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THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE URGENT SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, according to press reports on Tuesday, spokesman for the White House pictured the President as "taking a careful approach to two areas of potentially sharp controversy with Congress," and that "Deputy Press Secretary Gerald L. Warren said that Nixon would consult with congressional leaders before deciding whether to sign or veto legislation that would cut off funds for U.S. military activity in or over Cambodia and Laos." The dispatch goes on to state:

Although Nixon strongly opposed the legislation prior to its passage Tuesday, Warren said the President now wants to study the issue. The spokesman would not say whether Senator John C. Tower, of Texas, had the benefit of inside information when he told the newsmen he was "inclined to think the President will not veto the bill."

Mr. President, it is with the deepest concern and regret, despair and perhaps a degree of shock and alarm that I greet the President's announced veto of the urgent second supplemental appropriation measure. The word "urgent" is not my characterization. Its urgency was so maintained at the time this funding proposal was submitted to the Congress by the administration.

My concern and regret are founded on the fact that the moneys contained and approved in this measure are supposedly absolutely essential if this Nation is to pursue those policies and programs at home and abroad that are vital to the interests of this Nation—programs dealing with health and welfare and, yes, even national security.

My shock and alarm, however, lie in the fact that I suspect most assuredly that the veto was occasioned because of
the bombing halted by this proposal as it was sent to the White House. I feel that the action taken in vetoing this measure if not reversed can lead only to a constitutional impasse over the issues involved and over the will of the American people to affect those issues as never before witnessed in the history of this Republic.

I doubt that the embargo on bombing was not just the voice of the Senate, not just the voice of the House of Representatives but the loud and clear will of the American people expressed and exercised through their duly elected representatives. To ignore it, to veto it, is most alarming.

I can only say, and I believe I speak in behalf of the great majority of the American people, in saying that this veto will not and must not inhibit us from shutting off the use of American resources to carry on these continued actions in Cambodia and in other parts of Indochina. It has been, therefore, and indeed the veto may be sustained, but there will be other laws required and they, too, must be presented for signature within a few days. It is my judgment that they, too, will contain an expression of the will of the American people on the issue of the continued war in Cambodia and the way in which taxpayer funds are used to press that war forward with planes and bombs, with destruction and devastation.

The President has attempted to do is to stop the ill-advised, illegal, unconstitutional slaughter of Cambodians by American bombing. In 5 months of this year and approximately 116 days of continuous bombings, we have dropped over 200,000 tons of bombs on Cambodia compared to 175,000 tons of bombs in the preceding 3 years.

The bombing at times has been heavier than the Christmas season—season of the Prince of Peace—against Hanoi, Hal­phong and North Vietnam.

In all of Indochina, we have dropped approximately 6.6 million tons of bombs compared to 3.2 million tons of bombs in 1971. We have also dropped 3.3 million tons of bombs, let alone the casualties we have suffered, the cost entailed and the problems created here at home.

The United States does not belong in Indochina and never has, and of all the places we do not belong in, Cambodia is the most outstanding. We are supporting a corrupt dictator. We have created a client state and we are keeping it in power through bombings.

While the cost has been high for us, it has been a fraction of the cost in Cambodia. Where is this peace with honor which we have been told about time and again? Who are we creating new American prisoners of war in Cambodia?

A veto can precipitate an extremely dangerous economic situation. It is an ill-chosen and North Vietnamese action. It goes contrary to the will and the wishes of the Congress and the American people. If the veto is upheld, it would be our intention—I repeat it—to assist the Cambodian riders to every other possible peace of legislation, and we will do it, because under the precedent established Congress has given the warmaking power, not the President, and Congress has spoken.

If the President does not want to stop the bombing in Cambodia but does want to stop the Government from functioning, that is the President's responsibility.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. President, I have listened with grave concern to the distinguished leader. I, too, was shocked to receive word of this veto. I wish to ask the majority leader for further clarification as to the statement he made. As I understand the procedure, we will be voting on whether or not to override the President's veto.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, the House will be.

Mr. PERRY. The House will act first.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The House will have that opportunity and it is my belief that very likely the veto would be upheld, but that does not mean the end of the Eagle­ton amendment by any means, because it will be offered again and again and again until the will of the people prevails.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. President, I am concerned that the leadership to see that the Cambodian amendment is not in any way dropped; the will of Congress will continue, and it will be offered on every single bill that is appropriate for it to be attached to, and the President will then be faced with the decision each and every time he vetoes a bill, and the efforts will continue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is not the intention of the leadership, but it is the intention of the Senator from Montana. As far as I am concerned, I would hope there would not be another upcoming urgent supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, President Nixon has vetoed the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1973, H.R. 7447, on which action by Congress had been completed last night.

The President has once again rejected the expressed will of the Congress not only on a number of domestic needs, but also the expressed will of Congress in demanding an end to the cruel and illegal bombing of Cambodia.

This apparent reflex action on the part of the President reflects failure to consider the profoundly serious impact of denying these funds for programs of vital importance to communities across America and to thousands upon thousands of our citizens.

The President's veto undermines an intensive effort in which I and other Senators and Congressmen have been engaged to assure the provision of暑期 job opportunities for several hundred thousand disadvantaged youth in areas of poverty across the Nation, at the same level as last year.

The President's veto shuts down a number of education programs serving handicapped children, by denying $13.8 million in additional funds desperately needed to keep these programs alive through its action. It is through its action we recall that this crisis would not have arisen in the first place if the President's own administration had not committed an illegal action in backdating contracts last year, the correction of which neces­