

July 28, 1970

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR FANNIN TOMORROW.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, upon disposition of the reading of the Journal, the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA ON THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the reading of the Journal on Thursday next, July 30, 1970, that I be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1970, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. COMMITMENTS ABROAD AND THE MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, nearly 18 months ago—on February 3, 1969—the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, announced on the Senate floor the creation of a new subcommittee, the job of which he said would be to “make a detailed review of the international military commitments of the United States and their relationship to foreign policy.”

As the chairman said at that time, it was hoped this subcommittee would develop facts on the “relationship between foreign policy commitments and the military capacity to honor them.”

Some months later a distinguished member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator GOLDWATER, declared on the Senate floor that factual information from “an exhaustive investigation of this Nation’s treaty commitments around the world was essential to our efforts to reach any kind of sound judgment and legislative conclusions regarding the projected level of our military expenditures.” I agree with that statement, for it focuses on exactly what the Foreign Relations Committee had in mind in establishing this subcommittee.

On the eve of the debate on this fiscal year 1971 military authorization bill, I believe it incumbent of me, as a ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and chairman of that Foreign Relations Subcommittee on commitments, to offer a few observations on the investigation conducted by the latter, and its relationship to the upcoming legislation.

In the past year and one-half, our two-man staff traveled to 23 countries for on-the-scene investigation. We have thereupon held 37 days of hearings, with 48 major witnesses covering U.S. military forces, facilities, and security programs in 13 countries, plus NATO.

As of today, our subcommittee has published sanitized versions of hearings on the Republic of the Philippines, Laos, and Thailand; and last week on Taiwan.

With less than one-third of the transcripts released, the published record already has run over 1,000 pages.

The press, both here and abroad, and also officials of our Government as well as those of other countries have taken notice—perhaps they have learned something—from the factual material developed in the published records.

I regret that apparently there are some—even within the Senate—who do not consider ours a serious study—I regret also that others have complained we have gone too far. We will let our published transcripts, along with our report—which will be made public within a few months—speak for themselves.

Today, however, I would direct myself to some immediate points, particularly those raised by the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee in his interesting statement on defense requirements that he delivered on the floor of the Senate a week ago last Thursday.

Senator Stennis said, in part:

We are committed to more than 40 nations by solemn, formal treaties or other formal agreements.

He also observed that:

Congress should be well aware that our defense requirements are based in part on the need to be prepared to help defend other nations with whom we have mutual defense agreements approved by the Congress or whose defense is vital to our own national security interests.

Mr. President, one needs only to look at the situation in Laos where every year we are spending hundreds of millions of American dollars and—more important—the lives of our men fighting a war in the north—far from the Ho Chi Minh Trail—on behalf of a foreign country with whom we have no treaty of any kind whatsoever; with whom in fact the State Department has actually testified that we have no commitment.

Prior to these subcommittee hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, the war in north Laos was actually a tightly held secret from most of the Congress. We on the Foreign Relations Committee were not informed of the pertinent facts. We on the Armed Services Committee were not informed of the pertinent facts. Prior to the publication of our transcript, this war in and over northern Laos was a secret from almost all of the American people.

The continuing attempts currently being made to keep much of this informa-

tion secret are now a matter of public record.

In line with the thoughts of the Senator from Mississippi before we authorize more military spending in Laos; before we appropriate money to send more of our flyers to fight and die over that country, the American people deserve to know in more detail the truth about that war and the direction in which it is going. For as President Nixon told a nationwide audience last November:

The American people cannot and should not be asked to support a policy which involves the overriding issues of war and peace unless they know the truth about that policy.

There are various other countries where Congress has never endorsed any military commitment through a treaty, but where—as our inquiry has established—commitments do exist.

Senator STENNIS referred to some in his statement—those with whom he said we have bilateral agreements which impose military obligations on our part to come to their assistance in the face of aggression. There are additional ones, however, as our published records will show.

These records also show that the level of commitment varies even among nations with whom we have solemn treaties.

With some countries, our word alone is sufficient to insure that we will come to their assistance. With others, our commitment requires extensive military assistance. With others, not only our assistance, but also the physical presence of our own forces and bases are required. With others, joint military operations have secretly been agreed upon and are actually undertaken.

With still others, relations are deepened through clandestine agreements that permit us to store nuclear weapons on the land of the country in question, a policy which greatly increases chances for nuclear war.

As the subcommittee tries first to find out just what are our commitments, and then seeks to reassess them, our studies have demonstrated conclusively that not only the basic treaties or and agreements need review, but also the level of military cooperation which has stemmed from those basic commitments. The latter should be examined in detail.

Senator STENNIS noted in his Senate address:

When we look at the military arsenal which we must build and maintain, we cannot afford to think only of defending our own shores but we have to think of what is needed in order to give some reasonable assurance that we will be able to meet the extensive commitments we have assumed so freely.

Now a few words of caution with regard to that statement.

There are commitments which we the Congress, the executive, and the American people have not “assumed so freely”; and the significance of that observation is the fact that the Congress cannot tailor the defense budget to commitments about which it knows nothing.

Is it not a proper question to ask—how can the Congress limit or end commitments at the same time the executive branch, either openly or in secrecy, creates new commitments on its own?

July 28, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD SENATE

where schools are completely desegregated, as that term is defined in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, because, after all, it is to the executive department that we must look for the carrying out, and the Federal courts to support, these provisions which are set out above and which appear in the conference report of the bill making education appropriations.

Any reading of these provisions would clearly show that they are completely sound and I feel will be followed by this administration not only because of commitments but because the system of education is essential to any organized society; and unless we return again to putting education first, as these amendments would do, soon we will go down the drain as have other societies in years past.

Mr. Chairman, I thought it well to call these facts to the attention of the Members of the House at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with reference to this amendment—it is reported in amendment No. 38 in the report of the managers on the part of the House—this matter came up as a part of the \$150 million which was in the Senate amendment to the bill. We had the Jonas amendment and the two Whitten amendments in the House bill. This matter was settled in the conference. They agreed to drop the Jonas amendment and we agreed that they would keep the Whitten amendments, and the amount of money was split as a matter of adjustment, in conference, wholly within the meaning of the conference concept. There is no diminution or understanding or anything else about what they meant. They speak for themselves, of course.

Mr. President, here is a part of the rub. This amendment will do a great deal of good. The educators, the trustees, the parents who are trying to keep our public schools in operation and keep the doors open, who are trying to deal with court orders and HEW orders, have no hope for the future. It is an overbearing situation. They are not just integrating the schools. They are demanding racial balance of the faculty and the students. They do not deny it. Every judge knows it is true. Every HEW employee knows it is true. These court decrees are based on racial balance. In effect, they say, "Down with education. Our goal is to have racial balance." That is what is killing the spirit of this entire endeavor. You will never get education back to the foremost objective until some kind of reality is brought about, and these amendments will bring it. You cannot be withholding money and you cannot be busing children all over the district, from county side to county side, in order to bring about theoretical racial balance. It has never been required by the Supreme Court. It has never been required by Congress in the Civil Rights Act. It is only required in the minds and the practice of those who are trying not only to integrate the schools and the faculties but also to balance them off on some kind of racial proportion.

