headed by an Assistant Secretary of State.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

TRANSFER OF DUTIES OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE TO THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE

The Senate amendment transferred the duties of the Under Secretary of State to the Deputy Secretary of State.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House receded.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION, JULY 1, 1972

The Senate amendment set July 1, 1972 as the effective date of the provision establishing the positions of Deputy Secretary of State and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House receded.

EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE PAY RATES

The Senate amendment amended the Executive Schedule pay rates to substitute Deputy Secretary of State for Under Secre-

tary of State, and Under Secretary for Economic Affairs for the Deputy Under Secretary and to add a twelfth Assistant Secretary of State.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment eliminating the twelfth Assistant Secretary of State.

RETIREMENT ANNUITIES FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate amendment amended Title 5, United States Code, to authorize civil service retirement credit for certain alien employees of the United States abroad who work for a protecting power (foreign government) on United States interests during an interruption of diplomatic or consular relations.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS

The Senate amendment amended the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964 to (1) increase authority for settlement of claims from \$6,500 to \$10,000 for personnel of designated foreign affairs agencies other than the Department of Defense, the military departments and Coast Guard, for personal property losses incident to service, and (2) permit reconsideration, retroactive to August 31, 1964, of any claim heretofore settled and paid in the amount of \$6,500 solely because that was the maximum amount authorized under existing law.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

RETIREMENT OF CAREER MINISTERS

The Senate amendment amended the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to lower the mandatory retirement age for career ministers from age 65 to age 60.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTIONS

The Senate amendment amended the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to (1) require promotion of Foreign Service officers by rank order within class or rank order by specialty within class and (2) authorize the Secretary of State to recommend promotion as a remedy for grievances.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

FOREIGN SERVICE GRIEVANCES

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, that included detailed provisions relating to the handling of grievances by Foreign Service personnel.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS

The Senate amendment contained a provision that no person shall be designated as ambassador or minister or designated to serve in any position or use any title which includes either of those words unless he is appointed as an ambassador or minister with Senate confirmation or in accordance with the constitutional provisions relating to recess appointments.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment that permits the President to confer the personal rank of ambassador or minister in connection with special missions for the President of an essentially limited and temporary nature not to exceed six months.

BASIC AUTHORITIES FOR UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

The Senate amendment included a section that is, in effect, a "point or order bill". It

provided basic authority for USIA to support items traditionally included in annual Agency appropriation acts. The language in the Senate version was identical with the language regularly included in such appropriations acts and does not constitute any new authority.

The House bill did not contain a comparable section.

The House receded.

DOMESTIC DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION BY USIA

The Senate amendment amended section 501 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, to prohibit dissemination domestically of any information product of the U.S. Information Agency other than the publication, "Problems of Communism."

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded after the Senate provision was amended in two instances: first, to permit research students and scholars to examine USIA information products in Washington; and, second, to clarify further that USIA materials are to be made available to Members of Congress for examination only and not for dissemination.

ACDA REPORT TO CONGRESS

The Senate amendment contained a requirement that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the assistance of other relevant Government agencies shall prepare and submit to Congress a comprehensive report on the international transfer of conventional arms based upon existing and new work in this area. It specified some of the items that should be included in the report.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

PEACE CORPS NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

The House bill contained an amendment that abolished the Peace Corps National Advisory Council subject to the creation of a National Advisory Council for ACTION of which the Peace Corps is now a part.

The Senate amendment provided for the abolition of the Peace Corps National Advisory Council ninety days after the date of enactment of this legislation.

The House receded.

