

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

U.S. Congress

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 9

APRIL 3, 1973 TO APRIL 11, 1973

(PAGES 10643 TO 12002)

I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 1542 be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 1542

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. The Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by inserting after section 203 the following new section:

"§ 203A. Freeze on prices and rents

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, all prices and rents are hereby frozen at levels no higher than those prevailing on March 16, 1973. The President may, by written order stating in full the considerations for his actions, make adjustments with respect to prices and rents, in order to correct gross inequities.

"(b) As soon as practicable, but not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, the President shall by written order stating in full the considerations for his action, roll back prices and rents to levels lower than those prevailing on March 16, 1973, but not lower than those prevailing on May 25, 1970, in order to reduce inflation and otherwise carry out the purposes of this title. The President may make specific exemptions from the rollback by written order stating in full the considerations for his determination that such rollback is unnecessary.

"(c) The President shall, not later than 60 days after the enactment of this section, issue orders and regulations establishing a long-run control program to—

"(1) stabilize prices, rents, wages and salaries in order to reduce inflation; and

"(2) stabilize interest rates and corporate dividends and similar transfers at levels consistent with orderly economic growth."

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. PERCY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 1543. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for extension of authorization for special project grants under title V. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the President proposed 1974 budget provides \$244 million to continue the highly successful maternal and child health program. But unless Congress acts, the special projects which receive 40 percent of the funds would be dissolved on July 1.

Last year the Senate Finance Committee and the full Senate voted to extend the special project grant authority by 2 years. That extension was reduced to 1 year by the conference committee. So once again these projects are threatened with termination.

These special projects have proven to be a highly effective means of upgrading the health care of a million low-income mothers and children in this country. They are operated by health departments, teaching hospitals, and medical schools and in neighborhoods that otherwise lack the health resources necessary to combat high infant mortality rates and offer preventive care to mothers and children.

One very successful project has been operating out of the Hennepin County

General Hospital in Minneapolis, in my home State. In 1966, 43 percent of mothers whose children were born in the hospital had received no prenatal care. In 1970 the rate was 13 percent. Similar achievements have been recorded by projects all over the country.

I believe that it would be a serious mistake to destroy these existing health programs and facilities at a time when we are on the verge of constructing a whole new health delivery system in this country.

For this reason I am introducing today with Senator PERCY and a bipartisan group of other cosponsors a 2-year extension of the special project authority. Congressman KOCH of New York has introduced similar legislation in the House. In addition, Congressman WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has told representatives of these projects that he would personally support legislation to guarantee their extension for 1 year.

I am hopeful that the Senate will be able to enact an extension for these worthwhile programs soon.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am very pleased today to join Senator MONDALE in introducing legislation to extend the maternal and child health special project grants under title V of the Social Security Act. Since 1967, these special project grants have made possible one of the best investments of the Federal health care dollar. Maternal and Infant Care, Children and Youth, Newborn Intensive Care, Dental Care, and Family Planning projects have had a profound impact on the populations they serve, contributing to the reduction of infant mortality, affecting morbidity rates, and decreasing the rate, duration and cost of hospitalization for high-risk pregnant women, infants, and children.

In 1967, Congress revised the social security provisions under title V to redistribute maternal and child health moneys so that general support, through formula grants, would be made available to all States to promote optimal health care for mothers and children, while targeted support, through special project grants, would direct financial resources to geographical areas of greatest need. Congress anticipated that the special project grants, through steady increases in funding, would develop to a point that beginning July 1972, the States would assume responsibility for them.

In early 1972 the Comptroller General prepared a report for Congress which pointed out that many States would not have the funds to assume responsibility for the special projects and that neither the Federal Government nor the States had made adequate plans for the transition. Although the Academy of Pediatrics, the American Medical Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, as well as other medical and health related associations, recommended that the authority for special project grants be extended for an additional 5 years, Congress approved only a 1-year extension last year. Reports are that the 1-year extension has not been

adequate to effect an orderly transition process.

