

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 13

MAY 24, 1971, TO JUNE 2, 1971

(PAGES 16523 TO 17734)

first time that the charges of widespread waste and inefficiency and scandal were raised.

PIPELINE SAFETY AND THE WAITING GAME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 1 week ago I wrote to Joseph Caldwell, Acting Director of Pipeline Safety in the Department of Transportation, asking that his office investigate a pipeline safety case in Oklahoma.

I have not even received the usual reply—thanking me for my interest and promising prompt attention. That is all right with me. I am not looking for pleasantries. I am looking for action.

A professor of engineering at the University of Wisconsin examined radiograph sections of this line and found at least 47 unacceptable welds just in the X-rays he saw.

The May 6, 1971, edition of the Washington, Mo., *Missourian* has an editorial which boils away the fat from this issue and concludes with the following statement which is the crux of the matter:

Some day we may get laws with teeth to regulate pipeline companies, but possibly not before a few more homes are blown into Kingdom Come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"DAVID" WITHOUT A SLING SHOT

One man and his fiery wife in Oklahoma have taken on the pipeline industry, and have made themselves felt in places where it counts. But will they be able to make themselves felt enough to bring about a needed change? That's the question.

It's like "David fighting Goliath without a slingshot," says the man's wife.

The couple, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Baker of Collinsville, Okla., have good reason to fight. They have gained a great deal of support around the country, especially from people living near pipelines, but it takes more than goodwill and support to fight a giant industry with unlimited funds and a battery of lawyers, who have a way of recruiting and influencing witnesses to testify in their behalf!

The Bakers have a 131-acre farm near Collinsville. He is a welder. A 20-inch high pressure line runs through their vegetable garden, and is only 234 feet from their farm home.

Mr. Baker has charged that the pipeline companies are burying "time bombs" all over the country, and says somebody "has got to shake up this industry."

He also charges that the line through his place is full of defects. The walls are too thin, the welds are shoddy, and the wrappings are unsafe. Mr. Baker says he has pictures to prove it. He says the line could explode at any time. He considers it so dangerous that he moved his family away from the farm home!

The U.S. Office of Pipeline Safety sent a special investigator to Collinsville to check into the charges. He reported he found "no violations," and called "the case closed."

But, reported the Wall Street Journal in its issue of April 29, the case isn't closed. It's just getting off the ground. Politicians in high places are beginning to wonder and ask questions. Besides the Ralph Nader group has stepped into it.

There are a good many people in Franklin county who will be happy to learn that the fight against pipelines is not only going on, but is gaining momentum. Already hearings have been held, and others are proposed. The matter may be aired in a Senate hearing before much longer.

The people in the Beaufort neighborhood will be particularly interested to learn that the Bakers have challenged the pipeline companies on the question of "eminent domain."

It would be difficult to imagine that a powder company would have the right of "eminent domain" to plant a bomb on private property, yet that's what the pipeline companies are doing. The blast early last December in the Port Hudson area equaled the force of an entire bagful of ordinary bombs!

Reuben Robertson of the Nader group was quoted in the Wall Street Journal as saying the Bakers have raised some deep and fundamental questions that reach far beyond their own case.

Mr. Robertson, as quoted in the Journal, wondered "why the government seems to make all presumptions in favor of the pipeline companies instead of the individual citizens."

He also wondered "why should individual citizens such as the Bakers have to bear the burden and expense of proving that a line is unsafe, rather than the other way around, when there are agencies" to do this, paid for by the taxpayers!

The people in the Beaufort and Port Hudson areas also would like to get the answer to these basic questions. Why should they have to carry on the fight, and pay the cost of the fight to save their homes from a potential "time bomb"?

Both Sen. Stuart Symington and Congressman Bill Hungate have taken a deep interest in this matter. They want to know where the government stands on this problem, and what it proposes to do about it.

Some day we may get laws with teeth to regulate pipeline companies, but possibly not before a few more homes are blown into Kingdom Come!

PROBLEMS OF RECONSTRUCTION OF VIETNAM AFTER THE WAR

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to commend to the Senate a speech of Senator WALTER MONDALE which he gave to the Baptist National Convention on May 14. He seeks to stimulate thought on the problems of reconstruction of Vietnam after the war is ended and American troops have departed.

The Senator has my gratitude for providing the needed incentive in calling for research by Far East experts, and I am certain that other Members of the Congress will want to find a forum for offering constructive suggestions to the executive branch and committees of Congress on this subject.

Senator MONDALE's thought that an international conference be called is a useful suggestion. In such an event, however, the United States should in no way attempt to dominate or seek to influence the outcome, as has been our tendency in years past. Rather we should provide the research assistance, the technical expertise which is needed and which is asked for.

I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BEFORE BAPTIST NATIONAL CONVENTION

(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

You asked me tonight to speak about peace and justice in the international community.

