

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 7

MARCH 13, 1972 TO MARCH 21, 1972

(PAGES 7961 TO 9418)

with the pragmatic reasons for expanding the size and authority of the White House staff and even for the President's decision to play the role not only of Secretary of State but even of ambassador, that does not mean that the practice is either sound or wise—or in the long-range interests of the country.

For, as the White House becomes more and more its own foreign office, the tone and responsiveness of the State Department will inevitably decrease. Nothing is more demoralizing for an ambassador on the spot than to have his responsibilities as a negotiator suddenly taken from him by a Presidential envoy, as was the case, for example, with our chief representative at the Vietnamese discussions in Paris, William J. Porter. Since Ambassador Porter, like his immediate predecessor, David K. E. Bruce, is fully competent to conduct the most delicate secret negotiations with the North Vietnamese—as Ambassador W. Averell Harriman had done at an earlier time—Mr. Kissinger's 12 hurried trips to Paris would appear quite unnecessary to put forward America's revised position and explore fully all possible chances of settlement.

Able men, with proper pride in their professional skills, will not long tolerate such votes of no confidence, so it should be no surprise that they are leaving the career service, making way for mediocrity, with the result that, as time goes on, it may be hopelessly difficult to restore the Department to the level of effectiveness required by the urgent problems of the day.

Yet the failure to undertake this important task can produce a number of unhappy developments—a falling level of competence in our overseas missions, thus reducing our ability to know and affect what is happening throughout the world; the impairment of our constitutional system of checks and balances as the Senate becomes increasingly restive at the concentration of foreign policy management in White House assistants immune from Congressional accountability; and uneven attention to situations of incipient danger because the White House staff is concentrating on certain active crises, while the State Department—nudged out of the mainstream of policy formulation—has lost its capacity for independent decision.

These are predictable results of the trend now visible. But in essence the most serious consequence is likely to be felt in the quality and coherence of a body of policy that becomes increasingly ingrown—less subjected to the critical scrutiny of specialists in Washington and our missions abroad and more and more the expression of a small, closed circle of people working under conditions of excessive insulation—conditions favorable for the intrusion of personal bias or prejudice that can interfere with objective judgment.

I note these dangers not in an alarmist mood, and certainly with no desire to be captious, for I understand the process which has led to our present predicament and I am sympathetic with the problems faced by any American Government in today's unstable environment. But it is imperative that we move quite deliberately to depersonalize the highly personal processes by which policy is now made and administered. This means enlarging the circle of those now in command of policy, restoring the responsibility and competence of the State Department, and reestablishing the role of our missions abroad as the effective agencies for negotiation. It means, in other words, returning control of the levers of our foreign-policy machinery from the Court to the Cabinet and substituting for summit diplomacy the effective employment of an improved and upgraded ambassadorial corps, capable of firm and skillful negotiations within broad lines of policy set by the President.

It is a formidable agenda, but by no means impossible.

BLOOD: A NATIONAL RESOURCE

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I share many of President Nixon's concerns and hopes as expressed in his recent health message to Congress. I am particularly pleased that he had singled out "blood" as one of the major initiatives for a new Federal-private partnership to stimulate research and development.

The need for a nationwide system of blood collection and distribution is all too evident. There is now a multiplicity of systems, not necessarily compatible or interchangeable, used in blood banking. There is, moreover, no nationally accepted system of recordkeeping. No one knows exactly how much blood is used, or needed, or collected, or wasted. No one knows the exact price of blood or the exact profits made from blood. And no one knows exactly how many cases of serum hepatitis are related to blood transfusions or how many deaths are related to serum hepatitis.

What is known is that the need for blood grows every year, that critical shortages of blood exist across the country, that contaminated blood can cause serum hepatitis which has no known cure and can cause death, that many commercial blood banks buy blood from convicts, derelicts, and addicts who dwell in the dirt and squalor of city slums and skid rows where the infectious agents of serum hepatitis flourish, and that many commercial blood banks import blood from medically underdeveloped countries such as Haiti, India, and the Dominican Republic.

To protect the American people from contaminated blood and from unnecessary death, Senator HARTKE and I have introduced the National Blood Bank Act to encourage the establishment of a voluntary system of blood donation, requiring the licensing and inspection of all blood banks. Identical legislation has been introduced in the House by Representative VEYSEY from California.

