

U.S. Congress.  
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 7

MARCH 13, 1972 TO MARCH 21, 1972

(PAGES 7961 TO 9418)

procedures make it possible for all of these disarmament items to be discussed at any time.

Among the important resolutions adopted by the General Assembly is one concerning the convening of a World Disarmament Conference. The discussions revealed a broad interest in the holding of such a conference and led to a decision by acclamation to take immediate steps in order that careful consideration be given to convening, following adequate preparation, of a world disarmament conference open to all States. It would in my opinion be most fitting that a World Disarmament Conference be held at some early date, also in order to advance the common objectives of both the Disarmament Decade and the Second Development Decade. It is, of course, of prime importance, as the resolution itself indicates, that such a conference be the subject of the most careful preparation in order to ensure its success.

Mr. Chairman, while disarmament is of vital interest to all peoples and to every member of the United Nations, I share the oft-repeated view of my distinguished predecessor underlining the importance of the participation in disarmament negotiations of all the militarily most important States which as permanent members of the Security Council have—according to the Charter of the United Nations—primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in which progress in disarmament is such a vital element.

As far as the participation of China in disarmament negotiations is concerned, a new situation has been created by the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, its subsequent entry in the organization and participation in its various activities.

This new situation was reflected in the disarmament debates during the 26th session of the General Assembly during which a practically unanimous wish was expressed by those delegations which spoke on the subject underlining the desirability of the participation of China and France in disarmament negotiations.

I have thought it appropriate to bring these facts to the knowledge of the representatives of the Governments concerned.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that it is of paramount importance that China and France be associated with the disarmament negotiations. I hope that serious consideration would be given to this matter in order to ensure the participation of these two Powers in the disarmament negotiations.

During the Disarmament Decade all existing international treaties in the field of disarmament should be strengthened and fully implemented. I have already referred to the growing adherence to and support of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

Today we are only a few days away from the second anniversary of the entry into force of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In those two years, progress has been made in working out a Safeguards Agreement as required by Article III of the Treaty. As the previous chairman of the Safeguards Committee that succeeded in working out the Safeguards Agreement, I can share with you my satisfaction and appreciation of the good will and universal co-operation that was displayed by all involved in its deliberations. The efficient help and guidance given by the International Atomic Energy Agency was invaluable in reaching this agreement. It is essential that this spirit of international co-operation remain and be reinforced so as to facilitate the speedy and successful conclusion of negotiations on the Safeguards Agreement.

The report of the Secretary-General on the Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures was welcomed with satisfaction by the General Assembly, which recommended that the conclusions of the report should be taken into account in future disarmament negotiations.

The report underlined that the growing arms race not only puts human survival in jeopardy but, granted that humanity does manage to survive, it is also a cancerous threat to human welfare.

The report comes at a most opportune time. There is increasing evidence of a trend towards détente in international relations. The current political climate presents greater opportunities than ever before for additional agreements in the disarmament field. In these circumstances it would seem that nations can now at long last make a beginning in reordering their national and international priorities, so that their wealth and energy can be concentrated on the betterment rather than the possible destruction of life and society on this planet. The delegations present at this Conference have a most important function to perform in the fulfillment of this noble task.

I feel sure that all participants in this Conference will, in the year of its tenth anniversary, put forward their utmost efforts to deal with the full range of problems referred to the Conference by the General Assembly. I extend to all participants my most cordial wishes for the fullest success in their common endeavour.

The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (*translation from French*). I think I am interpreting your feelings in expressing to the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, our most sincere thanks for the interesting statement he has just made to us. We have listened attentively, Sir, to your clear and carefully thought-out remarks and to your words of encouragement. They will remain in our memories throughout the effort we shall be making to work out concrete and substantial measures of disarmament.

On behalf of us all, I should like to express our deep gratitude for this demonstration of sympathy and interest which you have made by your presence and by your statement.

Now I declare that we have finished the open part of this meeting. After a suspension of five minutes, the Committee will resume its work in closed meeting.

#### U.S. CUSTODY OF MARINE RESOURCES ON THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of Maine relating to U.S. custody of marine resources on the Continental Shelf.