That was a generous choice of topics. We could talk of so many urgent needs—peace in the Middle East . . . an end to the savagery in Pakistan . . . justice for the victims of racial tyranny in Southern Africa . . . justice for the Arab refugees in the Middle East.

But nowhere tonight are the human stakes in peace more pressing—nowhere in the healing of justice more needed—than in the devastated lands of Indochina.

I could talk about the Indochina we all know too well—

The towering illusions and senselessness of the war.

The promises unmet in Paris and the blunders hidden in Laos and Cambodia.

The corruption of the Saigon regime and the barbarity of North Vietnam toward American prisoners.

And not least, the scarred and crippled young veterans who came to Washington a few weeks ago to turn in their silver stars and purple hearts . . . because they wanted this country to be through with the whole soul-destroying mess.

As for that Indochina, I think our obligations are clear.

We have more than met our military duty to the defense of South Vietnam. We now have a duty to ourselves to bring our men home.

But beyond the taudry glitter of Saigon or the demonstrations in Washington, there is another Indochina—an Indochina seldom mentioned in Congress or by the Administration.

It is a land of fallow paddy fields, napalmed villages and defoliated forests—of bombed out schools and hospitals, and too many orphanages; of miserable resettlement camps for literally millions of refugees; of broken bodies and scarred minds; and of mute scenes of forgotten skirmishes.

I could talk to you of the tragedy in all this. But I would rather speak of hope.

I believe we have an obligation to rekindle hope in this Indochina—an obligation which can begin even as our troops leave. And in that—as much as in any act of arms—we will be nourishing our own hope for international peace and justice.

What I am suggesting is that we finally begin to turn our attention from the horrors of this war to a grand effort of peaceful reconstruction in Southeast Asia.

President Johnson proposed such an effort six long years ago in an address at Johns Hopkins University.

"Neither independence nor human dignity," he said, "will ever be won . . . by arms alone. It also requires the work of peace."

But the drums of war drowned out those words.

It is time to muffle those drums . . . and hear the cries of the children of Indochina.

The task will be enormous.

Even before the devastation and anguish brought by the war, most of the people of Indochina lived out a dreary cycle of want—malnourished, ill-housed, prey to disease, and facing death before 40.

The countries of Indochina were largely impoverished agrarian societies. The billions we have spent thus far in the name of helping them have done little to change that.

And in many ways, the war has made matters so much worse.

It has done irreparable harm to the village and family structure which were the foundations of life in rural Indochina.

A recently returned American observer (Don Luce) has estimated that more than one third of the Vietnamese people have been refugees.

Before the war more than 80 percent of the population was rural. Now it is 50 percent.

The family unit has been fragmented. The kinds of work the new urban population have been forced to do has wrenched the Vietnamese economy from agricultural pursuits to service functions. Yet no significant industrialization has taken place.

When the American military establishment departs, as it soon must, some of the older people will go back to the war-torn countryside. But what of the young who have no roots outside the cities? What will they do?

We have created in these newly urban masses, a well-paid proletariat, an American dependency. There is nothing to take our place when we are gone.

Nothing, that is, unless we begin to think and talk and formulate some meaningful alternatives to the economic and social vacuum which our military departure will create.

The problems are of a different order in Cambodia or Laos or North Vietnam, but they are just as compelling.

The technology that stripped bare the forests of Indochina must be put to work to bring farms back to life.

The organizational skills and money that mobilized more than a million men to fight a war can put them to meaningful work in building peace-time economies.

None of us can lay out a plan assured of success. The obstacles are too formidable for optimism. We would be unlearning all the lessons of this war, if we did not admit the incredibly complex political and human obstacles which will stand in the way of a reconstruction program.

We should never forget the pretensions that took us into this war.

We thought that we could shape the politics of Vietnam.

Then we thought that we could roll back with weapons an indigenous political movement that enjoyed wide support in South Vietnam.

And then we thought that we could destroy enough of that land to change the

We succeeded only in destroying. We proved only that we were terribly wrong and that we couldn't decide their destiny for the people of Indochina.

But if we can combine the wisdom won through that folly and the energy and resources we brought to the war, we can help lay the framework for an enduring peace.

And we can be no less ambitious in that than we were in the work of destruction.

First, this could not be a unilateral American effort. We have had enough of that, and so have the people of Indochina.

Other countries have played significant roles in the conflict in Indochina, and they should also be involved.

The People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union should participate. The neighboring countries of Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia and perhaps even India and Pakistan, should be brought in. Japan, which is assuming an important position in international regional affairs should be a participant at an early stage.

Even more important, it must be the victims of this war—South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos—who will play the major organizational and managerial role in their own development. Again, if this war has taught us anything, I would hope that it is that no outsider can make their decisions for them.

How could it begin?