Recently, Representative ROGERS announced that his Public Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee will begin hearings on blood bank proposals within the next month. I hope that the Senate will soon hold similar hearings, as, using President Nixon's words, "Blood is a unique national resource," to which I might add, not a commodity to be bought and sold.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators BAKER, BEALL, CASE, HARRIS, HATFIELD, PASTORE, RANDOLPH, STEVENS, and TAFT be added as cosponsors of S. 2909, the National Blood Bank Act.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON BUSING

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in President Nixon's message on busing given last night, he clearly directed the Nation's efforts to where they belong—"on better education for all of our children rather than on more busing for some."

Virtually every expression of public opinion on the question of busing has made it clear that the American people do not believe that busing is the answer

to the problem of segregation. The moratorium proposed by the President would allay the fears of parents, both black and white, that their children will not be forced to attend schools that are miles from their homes; and it gives us, as Members of Congress, the chance to create a truly equal opportunity educational system.

The President made it clear that the time has come for us to make a national commitment to see that the schools in central cities are upgraded so the children who go there will have as good a chance to get the quality education as do the children who go to schools in the suburbs.

The proposed Equal Educational Opportunities Act would establish standards for all school districts throughout the Nation, insure against racial discrimination in school assignments, and establish the equal educational rights of all citizens regardless of color, language barriers, or financial status. It would also provide money and incentives to help insure for schools in poor neighborhoods the fair treatment they have too often been denied in the past, and provide the special learning assistance and extra attention that those children so often need.

A part of the national commitment for equal educational opportunities is the need to preserve the tradition of this country to have children attend the schools in their neighborhoods.

Clearly it is wrong when children are forced to spend 2 hours a day on a bus going to school when it would be possible for them to walk to a neighborhood school. For this reason, I believe that it was wise for the President to declare a moratorium on any new busing and make it possible for local school jurisdictions to have the cases that have been settled by the court reopened.

I think that it is also important to realize that in ordering the moratorium on busing to achieve a racial balance the President was in no way attempting to delay desegregation. He made it perfectly clear that being antibusing is not to be antiblack or anti-Mexican-American. It would be an injustice to concerned parents all over this country to label them as prejudiced because they want their children educated in their own neighborhoods. In fact, the growing opposition to busing from all races demonstrates that their reasons have little or nothing to do with the question of race.

Clearly, what the President has proposed is a program that will put an end to the ill-advised practice of busing to achieve racial balance and in its place insert a program that will guarantee to all the children of this country an equal education opportunity. I support him in his efforts and hope that Congress will seize the opportunity given us to demonstrate our commitment to the continued well-being of our Nation's children.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the equal rights amendment, I wish to spell out the reasons for my support.

We have made great strides in this country in recent decades toward eliminating the legal basis for discrimination against members of minority groups. But we still have a long way to go to provide the same protection to the majority of our population—the 51 percent who are women.

Although in some quarters the women's rights movement prompts only humor and cynicism, the concerns the movement addresses are neither funny nor trivial. Discrimination against women is a documented, proven fact in many aspects of American life and a cruel reality that mars the ambitions of untold numbers of American women.

In its study of the equal rights amendment, the Senate Judiciary Committee uncovered shameful evidence of discrimination against women in the areas of criminal and civil law, business and labor, military service, and education.

According to that report, there is a State in this country where a man can be sentenced to up to 30 days in jail for the crime of "habitual drunkenness." A woman can be sentenced for up to 3 years for the same crime.

In the field of education, the committee found many examples of sex discrimination. One of the most striking concerned the fact that the number of women applying to medical schools increased by more than 300 percent between 1929 and 1966. Applications from men in the same period went up only 29 percent. Yet the percentage of women applicants who were accepted into medical schools actually declined.

Employment statistics demonstrate that women often earn less than their male counterparts in many jobs. And in 1969, the committee found, 35 percent of male, full-time workers earned \$10,000 or more per year, while only 5 percent of women earned \$10,000 or more.

The Federal, State, and local civil services are among the offenders discriminating against women. In the U.S. Office of Education, here in Washington, men earn an average of twice as much annually as women.

Congress and the Federal Government have taken official note of some of these types of discrimination by passing laws and setting up machinery to deal with complaints. Earlier this month the Senate voted to outlaw sex discrimination in most phases of education. Also in this session of Congress, we have devised legislation that will give the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission the power to follow up its findings of sex discrimination with action.

I was proud to cosponsor these measures and other antidiscrimination and civil rights measures in Congress in other years. But it has become increasingly clear to me that a piecemeal approach to the fundamental question of providing equal rights is not enough. We could go on striking down archaic, discriminatory laws in our courts and State legislatures for years and years and still not complete the job. And as long as one discriminatory law stands, we cannot truly say that all human beings have equal rights in our society.

