

*U.S. Congress // Congressional Record.*

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 6

MARCH 19, 1974 TO MARCH 26, 1974

(PAGES 7059 TO 8382)

nors of the World Bank adopted a resolution proposed by the U.S. Governor, Secretary of the Treasury Anderson, requesting that the Bank's Executive Directors formulate articles of agreement for IDA.

The United States provided the political and legislative leadership that resulted in IDA. For the first replenishment (1964), the U.S. share came to 42 percent of the total; in the second replenishment (1968), the share dropped to 40 percent, a figure matched in the third replenishment (1970). For the fourth replenishment, however, the U.S. share comes to but 33 percent of the total \$4.5 billion figure.

The U.S. share is still the largest among contributing countries, and remains three times as large as that of either Germany, the United Kingdom, or Japan—the next three countries by size of contribution. This should not be considered to be surprising, however, since in 1972 the gross national product (GNP) of the United States was about four times as large as that of Japan which among the contributing countries had the next largest GNP, about four and a half times as large as that of Germany, and seven and a half times as large as that of the United Kingdom. Also, a country's share in the combined GNP of contributing countries is regarded as a good indicator of its economic strength and hence of its ability to provide development assistance. In 1972, the United States share of the combined GNP of contributing countries was 43 percent and was thus significantly higher than its 33-percent share of the fourth replenishment.

As in the past, the agreement reached by the donors specifically states that no contribution shall become payable until 80 percent of the contributions have been pledged. This, in effect, means that since the U.S. share comes to 33 percent of the total, any IDA replenishment is effectively stalled until legislative approval for IDA funds is reached in the United States. And, any lessening of America's pledge would unravel the "Nairobi Agreement" on the terms of IDA's fourth replenishment, painstakingly reached among the 25 donor countries last September after almost a year of negotiations.

With all that is at stake, I hope the Senate reverses the action taken by the House earlier this year. It is critical that we act in a responsible manner.

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE ON THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS REGARDING ABORTION

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, last year, in perhaps its most controversial decision of the past decade the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a woman has a constitutional right to terminate her pregnancy under certain circumstances.

The decision, instead of resolving the abortion issue, has precipitated an intensification of an already heated debate. Opponents and proponents of the decision have flooded Capitol Hill with hundreds of thousands of letters. This

attention has focused primarily on the various proposed amendments to the Constitution, designed to overturn the Supreme Court decision.

Because I have many reservations concerning these amendments, I cannot in good conscience support the efforts to enact them.

In order to discuss the constitutional amendments, it is first necessary to understand precisely what the Supreme Court decided. In the companion cases, *Roe against Wade*, and *Doe against Bolton*, the Supreme Court held: First, that during the first trimester—usually meaning the first 13 weeks of gestation—the decision to have an abortion must be left solely to the woman and her doctor; second, that during the second trimester, Government regulations "reasonably related to maternal health," such as licensing of the facility and its personnel, are permissible; and third, that after the 26th or 27th week of pregnancy—when the fetus is potentially capable of life outside the mother's womb—anti-abortion laws may be passed to protect the State's "interest in the potentiality of human life," but that abortion prohibitions must make exception for the preservation of the woman's life and health.

Regrettably, confusion still exists as to what the Supreme Court actually allowed. For example, some contend that the decision authorizes "abortion on demand". This is not so. The Court held that based on her right to privacy, a woman has a qualified right to have an abortion. But, this right, as outlined above in the summary of the Court's holdings, is dependent on a number of factors.

Second, the Supreme Court decision does not force anyone to do anything that would be inconsistent with one's religious or personal beliefs. In fact, the essence of the Supreme Court decision is freedom of choice. The Government assumes a neutral position. It forces no one to have an abortion, nor does it compel anyone to perform an abortion.

On the other hand, I fear that the proposed constitutional amendments might preclude individuals from acting in accordance with the dictates of their consciences. In these amendments the Federal Government assumes an affirmative role. It can be argued that the religious or personal beliefs of some would be imposed upon others. If so, I believe that these amendments might endanger a central Judeo-Christian tenet—freedom of conscience. Such a result might also be violative of the spirit of the first amendment's freedom of religion clause. I am apprehensive about endorsing any measure that might threaten one of our most precious heritages.

In considering whether one should support one of the proposed amendments, it is also important to ask a practical, realistic question: Will this amendment stop abortions? Available evidence suggests that passage of an amendment would merely restore the practice of millions of illegal abortions—many under back-alley conditions—that have prevailed until recently. This would mean a return to

high maternal death rates, unequal treatment of poor women, and an increase in abandoned, abused and unwanted children. In addition, severe laws would again be permitted with criminal penalties for women who feel they must prevent childbirth. We must ask ourselves whether approval of such a constitutional amendment would create greater problems than it would solve.

