

major from
nature from
Senator
the Sena-
nality, the
(Mr. MOR-
ingia (Mr.
from Geor-
essarily ab-
Senator from
) is absent

from Wyo-
ed with the
ss). If pres-
from Wyo-
the Senator

present and
Iowa. (Mr.
West Virginia
or from New
the Senator
Mr.) would

nce that the
Stravins) is

Senator from
beant on off-

bed—years 41.

Leg.]

Muskie
Nunn
Packwood
Pearson
Scott Hugh
Spertman
Standiford
Stennis
Springston
Tat
Thurmond
Tower
Young

Nelson
Pastors
Pell
Perry
Proxmire
Ruddock
Both
Schweiker
Scott
William L.
Stevenson
Stone
Turney
Welcker

13
Morgan
Moss
Randolph
Stevens
Talmadge
Williams
passed, as fol-

other suspension
ilitary assistance
purposes
private and former

United States of
bied. That section
stances Act of 1961
resolution of Cypru-
1961, as amended by
each amended by

striking out "until February 5, 1975, and only if, during that time, and meeting in lieu thereof "if during such suspension", Sec. 2, Section 6103 (5) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, is further amended by designating the previous prohibition as paragraph (1) and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

(3) The President shall submit to the Congress within thirty days after the enactment of this paragraph, and at the end of each succeeding thirty-day period, a report on progress made during such period toward the conclusion of a negotiated solution of the Cyprus conflict."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, today I was regrettably forced to cast my vote against the bill to renew American arms assistance to Turkey. I say regrettably because Turkey has been an old and reliable ally, whose friendship and mutual-ity of interest with the United States have been demonstrated many times over the past three decades.

Turkish forces have participated proudly alongside the forces of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany, and other alliance partners in preserving the security of Western Europe and the Mediterranean. With approximately half a million men in arms, Turkey has NATO's second largest land force. In addition, it occupies the strategically vital position between the Middle East and the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that any withdrawal of Turkey from the NATO would seriously damage its effectiveness.

Nevertheless, I feel compelled to object to the restoration of American arms assistance, because I feel the requirements set forth when the embargo was first passed that there be "substantial progress" in the negotiations and a partial withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus have not been met. The mandate of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is clear—American arms are not to be used by allies in aggressive actions. The reason for that law was equally obvious—it was meant to encourage self-defense, not the imposition of foreign policy views by military fiat. That reasoning is as vital today as it was 14 years ago. No alliance can long endure if one ally is free to use indiscriminate force to settle its disputes with another ally.

I had hoped that progress on the Cyprus problem would have come more quickly. However, while it is true that today negotiations are again underway, it seems as though we are no closer to a resolution to the problem than we were 5 months ago. The U.S. Government has not even received private assurances that Turkish withdrawal would proceed once aid was renewed. This situation can hardly be described as representing substantial progress.

Under the circumstances, I feel that the arms embargo must be continued until the talks on Cyprus progress or until, as a minimum, we have received assurances from the Turkish Government

that if arms assistance is renewed there will be a new flexibility on the part of Turkey.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSTFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSTFIELD. Mr. President, I seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may the Senate be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. "A Senator will keep order in the Chamber."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSTFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no further votes this evening. We will, of course, take up the ship channel appropriation bill, which will be laid down this evening for tomorrow, plus the Butterfield nomination tomorrow.

SENATE RESOLUTION 160—RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ON THE ISLAND OF DIEGO GARCIA

(Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

Mr. MANSTFIELD. Mr. President, on May 12, 1975, the President of the United States, by letter, certified to the Congress that the construction of Navy facilities on the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean is vital to the national interests of the Government of the United States. The text of the President's letter to the Congress reads as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 613(a) (1) (A) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1975 (Public Law 93-582), I have evaluated all the military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for United States facilities at Diego Garcia. On the basis of this evaluation and in accordance with section 613(a) (1) (B), I hereby certify that the construction of such facilities is essential to the national interest of the United States.

GEORGE B. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 12, 1975.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear the Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senate may proceed.

Mr. MANSTFIELD. Under the provisions of Public Law 93-582, 90th Congress, 2d session, section 613, I am laying before the Senate a resolution of disapproval in accordance with the provisions of section 613. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks section 613 from the public law be printed in order that Senators may have an opportunity to read this section of law and know exactly how this resolution of disapproval will be handled in the Committee of the Armed Services and on the floor of the Senate.

(See exhibit 1)

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was very surprised that the President of the United States would send this resolution to the Congress at this time in view that we have been told by the administration that the President is in the midst of a reappraisal of our foreign policy because of the debacle of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Southeast Asia.

I think in the debate of this resolution, when it is returned from the Armed Services Committee, a number of very important questions should be examined during the debate.

