

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 22

AUGUST 17, 1970, TO AUGUST 31, 1970

(PAGES 29177 TO 30548)

We urge the Senate to take prompt action in ratifying the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

STATEMENT BY KATHERINE L. CAMP, PRESIDENT, U.S. SECTION, WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom strongly urges ratification of the U.N. Convention on Genocide. This Convention manifests man's striving for a more humanitarian way of life by condemning the organized destruction of any racial or religious group. The U.N. unanimously adopted the Convention on Genocide in 1948 and since that time 75 countries have ratified it. Both the Secretary of State and the Attorney General have stated that there are no Constitutional obstacles to U.S. ratification.

Man's goal of living in a world without war, with freedom and justice for all, can only be realized if we build a firm foundation of international law. The Genocide Convention is a vital part of such a foundation. This Convention embodies the revulsion of all civilized men at the systematic destruction of any group of people because of their racial or religious origin. U.S. ratification of the Genocide Convention would demonstrate our commitment to abide by the decent opinion of mankind everywhere.

Since the U.S. Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom first endorsed the Genocide Convention in 1949, we have repeatedly urged the United States to ratify it. Ratification of the U.N. Convention on Genocide this year would be a particularly fitting manner to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

#### GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925 SUBMITTED TO THE SENATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am pleased that the President, in fulfillment of his promise of last November, has today submitted the Geneva Protocol of 1925 to the Senate for its advice and consent. This action, together with the President's previous renunciation of the use and possession of biological warfare agents by the United States, will substantially strengthen the barriers protecting mankind from the horrors of chemical and biological warfare.

The dimensions of the danger posed by the existence of these frightful agents has been amply illustrated during the past few days as a result of the Army's disposal of a shipment of deadly nerve gas. More than anything else, the episode of the nerve gas underscores the potentially suicidal absurdity of producing weapons which are too dangerous even to destroy.

Fortunately, the President's actions over the past few months have had the effect of removing major chemical and biological weapons from their previous place in our military planning. In my opinion they should never have been there in the first place but the President deserves full credit for having initiated a comprehensive review of our chemical and biological programs.

At the same time there is still widespread concern over the erosion of U.S. restraint with regard to the use of agents at the lower end of the spectrum of chemical warfare. I refer specifically to the heavy United States use of harassing gases in Vietnam and to the extensive defoliation operations which we have

conducted in Vietnam, including the destruction of food crops.

The administration is reported to have weighed the questions of harassing gases and herbicides very carefully in deciding upon the action it has taken today. Indeed, it is reliably reported that it was the effort to resolve precisely these problems which has delayed submission of the protocol until this late date in the congressional session.

Quite frankly, I would have preferred for the President to have interpreted the protocol in accordance with the position adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in an 80-to-3 vote last December, as prohibiting the use of harassing gases and herbicides. While he did not do so, I am nevertheless pleased that in submitting the protocol he did not formally reserve the U.S. position with regard to those weapons.

There are ways other than action on the protocol by which the Senate can express its views on these issues. One of these ways is by our action on the herbicide amendment to the Defense procurement authorization bill sponsored by Senators NELSON and GOODELL. Passage of their amendment would be an effective means of curtailing the use of herbicidal agents by the military in Vietnam.

Too little is known about the long range effects of these chemicals on the environment or on human beings to justify their continued use at this time. What little we do know about some of the chemicals being used in Vietnam has led to their being prohibited for civilian use in this country. Until these questions are more fully studied, it is in my view unthinkable that we would continue to inflict them upon the long suffering Vietnamese.

I intend to support the ratification of the Geneva protocol. Before taking a final position on all of its interpretations, however, I believe that the Senate should make a careful study of the complicated legal, technical, humanitarian questions involved. While this need not be as lengthy as the executive branch review of these same issues, there are many points of view which deserve to be heard and considered.

Finally, I wish to commend the President again for the decisions which he took last November and for the action which he has taken today. Together they have moved U.S. policy a considerable distance toward conformity with the remainder of the world community.

#### INDIAN AFFAIRS LEGISLATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last month President Nixon sent to the Congress a message on Indian affairs. This was a significant statement by our Nation's Chief Executive. It was a statement deserving of attention and, in many respects, deserving of praise.

It is too early to tell how much of the President's message will be rhetoric and how much will be turned into action. But it is encouraging to note that the administration has submitted to Congress three bills which would implement some of the President's recommendations.