Another consideration is my reluctance to use the constitutional amendment process to solve the social problems that beset our country. In recent times there seems to be a disturbing trend to resort to a constitutional amendment as a panacea. In addition to threatening the independence of the judiciary, I believe that this tendency distorts the concept of our Constitution. It was not meant to be the repository of every proposed solution to every social ill.

In addition to the aforementioned factors, one other major reason contributes to my disinclination to endorse a constitutional amendment. Too many important and relevant questions remain unresolved. As the recent abortion hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments amply demonstrated, many issues deserve to be thoroughly studied. Included would be consideration of the legal status of the unborn child, the intention of the framers of the 14th amendment regarding the meaning of a "person," the origins and limitations of the "right to privacy," the rights of the father of the unborn child, the medical and psychological consequences of abortion, et cetera. If the subject of abortion is to be fully and fairly treated, all these issues must be comprehensively examined.

The cumulative effect of all these reservations is to make me quite dubious about the merits of these constitutional amendments. The available evidence appears to indicate that passage of such an amendment would only exacerbate an already difficult situation.

The abortion question is truly agonizing. I am fully sympathetic to the views expressed by individuals on both sides of the issue. I do hope that all involved in the debate will remain tolerant of one another's beliefs. Unfortunately, on occasion, the debate has been marked by uncommon bitterness.

Although we may believe our causes to be right and just, we must still respect differences of opinion—especially on an issue that embodies so many legal, moral, medical, religious, and sociological factors.

#### DÉTENTE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Secretary of State soon will be leaving for Moscow to prepare for another United States-Soviet summit meeting. Naturally, we wish him well in his efforts to further détente, to control strategic nuclear arms, and to bring a more lasting peace to the Middle East.

However, there is another issue of great importance which I believe that Secretary Kissinger should raise directly with the Soviet leadership. That is the

issue of limiting a naval arms race in the Indian Ocean.

With the opening of the Suez Canal, the prospect has been greatly increased of a significant competition in this area of the world. Indeed, the Defense Department is requesting \$29 million in its supplemental appropriation to expand U.S. naval facilities on the British-owned island of Diego Garcia.

This \$29 million must be viewed as only a first step. And a step which will inevitably be matched by the Soviet Union. As the military analyst, Victor Zorza, has stated:

In both countries—

Meaning the United States and Soviet Union—

the naval lobbies have been using the Indian Ocean because of the proximity to the Persian Gulf oil routes, as the bogey with which to push politicians into crossing a new strategic threshold.

Secretary Schlesinger has been perfectly clear about U.S. intentions in regard to Diego Garcia. He stated on February 5 to the Senate Armed Services Committee that his—

Purpose in regard to Diego Garcia is to provide us for the first time with a base in the Indian Ocean—so that if it were necessary for us to move in that area and station forces that we would have a facility.

Mr. President, I believe that before trying to provoke a naval arms race in the Indian Ocean this administration should seek to limit naval deployments in that area. General-Secretary Brezhnev in June of 1971 called for negotiations with the United States on the mutual limitation of naval deployments. He specifically cited the Indian Ocean as a region of interest. There has never been a public U.S. response to this initiative.

A few days ago, a resolution was introduced into the Senate calling for naval limitations in the Indian Ocean. I support the objectives of that resolution. But with Secretary Kissinger's imminent negotiations in Moscow, I am afraid that the resolution may be too little and too late.

The time for action on the part of the administration is now. The Secretary of State spoke yesterday about a conceptual breakthrough in SALT. I wish him well in getting such a breakthrough. But we also need a conceptual breakthrough in the field of conventional arms. And seeking a Soviet agreement in principle to limit the naval presence of the United States and the Soviet Union in the Indian Ocean is precisely the kind of conceptual breakthrough we need in order to avoid a 20th century version of the 19th century game of gunboat diplomacy and balance-of-power politics in remote regions of the world.

I do not believe that the Senate or the Congress can favorably act on the administration's request for Diego Garcia unless the administration can demonstrate good faith in having seriously attempted to stop a naval arms race in the Indian Ocean before it begins.

#### THE UNITED STATES STILL OVER THE OIL BARREL

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am extremely glad that the Arab oil boy-

cott has been lifted. The conditions of the "lifting," however, are not encouraging. On March 6 I expressed my hopes for a reduction in oil prices. The prospects for this decrease do not now appear very bright. In today's Washington Post Hobart Rowen illustrates how we are still "over the barrel." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rowen's article "The Oil Crisis Will Continue" be printed in the RECORD for consideration by the distinguished Members of this body.

