

U.S. Congress // Congressional Record

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 8

APRIL 4, 1974 TO APRIL 11, 1974

(PAGES 9705 TO 11148)



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

45-934/24:V 120, p 8

SENATE—Thursday, April 4, 1974

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. SAM NUNN, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we open our hearts to Thee and lift up our eyes to the everlasting hills, remembering that our help comes from the Lord who made heaven and earth. May the music of the wind and singing streams minister to our taut nerves, our tension-torn minds and our dutybound spirits. Deliver us from bondage to desk pads and appointment calendars lest we miss the glory of springtime and the renewal of life. Help us to do our work well and to do it to Thy glory.

O Lord, keep our hearts in warm fellowship with our colleagues. Keep our ears open to the voice of the people. Preserve our souls as the dwelling place of Thy spirit. Amid all that is finite and temporal keep us in tune with the infinite and the eternal.

We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. SAM NUNN, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. NUNN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 3, 1974, be dispensed with.

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

CXX—612—Part 8

DOCUMENTATION OF VESSEL "MISS KEKU" AS A VESSEL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 740, H.R. 12627.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read the bill (H.R. 12627) by title, as follows: An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the department under which the U.S. Coast Guard is operating to cause the vessel *Miss Keku*, owned by Clarence Jackson of Juneau, Alaska, to be documented as a vessel of the United States so as to be entitled to engage in the American fisheries.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 739, S. 3038, be indefinitely postponed.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first nomination.

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James L. Mit-

chell, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION BOARD

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James W. Jamieson, of California, to be a member of the National Credit Union Board.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read nominations in the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

By unanimous consent the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania. Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

NATO ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in this city 25 years ago, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed. Today marks a quarter century of the great Atlantic Alliance which the Secretary of State recently called the "cornerstone of American foreign policy."

Yet what a sad birthday it is. The President's trip to Europe has been canceled. The "Year of Europe" has turned into a bad joke. The President lashes out at the Allies in a way he has been careful never to do with our adversaries. The disillusion and disarray in the alliance

9705

419697

16 1978

has never been more profound; and the prospects of real European unity perhaps never more remote.

The concept of a partnership across the Atlantic between the United States and a strong and united Europe is a fading dream. The reality is that our relations have deteriorated to the point where our economic well-being and economic security may be jeopardized.

We do not have the necessary cooperation of our allies to solve pressing international economic problems, nor do we have their full support in dealing with the Soviets. At the same time, our relationship with the Soviets is not about to replace our allies—not for solving our economic problems—not for insuring our security—and certainly not for cultivating a political environment that encourages democracy and human rights.

The sudden quiet that has descended in Europe after the recent outbursts by the administration should not mislead us. The conciliatory posture of some allies can be chalked up not to contrition but to mystification over what the President was shouting about in the first place.

Nor should we take much satisfaction in having helped provoke further divisions within Europe. The dispute over consultation has not improved the trans-Atlantic dialog. The offer to consult with us at nearly every step as the Europeans make up their mind was very generous. But it was bound to run into difficulty and certainly runs against the grain of unity. It is a little like trying to encourage a young couple to fall in love by never leaving them out of your sight.

We also should not expect that the passing of President Pompidou will fundamentally alter the current United States-European relationship. The present crisis cannot be blamed on France alone, however much we may differ with French policy.

President Pompidou moved France into closer cooperation with the Alliance and with its European partners, reversing the trend of General De Gaulle. We should pay tribute to President Pompidou for this statemanship. We should hope his successor will continue in this direction. But I fear that the policies and rhetoric of this administration will make reconciliation and cooperation even more difficult for the next generation of French leaders.

We need this cooperation because there are serious problems to be faced together with the Allies—more equitable trade, a stable monetary system, a sustainable defense posture and a constructive relationship with the less developed world and with Communist countries.

These challenges are recognized on both sides of the Atlantic. I believe the Europeans must assume a substantial part of the responsibility for dealing with us on these problems. We cannot solve them alone. But I also believe it is our responsibility to look at our own role in the current crisis.

If we do, two things stand out:

We paid far too little attention to the Atlantic Alliance during a decade of war in Asia.

We placed higher priority on negotiations with old adversaries than on refurbishing the allied relationships that were in a state of disrepair.

Is there any wonder then that the sudden rush of the "Year of Europe" was greeted with suspicion and even disbelief?

The real problems of the Alliance cannot be solved by rhetorical declarations or rewriting the NATO treaty for its 25th birthday. A start has to be made by answering first for ourselves, and then with our allies, some basic questions about our policy toward Europe.

Do we fear European unity or view it as a threat?

Do we see the détente with the Soviet Union as so strong that we now regard our troops in Europe primarily as bargaining chips in trade negotiations?

If we take the Soviet threat so lightly can we expect our allies to do more in their own defense let alone pay a significant economic or political price for our military resources?

