

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

U.S. Congress
Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 22

JULY 31, 1971, TO AUGUST 4, 1971

(PAGES 28453 TO 29778)

wages and prices—wishes such a move could be avoided. It's like jumping from the fire into the frying pan. Americans are being badly singed by inflation, and those who normally would do a slow burn at the prospect of federal intervention are coolly calling for an incomes policy.

Early this year, for example, Forbes magazine quoted such unlikely advocates of wage-price controls as the chief executives of Motorola, AMF and Borden. Before that, the prestigious Committee for Economic Development recommended voluntary controls, with a few members leaning toward the mandatory version. Only three weeks ago, George Meany of the AFL-CIO conceded the need for setting limits on wages and prices. Bruce MacLaury, new president of the 9th District Federal Reserve Bank, has called for an incomes policy. And economists from Arthur Burns to John Kenneth Galbraith have been telling Congress that guidelines at least, controls at most, are necessary.

The Nixon administration expresses confidence in present policies. We are among those who do not share that confidence. The annual rate of increase in cost of living remains, like the unemployment rate, around 6 percent. Major labor contracts have been settled—sometimes after costly strikes—with requirements for annual pay increases that often are double that 6-percent figure and continue for two or three years. Last week's report of leading business indicators was a forecast for declining economic activity in the months ahead. Finally, the \$23 billion deficit in the federal budget for the year just ended is likely to be exceeded in fiscal 1972. Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, nicely understated the problem last month: "The rules of economics are not working in quite the way they used to."

We don't know whether an incomes policy would be a workable economic rule. Among those who think it would be, opinions vary widely as to just what point in the range between voluntary and mandatory controls would be best. Some experts say controls should be applied only to big business and big labor. Some would make them comprehensive. Others would freeze wages, but not prices. Still others would settle for presidential "jawboning."

All that seems really clear is the inadequacy of present policy. President Nixon assured Congress in February that "the basic conditions to bring about a simultaneous reduction of unemployment and inflation are coming into being." On that premise, his reaffirmed opposition to wage-price controls, direct or indirect, was logical. No president should be blamed for making a faulty forecast, but when the forecast proves wrong, adherence to past policy is not commendable consistency. An incomes policy is no panacea. Surely, though, it would be better than the present administration policy of unfounded optimism.

JEWIS IN RUSSIA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a number of Senators have taken the Senate floor to speak out against the oppression and persecution directed against Jews who live in the Soviet Union. I wish today to add my voice to theirs in the hope that, together, we can make ourselves heard in Russia.

Everyone in the free world is concerned with the Communist attitude toward religion in general. Christians in Communist bloc countries must endure a significant degree of discrimination which, of course, varies from country to country. Soviet anti-semitism is perhaps the most serious symptom of the anti-

religious disease that is inherent in communism. In Russia, this symptom has from all reports produced intolerable results for Jews who merely wish to be left in peace to live as their religion and ethnic heritage dictate.

The evidence which filters out of Russia through reliable sources makes the official and unofficial Soviet attitude toward Jews quite plain. Synagogues and cemeteries continue to be desecrated, and some destroyed completely. Essential religious articles can be neither manufactured nor imported. The study of Hebrew has been effectively precluded. Kosher food is well-nigh impossible to obtain. And both religious and ethnic publications are nowhere to be found as far as the Soviet Jew is concerned.

This is but a part of the whole. The cultivation and encouragement of anti-Semitism by those in positions of influence over the Russian people is the most insidious aspect of the misery which Soviet Jews must face daily. The public media misses no opportunity to arouse the people against Jews and Judaism. In short, there is persecution of the worst sort at every official and unofficial level.

The bitter irony of this situation is that Jews must remain and face this kind of treatment. They have been made exiles in their own land. Yet they are not allowed to emigrate to another country for the same reason that the Communists built the Berlin Wall—it would be an embarrassment to the idealistic existence one is supposed to enjoy in a Communist state. In their desire to leave, the many Jews who wish to do so are of course joined by significant numbers of others throughout the Communist world. If Soviet Jews were allowed to leave freely they would be joined and followed by more people of different faiths and beliefs who nevertheless share a common desire: the wish to be free.

Contrast this situation with America, where our citizens are free to emigrate. They are even encouraged to do so by advertisements in certain quarters which state: "America—Love It or Leave It!" But relatively few Americans do leave, in spite of their disenchantment with certain aspects of life in this country.

I am certain that Jews and other minorities in Russia would be willing to remain if they were given reasonable equality of treatment and allowed to live in peace. If Russia is unwilling to grant these people such status, it should allow them to leave in peace. But up to this point, neither has been done.

This deplorable situation must not be allowed to continue. The world grows smaller each day, and each day we renew our hopes for international harmony. President Nixon has made great strides during his term of office in attempting to lessen tensions between America and the Communist powers. We are told in various ways that Russia seeks an understanding with us as well.