This amendment is designed to stop things short of going that far—not to try to defeat the law, but to carry out the real purpose and spirit of the law in the beginning.

I thank everybody for their consideration of this serious problem, all the way down the line. I am confident that

these amendments will be carried out if they become law and that they will help the situation and be a path in the future. Someday, the country outside the South will want to find its way through this jungle of readjustment, and they can look back to this law as one that lit the path, and with its help they will find their way.

I yield back the remainder of my time. Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll. Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Minneapolis (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) and the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 250 Leg.]
YEAS—88

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Alken | Ellender | Mansfield |
| Allen | Ervin | Mathias |
| Allott | Fannin | McGee |
| Anderson | Fong | McGovern |
| Baker | Fulbright | McIntyre |
| Bayh | Goldwater | Metcalf |
| Bellmon | Gravel | Miller |
| Bennett | Griffin | Mondale |
| Bible | Gurney | Montoya |
| Boggs | Hansen | Moss |
| Brooke | Harris | Muskie |
| Burdick | Hart | Nelson |
| Byrd, Va. | Hartke | Packwood |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Hatfield | Pastore |
| Cannon | Holland | Pearson |
| Case | Hollings | Pell |
| Church | Hruska | Percy |
| Cook | Hughes | Proxmire |
| Cooper | Inouye | Roberts |
| Cotton | Jackson | Sarbanes |
| Cranston | Javits | Schweiker |
| Curtis | Jordan, N.C. | Scott |
| Dole | Kennedy | Smith, Ill. |
| Dominick | Long | Sparkman |
| Eastland | Magnuson | |

- Spong
- Stennis
- Stevens
- Symington
- Talmadge

- Thurmond
- Tower
- Tydings
- Williams, N.J.
- Williams, Del.

- Yarborough
- Young, N. Dak.
- Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—12

- Dodd
- Eagleton
- Goodell
- Gore

- Jordan, Idaho
- McCarthy
- McClellan
- Mundt

- Murphy
- Randolph
- Russell
- Smith, Maine

So the report on H.R. 16916 was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, first, I am very grateful, on behalf of the committee, for the vote of confidence on this conference report, with no "nay" votes and 88 "yea" votes. I do not know when this has happened on an appropriation bill of this magnitude, but the Senator from New Hampshire and I are pleased.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I join in those sentiments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before I make a motion, I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire, as well as the members of the subcommittee and the full committee will join me, in commending the staff for the splendid work done on this very complicated bill. For the long, hard work that was done on the bill, in the hearings, during the mark-up, the floor action, and the conference by Mr. Harley Dirks of the committee staff and Mr. Bill Kennedy, on the minority side of the staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments in disagreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"That this appropriation shall not be available to pay local educational agencies pursuant to the provisions of any other section of title I until payment has been made of 90 per centum of the amounts to which such agencies are entitled pursuant to section 3(a) of said title and 100 per centum of the amounts payable under section 6 of said title: Provided further, That \$8,800,000 of this appropriation shall be available to pay full entitlement under section 3(a) of said title to a local educational agency where the number of children eligible under said section 3(a) represent 25 per centum or more of the total number of children attending school at such local educational agency during the preceding year."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Strike the sum of \$150,000,000 named in said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof \$75,000,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 38.

The motion was agreed to.

These are but a few of the thoughts I believe we should be considering incident to the taking up of this defense legislation.

An additional question comes to mind: Will the Congress—and hopefully the executive branch—realize that the primary commitment is to the American people; and that to honor some of these executive agreements—and even treaties—in the manner considered appropriate in recent years would bankrupt the Nation; and in the end, therefore, do irreparable harm to our own national security?

Surely there must be limits to what this Nation can do for other countries, particularly those nations which seem to want to do so little for themselves.

I believe that for this reason, if for no other, the Senate should face up to its responsibility in working with the executive branch to establish those limits. Is this not a legitimate and responsible role for the Senate?

In any case, it is a responsibility the Foreign Relations Committee has undertaken with the commitments resolution; and this action was followed last December, with administration support, by a bipartisan group of Senators first drafting and then passing into law the Laos-Thailand amendment.

It was a responsibility which was again recognized by Senators COOPER and CHURCH in their Cambodian amendment to the Military Sales Act; and it is in that role I see the recent Armed Services Committee amendment to limit free world force equipment to the sanctuary area—lacking new authority—rather than in support of the Cambodian Government.

The Senate need not look to any future decision to meet, head on, the difficult question of what this Nation should do with its increasingly limited manpower, resources and assets. That has already begun, and my hope is that it will continue.

I believe it will continue if the responsible committees of the Congress obtain the same type and character of information about our worldwide military commitments that has been demanded, and in most cases thereupon obtained by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The political, military, and economic positions in which the taxpayers of this Nation now find themselves demand no less.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for this statement. It is a very succinct and significant statement, in my opinion, and deserves a little elaboration.

First, I wish to say that the Senator, as chairman of his subcommittee has done a remarkable job. He has been very thorough and his subcommittee has a most able staff. Much of the information which he has developed was certainly not known by me, and I do not think it was known by the other members of the

Committee on Foreign Relations or the Senate as a whole, as the Senator has so well stated.

I wanted to ask the Senator about one or two specifics in his statement. On page 3, the Senator says:

The continuing attempts currently being made to keep much of this information secret are now a matter of public record.

The Senator has reference, I presume, to the deletions from some of the hearings of his committee, does he not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; that is correct; and in addition, as the Senator knows as chairman of the committee, for the first time in the history of the Foreign Relations Committee, an ambassador has refused to testify, on instructions of the State Department, unless all stenographic tapes incident to his testimony were burned, and the only printed record would be kept by the State Department, with no record retained by the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the first time this has happened. I would remind the Senator that, in addition to that, on two other occasions ambassadors were told not to discuss certain questions with the committee, particularly as to nuclear weapons and some other areas.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, they reconsidered the matter concerning the question of the pay to the Thai troops, and so on, and we finally got that information. But there has been a disposition to refuse to make public, or even to divulge in executive session, a good deal of very pertinent and important information.

With regard to publication of the subcommittee records of sworn testimony taken in executive session, the administration insisted on deleting a great deal of that information, did they not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It took about 6 months to clear some of the testimony because of the difficulty in getting agreement on what was to be published; is that not correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Taiwan hearings, which have just been published, were held how long ago?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last November, a good many months ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That brings me up to the pending issue, which is the Spanish bases agreement. The first time this matter was gone into was by the Senator's subcommittee last year. There have been two agreements, an agreement in 1953 with an extension in 1963, and then last year they were considering a further extension, originally, I believe, of 5 years, and then it was compromised—largely because of the work of the Senator's subcommittee—to a brief period, I think, of 18 months. Those were executive agreements.