On July 20, the Forum, the newspaper serving Fargo, N. Dak., Moorhead, Minn., and the surrounding areas, published an editorial analyzing the statement. The editorial succinctly summarized the key points of the message and recognized the significance of self-determination if the Indian is to progress beyond the state of poverty in which so many of our Nation's first citizens are forced to dwell.

I ask unanimous consent that the Forum's editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### NIXON'S MESSAGE IN INDIAN AFFAIRS CONTAINS PROPOSALS WHICH SHOULD BE ACTED UPON

President Nixon's message to Congress on Indian affairs contained recommendations which we hope are enacted into law.

Mr. Nixon's program can best be described as one of self-determination for the Indian. It condemns both paternalism and neglect in government policies. Mr. Nixon stated that Indians are "the most deprived and most isolated minority group in our nation." The chief executive stated that even the federal programs which are intended to meet the needs of Indians "have frequently proven to be ineffective and demeaning."

One of the nation's leading spokesmen on behalf of the Indian, Democratic Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota, had praise for the President's message. Mondale, a member of the Senate subcommittee on Indian education, has long been a champion of many of the reforms Mr. Nixon recommends.

The President asked Congress to renounce its previous endorsement of the "termination" policy which promoted the weakening and ultimate finish of the reservation system. Instead, Mr. Nixon would affirm that "the historic relationship" between Indians and the government cannot be abridged without Indian consent . . .

"Even as we reject the goal of forced termination, so must we reject the suffocating pattern of paternalism. We must assure the Indian that he can assume control of his own life without being separated involuntarily from the tribal group," said the President.

Mr. Nixon proposed that Indian tribes be empowered to take over the control or operation of present federally run programs if they choose without loss of federal funds.

For example, Johnson-O'Malley school aid would go directly to Indian tribes and communities as well as to public schools in order to prevent misuse of these funds. Many school districts, after receiving the Johnson-O'Malley Act federal funds for Indian education, have turned the money into the general fund, with Indians getting little benefit.

President Nixon, in his message, recognized the fact that many Indians are turning from rural to urban life, going to the cities where they are meeting special problems of unemployment and lack of social inaction. Mr. Nixon proposes to expand the operation of urban Indian centers, such as exist on a limited basis in Minneapolis and other large cities.

The President presented an impressive list of other measures which would help the Indian meet social, economic, education and health needs.

Throughout the message, the emphasis was on self-determination, giving the Indian the opportunity to live in dignity whether he chooses the reservation system or wants to enter the mainstream of American life.

The Indian himself has become more and more vocal for self-determination and participation. He wants some of the decision making power which too long has been in the hands of an impersonal bureaucracy.

With favorable action by Congress and new and eager leadership among the Indian population, perhaps we will see some strides which will help both the Indian who chooses to retain his tribal way of life, and the Indian who would rather integrate into the larger society of American life.

#### TAKING AGRICULTURE FOR GRANTED

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, sometimes it takes a catastrophe—a near disaster—to bring us to our senses—to bring us back in touch with reality.

Such is the case now with a serious blight affecting cornfields across the Nation.

Although exact figures are not yet available, apparently we are going to lose a substantial portion of the 1970 crop. Estimates of nationwide losses now range from as low as 10 percent to as high as 50 percent. In Illinois, last year's leading corn-producing State, the State department of agriculture estimates that fully one-fourth of the crop has been seriously damaged. We will not know the full extent of the damage until USDA surveys now underway have been completed.

I have discussed this problem with officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Educational Institute for Agriculture, a nonprofit organization which seeks better public understanding of farm issues, and I believe enough is known to draw some useful and important conclusions.

First—and this is foremost—American agriculture is being taken for granted; if nothing else, what has happened should alert us to this fact. U.S. agriculture is one of the real miracles of the modern age; farmers have broken record after record; and agriculture has become so dependable that the thought of going without needed food or fiber almost never occurs to anyone in this country any more.

A blight that may well ruin one-half of the largest crop our country produces—the largest both in terms of value and volume—is a very serious matter, yet in the larger sense it tells us just how lucky we really are.

In America even a 50-percent loss—a staggering figure by any standard—is not really a disaster. Anywhere else in the world it would be unthinkable.

In America we have combined research and reserve capacity to prevent the tragedies that occur elsewhere from natural causes.

Our extensive agricultural research facilities, and the people who man them, are the world's best—and given time, they will find a way to prevent damage from the fungus that is causing the current blight. And once the cure is found, our farmers will apply it immediately and effectively, because they know the value of research, and over the years have learned to utilize it well.