Take Illinois as an example. The impending change in funding distribution will reduce Illinois' share of maternal and child health funds by 42 percent or \$3.5 million. Such a drastic reduction will have a major effect on the availability of services to pregnant women, infants, and children in medically indigent communities in Illinois where there is virtually no alternative health care. According to the state department of public health, maternity and infant care programs, which currently serve 123,666 patients, and children and youth programs, which serve 57,600 children, will have to suffer a 50-percent cutback should such a reduction take effect.

On the merits of effectiveness alone, these special project grants deserve our continued support. In a 1969 study, mortality for maternal and infant care newborns in Chicago was 19.4 per thousand live births, as compared with 19.9 per 1,000 for newborns under private physician care, 31.2 per 1,000 for newborns in hospital clinics, and 21.7 per 1,000 for American newborns in general. Equally important, the average annual cost per child in the Chicago children and youth program is \$120, while comparable cost per child under medicare is \$300. Such achievements are extraordinary in view of the fact that the patients served under these programs are drawn from the least healthy areas of the State.

Illinois, it must be stressed, is not an exception to the rule. Nationwide infant mortality rates decreased by only 5 percent between 1960 and 1965; after maternal and infant care projects began, infant mortality rates decreased by 19 percent between 1965 and 1970. Since the beginning of maternal and child health projects, there has been a 50-percent decrease in the number of children served who needed hospitalization, a decrease of more than 50 percent among those served in dental recall examinations. Most important, the average annual cost per child in these projects dropped from \$201.26 in 1968 to \$149.32 in 1970.

It should be noted that the President, commendably, has recognized the worth of these programs. Maternal and child health is not one of the activities designed to be phased out or significantly reduced. In fact, the President's fiscal 1974 budget request for maternal and child health is \$244 million, an increase of \$5 million over the past appropriation.

It should also be emphasized that the bill which Senator MONDALE and I are introducing today does not ask for one penny more than the President's budget request for maternal and child health. We are merely asking for a 2-year extension of the special project grant authority so that some very successful and effective health programs might continue to exist and perhaps enjoy incorporation into whatever new health delivery for financing system is enacted by Congress.

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. PELL, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. MOSS,

Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ABOUREZK, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

S. 1544. A bill to prohibit the further expenditure of funds to finance the involvement of the Armed Forces of the United States in armed hostilities in Cambodia. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today I am introducing, along with Senators NELSON, HUMPHREY, PELL, CRANSTON, MOSS, HUGHES, TUNNEY, CLARK, ABOUREZK, and HATHAWAY, a bill to prohibit the further expenditure of funds to finance the involvement of the Armed Forces of the United States in armed hostilities in Cambodia unless such expenditure has been specifically authorized by Congress.

Mr. President, my bill is simple. It provides that money can be spent for U.S. combat efforts in Cambodia only if authorized by Congress.

My purpose is also simple. It is to avoid a constitutional tragedy as well as further human tragedy. Twelve years after American forces were first committed to Vietnam in the name of protecting a friendly but vulnerable government, once again a President of the United States, entirely on his own, is using U.S. military force in a foreign country with absolutely no constitutional authority for doing so.

In pursuit of a will-of-the-wisp—the North Vietnamese Command Headquarters—COSVN—we invaded Cambodia in April 1970. On March 12 of that year, the Nixon administration indicated, in a letter to Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT, that it was no longer depending on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution “as legal or constitutional authority for its present conduct of foreign relations.” The sole constitutional authority claimed by the administration for our military activity in Indochina has been, as the President stated in 1970, “the right of the President of the United States under the Constitution to protect the lives of American men.”

But now that U.S. combat forces are out of Vietnam, U.S. participation in the Vietnam war has ended. Hence any renewed military activity anywhere in Indochina constitutes—even according to the President's own reasoning—a new war and therefore the need for the advance consent of Congress.

Yet incredible as it may now seem, we are witnessing massive air raids over Cambodia. On April 10, U.S. B-52 and F-111 fighter planes struck insurgent forces for the 33d consecutive day. As many as 60 B-52 sorties are flown in a single day, dropping an estimated 1,800 tons of bombs. We are told that this bombing is essential to support the besieged Lon Nol government.