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

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PETITIONING THE HONORABLE WILLIAM P. ROGERS, SECRETARY OF STATE, AND THE MAINE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION FOR U.S. CUSTODY OF MARINE RESOURCES ON THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Whereas, the living resources found in the waters adjacent to the State of Maine and associated with the continental shelf and slope of the United States are essential to the seafood needs of the State of Maine and the nation; and

Whereas, these living marine resources are gravely endangered from unrestrained harvesting and fishing; and

Whereas, the United States, because it lacks adequate jurisdiction over all domestic and foreign fishing in the area in which these resources are found, is unable to provide proper protection and management for the conservation of these living marine resources; and

Whereas, the State of Maine has traditionally depended upon its commercial fish-

ing industry for a major portion of its coastal income; and

Whereas, the State of Maine believes that, because of a further decline in the fish stocks in this area as a result of continued heavy fishing pressures by foreign distant waters fleets, the living marine resources are in danger of critical depletion; and

Whereas, the State of Maine is convinced that the harvesting of these living marine resources on a sustained basis can be continued only if a greater measure of jurisdiction is given to coastal authorities; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That we, the Members of the 105th Legislature of the State of Maine now assembled in special session, go on record as petitioning the Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary of State for the United States, and members of the Maine Congressional Delegation to use every effort at their command to establish a legal basis so that the United States shall become the custodian of all living marine resources on the continental shelf and its slope, including all such living resources in the water column above the continental shelf and its slope, so that these resources may be harvested in a manner which would provide proper conservation and wise utilization; and that in addition to such management, the United States would have the rights to the preferential control and use of such living marine resources on the bottom and in the water column above the continental shelf and its slope as is now provided for the nonliving resources of this area; and that such fishery jurisdiction be qualified to permit controlled harvesting inside said United States fishery zone of species not fully utilized by United States vessels; and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this Resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State of the State of Maine, be transmitted forthwith by him to said Secretary of State of the United States and to each member of the Maine Congressional Delegation with our thanks for their prompt attention to this vitally important matter.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, an incisive review of the long history of the civil rights struggle in America, written by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, was published in the *New Leader*, of February 21, 1972.

Senator HUMPHREY correctly identifies the crucial role of the President in advancing or delaying the Nation's movement toward the establishment of genuine equal opportunity for all Americans. In his article, entitled "Civil Rights and Executive Commitment," Senator HUMPHREY concludes that the present administration has yet to demonstrate a genuine commitment to the quest for civil rights and full opportunity.

Senator HUMPHREY suggests a social action program to get America back on the road to equal opportunity where every possible effort is made by the Federal Government. It is a program that would assure affirmative compliance with our civil rights laws, provide effective assistance for self-help community economic development programs, rebuild our cities, and develop new growth centers in rural America—all designed to give every American genuine equality of opportunity.

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

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINKING ALOUD: CIVIL RIGHTS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITMENT

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Is President Nixon trying to create a new climate for civil rights, a second post-Reconstructionist era in which the pains of the past decades will be cast aside? Judging from the political ebb and flow of the past three years, one would have to say Yes. The Administration has unflinchingly straddled civil rights issues; even the most liberal Republicans have found their zeal chilled by Presidential memoranda warning that their heads will roll if they seek to enforce existing statutes. "Watch what we do, not what we say" has been the official password, and in some instances the admonition has proven not without merit. Yet on the whole, little has been said and less done.

Although the Declaration of Independence held it to be a self-evident truth that all men are created equal, Richard Nixon is not our first national leader to compromise that ideal for political considerations. Some historians argue that Thomas Jefferson, for example, wanted the Declaration to censure George III for emasculating the "most sacred rights of life and liberty of a distant people, who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere." As Jefferson succinctly pointed out, however, this provision was not inserted because it might have offended the North, where "people had very few slaves themselves, yet . . . had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others." Throughout the history of our quest for civil rights, progress has been blocked by the tacit agreement that only he who is without sin may cast a stone.

Immediately following the Civil War, radical Reconstructionism was imposed on the South; but in a decade it gave way to a general weariness about the rights of black Americans, and once again reality fell short of ideal. President Grant finally complained that "the whole public are tired out with these annual autumnal outbreaks in the South, and the great majority are ready now to condemn any interference on the part of the Government." When Northern liberalism acceded to the Compromise of 1877, we began the long retreat during which, as C. Vann Woodward observed, "at no time were the sections very far apart on race policy." Education, voting, public transportation, decent housing, employment—all became legally the exclusive preserve of whites. William Graham Sumner and the Darwinian sociological tribe soon confirmed American prejudices by "proving" that "legislation cannot make mores" nor "stateways change folkways." No one, we were informed in Congress, can legislate morality.