Mr. President, how can we hope to reach an understanding with a country which will not treat its own people in a civilized manner? How far can we go in dealing with a nation which has so little regard for the rights of people living within its own borders?

The plight of the Soviet Jews should be of grave concern to every citizen of this country, both for its own sake and for its larger implications. We must not allow these people to be forgotten, and we must not permit Soviet officials to ignore their responsibilities. I urge the Soviet Government to act responsibly in this matter, and to provide its Jewish citizens with fair and equal treatment. I further urge that all citizens of Russia be given the right to emigrate as provided by the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that appropriate action by the Soviet Union in this matter would go a long way in the cause of world peace. It is my hope that they will see the wisdom of such action.

BRUTAL REPRESSION IN EAST BENGAL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there can be no doubt of the grave and mounting danger of major catastrophe in Asia. One region is already devastated, with hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians brutally murdered in East Bengal. Now seven million more face starvation or deadly disease as refugees in India. Tens of thousands join them every day.

Journalists and other independent observers have thoroughly documented the role of the West Pakistan government and military in carrying out the systematic destruction of East Bengal. People in the United States and many Senators are shocked and deeply grieved by that regime's brutal repression of the East.

America's true principles as well as sympathy lie in offering maximum assistance to the victims of this tragedy and at the same time in opposing the inhumanity displayed by the government of West Pakistan.

But in spite of all the evidence, the State Department here in Washington still clings to the out-dated assumptions which first inspired economic and military aid to Pakistan. Continuation of such aid not only breaks faith with our principles, it undermines our national security interests as well.

The old abstractions about balance of power in Asia have little connection with the incredible suffering now taking place among the Bengalis. But the desperation of these people and growing tensions in India may erupt at any moment. Still it is the near incomprehensible proportions of human loss—not the old assumptions—which the administration apparently considers irrelevant to American diplomatic policy in Asia.

If, as we are told, one purpose for continuing support for West Pakistan is to gain leverage to prevent bloodshed, we must understand the error implicit in that kind of logic. Such thinking could justify support for the worst imaginable dictatorship.

In truth, the primary purpose for our aid to Pakistan has little to do with the bloody repression in the East. But the effect of our aid is directly connected with the destruction going on there. Our weapons and our economic assistance help to carry out the inhumanity.

And that link is not unobserved by India and other countries in Asia. It will have a great impact on the way these countries regard us and it could irreparably damage our long-range diplomatic interests with them.

More immediately, our aid to Pakistan only contributes to the volatility of relations between India and Pakistan. As new refugees pour out of East Bengal, India may soon be unable to even barely sustain the millions there now.

The level of hostility has grown and will continue to do so until these conditions are alleviated.

Earlier this month, I received an extremely thoughtful and troubling report from Prof. Martin E. Abel of the University of Minnesota who has just recently returned from New Delhi. Dr. Abel has firsthand knowledge of the tensions caused by massive migration of Bengalis to India. I believe his letter reveals many important considerations our present diplomacy badly neglects.

I have written to Secretary Rogers for his response to these serious concerns. I have also asked him to provide concrete evidence of any positive results from our support for Pakistan since the terror began last March. I am looking forward to his answer because I can myself conceive of no gain which could possibly compensate for the most remote U.S. association with chaos and terror of the past 4 months.

I would like to share Dr. Abel's letter with my colleagues and ask that his comments be given urgent consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul Minn., July 9, 1971.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate of the United States,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I have recently returned from India after a two year assignment as Program Advisor in Economics with the Ford Foundation in New Delhi. In this position I was able to observe closely economic and political developments in India.

I am writing to express my personal concern about the refugee problem in India created by the actions of the Pakistan government in East Pakistan and the economic and political consequences of this problem for India. The situation is extremely grave. However, the United States has not recognized the magnitude of the problem, its long-run consequences, or what it should do to contribute to stability in the region. I will confine my remarks to the problems created for India by the Pakistan situation. The inhumanity of the situation within East Pakistan has been treated by the world press as well as by others.

There are now over six million refugees from East Pakistan in India. They have been coming in at the rate of about 100,000 a day and continue to do so. While the initial influx of refugees was predominantly Muslim, the vast majority of them are now Hindus escaping persecution in East Pakistan. There are two very serious long-term consequences of the quantity and composition of the refugees for India.

First, because the refugees are predomi-

nantly Hindu, they can't be sent back to East Pakistan and must be absorbed by India. This presents a terrible, long-term economic problem. Problems of rural and urban underemployment and unemployment have already reached critical proportions in Eastern India. The refugees cannot be absorbed through effective employment—there is just not enough land or jobs. Also, there is a severe shortage of administrative staff! The financial burden to India is enormous. Maintaining six million refugees will cost India annually nearly \$600 million; an amount almost equal to the net foreign aid it receives. The financial burden is sufficient to halt progress in economic development and certainly to undermine the new and promising directions in which Mrs. Gandhi is trying to move the country. As of a few weeks ago, total foreign assistance to India for the refugee problem totaled a mere \$47 million.