Passage of the equal rights amendment would ease forever any doubts about the commitment of this country

to justice for all of its citizens—women as well as men. Some argue that the "equal protection" clause of the 14th amendment of the Constitution provides all of the legal protection needed by women. Yet in 200 years the Supreme Court has not enunciated the application of the amendment to discrimination against women, except in one narrow case. We cannot expect the majority of our population to wait any longer to secure a basic guarantee of its rights.

Some opponents argue that passage of the amendment will force a merging of the sexes into a "unisex," that it will destroy the traditional relationships between men and women. None of these drastic developments is mandated by the amendment. Its enactment, I believe, will rather encourage us to be more sensitive, human individuals, cognizant of each others' differences but respectful of them.

I agree fully with the conclusions of Virginia Allen, Chairman of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, who wrote to the President in 1969:

Equality for women is unalterably linked to many broader questions of social justice . . . (What is needed) is a national commitment to basic changes that will bring women into the mainstream of American life. Such a commitment . . . is necessary to health, psychological, social and economic growth of our society.

THE LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE RETARDED

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an editorial published recently in the Washington Post on the legal rights of the retarded. The editorial describes a recent Federal court decision in Montgomery, Ala., ruling that the mentally retarded in institutions have a right to proper treatment and care.

I have stated time and again that the mentally and physically handicapped in our Nation are neglected citizens who, for the most part, have been denied the basic rights and privileges that you and I take for granted. Unequal job opportunities, unequal educational opportunities and exclusion from community life have virtually prevented many handicapped persons from achieving the dignity of self-fulfillment and self-support.

I find it highly encouraging that our Federal courts are beginning to define the basic rights of our handicapped. The Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) and I recognized the need for such action when we introduced legislation, S. 3044, to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit discrimination against the mentally and physically handicapped in all Federal programs.

I commend the recent Washington Post editorial to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1972]

THE LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE RETARDED

Accounts of gruesome and pitiful conditions in mental hospitals have been regularly reported in the press in recent months. Few

states are without their human warehouses where large numbers of the sick and retarded are allowed to be stacked indefinitely on shelves of despair and deprivation. In many places, perhaps even all, inhumanity to the retarded is not intentional nor the result of designed contempt; instead, the sorry treatment of so many proceeds from lack of money and lack of staff—traditionally the twin causes of institutional neglect.

The situation is grim but not entirely hopeless. A recent order by a federal court in Montgomery, Alabama, may mark the beginning of a new national attitude toward people who are mentally retarded. Judge Frank M. Johnson Jr. ordered state officials to correct conditions at the Partlow State School and Hospital at Tuscaloosa. The evidence seen by Judge Johnson "vividly and undisputably portrayed Partlow as a warehousing institution which, because of its atmosphere of psychological and physical deprivation, is wholly incapable of furnishing treatment to the mentally retarded and is conducive only to the deterioration and debilitation of residents."

In more personal terms, Harold E. Martin, editor and publisher of the Montgomery Advertiser-Journal wrote in his newspaper after a visit to the hospital: "I have covered wars and death in almost every kind of catastrophe during 30 years in the newspaper business but was totally unprepared for the horrors of an institution whose whole concern for the more severe cases is uncivilized and dehumanized custodial care . . ." Judge Johnson entered an interim order to correct immediately such things as fire hazards and unhealthful food, and to begin a disease immunization program. A March 31 deadline was issued for the hiring of 300 staff persons; this deadline has already been met. According to one observer, this is the first time a court has ever held that mentally retarded persons involuntarily confined in an institution have a right to adequate treatment and care.

The importance of this decision lies in the fact that not only has actual help been given to thousands of the retarded in Alabama, but that the decision may have a positive affect nationally. Other suits may be brought involving other hospitals. Already, a proposal has been made by the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Orthopsychiatric Association and the Center for Law and Social Policy—a Washington public interest law firm—to form a national council on the rights of the mentally impaired. Through test case litigation, the council would identify and implement the rights of the mentally ill and retarded. As the group notes, "mental impairment is more than just a health problem for our society. It is also a pressing legal problem. Despite their numbers, the mentally impaired are among our society's most abused minorities . . . The hospitals in which these persons are confined are often worse than prisons and the 'treatment' which is the purported justification for such confinement is often non-existent."

Successful court cases are an important and obviously much-needed way to guarantee the rights of the retarded. Ideally, states should not have to be forced to provide adequate treatment, but since legislative appropriations for mental health are often small, decisions like Judge Johnson's will become more and more crucial. It is also welcome news that mental health lawyers will be active.

POWERPLANTS AT CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, many articles have been written about the power generating plants being constructed in the Four Corners area as a part of the central Arizona project. Too often these articles have presented only