Efforts by the administration in recent days to justify its bombing policy have been imaginative but futile. The SEATO Treaty commitment has been suggested, but the government of Lon Nol has not altered Prince Sihanouk's 1955 decision to exempt Cambodia from the treaty's protection. A tenuous link has been offered by Ambassador William Sullivan of the State Department and Sec-

retary of Defense Richardson between the President's mandate to make war and his reelection mandate. Surely this cannot be a serious point. State Department lawyers have reportedly produced a complex rationalization, but so far they are reluctant to reveal it. The administration has also tried to rely on a tacit understanding of an ambiguous section—article 20—of the Paris Agreement—an agreement which was not even submitted to Congress for ratification—as justification for its actions.

Finally, Secretary Richardson said that the administration feels its constitutional authority to bomb Cambodia “rests on the circumstance that we are coming out of a 10-year period of conflict.”

This is the wind up . . . So I think one way of putting it is that what we are doing in effect is to try to encourage the observance of the Paris agreements by engaging in air action at the request of the government, which is the principal victim of the non-observance of the agreements.

Such a rationale could easily be extended to involve us again in both Laos and Vietnam as well as Cambodia. And it is ominous that Richardson, in fact, refuses to rule out the reintroduction of American troops into Vietnam. Because of this possible danger, I continue to support the legislation introduced by the senior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the senior Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) prohibiting the reengagement of U.S. forces in land, sea or air combat anywhere “in or over or from off the shores” of the entire Indochina area.

Mr. President, we no longer can permit the President's warmaking powers to go unchecked and unchallenged. The legal legerdemain that the administration offers is an open challenge to the Congress to assert our constitutional responsibility.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 1544

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to avoid further involvement of the United States in armed hostilities in Cambodia, no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be expended to finance the involvement of any member of the armed forces of the United States in armed hostilities in or over Cambodia unless such expenditure has been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1545. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, so as to extend from 1 to 3 years the period that a member of the uniformed services has following retirement to select his home for purposes of travel and transportation allowances under such title, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in the last Congress, I introduced a measure to correct what I felt to be an unfortunate problem connected with the armed services. That bill, S. 1321, very simply would

have extended the time a member of the uniformed services has following his retirement to select his home for purposes of travel and transportation allowances.

As you know, a serviceman is currently allowed 1 year after the date of his retirement in which to select his permanent homesite for purposes of PCS travel and transportation allowances. But this unnecessarily short time places a burden on those parents with children in high school. Many times the child must forgo graduation from the school in which he has spent his secondary years so that the final move may be made, as is the serviceman's right at Government expense. There are, of course, other exceptional instances which prevent full utilization of this privilege, for example a serious illness which precludes movement of the patient.

No matter what the reason, however, the 1-year limit is an arbitrarily short one. Extension of the limit to 3 years will solve most problems that could occur and yet will not create additional costs to the Government. I ask my colleagues to join me in effecting rapid consideration and passage of this legislation, which I introduce today.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1547. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on National Security. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today which would establish a permanent Joint Congressional Committee on National Security.

I believe this committee will enable Congress to address itself in a more comprehensive way than ever before to a thorough and ongoing analysis and evaluation of our national security policies and goals.

If the 93d Congress has one important objective, it should be redressing the imbalance between the executive and legislative branches relating to both domestic and foreign policy.

I propose that the committee have these main functions:

First, to study and make recommendations on all issues concerning national security. This would include review of the President's report on the state of the world, the defense budget and foreign assistance programs as they relate to national security goals, and U.S. disarmament policies as a part of our defense considerations.

Second, to study and make recommendations on Government practices of classification and declassification of documents.

Third, to conduct a continuing review of the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Departments of Defense and State, and other agencies intimately involved with our foreign policy.

For too many years, the Congress has had inadequate information on matters concerning national security. We in the Congress have had to accept partial information, often in limited context, and as a result have been unable to weigh the total picture.