CERTAIN ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate amendment included authorizations of appropriations for the Department of State and USIA for fiscal year 1973 for programs or activities authorized by law subsequent to the date of enactment of the authorization act for these two agencies.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

EXPRESSION OF INDIVIDUAL VIEWS TO CONGRESS

The Senate amendment included language to permit a presidential appointee in any of the foreign affairs agencies to express his views and opinions, and make recommendations he considers appropriate, upon request by a committee of either House, a joint committee, or any member of such committee, if the request of the committee or members of the committee relates to a subject within the jurisdiction of that committee.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PERSONNEL CEILING

The Senate amendment restricted the total number of American employees of the Department of State overseas to 6,000 after April 1, 1972.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS
CONSTRUCTION

The Senate amendment contained a provision reaffirming the authorization by the Congress (P.L. 91-622) of providing \$20,000,000 to the United Nations through the Secretary of State as a contribution to the cost of expanding the U.N. Headquarters in New York.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

The Senate amendment contained a section modifying the restrictions on the use of foreign currencies in connection with travel by members of Congress.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

The Senate amendment substituted new provisions in lieu of section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizing an appropriation of \$42,500,000 for fiscal year 1973 for international narcotics control.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House receded.

STUDY COMMISSION RELATING TO FOREIGN
POLICY

The Senate amendment contained a title relating to the establishment of a study commission to submit findings and recommendations on the formulation and implementation of American foreign policy, with membership from the Congress and the Executive Branch.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment.

TITLE

The Senate amendment provided that the Act may be cited as the "Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972."

The House bill provided that the Act may be cited as the "Department of State and United States Information Agency Appropriations Authorization Act of 1972."

The House receded.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
L. H. FOUNTAIN,
DANTE B. FASCELL,
WILLIAM S. MAILLARD,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.,
FRANK CHURCH,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO
FILE REPORT ON U.S. ECONOMIC
ASSISTANCE FOR THE KHMER
REPUBLIC (CAMBODIA) UNTIL
MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report entitled "U.S. Economic Assistance for the Khmer Republic—Cambodia."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JUNE 13

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader if he can inform us as to the schedule for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, we have concluded the program for this week and I will ask unanimous consent to go over to Monday.

Monday is Consent Calendar Day.

That will be followed by four suspensions:

First. H.R. 13694, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission;

Second. Senate Joint Resolution 211, National Commission on Consumer Finance;

Third. H.R. 15439, Compensation for Disabled Veterans; and

Fourth. S. 3343, Housing for Disabled Veterans.

For Tuesday there is the Private Calendar, to be followed by general debate only on the Public Works-AEC appropriation bill and general debate only on the Treasury-Postal Service appropriation bill.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week there is scheduled for consideration the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act, commonly called the revenue-sharing bill, under a closed rule with 8 hours of debate; and the conclusion of consideration of the two appropriation bills which I have just mentioned, Public Works-AEC and Treasury-Postal Service; followed by consideration of the cyclamate ban compensation bill, which is subject to a rule being granted.

Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

It is entirely probable that on Friday next the House will be in session. I might say that we have an exceedingly heavy schedule for the following week.

Under the plan previously announced, the House will recess for the Democratic convention at the close of business on Friday, June 30, so it is highly likely we will have business on Friday next and on the succeeding Friday.

Mr. FREY. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As to what appropriation bill did the chairman of the Appropriations Committee ask permission for consideration on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. BOGGS. On Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. Tuesday. That would be the Treasury and Postal Service bill?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman asked to call up two, the Public Works-AEC bill and the Treasury-Postal Service bill, for general debate only.

Mr. GROSS. On both bills or one?

Mr. BOGGS. Both bills.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman, when would it be planned to return to these bills, in view of the schedule thereafter?

Mr. BOGGS. Following the conclusion of the revenue-sharing bill.

Mr. GROSS. Conclusion of the revenue-sharing bill?

Mr. BOGGS. The revenue-sharing bill is the first order of business on Wednesday. If the rule is adopted, the debate cannot exceed 8 hours. So if all the debate is consumed, we will finish the revenue-sharing bill on Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Then we will go back to the two appropriation bills, after the revenue-sharing bill?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is the debt-ceiling bill ready to be considered by the House?

Mr. BOGGS. The debt-ceiling bill is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, June 27.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hope that would be called up tomorrow or Saturday, in view of the \$100 billion bill we just passed. I would think it would be urgent that the debt ceiling be increased in view of that kind of wild-eyed spending.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, the debt ceiling will be increased, as the gentleman knows.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY,
JUNE 19, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WED-
NESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNES-
DAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business scheduled for Calendar Wednesday on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

TO SECURE HUMANE TREATMENT
FOR OUR POW'S AND MIA'S

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, according to the latest Department of Defense figures, 1,737 U.S. military personnel and civilians are reported captured or missing in action in Southeast Asia; 65 of these men are from my own State of Oregon. The parents, wives, and children of a majority of these men have no idea whether or not they are even alive. And those who do know, must still live in daily anxiety for the health and well-being of their loved one.