The executive branch is now negotiating another agreement which we had a hearing about last week. We urged the Department of State and the administration to submit this new agreement as a treaty, so that the Senate would have an opportunity to pass upon it.

What does the Senator think about that? Should it be a treaty, or should it be an executive agreement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, unfortunately I was not here when the latest executive hearing on the Spanish bases, and the proposed agreement with Spain, was held; but I do not see how formal arrangements which involve money, troops, and very possibly the lives of Americans can be agreed upon without any knowledge on the part of the proper committees of Congress, this in order that they can be voted on under the advice and consent clause, which gives the Senate authority to approve treaties.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have not positively decided on the proposal, I believe. Mr. Alexis Johnson, the Under Secretary, appeared before the committee and I urged him and other members of the department submit this as a treaty, to give the committee and the Senate as a whole the opportunity to study and to develop the meaning of this agreement, and then to approve or disapprove it.

It seems to me that is the only proper way to meet the suggestion that has been made by the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Arizona.

These Senators talk about tailoring our commitments to our necessities and to our capacities to pay for them. If the administration executes it as an executive agreement, then we will be confronted with a situation in which they will say, "We have made the agreement, we have promised to pay all of this, now we call upon you to pay it. If you do not, you will renege upon an agreement made by our President and the administration."

This would be a wholly intolerable procedure, and certainly inconsistent with the views expressed by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Mississippi; would the Senator not agree with that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would agree. I do not see how we can appropriate money—authorize it first and then appropriate it—for honoring commitments when we do not know what those commitments are.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Even if the executive agreement is published in the newspaper—assuming that is done—then we have a situation in which the meaning of this agreement—the commitment, in effect—has not been developed in hearings in the normal way and in debate on the Senate floor.

I use this as a current example of what we have been talking about. This executive agreement with Spain, which I have seen—the administration has submitted it to the committee to look at; not for its approval, but simply because we requested it—is very ambiguous, I would say. There is some language in it which I have never seen in any executive agreement or treaty. What it means is very unclear.

The Under Secretary may interpret it one way today. He says that when the document uses language to the effect that we will support each other Defense Establishment it does not amount to a security commitment. I submit that reasonable men could have different views on this. I would interpret the language,

plus the actual disposition of troops, as a commitment in the nature of a security treaty. If we station several thousand men there, with quantities of airplanes and other equipment, and we have a joint planning staff—all the usual arrangements which go with a security treaty—then I would say it is clearly in the nature of a security treaty.

So there is perhaps a basis for a reasonable difference of opinion about it. But this is exactly a classic case. What it actually means and what the nature of the commitment is, ought to be developed in hearings and in debate on the floor of the Senate and the agreement passed on by the Senate. I submit to the Senator that here is an example of trying to tailor our commitments with our capacities bearing in mind the needs of the country. We should do this now while the commitment is under consideration and not 2 or 3 years or several years later, when a commitment such as this has already been undertaken.

I would hope that the Senator would agree and that the Senate would agree that this kind of agreement should be submitted for the Senate's approval. I believe it is the only possible way in which the Senate can regain some control over the worldwide commitments which this country has undertaken in the past 20 or 25 years.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator.

As everyone knows, Spain is not a member of NATO; therefore, we have no treaty with Spain under NATO. It has been our policy to maintain airfields, naval bases and thousands of troops in Spain. I do not necessarily object to this; but, on the other hand, as the able Senator knows, we have been paying a tremendous amount of money, in effect, to defend Spain. It seems to me that if we are going to be there at all, it ought to be on a mutual basis; because everybody knows about the problems in the economy of the United States. In addition, any agreement with respect to the Spanish bases ought to be in the form of a treaty and not an Executive agreement. As the Senator will recall, at one time it was strictly a military agreement which was expanded upon later by people in the State Department.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in today's New York Times entitled "Vague Pledge to Franco," which discusses this matter.

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

VAGUE PLEDGE TO FRANCO

After the long and divisive debates about the legal and constitutional bases for United States military actions in Indochina, the last thing the Nixon Administration ought to be considering is another vague overseas defense commitment. It appears ready, however, to sign a pledge to "support the defense system" in Spain in return for continued use of air and naval bases there.

Some members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee say they are not clear, even after briefings from high-ranking State and Defense Department officials, just what would be involved in such a commitment.

Neither are we. Nor is it clear exactly what is meant by the pledge that "both Governments will make compatible their defense policies"—more language from the draft agreement expected to be signed in a few weeks.

On one interpretation, the pledge of support for Spain's defense system could be considered stronger than the statement in all Spanish-American military agreements since 1953 that an attack on either country would be "a matter of common concern." In any case, before the agreement is signed, the Foreign Relations Committee ought to insist on clarification of its meaning and consider whether such a commitment should not be made in the form of a treaty, subject to Senate approval.

In fact, Congress should go further and raise the question whether the long-run interests of the United States are served by any renewal of military arrangements with the regime of Generalissimo Franco, now 77 and facing increasing opposition. A group of 120 members of this opposition argued in a petition to Secretary of State Rogers in May that it was unwise for this country to sign this kind of agreement with a regime that made such decisions without consulting its people.

Many among these opponents may be influential in future Spanish governments. Congress should weigh their arguments against the short-run military advantages of the bases in Spain while there is still time to reconsider the agreement with the Franco regime.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say to the Senator that I think his remarks are especially appropriate to debate on the bill which is under consideration. I do hope the Senate will take seriously what he has said and also the findings of his subcommittee in this field.

This is entirely in line with the sense of the Senate as expressed in the commitments resolution. If we do not take action now on the current measure as well as the proposed agreement with Spain, I think it will be extremely difficult for us ever to regain control of the appropriating process of our Government.

One further remark: In the course of the Senator's hearings, there also have been other secret agreements, some of them verbal, which obligate us in countries other than Spain. I think these agreements should be submitted as treaties and thus give the Senate an opportunity to pass upon their wisdom and to decide whether or not we should undertake the responsibilities of paying rather large sums of money to other countries.

I congratulate the Senator on his statement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the chairman for his observations.

As far back as 1965, I became very worried, about the nature and degree of our commitments all over the world, which even today, counting Europe and all the other parts of the world, are costing the American taxpayers some \$100 million a day.

If we build a house or a road or a hospital or a school in this country, whether it is right or wrong, at least work would be created. One of the sad things that has developed recently in our country, incident to trying to pay for all these foreign adventures, is the high interest

rates, along with the inflation, plus rising unemployment, due in part to the exporting of jobs.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. First, may I thank the Senator from Missouri for again attempting to bring to our conscience the obligation that rests on us to be informed before we act, whether it is on military procurement, commitments in defense of other nations, or the adequacy of our school lunch program. In all these programs, he has given us this leadership.