In America, the average citizen can afford to be unconcerned that severe shortages of basic products may occur—he does not need to race his neighbors to the nearest grocery store to stockpile staples to guard against an impending emergency—but only because adequate food and fiber reserves protect us all.

These reserves are made possible through our agricultural programs—the price support and acreage control system made available to farmers over the past 37 years. Today we have approximately 1.5 billion bushels of feed grains—corn, grain sorghum, oats, and so forth—in reserve. This is considered an adequate carryover between harvests. It will prevent what could have been a disaster from becoming just that.

I do not lightly dismiss the threat posed by the current corn blight. Obviously, serious disruption will occur as a matter of course in many major segments of American agriculture.

The effect on next year's corn plantings could be most dramatic of all.

But certainly, a sharp reduction in corn supplies will have immediate impact on the beef, poultry, and swine industries.

If feed costs rise—and they most likely will—meat prices will follow and reflect the increase.

I believe we will weather this adversity with a minimum of economic disruption, but only because our agricultural programs make it possible to plan for the unexpected.

These present circumstances also strongly underscore the need for adequate reserves as part of our total national food budget.

If we ignore the lessons of history—if we let supply outstrip demand—then we will plunge ourselves back into a serious oversupply situation. That is why 3 million farmers still need Government farm programs to gear output to meet demand—to maintain a reserve to meet just this type of emergency, yet avoid price depressing surpluses.

We hear many complaints about farm programs, especially from the standpoint of the costs involved. Actually, the costs to taxpayers have been minimal when compared to the benefits brought about as a result of expenditures on farm programs. In effect, these programs have subsidized the consumer to a greater extent than the farmer.

Anyone familiar with basic economics knows that buyers pay more when supplies are short, and that they pay less when there is too much; in agriculture, prices drop even when there is a slight abundance. Farm programs have assured the American consumer an abundance of food and fiber.

The costs have been small indeed—especially if compared to what can happen in a period of short supply.

The corn blight is a serious problem, but one that American agriculture can and will solve. The present situation serves to dramatize the fact that Americans have taken agriculture too much for granted—for too long.

#### THE SERVICE OF J. MARK TRICE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is indeed a privilege to join with many others in congratulating the Honorable J. Mark Trice on this unusual occasion. The fact that everyone calls him "Mark" indicates something about the fine character that he possesses. He is a friendly man. The Senators and Senate employees

like him. He is a man of humility. These are all desirable attributes.

We honor Mark at this time not just because he has served for 50 years. This indeed is a remarkable record in public service. A half a century in a particular activity is a long time. We do honor him because he has reached this milestone, but we also honor him because of the quality of the service that he has rendered throughout these years.

Mark has been a source of intelligent and dependable service for everyone who has turned to him. It has been my experience that when a question or request was directed to Mark, he responded with accuracy, thoroughness, and utmost fairness. His sincerity and his personal integrity, plus his competence, made it possible for all of us to totally rely upon him.

So at this time when we are honoring him for his unusual services, it should also be a time when we express our gratitude to him. I personally want to thank Mark for his kindness and help extended to me throughout the years. I am sure that there are many in our offices and employed elsewhere by the Senators who join me in this. This is especially true of the page boys. Mark is respected and admired by them. I know that he has the gratitude of all of them.

Mr. President, I shall leave to others the enumeration of the many events in Mark's life and the writing of the biography for him. I simply want to praise him for his devoted public service. Mrs. Curtis joins me in an expression of congratulations, gratitude, and best wishes to Mark, to Mrs. Trice, and to their daughter.

#### PROJECT SOC—SUCCESSFUL MDTA PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a very interesting training program here in Washington was described in the August 12, 1970, issue of the Los Angeles Times. This model program, Secretarial Opportunities Consortium or Project SOC, has succeeded in preparing disadvantaged young women, many of them high school dropouts, and many with undeveloped skills, for responsible jobs in the community. This goal is achieved not only by teaching basic clerical skills, but through a process of broadening the individual's total outlook; with an emphasis on providing new opportunities and productive careers.

I should like to bring this unique and highly successful program to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Saga of Lunch-Hour Tutor," be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE SAGA OF LUNCH-HOUR TUTOR (By Marlene Cimons)

WASHINGTON.—Two years ago Mary Wolf was working as a secretary in the White House, and she was bored. So during her lunch hours she began tutoring a young black girl who had dropped out of high school.

It was to be the beginning of a much larger project, although Mary Wolf didn't know it