Here in the United States, perhaps, a bipartisan, bicameral group in the Congress

like the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law might examine the situation in Indochina and the possibilities for organizing an initial research effort in consultation with the Executive Branch. President Johnson's Johns Hopkins speech of April 5, 1965 might be a good point of departure. And President Nixon supported this concept in his Foreign Policy Message to the Congress last year.

After preliminary work, an international conference could be called to determine the overall goals for a South East Asian Development Association. Invitees could include all the nations of Indochina, China, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Soviet Union and other countries in South and Southeast Asia.

The site for such a conference could be determined through consultation. Perhaps two conference sites could be selected initially, one in a major non-Communist capital in the region—Tokyo, Bangkok or Djakarta.

I think it might be appropriate for the other to be in Peking.

Such a conference could discuss broad plans for the reconstruction of Indochina and its economic reintegration into the economy of the region.

Each participating nation, aside from those of Indochina, could contribute funds. The programs could be administered by a joint council with a revolving chairmanship made up of the Indochinese members.

As for the U.S. contribution, we might start with a percentage of the total amount this country has spent in war efforts in Indochina since 1961. If that figure were to be only one percent, the total would be \$1 billion.

And that would be only a start on the needs of reconstruction. Others would also have to give generously.

The organization, for example, could maintain a coordinating secretariat in Tokyo. Japan could thus be brought into the mainstream of the plan. That strikes me as altogether fitting, since the Japanese have profited more than any other Asian nation from this war.

Of course, other major offices should be located in the nations of Indochina.

A possible point of departure for the organization's efforts might be the Mekong Valley Authority plan proposed by President Johnson and endorsed by President Nixon as well. This would underline the bipartisan nature of the American involvement in the plan.

It would be essential that there be no military assistance component in this multilateral effort. I realize that military aid may be an unfortunate necessity for the security of the countries involved, but this could be much better handled through bilateral aid mechanisms.

I can see a number of regional organizations which might be established under the direction of South East Asian Development Association. These could include:

- An Agricultural Research Institute;
- A Public Health Organization;
- An Industrial Development Corporation;
- An Agricultural Commodities Bank;
- An Export-Import Bank, and
- A University Center along the lines of the East-Wide Center of the University of Hawaii.

Certainly none of these suggestions should be taken as firm or binding. What I have been trying to do is to stimulate ideas. Each country will inevitably have special problems and needs which are not always amenable to multilateral efforts.

Ultimately, the decisions are with the nations of the area.

But perhaps these thoughts are at least a start in the right direction.

In any case, we must confront both the problems and the opportunities.

A generation in Indochina has not known what it was like to sleep without fear of terror or the sound of bombs. A generation of peasants has not been able to walk out in their fields without searching the skies or hillsides or undergrowths for the threat of death.

And that fear and misery and bitterness will never make the generation of peace all of us—critics and supports of the Administration alike—want so desperately for our children.

John Kerry, the leader of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, said it eloquently before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The people of Indochina want, he said, "... to be fed, to bury their dead in plots where their ancestors lived, to be allowed to extend their culture, to try and exist as human beings... I think we have a very definite obligation to make extensive reparations to the people of Indochina."

And President Nixon said it in a speech to the United Nations in 1969:

"When the war ends, the United States will stand ready to help the people of Vietnam—all of them—in their tasks of renewal and reconstruction. And when peace comes at last to Vietnam, it can truly come with healing in its wings."

In this common effort, we can bind up not only the wounds in Southeast Asia, but also perhaps the divisions the war has created in America.

And if we truly believe in international peace and justice, we can do no better—and no less—than to try.

GROWING OPPOSITION TO LOCKHEED BAILOUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the current issue of Time magazine contains an excellent article about the administration's proposed bailout of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. The article raises a number of critical questions which Congress will have to decide about the proposed \$250 million loan guarantee.

The article points out that a Government loan guarantee to rescue Lockheed could set a dangerous precedent for our economy by propping up poorly managed firms. Moreover, the article indicates that the Lockheed guarantee would be unfair to Lockheed's competitors, notably McDonnell-Douglas and Boeing.

Finally, Mr. President, the article suggests that a Lockheed failure would likely increase U.S. employment rather than decrease it as the administration contends. This is because McDonnell-Douglas would pick up most of the orders for the Lockheed L-1011 airbus. Since the McDonnell-Douglas plane, the DC-10, uses the American built GE engine rather than the foreign built Rolls-Royce engine, at least 10,000 additional jobs will be created throughout the United States. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Time magazine article be printed in the RECORD.

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

SHOULD LOCKHEED BE SAVED?

The U.S. Government is being confronted with a major and difficult question of principle—and practice—involving the nation's way of doing business. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., the biggest defense contractor, is in a deep cash crisis, and it is looking to Uncle Sam for a bailout. The company wants Con-