May I ask a question which indicates that I got an impression from the Senator's remarks that I would not want to labor under if I were wrong.

Does the Senator from Missouri suggest that the Senate, as of today, cannot intelligently act upon the military procurement bill that is now pending, for the reason, among others, that the extent of our commitments is not yet known?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that we do not have the information before the Senate that any board of directors of any business—and I say this as a former businessman—would have before, in the interest of the stockholders—in this case, the American people—they would feel they had the right to approve or request funds to be spent by the management.

I know that some particular things cannot be discussed in the Senate because they involve the security of the United States. As one who spent many years in the Defense Department I understand that. But what we are talking about are the hundreds of millions of dollars—in fact, the billions of dollars—that we have been expending around the world under the guise of military authorizations and appropriations—some for wars that we have been fighting in countries like Laos, which not only were not approved by the Senate, but also, to the best of my knowledge, nobody in the Senate knew about in any detail.

Mr. HART. As a businessman, would not the Senator from Missouri agree that stockholders recognize the sensitivity of certain corporate information because, if treated too casually, it could wreak havoc with the company by feeding information to the company's competitors?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, indeed. For example, a secret formula that made a product.

Mr. HART. Exactly. But, notwithstanding that problem, corporate law holds the director responsible for expenditures of money if all effort short of disclosing to the competitor has not been made before he makes the decision.

So that the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri in his remarks today is that until, perhaps in executive session, this board of directors—the Senate—knows more fully the extent of our commitments, this board of directors—the Senate—should not act to authorize or expend moneys?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That question is pretty direct. There are many people who

believe, and have so stated, that before we vote on this bill, we should have an executive session just as we had last year on one component of the bill.

I would not criticize that suggestion and see many reasons to praise it; because, having been in business for many years, I know that the chance of making the right decision, especially when using other people's money, is almost invariably directly in proportion to one's knowledge of the facts.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Missouri very much.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able colleague from Michigan.

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, I join in the general commendation of the Senator from Missouri on a most important and helpful speech.

However, I was especially depressed at the fact that although the Senator's subcommittee has held extremely comprehensive hearings, and his team investigated and visited 23 countries and held hearings on our responsibilities with regard to 13 of them, I am sure he would agree that this just scratches the surface in view of the commitments we have already made, so that a great deal more will need to be done before we can even investigate, let alone ascertain or determine the degree of our commitments.

Furthermore, the Senator from Missouri has told us that we have a big operation costing hundreds of millions of dollars with many lives having been lost in Laos, with no agreement at all. Is that not correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. We have no formal treaty with Laos nor—the State Department tells us—do we have any commitments with Laos; yet, we have spent billions of dollars in Laos and many American boys have died fighting in and over Laos.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So that it appears we have a situation which is about as open-ended as anyone can imagine, which can cost us literally billions of dollars to meet the specific commitments implied, or even where there is lack of commitments but situations which some President may construe necessary to help a country east, north, south, or west of another country with which we may have commitments.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct; these commitments and "noncommitments" are not only costing us money, but perhaps can draw us into a far greater war.

Take the case of the Philippines. The impression I had as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, was that the Philippine Government was anxious to support us in South Vietnam.

However, as a result of the hearings of the subcommittee, we found that the Philippine Government did not want to send any of its troops to Vietnam but finally agreed to do so under two conditions: the first one was that they would not have to fight as our boys fight there; the second was that they would be heavily paid in addition to their normal salaries.

Then it turned out that the money for noncombatant soldiers who went from the Philippines to Vietnam apparently

was never received by them. This matter was therefore turned over to the General Accounting Office and after extensive investigation they finally found the checks which showed that the money had been delivered to the Secretary of Defense of the Philippines, although apparently it never reached the Philippine soldiers for whom it was intended.

As a result of the disclosures of the subcommittee, open hearings were held in the Philippines about this matter, so that the Philippine people—as is the case so many times in other countries—today know so much more about what the United States was doing in their country than the people here know about what is going on in those countries.

We have waited many months in the hope of clearing up this matter after the revelations by the General Accounting Office, but we are now told by the State Department that they will not agree to have anyone appear before the Foreign Relations Committee, except in executive session. Thus, I think it is fair to say that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for such additional time as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think it is fair to say that the people of the Philippines find out this information in public session of their Senate, but the people of the United States, unless State's policy is changed, will never know what happened to the money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What I am trying to get at is, What do we do about the situation the Senator so well described in his speech? How do we meet it? The investigations by the Senator from Missouri have been enormously helpful, of course, and I hope that they will continue. I am sure that they can give us the kind of intelligence and understanding which will enable us to make better decisions in the future. But, meanwhile, we have a bill before us and a military budget this year asking us to commit \$72 billion, overall \$75 billion, for defense. How do we know how much to commit?

I say to the Senator from Missouri that if we try to do this on a basis of attempting to meet our obligations, and the Senator from Mississippi tells us we have commitments to 40 countries, for whatever kind of military costs that may involve—50, 60, 70—any number of countries, in terms of what secret agreements we do not know about, perhaps, or other commitments involved, as we did via South Vietnam, an obligation that spread into Laos. It is endless. Therefore, I would hope that the Senate would seriously consider—and I think that the Senator's speech goes quite a way to support this position—putting a limit on the amount of funds that will be made available.

It seems to me to return to the analogy of a board of directors, that when they feel the officers of a company are being extravagant and wasteful, not knowing what their obligations are and their

limits, and are spending the funds they have in a way that the board of directors feel is not fully responsible, then they tell the officers of the company to cut the amount they can spend.

We in the Senate have this within our power. It is our responsibility to do it.

I would like to say to the Senator, furthermore, that in the event we took the administration seriously on its assertion that it will now proceed on a 1-plus war strategy and give it all the funds they say this needs—for strategic considerations, including the ABM, phase 1 and 2, the B-1 bomber, including \$100 million which is more than the committee asked, and all the other weapons systems like MIRV, the Minuteman, and so forth, and give the Defense Department all of that, and assume that we have no reduction in the Vietnam level of activity below that planned by the Nixon administration, but if we would cut off funds on a general purpose basis that the Senator is talking about; that is simply conform general purpose to the 1 force-plus war strategy plans, we can save \$9 billion.

In other words, the cost of the general-purpose program will go down from \$43 to \$34 billion, and the cost of the overall budget will go down from \$72 to \$63 billion. This is pertinent and germane to what the Senator has been talking about. Because I do not know how long we can keep up the situation where we are committing ourselves to fighting all over the world, sometimes simultaneously.