I obviously cannot answer those questions for the administration.

But forthright answers would be the best gift to alleviate the moribund quality of this anniversary celebration. Otherwise I am afraid some profoundly dangerous conclusions may be reached.

That the administration prefers disorder among the Europeans to unity.

That we prefer to take care of our security interests in Europe through negotiations with the Soviets rather than compromise with our allies.

That our troops in Europe are in effect mercenaries, not to be counted upon for security and stability, but to be regarded as a source of political and economic pressure.

If these are the conclusions that are drawn on both sides of the Atlantic, I do not see how this cornerstone of American foreign policy can long survive. And I see nothing to take its place.

So it is a sober birthday. And I therefore call upon the administration to use this anniversary occasion to withdraw the gauntlet it has thrown down against our oldest allies, to clarify its policies, and to earnestly pursue the regeneration of the relationships with Europe on which both our economic welfare and fundamental security interests are founded.

Mr. President, along this line, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in yesterday's New York Times by James Reston appear at this point in the RECORD, followed by an editorial appearing this morning in the New York Times on the same subject.

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

POMPIDOU AND THE OLD ALLIANCE
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—Men pass but nations and the problems of nations go on. Twenty-five years ago this week, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in this capital,

and since all the governments concerned seem to be fussing with each other these days, maybe somebody should celebrate the original idea.

The Atlantic idea was very simple. It was an apology for the spectacular tragedies of the past, and a recognition of human frailty. And it was an admission by the Old World and the New World that they shared a common civilization and could preserve it only by common policies.

Also, despite all the friction, the Atlantic partnership and its companion, the European Community, have not been failures but considering the long history of Western disunity and stupidity, comparatively successful.

After all, the two World Wars were really one long civil war between the few remaining nations, including Germany, that believe in personal liberty and political democracy and they maintained the peace for only twenty years, between 1919 and 1939. Compared to that, the Atlantic Alliance has kept the peace for over 27 years—halfway between the end of the last World War and the end of the century, and while we are now living with death, impeachment and a lot of weak and staggering governments, maybe we should be celebrating the 25th birthday of the shaky Western Alliance instead of opening its wounds.

Europe and America are not talking today about the ideals of human dignity, or the majesty of their inheritance, or even of their common interests in controlling inflation, population, military arms, pollution and the poverty and hunger of half the human race.

They are talking now about personal and political things—about the death of Pompidou and who comes after him; about the arguments between Henry Kissinger and Michael Jobert; the political weakness of Richard Nixon; the aging leaders of China; the price of oil and other raw materials; whether Harold Wilson can make it in the House of Commons; what kind of man is Jerry Ford anyway, and isn't it wonderful that Henry is married?

After a quarter century, in the Atlantic, of the most successful alliance in history and, in Europe, of the most imaginative experiment in political federalism since the formation of the American Republic, his is a poor and narrow show. Both the Atlantic Alliance and the European Community are more enduring than men or regimes but they are now loitering into weakness, and allowing their short-run national interests to threaten their common security.

On the 25th anniversary of the NATO alliance, and at a critical point in the development of the European Community, America is puzzled about what France has been saying to us on this side of the Atlantic during Pompidou's last days. Was French Foreign Minister Jobert saying there is a fundamental conflict between the interests of a unified Europe and an Atlantic partnership with the United States and Canada?

Was he saying that De Tocqueville and Monnet were wrong, that Valéry's concept of our common civilization was false? Was he asking the United States merely to stop dominating Europe, or was he asking us to defend Europe, to protect France, to maintain peace in the Middle East, while refusing to cooperate with NATO in the defense of Europe, or with America in the oil crisis? Now that President Georges Pompidou is gone, it would be helpful if, after the personal tragedy, somebody would speak clearly for France.

The Nixon Administration obviously has its own internal problems: inflation, unemployment and even the possible impeachment of President Nixon. It is aware of its own fragility, as in Paris, but it has not forgotten the mistakes of American isolation, or the

tragedies of the two World Wars, or its hopes for the reconstruction and unity of Europe, or its dreams of an Atlantic community that would defend the common civilization of the West. Mr. Nixon has stuck to his foreign policy initiatives despite his troubles at home.

The opening to China and the efforts at accommodation with the Soviet Union were never regarded in Washington as a new alliance against the old alliance with Europe. Even when the European Community, like Japan, emerged as a competitor to the United States for the trade of the world, the Nixon Administration, and even the Congress, defended the principles of collective security and free trade.

Accordingly, on this anniversary of the Atlantic Alliance and at this critical point of transition in Paris and of controversy within the European Economic Community, Washington, with all its troubles, is sticking to the hope of Atlantic partnership and European unity, which has guided its policy since the last war.