Second, severe political problems have arisen. Hostilities have been created because some of the refugees are competing with local labor for employment. Wage rates in West Bengal, which are already very low, have been depressed sharply as a result of the influx of refugees. There are sharp language differences between the refugees (Bengali speaking) and people in more distant states (U.P., Bihar and Madhya Pradesh—Hindu speaking). This complicates absorbing the refugees outside of the immediate environs of Eastern India. Furthermore, certain political elements in India are exploiting the present situation to their advantages. Prior to the Pakistan problem, the political situation in Eastern India, especially West Bengal, was precarious. Additional political unrest could have very grave consequences for India, and the world will be touched by it. It could dash all hopes for stability in that part of the country and undermine India's economic development!

Increased communal (Hindu-Muslim) tensions have also to be noted. This problem is widespread. There have been numerous large riots in the past two years. There could be a much larger explosion of Hindu-Muslim confrontations as a result of the Muslim persecution of Hindus in East Pakistan.

Time is running out for India and she will have to act soon, although no bright alternatives exist. Most of the refugees now in India can't be sent back. The flow of new refugees will have to be stopped. Under these circumstances, it will be difficult to avoid some form of military confrontation between India and Pakistan at least along the borders of East Pakistan. It could be costly to both countries.

India needs help and needs it fast! Immediately, recognition of the extreme and long-term nature of the political dimensions of the problem by the United States would be terribly helpful. So far, only the USSR has seen this aspect of the problem. And, there are many in India who are dismayed by the influence this will gain for the Soviet Union. The Pakistan problem, for India, is not an internal one. This must be recognized by the U.S. The political and economic problems created in India must also be recognized. India cannot cope with these problems without significant long-term assistance from other countries. For reasons given above, it would be well for the world to recognize such action as a necessary defensive measure and not view it as another Indo-Pakistan confrontation of the 1965 type. India needs now, and will continue to need for a long time to come, considerable economic assistance to effectively absorb the million of refugees and minimize domestic political repercussions. What it is now receiving is a mere pittance. A strong and forthcoming position by the United States would mean a great deal.

The U.S. has much to gain. Mrs. Gandhi won a smashing political victory in March

and wants to use it to develop sound economic policies and programs. Some promising initial steps have been taken. However, the Pakistan situation has side-tracked all of this. Further delay will be costly. The U.S., like it or not, has a big investment in India. Some added expenditure on "insurance" for this investment may make good sense. With sufficient assistance, India might be able to cope with the explosive political situation created in the Eastern region of the country and to keep it from spreading to other parts.

I would hope that you would be able to help in quickly moving our country toward a more constructive set of policies in the Pakistan situation and, particularly with respect to India. I will be happy to further discuss this matter with you.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN E. ABEL,
Professor.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., August 2, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have recently received a deeply thoughtful and troubling report from Professor Martin E. Abel of the University of Minnesota regarding the desperate refugee situation in India.

Dr. Abel has first-hand knowledge of the dangerous tensions created by massive migration of Bengalis to India. His letter raises several immediate questions about our present diplomatic policies with respect to India and Pakistan.

I would appreciate your responses both to Dr. Abel's perceptive comments, and to several questions related to his observations. Specifically, I would like to know:

1. If—as we are told—continued support for West Pakistan is designed to deter further violence, what concrete evidence do you have of any positive results since the terror began last March? I believe this appraisal must be made in full awareness of the use of American weapons and economic aid in carrying out brutally repressive policies in the East.

2. Since our diplomatic policies lend support to the West Pakistani regime, what steps have we taken to validate that government's promise for the safe repatriation of refugees? What measures have we taken to guarantee no retaliation will be taken against members of the political opposition to the West Pakistani regime? What assurances are we prepared to offer as to the lives and freedom of refugees who voluntarily return to East Bengal?

3. If we are not prepared to make assurances to the refugees, what provisions has the Department of State made to respond on a continuing basis to the overwhelming burdens facing India in sustaining nearly 7 million refugees? How much additional relief is contemplated? How many State Department officers are now assigned to assure a timely and effective U.S. response to the refugee crisis?

As you know, the foreign aid bill will soon be coming before the Senate for a vote. Our policies with respect to India and Pakistan are central to any debate on this legislation. I am confident that your response would shed much needed light on the discussion of our policies to alleviate the terrible suffering and loss in India and East Bengal.

I look forward to receiving a reply at your earliest convenience.

With warmest regards,
Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE.

VOTER REGISTRATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as every Senator is aware, one of the most