One way to stop this effectively would be to say that we, as public officials, charged under the Constitution with the responsibility of spending money, will spend only so much and that is it.

The Defense Department is going to get along on the basis of obligations that will be limited and will involve one plus man maximum.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, that is a very interesting idea. I would not say that I agree with it at this time; I would like to study it carefully.

I do think that we have to take steps today that a business takes before it gets into a situation such as the Penn Central did.

The man who knew more about inspiring the American people than any other person was Mr. Bernard Baruch. He was very proud of a nickname that had been given to him—"Mr. Facts."

I think that we need more facts. I think that Mr. Laird has done a constructive job in reducing defense expenditures. But the main point was made in the speech of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and again by the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS)—that we tailor the Defense budget to our commitments.

It is essential, therefore, to find out what those commitments are. As the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) just pointed out, no one in the Congress knows what all these commitments actually are. And I have found cases in the executive branch where people whom we would think, on the basis of trying to do their jobs, would know the commitments, did not know them.

My primary purpose in having this discussion this afternoon was to point out that before we proceed to spend tens of billions of dollars of the taxpayers money, we should do our best to get all the facts possible with respect to our commitments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Missouri. Although I am very hopeful that in the next few weeks we can get this information, on our commitments I am very doubtful that we can.

I would appreciate any alternative suggestions that the Senator might have. I do not necessarily think that we should propose a \$9 billion cut in the overall defense budget. That may or may not be realistic. However, this issue of the cost of our international commitments ought to be one of the questions that ought to go into the determination of how much money we permit the Defense Department to spend. We will have to make some kind of a decision based on very imperfect, limited, and unsatisfactory knowledge. Under the circumstances, it would seem to me that now is the time for a sharp, decisive reduction.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin, in his work on the Joint Economic Committee, is interested in the problem of waste. There is not a Member of the Senate who is more anxious to see that whatever money is necessary to spend for the security of the United States should be spent and that we should be taxed in order to do so. However, waste is another matter. Waste has destroyed some of the greatest of all corporations. Waste could destroy the United States.

In this connection I pay tribute to the Senator from Wisconsin who through his committee could well be the person who saves more money for the taxpayers of the country than any other Member of Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I first compliment the chairman of the subcommittee on which I have the honor to serve. He has been indefatigable in his work and has been tremendously useful to our country in making this inquiry.

I ask the Senator whether the problem we face is not a very deep, fundamental issue of Government which the people must help us to decide.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are being told that for the health and security of our democracy, many of these things should be secret.

Indeed, the supposition is that we who pry into this matter are busybodies and that we would be better off as a nation if we did not pry into these matters—the matter of the Spanish bases or the war in Laos which is an undeclared war.

Do we not need the support of the people? We are adult enough so that we will make an agreement even with Franco if we think it is in the interest of our Nation. We do not need any government to tell us about it or to spare us the

trouble because they do not think we will consider the matter or are not interested enough or sophisticated enough to do it.

I ask the Senator whether he does not think there should be an appeal to the people of the country so that Congress and the people of the United States, as a result, will be cut in on the action. And, of course, if we do not think something should be done, it will not be done.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question. A few years ago in an open hearing the Secretary of Defense testified that we had over 7,000 nuclear warheads in Europe. Yet for some reason, information with respect to country-by-country location of all U.S. nuclear weapons overseas is highly classified.

Everyone knows that the more nuclear weapons are spread around, the greater the danger of nuclear war. If anyone has any doubt about such danger they ought to look at the pictures in Life magazine this week of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. They should then recognize that we have hundreds of weapons that are 50 times more powerful than that.

I believe there is more protection of the world through disclosure in this field than less. Certainly the other superpower does not want to see a nuclear confrontation which they know would destroy them.

I hope the administration follows the thinking of the Senator from New York and realizes that in a democracy it is often better to tell the people more than less.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I point out that the Russians are also faced with a crisis in the Mideast as well as on the border of Red China.

Is it not a correct answer to the pertinent question of the Senator from Wisconsin to state that we would have a right to say to the executive branch, "We will give you money for everything you have disclosed. We are satisfied and will adjudge the amount. We will give you money for everything you have not disclosed if you give good reason for not having disclosed it. It is a fact that democracies may have to have some secrets. But we will not give you money in a very selective way for what you have not disclosed and for what you cannot give us good reason for not having disclosed."

Is that not a good rule in accord with Senate Resolution 85, the commitments resolution and the first in this whole direction adopted by the Senate?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from New York is one of the most able parliamentarians and debaters it has ever been my experience to be associated with.

He is in effect asking me the same question that the senior Senator from Wisconsin asked me but in a different way.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly right.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would rather not answer that question immediately. I would rather answer it as a member of the board of directors of a corporation.

I would like to get as many facts as possible with respect to what I was go-

ing to do with stockholders' money before I agreed the money should be put up for the management to spend.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator is correct, but I do think the Senator could answer me. I do not think I asked the same question that has already been asked, and I think the Senator could answer. I shall rephrase my question.

We are perfectly willing to appropriate money for what we know. There are many things the administration says we cannot know. I say if they give us a good reason why we should not know, then we should appropriate the money, but we have the right to judge if that reason is valid. Therefore, the only weapon available to us is to say no if they do not disclose to us or give us a good reason.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We have a right to ask. In certain fields I am not sure that they do not have the right to refuse and I am not completely sure that if they refuse we should, in turn, refuse to give them the money. But those cases would be very minute, and less than one-half of one percent of what we are talking about in the budget.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator for the very able address he has given.

The most basic question the Committee on Foreign Relations faces is the one to which the Senator has addressed himself today.

Ever since the end of the Second World War, we have regarded the world as our oyster. No country in history has formally undertaken to defend more foreign governments than the United States. No major power since Pearl Harbor has engaged in more active warfare than the United States. No country today has as many troops stationed in foreign lands than the United States.

In the face of this situation and the calamity which has befallen our own policy in Southeast Asia, it is the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations to review our commitments abroad to ascertain whether they are or are not vital to the interests of the United States. Also, we must find out whether we can afford them. These twin objectives have been very much in the mind of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri; his subcommittee has given not only great attention to these two central questions, but has undertaken the most thorough and probing examination of American involvement abroad that any committee of Congress in either House has given to this fundamental question since the conclusion of World War II.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. CHURCH. I hope the Senator continues to pursue the examination of this question until all aspects have been probed and until all committee reports have been released. I hope the Senator continues to insist on the maximum dis-

closure of information by the administration; I hope he persists in his determination to see to it that the American people are fully informed. If he does that, as I am sure he intends to do, we shall have strengthened our democratic institutions and we shall have formed the basis for appropriate legislative action.

The Senate has already taken the first step by repealing the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Hopefully, the House of Representatives will see fit to repeal that resolution as well. There are many other resolutions, passed in haste by Congress conferring carte blanche authority to the President to conduct our foreign affairs, that need to be reviewed and possibly repealed.