Why, in the face of the fact that all the nations bordering on the Indian Ocean have asked the United States and the Soviet Union not to escalate the arms race in the Indian Ocean area, has the administration forwarded this letter of certification? At a meeting in New Delhi on November 17, 1974, 30 nations issued a policy statement opposing the United States building a naval facility on the island of Diego Garcia.

Why does this administration persist in the face of a staggering deficit in our budget insist on building a naval facility that will cost approximately \$175 million? I contend that the money that the administration is requesting to start building naval facilities on Diego Garcia, amounting to \$14 million for the Navy and \$3.3 million for the Air Force, fiscal year 1976 budget, already in the bag for an additional \$13 million for operational facilities on Diego Garcia.

Mr. President, are we going to engage in an adventure of Southeast Asia and Vietnam all over again? Is there an existing policy of the United States in the face of our bitter experience in Vietnam?

Are we not scattered throughout the world enough by having military personnel on all five continents—perhaps, if on all six continents—and naval ships on all the oceans of the world and on a good many seas?

In voting the naval base on the island of Diego Garcia, are we going to vote a three-ocean Navy? The Navy contends that they will be able to operate carriers in the Indian Ocean with only a 13-airplane carrier force. However, will it really have to be 15 carriers to fulfill our commitment in the Atlantic, Pacific, and the Indian Ocean?

I believe that the role of the carrier in sea warfare should be a part of the debate on the island of Diego Garcia. I submit that the aircraft carrier is now obsolete with the technical advancement in the new cruise missiles I submit that always know exactly within a few hundred yards where our carriers are operating. Can a carrier task force adequately protect itself in its operations in the Indian Ocean?

What are our so-called vital interests in the Indian Ocean? Certainly, having a task force in the Indian Ocean

has no effect on the oil situation during the Yom Kippur war in October 1973. In fact, our naval vessels were completely cut off from Arab oil and the United States could do nothing about the Arab action.

Incidentally, I understand that there is an interesting article in this week's U.S. News & World Report, which once again raises the specter of war in case of another oil embargo. I hope that that does not come to pass.

Mr. President, the question of Diego Garcia and allowing the Navy to build a naval operating facility on this island some 1,200 miles south of the tip of India is a vital policy question. I urge upon my colleagues to take due notice of this action and to study all of the facts that are available. I urge my colleagues to give serious consideration as to whether this Nation should support a naval base thousands of miles from our shores which will amount to nothing more than "showing the flag" in an area of the world where the nations have requested that we not have our Navy there in force.

For the information of my colleagues, on December 5, 1974, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, S20742, I delivered a speech setting forth reasons for my opposition to the building of naval operating facilities on the island of Diego Garcia.

I ask unanimous consent that that speech be printed in the Record at an appropriate point.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

MR. MANSFIELD. Finally, I point out that the Senate has 60 legislative days to act upon this resolution and the Armed Services Committee should report it back to the floor of the Senate within 20 days with its recommendation. I urge the Armed Services Committee to report this resolution of disapproval favorably in order that the United States will not embark upon another adventure in the southern part of Asia.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the resolution of disapproval and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 160
Resolved, That the Senate does not approve the proposed construction project on the island of Diego Garcia, the need for which was certified to by the President and the certification with respect to which was received by the Senate on May 12, 1975.

EXHIBIT 1

SEC. 513. (a) None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act with respect to any construction project at Diego Garcia may be obligated unless—

- (1) the President has (A) advised the Congress in writing that all military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for United States facilities at Diego Garcia have been evaluated by him, and (B) certified to the Congress in writing that the construction of any such project is essential to the national interest of the United States;
- (2) 60 days of continuous session of the Congress have expired following the date on which certification with respect to such project is received by the Congress; and

(3) neither within said approving.

(b) (1) A community

only by a state city, and is not in use of more than 60-day period

(2) For a "mean of Congress, clause of the Senate does

struction project by the President on May 12, 1975, being filed in House and the appropriate

(c) Subject section are (1) as an deemed a part applicable only to be followed resolutions of this section rules of the Senate they are in (2) with full

national right of rules at any time to the same a other rule of (d) A report construction project Garcia shall be Armed Services

(e) (1) If the ies of the Senate respect to a project the island of Diego has not reported or 20 calendar not counting a under subsection in order to move natives from in resolution or in from further construction introduced proposed construction been referred to no motion to d after the completion of disapproval proposed construction

(2) A motion graph (1) of this only by a Senate is privileged, and limited to not more than 10 minutes divided equally between those opposing the motion and those in the majority leader or member to the motion not in order to move by which the motion agreed to.

(3) (1) A motion to the construction privileged, and shall not be in order to move to rescind motion is agreed to (2) Debate in the and all debate connection therewith more than 10 hours between, and court leader and the mind news.

(3) Debate in the