I am quite certain that everyone in this body would like to see the conclusion of the Vietnam war and the safe return of our prisoners to their families. It is

State-USIA bill

Approved For Release 2005/01/05 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600110023-5
 THE WASHINGTON POST DATE June 12 PAGE 1

\$1 Billion Voted for State, USIA

By Spencer Rich
 Washington Post Staff Writer

The Senate, by a 76-to-1 vote, passed a \$1 billion authorization bill for the State Department and USIA yesterday, after first voting 40 to 36 to allow continued U.S. chrome imports from Rhodesia despite a U.N. embargo.

Before passing the bill, which now goes to conference with the House, the Senate set aside the end-of-the-war issue for consideration in the foreign military assistance bill, which is expected to reach the floor later this month.

In a series of pro-forma voice votes it stripped from the State-USIA authorization a group of Vietnam fund-cut-off proposals which had held up passage of the bill for four weeks.

Backers of the fund cutoff are uniting now behind an amendment sponsored by Majority Leader Mike Mansfield requiring withdrawal of all U.S. ground forces from Vietnam by Aug. 31. This amendment has already been attached to the \$1.7 billion foreign military aid bill by the foreign relations committee. Mansfield has decided to press for a showdown when that bill comes up.

After the vote on the chrome issue, Sen. Gale W. McGee (D-Wyo.), usually an administration supporter on foreign policy issues, blasted the White House for failing to exert any real effort on behalf of the U.N. embargo. As a result, he said, the Senate vote will permit importers to continue ignoring it.

McGee said the White House had formally given its endorsement to his proposal to restore U.S. compliance with the embargo, but had declined to put any pressure on wavering GOP senators. He said he had told the White House Tuesday, "Somebody's got to pick up the telephone and make some calls," and had given the names of six Republicans who would vote for the embargo if the White House asked him to.

"That suggestion was greeted with silence," he said. The United States began participating in the embargo

See DEBATE, A15, Col. 1

in 1966 after the U.N. imposed economic sanctions against the breakaway British colony in an effort to force it to grant the nation's black majority a bigger voice in government.

Last year, Sen. Harry Flood Byrd (Ind.-Va.), arguing that Rhodesian chrome was needed for high-quality steel used in defense industries, pushed through Congress a proposal to permit imports despite the embargo. He said the United States was taking 60 per cent of its chrome imports from Russia.

Yesterday, Byrd's floor amendment killing McGee's proposal was adopted 40 to 36, with only 10 Republicans supporting McGee.

J. Glenn Beall (R-Md.) and William B. Spong (D-Va.) voted with Byrd. Charles McC. Mathias Jr. (R-Md.) was absent.

Byrd insisted that the issue was a defense matter, not a foreign policy matter. McGee retorted that the United States has so much chrome in its strategic stockpile that even after 1.3 million tons are released into the market in accord with recent legislation, the stockpile still will contain more than 3 million tons — a reserve covering all needs for full three-year war.

As passed by the Senate, the State-USIA bill authorizes \$648-354,000 for the State Department (this includes \$85 million, not sought by the department, for resettlement of Jewish refugees from Russia), \$200,249,000 for the USIA, \$22 million for the Arms Control Agency, \$88 million for the Peace Corps and \$42.5 million for international narcotics control.

During the weeks of debate on the measure, the Senate stripped a number of key provisions inserted by the Foreign Relations Committee. These included a requirement for a 10 per cent cut in overseas personnel, a shift of the seismic research program to detect underground tests from the Defense Department to the Arms Control Agency, and a ban on providing other governments with propaganda materials.

Left in, however, were a ban on the use of USIA propaganda materials within the United States, except for sale of the scholarly magazine "Problems of Communism"; a new mandatory grievance system for State Department employees; and a proposal for a little Hoover Commission to study foreign policy agencies.