

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 13

MAY 25, 1970, TO JUNE 3, 1970
(PAGES 16851 TO 18274)

hegemony—and in defense of one of the most democratic, progressive, enlightened, and courageous nations in the world—there should be no doubt of our national interest or our moral commitment.

I applaud the administration for its steadfast attempts to avoid a Middle Eastern arms race and to reach an accord with all nations in that part of the world. If there has perhaps been any excess of objectivity and neutrality, it has undoubtedly been with the very finest motives.

But it has been increasingly clear that our efforts to restrain the conflict have not been met with any corresponding restraint on the part of the Soviet Union. The Soviets, in fact, have met every conciliatory move on our part with actions which have only escalated the hostility and intransigence of the Arabs.

The introduction of Russian pilots flying air defense and Russian technicians manning the missile sites has severely destabilized what was only a precarious balance, at best. There is little doubt that the Arabs have no intention of negotiating with the Israelis, in spite of the continuing willingness of Israel to discuss any and all matters directly with the Arab States. There is little doubt that only Israel air superiority has prevented the Arab nations from launching a new Middle Eastern war. And there is no doubt that with such heavy Soviet assistance, both materials and men, the Arabs are only counting the days until they can once again try for the total elimination of Israel.

The introduction of Soviet pilots and technicians has not only affected the balance of power. It has seriously and dangerously changed the very nature of the conflict.

We know, from the very bitterest experience, how "a few technicians and defensive military advisers" can escalate into an enormous commitment which grows far out of any planned proportion. Have the Soviets thought about what they will do if the Arabs should launch a strike tomorrow across the canal? Can the Soviets keep their pilots and technicians in a purely defensive capacity if hostilities should break out? What will happen when the first Soviet pilot strays over the canal and is brought down by an Israel flyer? What have the Soviets done by their actions to the Arab's willingness to reach a reasonable accord on the basic issues that still divide the Middle East? Can the Soviets truly control the Arab nationalists? Or, will they wind up being slowly and tragically drawn into a great and prolonged conflict much as we were drawn into the Indochinese war?

These are reasons why the President must take all possible steps to get the Soviet Union to abandon this reckless course. No escalation of the arms race in the Middle East can bring peace any closer. But we will soon have—we may now have—no other choice but to respond by providing Israel with jets and other implements of war with which to protect herself.

Unless the Russians can be persuaded of our resolve to stand by Israel and of the futility and danger of their recent actions in Egypt, I see a new and more dangerous level in the Middle East confrontation.

So I repeat my plea to our President which is contained in the resolution introduced by the distinguished minority leader and myself: Bring all the power and prestige of your Office and your past record of statesmanship in the Middle East to bear upon the Soviet Union to reverse their dangerous policies. Know that we in the Senate stand behind you in that effort, prepared to uphold American interests in the Middle East and our moral commitments to the people of Israel.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT—THE CHURCH-COOPER AMENDMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in newspaper advertisements and on the floor, I have been struck, during this past 2 weeks, by one interesting line of argument being raised by opponents of the Church-Cooper amendment. In these advertisements and statements by Senators on the floor a great deal is being made of the fact that several years ago the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, made a number of statements in support of Presidential power as against congressional restriction, and supported the effort in Vietnam in 1964 at the time of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

Mr. President, as everyone in this body knows, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has in the course of the years changed his position on both of these points based on the performance of the President and the course of the war. He has readily confessed he was mistaken in both matters.

Those who seek to use his words today seek to imply that once a position is taken on matters affecting defense and foreign policy there should be no change.

I find this position ironic, particularly in the face of the sharp change that apparently has taken place both in the White House and here in the Senate with regard to the administration's attitude toward so-called limiting amendments.

On December 15, 1969, the Senate approved overwhelmingly an amendment which reads as follows:

In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to finance the introduction of American ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand.

I listened to the debate of that amendment and at no time was mention made of any inhibition of the President's constitutional powers or his right as Commander in Chief to protect American troops in South Vietnam or anywhere else.

