

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 10

APRIL 23, 1970, TO MAY 4, 1970

(PAGES 12657 TO 14096)

American boys stationed near those bases. In my opinion, that is the only acceptable rationale for the action.

I cannot support any broadening of our involvement in Southeast Asia. Any action which would commit American troops or taxpayers' dollars to such an end is simply unacceptable to me. In Cambodia, there is a very real possibility that Prince Sihanouk will return to lead troops loyal to him against the military officers who brought his government down. Revolution and counter-revolution, when its protagonists are all nationals, is civil war. The United States has no business being involved in a Cambodian civil war.

The burden is on the President to justify this startling new commitment. I await his statement this evening. It remains to be seen whether he will be able to convince me and the American people that his course is reasonable. I am sorry he did not counsel with the Senate before he moved. I hope that he will reject any U.S. activities in Cambodia unless essential to the protection of U.S. fighting men in Vietnam.

ADMINISTRATION SPOKESMEN ADMIT SPURIOUS BASIS FOR PRESIDENT'S RESTRICTION ON CANADIAN OIL IMPORTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a number of Senators have expressed their serious doubts about the validity of the President's recent decision imposing import quotas on Canadian oil in a letter to him dated March 25, 1970. The letter was signed by 25 Senators from both parties. It was the view of those 25 Senators that a clear case had not been made, and could not be made, that imports of Canadian oil were adversely affecting our national security interests.

The Washington Star for April 20, 1970, contains an interesting article quoting officials in the Department of State and in the Office of Emergency Preparedness. Mr. James Akins, of the State Department, was quoted as saying that one reason for the order was that the higher import level "disrupted the relationships among the American refiners." Mr. William C. Truppner of the Office of Emergency Preparedness was, perhaps, even more candid. He said:

In a way it was a protectionist measure . . . this is not necessarily a sin.

I think these comments underscore what a number of us have believed from the outset. That is, the oil import controls are an improper exercise of the statutory authority to protect the national security. Mr. Truppner did say in the same interview that the Canadian imports were a threat to national security because they were making the government's job more difficult in moving toward an orderly import program. Unfortunately, the administration has given no evidence, whatsoever, that it is moving toward an orderly import program. Instead, it has abandoned the exhaustive, year-long study by the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Controls by relegating it to yet another study group. In the meantime, it has added to the basically illogical structure of the program by im-

posing controls on Canadian oil for the first time since the oil import control program was adopted by President Eisenhower in 1959.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Stephen M. Aug be printed in the RECORD.

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

SQUABBLE OF U.S. OIL FIRMS LED TO CANADIAN IMPORT CURB (By Stephen M. Aug)

A State Department specialist on fuel and energy imports conceded today that a squabble among "a group of American companies" producing oil in Canada led to the first formal limits on the amount of Canadian oil that could be imported into this country.

James E. Akins, director of the State Department Office of Fuels and Energy, said at a news briefing that one reason for the March 10 White House decision slicing about 100,000 barrels a day from the amount Canadians had been exporting was that the higher import level "disrupted the relationships among the American refiners."

Some domestic refiners, he said, had been getting their oil cheaper than others because the Canadians had been exporting about 800,000 barrels a day to the United States.

STUDY OPENED

At the same time, Akins said that once an agreement is concluded between the United States and Canada calling for a joint policy on energy—oil, gas, electricity—"there can be a relaxation" of the import quota on oil. But, he added, "there is no question of twisting an arm" to try to force Canada to agree to such a policy.

The briefing had been called to inform newsmen of what President Nixon's Oil Policy Committee had been considering since its formulation in February. Nixon had ordered the committee—which comprises members of several cabinet agencies—to study recommendations made after a year-long study of oil import policies, and to determine which could be carried out.

The principal recommendation of the study was that the present oil import quota program be scrapped in favor of tariffs on oil imports.

William C. Truppner, an official of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, who is directing staff work for the policy committee, declined to give a timetable for effecting the changes recommended—or to say whether he felt the tariff system ever would go into effect. "We possibly can look forward to effecting a lot of long-term changes by 1975," he said.

Truppner said staff papers have been prepared on such problems as:

1. Improve treatment of petrochemical feed stocks—petroleum and oil products used for chemical, rather than other uses.
2. The possibility of increasing imports of No. 2 fuel oil that would lower the price of this fuel which is much in demand especially in New England.
3. What to do about Foreign Trade Zones.
4. Residual oil importation. Residual oil is used by power plants, and there is a growing demand for such oil that is low in sulphur content as a means of reducing air pollution.

Most of the questions at the briefing, however, dealt with the Canadian oil import quotas.

Akins said Canada's recent decision to assert sovereignty over Arctic waters, and the U.S.-Canadian differences over the border off Maine "had nothing to do with the oil import decision." He said the Canadians "don't connect the two issues and neither do we."

SECURITY INVOLVED

Truppner said one reason for limiting Canadian imports was "a threat to national security . . . the flow of oil so far in excess of the previously agreed upon level was so disrupting the distribution of oil throughout the United States that it was making our job more difficult . . . in moving toward an orderly import program."

Asked about the effect of the move on consumers—Canadian oil is about 50 cents a barrel cheaper than domestic oil—both Truppner and Akins said there would be none. Truppner said the import committee has "a responsibility to take the leadership in assuring that the consumer interests are protected beyond the price at the pump." Akins said there was no evidence savings by refiners using the cheaper Canadian oil were being passed on to consumers.

He said of the import-limiting move: "In a way it was a protectionist measure . . . this is not necessarily a sin."

OREGONIANS COMMENT ON NIXON ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, when I joined the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), as a cosponsor of the Nixon administration "environmental package," I wrote a number of Oregonians to ask their comments on these proposals.

Three of the replies are of particular importance. Gov. Tom McCall commented favorably on these proposals. A respected member of the Environmental Quality Commission, Mr. Herman P. Meierjürgen, of Nehalem, addressed favorable comments to this group of bills. Mr. Larry Williams, who wears two hats—of the Sierra Club and of the Oregon Environmental Council—also supports these proposals. This is an indication of the support for such legislation in Oregon.

I might add that the ballot measure referred to in the letters is yet another measure of the commitment to clean water and clean air in my State. House Joint Resolution 14, also called Ballot Measure 4, will be voted on at our Oregon primary, and I certainly hope Oregonians will support it completely.

I ask unanimous consent that the three letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salem, Ore., April 10, 1970.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARK: I appreciated having my attention called to the package of environmental protection legislation contained in S. 3466 through S. 3472 as reported in the Congressional Record. My comments follow:

S. 3466: Providing that automobiles have mandatory testing for emissions to meet standards is desirable. I think a good way to proceed would be to require tuning to acceptable emission standards prior to annual licensing.

I support the idea of government establishing the formula for fuel, and I presume states could set higher standards. In any event, any existing state standards should be recognized, so federal action would not result in a lowering of current state requirements.

S. 3467: This appears to be in good order, and I have no comment.

S. 3468: I would like to see provisions for financing construction projects also provide for refinancing which can be extremely help-