Not until the time Franklin Delano Roosevelt did the mass of Negroes begin to move out of the backwaters and slowly into the mainstream of national life. Under Harry Truman, who told his Committee on Civil Rights that "I want our Bill of Rights implemented in fact," the Presidential commitment to equal opportunity matched that of the Declaration. Except for military desegregation, unfortunately, Truman did not see his dreams carried out in his tenure. Yet his stand was so firm that four deep South states defected from the Democratic camp in 1948.

During the Eisenhower era straddling on civil rights became the Executive norm, despite the leadership exercised by the Supreme Court from the 1954 Brown decision onward. The lesson we all learned was that if decisions of the courts are not actively supported by appropriate administrative agencies, the sores of racial injustice are inevitably rubbed raw.

Fortunately, in the '50s several developments were conspiring to put Jim Crow behind us. The modern civil rights movement,

inspired by the courage of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., was helping Americans to accept the Negro not simply as a Negro but as a fellow human being. His nonviolent vision captured all of us when, echoing St. Paul, he cried out to his followers: "You may even give your body to be burned, and die the death of a martyr, and your spilled blood may be a symbol of honor for generations yet unborn, and thousands may praise you as one of history's supreme heroes; but even so, if you have no love, your blood is spilled in vain."

At the same time, America was increasingly realizing that it had a "white problem" too. Once this recognition took hold, pressure mounted on Congress to enact needed changes. After 1956, a great part of the legislative leadership in the area of civil rights and social welfare came from a generally unnoticed source—the Democratic Study Group. Formalized out of Minnesota Representative Eugene "McCarthy's Mavericks," this ad hoc body developed a broad social and economic platform, much of which became the law of the land under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. And over in the Senate a strong corps of Republicans and Democrats was also coalescing around key issues, leading in 1957 and 1960 to the first of the modern civil rights bills. Their limitations notwithstanding, these measures helped create the lawmaking momentum of the '60s.

With John Kennedy's leadership on civil rights, America could no longer turn back. True, his Administration offered few legislative initiatives at first and sometimes was also compelled to straddle in order to ease its programs through Congress. But when the crunch came and the nation had to know just where he stood, President Kennedy left no doubt. Responding to the racial violence in Birmingham and elsewhere in the South, he said: "Let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right."

President Kennedy's death triggered the flood of civil rights and social legislation worked through Congress by President Johnson; ambivalence on equality became a historical and political anachronism. While black, brown and red Americans still trail white in most economic and social measures of success, and free social relations among the races remains a goal envisioned but unachieved, minority progress since 1960 has been truly revolutionary. Legal barriers to integration have generally fallen and housing, jobs, income, and education have improved dramatically. The country has good cause for hope—provided we recognize that America's problem, to cite Archibald MacLeish's formulation, is "not to discover our national purpose but to exercise it."

A President out of tune with history, as Richard M. Nixon has been, might attempt to return us to the social complacency of the past, and in limited ways he might succeed. But history does not stand still, even for Presidents. Our nation simply will not long support attempts to sidetrack the quest for civil rights and full opportunity.

The two essential ingredients of the Nixon recipe for civil rights seem to be (1) code words such as "strict constructionism" and "forced integration" to slow down Federal efforts against racial discrimination, and (2) reliance on welfare reform and revenue sharing to improve the lives of the urban poor. These have been mixed into a political stew called the "Southern strategy."

Some uses of the first ingredient are well known—e.g., Attorney General John Mitchell's 1969 confrontation with the Supreme Court over desegregating Mississippi's schools. Even legal novices realized this ploy would merely transfer responsibility for Fed-

eral civil rights leadership from the Executive Branch, where Congress had placed it in 1964, to the Court, which has few instruments to integrate urban schools, higher education, the nation's 25,000 nursing homes, and so forth. The President subsequently produced his 8,000-word legal brief on school desegregation, promising no busing, and his June 1971 message on equal housing. Whatever their intentions, these statements were interpreted as a pledge to keep blacks in their place. Of course, neither statement reflected "strict constructionism" or "law and order," but rather a defiance of the affirmative compliance provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the 1968 Act. The public should not have been surprised when Nixon Supreme Court nominees were marked by inadequate judicial qualifications or actions connoting bigotry.