On the day following that vote, when faced with newspaper articles which referred to the Laos-Thailand amendment as a curbing of Presidential power, both the White House and the President's

supporters here in the Senate were quick to argue that the Senate action in no way inhibited the President and, in fact, was endorsed fully by the White House.

At this point I would like to read a statement made on the Senate floor by the distinguished minority whip (Mr. GRIFFIN) on the day after the passage of the Laos-Thailand amendment:

The Senate did not take any action to "curb" an Asian role. The intent and the plain meaning of the amendment ultimately adopted by the Senate yesterday was to reaffirm the existing role and existing policies of the United States with respect to Thailand and Laos.

Indeed, the amendment was drafted—and I think most of the people on the Senate floor and those who were watching from the gallery were aware of the fact that it was drafted right here in the Republican cloakroom. In fact, the principal Senators involved in its drafting, along with the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Church) were the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Allott) and the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits); . . .

Following a meeting with the President and others at the White House this morning, I can report to my fellow Senators that the President is pleased with the amendment, and he recognizes that it is in accordance with his announced policies.

White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler and the Senate minority leader, Senator SCOTT, were no less forceful in pressing the idea that the Laos-Thailand amendment was approved by the White House, in fact there is an indication that they sought to take partial credit for the effort:

This wording, it was disclosed today, was approved by the White House in advance of adoption.*

I would like to point out that no limiting language was offered to that amendment and in January of this year that same language was included in this administration's requested appropriations language.

That brings us down to the Church-Cooper amendment which, as any reasonable person must agree, is drafted in the same context as last year's Laos-Thailand amendment. Though it has more sections than the initial effort by the Senate last fall to set outer limits in line with Presidential policy, the thrust of this Cambodian amendment clearly follows the precedent of Laos-Thailand.

It is, therefore, strange to see statements such as the one made on the Senate floor on May 14 by the minority whip, which reads as follows:

Even if we were to draft an amendment which was precisely tailored to the exact and actual intentions of the President, it seems to me that it would be a mistake to adopt such an amendment. We would be tying our own hands needlessly in a way that would serve the enemy, and would make it more difficult to negotiate with the enemy. I am sure the enemy would be delighted if we were to announce that we are going to tie our own hands in this way.

I would be interested in knowing what has occurred between the enthusiasm of

*"President Backs Senators on Laos," by John W. Finney, *New York Times*, December 17, 1969, p. 12, column 4.

last December and the frostiness of the spring. Does the Senator from Michigan believe that we tied our own hands needlessly last December?

Was the enemy delighted with the Laos-Thailand amendment? May I remind the Senate that as with Laos-Thailand—which was framed to conform with the President's own statements—Church-Cooper also puts into Senate language the President's own statements. As has been noted on this floor before, does the enemy only become joyful when the Senate acts in line with the President's statements of limits, or does that joy begin when the President himself announces the limits under which he will act as Commander in Chief?

When did the great constitutional crisis develop that apparently was unseen last December, but appears to be overwhelmingly with us today?

Mr. President, I must suggest that this change of position of the White House and of the White House supporters here in the Senate on this amendment represents apparently arose from necessity to develop a rationale of what was close to an unconstitutional if clearly an unauthorized act by the President of the United States in sending troops over the border into Cambodia. The President himself recognized the situation when he sought to regain congressional support by arbitrarily setting a limit of 21.7 miles beyond which he would not go without congressional authority.

Is this some new refinement that the Constitution becomes applicable 21.7 miles over the border of South Vietnam or any country?

The President, I am afraid, does both himself and his office disservice by seeking to use the constitutional argument to protect himself from his own responsibilities to protect himself, not just from the public at large but from the public's representatives. And I think his supporters who refuse to look back at what they did in December are showing the same shortsightedness today that the administration itself showed in undertaking the Cambodian adventure in the first place.

I opened this statement by referring to Senator FULBRIGHT's change in mind on two key matters of Presidential and congressional responsibility. I would note that his changes were accompanied by continuous study and analysis which often has been shared with us on the floor and with the public at large. The fact that the President and his supporters wish to forget their support of Laos-Thailand at the same time they stress their opposition to Church-Cooper shows that they are suffering not from new understanding but from the practical necessity of making the best arguments that they can in what is otherwise an untenable position.