In fact, some of our formal treaties should be reviewed in light of current circumstances. SEATO is such a treaty, honored more in the breach than in the observance by major signatories such as the United Kingdom, France, and Pakistan.

SEATO no longer reflects the power structure that now exists in Southeast Asia. Indeed, it has been rendered obsolete by the events of recent years. It is our responsibility, therefore, to raise the question whether or not such treaty obligations, undertaken in years past, are of continuing pertinence.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will yield at that point, the Senator could not be more right because under the SEATO treaty, and the able Senator knows because he is an authority on these treaties, no country is required to act unless it decides at the moment of the "crunch" to do so is in its national interest. In previous administrations, however, the Secretary of State justified going into South Vietnam on the basis of the SEATO treaty and not a single other signatory of the SEATO treaty agreed he was right and not a single other signatory of the SEATO treaty provided help proportionate to ours.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. The United Kingdom, France, Pakistan, and others, including the United States, are signatories to SEATO; the time has come to ask if this treaty is or is not excess baggage.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We paid heavily to get the support of some of those signatories.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree. The amount we paid and the arrangements we made would not have come to light, in my judgment, but for the persistence of the press and the investigation the senior Senator from Missouri has undertaken in his subcommittee.

The time has come for us to remind the Senate and the country as a whole that we are at work in the Committee on Foreign Relations on the basic question, what role shall we play in the world at large. When the final record is written regarding this important matter, great credit will be given to the senior Senator from Missouri. I again commend him on his address this afternoon, and I join him in the position he has taken.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distin-

guished Senator from Idaho. There is no one from whom I would rather have such tribute.

I would like to give credit to the relatively small staff I have had on this subcommittee: Mr. Walter Pincus and Mr. Roland Paul, of the Committee on Foreign Relations. They did not sit home and read the cables and listen to the discussions. They went out for weeks and months in these countries and talked to people high up and people not nearly so high up. They came back fortified with the facts. I would like to state for the Record, in all sincerity, that if it had not been for the superb work they did in preparing for the hearings we have held in executive session, and some of which we have been able to release to the public, it would not have been possible to get the information I think is so important before making decisions incident to national policy.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I, too, would like to congratulate the senior Senator from Missouri not only on his speech but on all the excellent work that has been done by the Subcommittee on National Commitments. I have been privileged to sit in for a short time at some of those hearings.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is always welcome.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator. One of the points he made today concerning secrecy struck me particularly. I happened to be out of town when there was an executive hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee. Later, I wanted a record of exactly what had occurred at that meeting. I asked the staff for a copy of the record, and I was told that it was so secret that the executive branch of the Government had declined even to permit a stenographic record to be made of the hearing. Senators' memories are no different than those of other people, and if we are not at a committee meeting, we should have a record at which to look to refresh our memories and, particularly, to examine in the event we could not be there.

I think the tendency of the executive branch to overclassify is a very real one, and I think the Senator from Missouri has done a real job in pointing it out.

One other thought: I am wondering if the Senator would agree that there is a sort of chicken-and-egg relationship between military potentials and military commitments. There are some countries, like Israel and Portugal, whose military potential is not up to what they judge is their national needs, in one case for their self-defense and in the other case for the carrying out of their objectives in Africa. On the other hand, there are countries like the Soviet Union and the United States with tremendous military potentials, and there we find that the commitments start to catch up to those potentials.

I think we must bear in mind that in Egypt, one of the reasons why the Rus-

sians are there is that the Egyptians have been inviting them in with open arms. They have not forced themselves on the Egyptians. One of the reasons we have our commitments is that we had such similar potentials, there was a vacuum area, and we filled up the vacuum in the days of the Dulles treaties. Those areas were filled in to the point where right now our national commitments and our military potentials are out of balance, in fact the commitments may have passed our potentials.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is a difficult question to answer "yes" or "no." From the standpoint of the fiscal, economic stability of the United States, it worries me that this Nation, with all its problems at home, and with the increasing strength of the other superpower, has the tremendous expense of 374 major military bases abroad and over 3,000 minor installations, along with thousands of nuclear warheads placed in other countries. I think this is one of the reasons why it is important for the Foreign Relations Committee, as has been suggested by the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and for all committees involved in this matter to find out just what these commitments are, because we are having very serious troubles throughout the world today. We are spending a great deal of money and, what is far more important, we are losing many of the best young men we have.

Mr. PELL. In other words, the Senator believes that there is a very real relationship between, first, a nation's wealth, second, its military commitments abroad, and, third, its military potentials. And, when that balance gets out of line, the country starts to get in trouble?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would think so. If it does not get in physical trouble, it certainly gets in economic trouble.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1328) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1328) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to attend the 14th session, General Conference of International Atomic Energy Agency, to be held at Vienna, Austria, September 22-29, 1970: PASTORE and BENNETT.

July 28, 1970

S12264

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

U.S. COMMITMENTS ABROAD AND THE MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question. I understand he has a time commitment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate. I wanted to ask a question relative to what I was saying a moment ago. Has the committee had an opportunity to consider the proposed agreement with the Spanish Government?

Mr. STENNIS. No; we have not. I know, in a general way, about it, but we have not had.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that connection, does not the Senator believe it is very difficult to tailor our military appropriations of the Senate, and especially the Senator's committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have never had an opportunity to ask questions about it and discuss it and develop what it really means?

Mr. STENNIS. I know, in a general way, about the substance of it, but we have never had hearings on it or taken any formal action on it. I do not think there is any commitment there, frankly, as I understand it, that is of any shocking consequence one way or another, and it is not expected to involve a great deal of commitment on our part.

We have a continuing operation of bases, and we will have some consideration. I do not think it is a major matter, frankly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator does not think it is a major matter?

Mr. STENNIS. No; I do not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it were a major matter, does not the Senator believe the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate ought to approve of it, if it were a major matter?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; that would suit me fine. But there is no doubt or suspicion, now, to be thrown on this bill that is before the Senate, just because the Committee on Foreign Relations has not gone into the Spanish agreement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, they have not submitted it to the Senate for approval. That is the point.

Mr. STENNIS. It is up to the Senator and his committee to assert themselves on that. I do not think it has any sub-

stantial bearing on the military procurement bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am soliciting the support of the Senator from Mississippi. If we make commitments, if Spain is a commitment, then they should be submitted to the committee and the Senate for approval. The support of the Senator from Mississippi for this principle would be very important.

Mr. STENNIS. I am depending on the Senator from Arkansas to go into that. I am certainly not going to pass on the matter prematurely. I think the Senator's committee has jurisdiction over it, and has an interest in it, the way it looks to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri and I have sat side by side on the committee for a good number of years, and no one has profited any more than I have from his advice and counsel and association. The association has been very pleasant in a personal way, and his counsel and advice have been very pleasant and also very helpful in an official way. So my kind feeling toward him is constant and steady.

