

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

2-5-1976

Congressional Record S. 1290 - Congress and Foreign Policy

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record S. 1290 - Congress and Foreign Policy" (1976). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 1289.

https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1289

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.



Congressional Record

February 5, 1976

S 1290

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Secretary of State has been discussing foreign policy, world affairs, and other matters of primary significance in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Laramie, Wyo., and stops in between. He seems to be pointing the finger at Congress and blaming Congress for the situations which confront the executive branch of this Nation and the people as a whole at the present time.

I would point out to the distinguished Secretary of State, for whom I have high personal admiration, that such is not the case. If he expects Congress to lie down and play dead, he had better think again, because Congress is and will continue to be, insofar as it is possible to be, a partner in the conduct of foreign policy. Our exercise of responsibility will be constructive, I hope, and not obstructive.

I would point out, looking at the world in brief, that as far as Western Europe is concerned, Congress, by and large, has generally been in favor of the administration's policies and those of this Secretary of State.

As far as NATO is concerned, even along the southern rim, including Portugal and the recent upheavals which have occurred there, including the tenuous situation which has been developing in Italy, and including the Greek-Turkish situation, Congress, after some deliberation—and we were correct in our deliberations, based on the law—came around to a large extent, at least, to what the Secretary had been advocating in those parts of Europe.

Then there is the Middle East. I do not think there has been a confrontation or an antagonism between the executive and legislative branches in that area. Rather, there has been, as in the case of Europe, cooperation.

We come next to Asia. I have no knowledge of Congress finding fault with the Secretary of State's or rather the administration's policy toward Japan. On the contrary, there has been support. The same applies to the People's Republic of China. The same does not apply to Southeast Asia, where Congress exercised its prerogative and was able to help to bring about an end to the most tragic war in the history of this Nation—namely, the war covering Laos, Cambodia, and North and South Vietnam, a war in which this country should never have become involved, and a war for which we paid deeply, in loss of life and limb, in prestige, and also in cost in treasure.

Latin America? Unfortunately, we have not been paying too much attention to Latin America but there has been no reason for disagreement between the administration and Congress. I would assume and I would expect without question that if a stronger, more understanding policy was developed toward Latin America, the Secretary of State would find that he had the support of the overwhelming majority of Congress.

Then we come to Africa. Maybe that is the reason for the statements being made by the Secretary of State on his jaunt to the hinterlands, where he finds fault with Congress.

He finds fault with us because we refuse to follow the administration's policy—a covert policy in the beginning—of providing additional funds for a war in Angola, an area in which we have not had and do not have any business, an area in which its internal difficulties will be settled by the Angolans themselves, including all the factions. There is a difference there, as there was in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, between Congress and the administration; but in both areas and on both issues, in my opinion, the actions taken by Congress were the correct actions, and if necessary, actions of that kind will be taken again in other parts of the world.

Today, we have a foreign aid bill before us which provides something on the order of \$2 billion plus for the Middle East, as I recall, covering assistance to Israel, to Jordan, to Egypt, and I am sure to other countries. I am certain that in this area Congress will go along with the executive branch and support the requests made.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that since we inaugurated foreign aid programs beginning with the Marshall plan in 1948, this Nation has extended, either on a loan or a grant basis, in excess of \$150 billion in foreign aid; and this bill, now pending, calls for an additional \$3.1 billion.

Mr. President, we have not missed a continent in the world. There are very few countries outside of the Communist bloc that we have missed, and even there we have made some contributions on a loan or a grant basis. It is a remarkable story of what this country has done in the field of foreign assistance to every continent and every country in the non-Communist world. I note that a country which received its independence only last year, Papua New Guinea—it was the latter part of last year, I think, in September—is already on the list of those receiving foreign assistance.

So we do not miss them. We try to make sure that every country possible is given consideration and all we have to do is to hold out the grab bag, ask them how much they want, in some instances, and I can prove that, and then begin to disburse the wealth which the American people have worked so hard to achieve.

But my main point is that Mr. Kissinger is wrong when he points the finger at Congress. We have cooperated. We will continue to do so. But we will express our views; when we think we are right, we will do what we think is right in the matter of holding back appropriations or passing legislation.

Congress does not want a confrontation with the Executive in the field of foreign policy. But Congress will not avoid a confrontation if the finger continues to be pointed at us, and Congress will continue to seek to achieve its rightful position in the affairs of this Nation insofar as the Constitution and its responsibilities are concerned.