Therefore, I would hope that the Senate's position could be seen in the same light it was last December and that the Senate could follow the precedent so clearly set with Laos-Thailand and overwhelmingly approve the Church-Cooper

amendment without additional language. That language was unnecessary 6 months ago and is only necessary today to justify the President's Cambodian adventure and perhaps some other in the future.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) to attend the Washington Diplomatic Conference on the Patent Treaty being held from May 25 to June 19, 1970.

SOVIET INVOLVEMENT AND THE DELICATE BALANCE OF POWER IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed a letter to Secretary of State William Rogers. I quote the following extracts from that letter:

The recent escalation of Soviet involvement in the Middle East has seriously endangered the delicate balance of power in that part of the world, and has become a source of great concern to all Americans.

In light of this military buildup, and in light of the continuing hostilities between Israel and the Arab states, I urge that Israel's request be granted to purchase 125 jet combat aircraft from the United States.

In March, it was decided to postpone any action on the Israeli request, and, given the situation that prevailed at that time, the decision was understandable. However, in the past three months, the number of Soviet technicians in Egypt alone has grown from 3,000 to about 10,000; and reports indicate that an estimated 200 Soviet pilots are flying training missions in the area of the Nile River.

This increased military activity appears to be the Soviet Union's response to the decision to hold in abeyance the sale of jets to Israel.

I believe the best guarantee against a major eruption of hostilities—that could result in a confrontation between the super powers—is for the United States to do everything it can to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East; and, in view of the Soviet military buildup there, I feel that a balance of power can best be assured by selling the jets to Israel.

I also urge the renewal of your efforts to bring about direct peace talks between the Israelis and the Arabs, and that every channel be explored to bring the parties to the conference table where direct negotiations could, hopefully, lead to a stable peace in the Middle East.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LETTERS FROM MICHIGAN SOLDIER SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S DECISION

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on Sunday I was in Marquette and the editorial page of the Marquette, Mich., Mining Journal of Saturday, May 23, 1970, contained a letter from the parents of a young man assigned to combat duty in South Vietnam.

In it, Mr. and Mrs. Don D. Becker of Marquette, quote from portions of letters they have received from their son, David, relating to President Nixon's decision to clean out enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia.

I ask unanimous consent that the Beckers' letter to the editor of the newspaper be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FROM LIEUTENANT IN VIETNAM

DEAR SIR: With the recent campus uprisings and the discontent shown by those who are safe here at home, I would like to quote you some words written by our son, Lt. David M. Becker, now serving in Vietnam.

May 5: "I suppose you're wondering about Cambodia—I suppose it's the 'big' thing back there. I do believe the President has made the right decision—as long as we go in and then get out. That's where all the North Vietnamese army is coming from—through Cambodia."

May 10: "I wish all those so-called 'educated' demonstrators who create violence could be packed aboard a plane and flown over here and find out what it's like to be awakened in the middle of the night and be told you'd better get down to the hospital because one of your men has been shot while on patrol—or listen to the rockets hitting your base camp at night—or see some hootches blown up by sappers with American bodies lying around. Maybe then they'd realize why we here are anxious to return to the 'world' where freedom and democracy reign. No one here looks forward to a 'violent' life back there like it's happening. For those who disagree with the President's policy, let them disagree, but peacefully, and in an educated manner, like a free society as ours permits, whether it be by letters, books, magazine articles or politicians—because they elected our politicians. A divided country is what the Communist world wants—because that's the only way they will ever reign over a free and democratic society as ours."

David is a four-year ROTC man, a graduate of St. Norbert's College. He recently received a citation which reads in part: "The Bronze Star Medal is presented to Lt. David M. Becker, who distinguished himself by outstanding meritorious service in connection with military operations against a hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam."

We, his parents, want to see the end of this war as do all right-thinking Americans. But we also feel that it is our place as Americans to stand by our President in these very difficult times.

Mr. and Mrs. DON D. BECKER.
MARQUETTE.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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