I know also that he has done a lot of hard work and he has done a lot of fine work as chairman of this subcommittee. He has worked on it and deserves credit, that is the way I look at it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I fully reciprocate with my respect and regard, for the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his very fine and generous words. I value his statement.

I would just say this: This is a matter that I am interested in and concerned about, and it is a matter, if the Senator will remember, that we got into a little once, and started some hearings, several years ago, and had Secretary of State Rusk before us for two appearances, that I recall.

The war worsened about that time, and we did not get into it further. I mention that just as an expression of interest in this broad subject matter.

But at the same time, now, I do not want the Senator's concern—and he is sincere in it—and the concern of the Senator from Wisconsin about waste, and the Senator from Idaho mentioned waste—I do not want there to be built up here an atmosphere that will obscure anything about the merits of this military procurement bill. This is an important matter. It is a bill that we have to pass; and, as I said today in the presence of some Senators, I wish it were two bills, one for this military procurement which is so important, and the other about the war in Southeast Asia. That is important, too. But I think really they ought to be handled separately, and if I have anything to do with it next year, I am going to recommend that we bring it in in the form of two bills.

But now back to the main point. As to the discussion, here, about waste, I am

sure there is some, but everything does not always come out just right in running a railroad, or running a business, or running a military department, particularly with an important weapon that has to be created from the mind of someone on into a perfected instrument. There are going to be stops and starts and backs and fillings, and disappointments, and it is going to cost a lot of money. It is going to cost more and more money. If we are not going to have those weapons until we are certain there is not going to be any waste, we just will not have the weapons.

But I wish to address myself principally here to the idea that the people are entitled to know. That is a good sounding sentence, and generally speaking, it is good logic and commonsense.

But I think the people, for who have thought about this matter, there are a lot of things they do not want to know. They want it taken care of here, the best we can, so as to be effective, and they are willing to not be told all these matters. I am going to give an illustration.

In my humble opinion, of all the things we have had save us the most money since I have been at the Armed Services table, the most important is the U-2. I think the U-2 saved us billions of dollars. I shall not go into details on that, but if 537 Members of Congress had been told all about that instrument from the date it was started until, as time went on, it was almost shut down, there would not have been a chance for it to have been so effective, to have brought us so much information that, just in terms of money, was worth literally, as I see it, billions of dollars.

That is a mild illustration. I am not one who is possessed of a great deal of knowledge. What is in my mind is not more important than what is in anyone else's. I do not have a great many things in my mind that the average Senator does not know about. But it is just a part of the commonsense situation that somebody has to know about some of these secret matters, and I never have turned down any Senator, to tell him, if we were talking head to head, what I know about some of these matters that have not accrued.

But that is altogether a different situation from telling a roomful of men. In sitting down, as I see it, and talking to a person, and confiding with him about some plans that the military or any other department has, that you think are valuable—and many of them are—he will understand a whole lot better the seriousness of it, than to have a hearing of some kind, with people coming in and leaving the room, and having to have some staff members around. Some things just have to be kept quiet for a while. That is my attitude toward it. I shall be glad to surrender what special obligation I have in this connection. It is not something I solicit nor particularly like, but I know that we have to keep some of these things on the quiet.

I think that is what the people want us to do. I think they think we talk too much, rather than too little. I think sometimes what I need is more judgment to pass on the facts I already have, than

July 28, 1970

S 12265

just to be accumulating more and more facts. What we need to do is make the best judgment we can and then, when it comes our turn, we can make another judgment on what it before us.

It seems as though there is a suggestion that somebody is doing something wrong, that they are withholding matters.

Who are these malefactors? Who are these wrongdoers? Mr. Johnson was President of the United States for 5 years. Mr. Nixon has been President a year and a half. Mr. Laird has been over the Pentagon a year and a half, and Mr. McNamara was there before. We could name a great number. What is the source of these wrongdoings?

I know Senators are not accusing them of being traitorous, or anything like that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am not accusing anyone of anything. The Senator from Mississippi mentioned the fact that he thinks we talk too much. Sometimes the American people think we spend too much.

Mr. STENNIS. Well, that is correct, too. I think myself I vote too many dollars sometimes.

But this bill is here, based on the best knowledge that we know anything about, and I think even though they do wear military uniforms, as the Department of Defense, it pretty well represents the best they can do; and we all know Mr. Laird, we knew Mr. McNamara, and we knew these Presidents.

I think it represents a lot of hard work and a lot of hard effort, and is the best they could do under the circumstances. I disagree with them myself on some points, but that is just a part of life here. The bill is a must to pass, I mean, and we have to make a start on it.

We will have a good debate, but I just do not want it to be beaten to death here on the grounds of just a difference of opinion about a weapon. The Senator from Missouri knows more about weapons than I do.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The reason for my talk this afternoon is that the able Senator from Mississippi delivered an address before the Senate last week in which he said that the military budget was tailored to our foreign commitments. In that speech he suggested—in the original copy I received—that the Committee on Foreign Relations look into these commitments. Inasmuch as I am chairman of a subcommittee that has been looking into this matter for a year and a half, I appreciated the fact that later when he delivered the statement on the Senate floor he said we have to look into it more than we already are.

Let me assure the Senator that in no way am I criticizing any action on his part. I would not have made this talk this afternoon if he had not gone into great detail as to the nature and character of the treaties we have and the importance of looking into the commitments arising from them.

Inasmuch as he, himself, advanced the idea of tailoring our defense budget to our commitments and inasmuch as apparently he was unaware of the extent of the efforts that had been made, I felt it was advisable to set the record straight about the work that has already been done.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator's speech was relevant and very fine. I was addressing my remarks to the questions that were built up here to cast a doubt about the solidarity of this bill.

I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin would like me to yield. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not sure that I understand what the Senator from Mississippi is saying. He is such a logical and thoughtful and considerate man, that I want to be sure that I do not misunderstand him.

The Senator from Mississippi seems to be saying that the American people do not want to know some of this information. I assume he is not saying that the American people do not expect their U.S. Senators and Representatives, when they vote on expending money, do not know fully the reason why they cast that vote, why it is necessary for us to spend over \$19 billion in this procurement bill and, overall, more than \$70 billion for the Defense Department, when a very vital reason for our spending so much as the Senator from Mississippi pointed out in the speech he made the other day, is that we have obligations not only on our own shores but all over the world as well.

Is it the position of the Senator from Mississippi that the American people do not want Congress to know fully about what these obligations are and the extent to which they require us to appropriate more funds to produce more weapons?