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

#### THE OIL CRISIS WILL CONTINUE

(By Hobart Rowen)

The Arab oil weapon has temporarily been laid on the shelf, within easy reach by the managers of the exporters' cartel. It has not been abandoned, and it would be a mistake for the American public to delude itself into thinking that the Vienna announcement of the lifted embargo has more than marginal meaning.

So long as prices for oil remain skyhigh—triple what they were prior to the embargo—and so long as production levels are carefully controlled by the oil-producing states, the oil crisis will continue.

Of course it will be difficult to sustain public concern about the oil crisis if gasoline becomes somewhat more readily available—albeit at prices nudging 70 cents a gallon in the East.

But the most difficult problem created by high oil prices—the potential for economic recession in the industrialized world—remains unsolved.

As much as \$50 billion to \$60 billion must be transferred from the oil-consuming nations to the oil cartel this year to pay for increased costs of oil—a sum which threatens vast dislocations here and abroad.

No one has yet figured out how the consuming nations will pay the bill—or how the exporting nations will use or invest the vast sums they receive—once they're paid over.

But the terms of the lifted embargo, as made public in Vienna, carefully eschew any guarantee of increased production which would tend to assure a softening in prices, Iran and Algeria, to the contrary, have been arguing loudly for yet another increase in price.

The remaining potency of the oil weapon, moreover, should be seen from the Arab statement which warns that "Israel alone" will bear the responsibility for "more severe oil measures, in addition to the other various resources which the Arab world can master in order to join the battle of destiny."

Plainly, this is a threat to use not only oil itself, but oil money, as it piles up, as a bludgeon over the West. By moving large blocks of capital in and out of money markets, for example, a concerted drive by the oil cartel countries could shake Western currency markets. Demand for payment in gold, from those who have limited supplies of gold, could also weaken the financial underpinnings of the West. And large-scale industrial and commercial investments in industrialized countries could provide the Arab nations with a degree of leverage over economic prospects and job opportunities.

It is not at all far-fetched to visualize a scenario in which the embargo might be threatened again unless the industrialized countries step up their aid programs for the hard-pressed African countries who have given the Arabs political support.

Faced with the Arab nations' clearcut success in the initial round of the oil war, it is disconcerting to see the potential for joint action by the consuming nations fade away in a welter of acrimonious debate between President Nixon and Europe.

Europe—dominated by France—seems determined to pursue bilateral deals with the Arab nations. If the United States were to sacrifice principle to be assured of a steady flow of Arab oil, it could elbow the French and British or anyone else out of the way, especially with Iran and Saudi Arabia, offering them as much money and technology and certainly more security than any combination of European nations.

Because it has not succumbed to blackmail, the United States has so far not chosen this course. Hopefully, the Nixon administration will not be panicked by the new harsh language in the cartel's Vienna announcement, or by a political need for some new diplomatic "success" to offset Watergate troubles.

We can anticipate a flood of fairly optimistic assessments from the major banks and the big oil companies who are heavily engaged with the producing countries in oil and money matters. It isn't reasonable to look to bankers or oil presidents for a re-statement of the need for independence from Arab oil.

But if that crucial drive gets lost in a misplaced euphoria over a slight jiggle in the use of the Arab oil weapon, it will be a shame. They have the ability to turn the oil supply valves on and off at will. They make no pretense of their willingness to use their oil and new found wealth as political blackmail. A policy that doesn't recognize this as a fact is suicidal.

We hardly needed to be told that the embargo will be "reviewed" June 1. Only a year ago, Saudi Arabian Minister Zaki Yamani was saying that oil would never be used as a political weapon. Now, we know (or should know) that no assurance from the Mideast exporting countries means anything.

The oil cartel has created a vast uncertainty over a vital supply, with the combination of oil and money forged into a devastating weapon. So far, the Western World has evolved no effective response.

#### THE TWIN CITY EXPERIMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, an article in yesterday's Wall Street Journal was notable for its candid and incisive analysis of one of the Nation's most ambitious experiments in urban government—the metropolitan council, in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area.

Created in 1967, the council has attempted to bring a new sense of coherence and planning to the many problems which beset large metropolitan areas all over the Nation. This experiment, as the article notes, has not been without problems, but it has begun to effectively address the types of concerns which must be solved if our urban areas are to improve the quality of life for their millions of inhabitants.

Mr. President, I commend this article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE TWIN CITY EXPERIMENT

(By Dennis Farney)

ST. PAUL, MINN.—A friend calls John Boland "a tactician of politics" and the description fits. A visit to the Boland command post finds a gregarious man of 36, enjoying a cigar and heavily engaged in the stratagems of an ongoing battle of sorts.

It is a political battle to regain the momentum for one of the nation's most innovative experiments in urban government.

For Mr. Boland is the chairman of a seven-year-old institution called the Metro-