The death of President Pompidou merely dramatizes the point. Churchill, Eisenhower, de Gaulle, Adenauer, Kennedy, Truman and Johnson have all disappeared since the inception of the Atlantic partnership and the European Community, but despite all the divisions of national politics, the ideal of Atlantic partnership and European unity go on.

NATO AT 25 . . .

In the present miasma of dissension among the member governments it is all too easy to forget what a success the Atlantic Alliance has been. On the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington it may be in order to recall some of the bench marks of that success in addition to assessing the future prospects of the Alliance.

NATO has managed to maintain peace in the European-Atlantic area for a quarter-century. That is a fundamental accomplishment; but to let it go at that would be to overlook many positive by-products of the cooperation engendered under the Treaty. It can be argued that the very success of NATO and of enterprises owing something to NATO created some of the problems that beset the Alliance at 25.

The confidence generated by NATO, backed by the unprecedented commitment of the United States to the defense of Western Europe, was a necessary ingredient for the spectacular economic recovery achieved under the Marshall Plan. Cooperation for mutual security in NATO helped spark cooperation in other areas—in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European Payments Union, even Benelux, the Coal and Steel Community and eventually the Common Market.

NATO and the Western European Union organization provided the machinery for bringing West Germany into alliance with Germany's historic enemies, thus buttressing Bonn's already substantial commitment to the West in other areas and helping insure against any future revival of the "civil" wars that had devastated Europe so often in the past.

It has become fashionable in some quarters to scoff at the notion that a Soviet military venture into Western Europe was ever a possibility. But European countries, prostrated by war and occupation, facing strong challenges at home from Communist parties then solidly linked to Moscow, and frightened by such Kremlin misadventures as the Berlin blockade of 1948-49, would have been criminally negligent to have ignored the threat.

Even in today's more relaxed climate, not one Alliance member is ready to take its chances alone with a Soviet Union that is

still expanding its military power in every category. Perhaps the most striking fact about the Atlantic Alliance is that not one member government—not even France, although it withdrew its forces from integrated NATO commands seven years ago—has pulled out of the treaty as all have had the right to do at any time since 1969 under Article 13.

On this side of the Atlantic, not even those American officials from the President on down who are most vexed by the independent behavior of the Common Market allies, nor those Senators and Congressmen most eager to bring American forces home from Europe, even has advocated withdrawing from the Alliance.

Perhaps it is because, underneath all the dissension, everyone concerned—European and North American alike—is convinced that West German Chancellor Willy Brandt spoke the truth when he recently said of this relationship:

"No European unity can dispense with Atlantic security; and a viable Atlantic Alliance cannot dispense with European unity." Words to ponder on the Alliance's 25th birthday.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) is recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time of the quorum call not to be charged to the Senator from Florida.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. 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.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time was left under the order of the Senator from Minnesota?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Six minutes were left under the order.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged to the remaining time of the Senator from Minnesota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on Mr. MONDALE's time, I ask unanimous consent that upon the disposition of the vote on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to S. 1866, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be recognized to call up amendment No. 1134 to the public financing bill, and that there be a limitation thereon of 1

hour, to be divided in accordance with the usual form; that upon the disposition of amendment No. 1134, Mr. BAKER be recognized to call up amendment No. 1135, on which there be a limitation of 30 minutes, to be divided in accordance with the usual form.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because I am aware of the fact that the proposal has been cleared all around—I think, in view of the problem that developed yesterday, we are in this particular agreement setting a time limit. It does not require, however, that the vote shall occur on the amendment today at a particular time, and is in the form which was stated. I do not expect or anticipate that any motion to table will be made, but a motion to table would be in order under the form of the unanimous-consent agreement. Is that correct?

There was a time limitation on the amendment, and after it was disposed of we would go on to something else.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. A motion to table would be in order. I think that is a very important point. It depends on how the unanimous-consent request was made or phrased.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The Senator is correct. I thank him for his observation.

NEED TO HAVE STANDBY AUTHORITY ON WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS IN CRUCIAL AREAS OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I join all those in the country who feel that the time has come when the broad sweep of economic controls should be done away with. Wage and price controls have been on long enough to have created shortages and distortions in many areas of our economy that have hurt many people.

I personally feel that wage and price controls, if they are to have any real effect, should be used for a short period of time in an attempt to shock the economy, and they would have to go completely across the board, which was never done. There should have been controls on wages and prices, perhaps not complete controls, but for a period of 90 or 120 days, long enough to shock the economy and cause some trend to develop. But across the broad range, the controls we now have, for the most part, should be withdrawn as planned by the end of April.

But, Mr. President, we cannot let the matter rest there. We cannot just say that because controls have outlived their usefulness in most areas that controls have outlived their usefulness in all areas.

Because we have grown weary of controls does not mean that the problem that price controls were meant to address is somehow solved.

It is just the other way around. We are talking about abandoning price controls while inflationary pressures in the econ-