Mr. STENNIS. No. I did not make any statement to that effect. I said that sometimes the people want us to use our judgment and do the best we can on the facts we have; and I believe we have a good bill here, and we want to move on. The people know. They get plenty of this. The news media do a very good job. We have access to most of what we need here, I believe, as their representatives, and we must keep it that way.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was disturbed by the reference the Senator from Missouri made to the Laotian situation, when he said that members of the Committee on Armed Services were not informed and members of the Committee on Foreign Relations were not informed of the pertinent facts, although we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in Laos. This information had not been disclosed or revealed. This is the kind of information, it seems to me, that we, as U.S. Senators, have an obligation to insist on if we are going to appropriate funds.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator certainly can get that information, too, I think. There are some matters which by their nature have to be handled by some committees. Some matters about which he is talking were not handled by the Armed Services Committee but some were.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Mississippi would understand—and perhaps he would strongly disagree—that some Members of the Senate might feel that to the extent they are not given information, under those circumstances they have a right and a duty not to appropriate the full funds that are requested.

Mr. STENNIS. I have never discouraged them. There are many things I cannot say on the floor, for publication to our adversaries, weaponwise. But I said before that I have never refused to talk to a Senator in full about any matter about which he inquired; and I say that here again to the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entitled to anything I know.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The problem is that none of us really seems to have the answers on the extent of our obligations overseas to the many countries, which could involve the expenditure of billions of dollars. We do not have that information. It does not seem to be available. That is why I think the Senator from Missouri's speech was valuable today in delineating how vast our ignorance is.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have been listening to this colloquy with great interest, and have read the statement of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

I was struck particularly by the reference to Laos, to which Senator PROXMIRE has just made reference. I recall that the Members of the Senate, as a whole, were briefed on this subject by President Johnson during his tenure in office. I also recall that a number of Senators went to Southeast Asia and received briefings there on what was going on in Laos. In fact, some of them, including the Senator from Missouri, as I recall, actually went into Laos during that period.

I also know that some Senators have requested briefings on this subject before and have always received them. So far as I know, no briefings have been turned down either by our committee or by members of the Defense Department or other agencies.

I do not understand why, simply because this information was not made public—which might have had an adverse effect on national relationships around the world—somehow it is deemed to be culpable in the public eye. As the Senator has said, it seems to me that there are inferences which are unsaid, but they are inferences, which should not come into play in his bill and probably should not come into play at all, unless we are arguing about a whole change in foreign policy and a different bill. In that case, I think it is legitimate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In reply to the able Senator from Colorado, let me say that in 1965 I requested approval to go to Laos. I have had a good many briefings in this town; some of them provided a great deal of information; some not very much.

It was requested by a representative of the State Department that I not go into Laos; so I went up to Udorn, in northern Thailand, and met the Ambassador.

As a result, the next year I was determined to go into Laos, and did arrange to go in, despite the fact that further objections were raised.

I can say to the Senator from Colorado, that some of the information as to just what we were doing in Laos I did not learn until we had witnesses under oath before our subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. Perhaps I would not even have received that information if it had not been for information obtained by the staff when they went to Laos some time after I had been there.

Once again, it is important, as I see it, to go out in the field and get the facts in a case of this character.

I would be glad to talk to the Senator off the record about the details of what I never knew, even though I spent a great deal of time in Laos, particularly northern Laos.

Mr. DOMINICK. I shall be brief. This has been an interesting colloquy. It does one thing, if nothing else, it points out the results and the problems that the military and the Armed Services Committee have in trying to perform their functions when commitments have been made by other people elsewhere.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I could not agree more.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yet, all over the country we hear criticism of the military when, in fact, it has been in large part due to the civilians who have made the commitments which we have asked the military to fulfill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that. I fully agree with the Senator on that observation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks quite quickly now, if I may. The Senator from Missouri mentioned the Philippines and the Philippine Government and their soldiers in South Vietnam. We were also talking about Laos. I tell you, Mr. President, that the attitude of all of us has been to get all the help we can in this war in Southeast Asia. We have lamented the fact that we could not get very much help anywhere. I asked everyone in Western Europe that I talked to there in an official way about this thing years ago, and as late as 2 years ago. We were also trying to get people in the Asian part of the world to come in and help us and bring in men or send in men. I thought everyone knew that we were paying some soldiers from the Philippines. I did not know that that was secret. However, I did know a good deal about Laos.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We put the money out for the Philippine soldiers, that was the sworn testimony of the Acting Ambassador. But the General Accounting Office investigation cannot prove it and the Philippine Government says that the soldiers did not get it.

Mr. STENNIS. My point is, we were trying to get all the help we could. I was pleased that they were there. We were trying to get the situation in Laos favorable. It might have been there was not

any more said about it, and maybe some of those governments did not want any more said about it. That question is all mixed up in it, but we have not been successful in getting any help over there—at least any appreciable help. We do appreciate the help we did get, so that perhaps what money we did spend, even if it did not reach all of its destination, was worth something to us.

I want to be sure that the Senator understands this. I have paid my respects to the hard work of the Senator from Missouri. He never stops. He is after things that are important and things that count. I am glad that he is working on this subcommittee. However, I do not believe that we can create foreign policy here in opposition to a military bill, or even in support for it, so much. These problems are already on us, those that are in the bill. We have to move forward. I want to revise our foreign policy. I said so in the speech to which the Senator from Missouri referred. I have said that before. It is something that I think is the most serious matter now before the country outside of the war in Southeast Asia.

I hope that this will continue, but we have got to create a foreign policy that is based on foreign policy and not just on a few weapons here and there. Thus, I hope that this debate can proceed. The Senator has made a great contribution. I hope that we can get down to some amendments and I expect good debate on them.

Mr. President, those are my remarks and observations on this subject, and I am glad now to yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am certain that all Members of the Senate and the American people know of the dedicated work of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. As the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) points out, when we get into military matters, we automatically seem to get into matters of foreign policy and vice versa. As a result I think, inasmuch as the able Senator from Mississippi has been so gracious this afternoon, and in pointing out last week that the military budget is based on our foreign commitments, that the analysis and the details of these foreign commitments will be, in the long run, of great service to the American people.

I think it is clear the security of the Nation depends not only on our physical capacity to destroy an enemy, but also on a viable economy and the faith of the people in their government.

Let me assure the chairman of the committee, that nothing I have said this afternoon is in any way critical of the fine work he does in the interest of the armed services.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator and I fully understand his remarks and the spirit in which he made them. I believe he does mine as well. Again, his speech was relevant and pertinent and very helpful.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SPONG TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, following the remarks of the able

Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) on tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS AND CONSIDERATION OF UNFINISHED BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the orders under which speeches by Senator FANNIN and Senator SPONG will be made tomorrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes; and that, upon completion of the transaction of routine morning business, the unfinished business be then laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CANNON TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate on tomorrow, the able Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) be, at that time, recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MCINTYRE TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the statement by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) on tomorrow, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GOLDWATER TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the remarks of the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the able Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.