Meanwhile, the President has allowed the second ingredient, his plans for revenue sharing and welfare reform, to be consigned to the limbo of neglect. In his eloquent farewell to the Administration, Daniel P. Moynihan forecast precisely this result, pointing to the persistent inability of the White House to develop a second- and third-order advocacy of its priorities. Although Moynihan did not mean for his remarks to be so construed, they leave a distinct impression of the Executive's gross mismanagement of its own initiatives. And when this mismanagement of programs was extended to a massive mismanagement of the economy, the cause of legal and social justice suffered a sizable setback.

Lyndon Johnson used to remind us that we have only one President at a time and that he deserves at least our sympathy and respect for trying. Richard Nixon, for all his failures, did try to achieve progress in employment, welfare reform and revenue sharing. Unfortunately, these efforts seem to be headed nowhere. In his dramatic August 1971 address to the nation on economic reforms, the harsh reality became clear: The President's bungling of the economy for three years forced him to ask Congress "to amend my proposals to postpone the implementation of revenue sharing for three months and welfare reform for one year."

Several years ago Harry Golden observed that "noble Southerners have raised their voices against immorality and injustice but have remained mute about racial segregation because to condemn it made them traitors." But in today's South economic and social questions—which cannot be answered by rhetoric—are evidently larger than racial ones. Moreover, as John S. Nettles, Vice Chairman of the Alabama NAACP, told the Washington Post, the South is "dealing with a new nigger now—a black man who is no longer afraid."

President Nixon's Southern strategy might have succeeded in the South of 10 years ago, when only 1.5 million black citizens were registered to vote. Now the number has reached 3.6 million, and the white community is turning its back on the past. (In this new South, the Republican Governor of Virginia—once the home of "massive resistance"—"respectfully" disagrees with the President and urges Virginians not to resist court-ordered busing!) Indeed, the new South is increasingly facing the same problems as the rest of the country.

Should his new economic course pay off, Nixon may still check inflation and create more jobs, goals that eluded him during his first three years in office. But even if he achieves these goals, he will surely have done little to improve the quality of life for the poor—black, Spanish-speaking, Indian, or white.

What, then, must the Democrats do to get America back on the road to equal opportunity? We must develop a social action program that can be implemented if our candidate gains the Presidency.

First, we must pledge to enforce the statutes already on the books. As the U.S. Civil Rights Commission conclusively demonstrated in 1970, there has been a massive breakdown in Federal execution of existing legislation, a situation that is continuing to grow worse. Similarly, we must promise that affirmative compliance with existing civil rights laws by state and local governments will be a routine condition for receiving all Federal financial assistance, including funds returned in any revenue-sharing plan.

Second, Democrats ought to promote the cause of equal opportunity by expanding Federal monetary and technical assistance to minority enterprises and to financing institutions, as well as to community self-help programs. Federal projects like "Model Cities," now tottering after three years of the Nixon Administration, must be strengthened. In addition, renewal and development plans for our metropolitan centers must be made to include lower- and moderate-income housing with good public facilities and services. Since housing opportunities and public transportation in suburban locations are limited, jobs in these areas are effectively denied to underemployed and unemployed residents of the inner city. Principal HUD officials have stressed that income discrimination in housing affects more whites than blacks, but one would never guess this to be true from the President's pronouncements on the matter. Furthermore, we should create a National Domestic Development Bank (as proposed in legislation I recently introduced) to provide the funds to restore our decaying cities.

Third, although our urban problems remain the most serious obstacle to equal opportunity, the Congress has committed this nation to promoting a "sound balance between rural and urban America." To fulfill this mandate, we need to encourage rural capital development that would create new regionalized growth centers in the American economy. These will ease the pressures—economic, environmental, social, and fiscal—generated by the concentration of 70 per cent of our people on 2 per cent of the land.

Raymond Aron has argued that America's civil rights problem is "tragic, because Negroes and whites, despite their theoretical loyalty to Americanism and its values, have remained socially so alien they may perhaps be tempted to formalize their separation at the very moment they achieve the right and ability to become united." Rigid separation would certainly be a tragic outcome to our historical quest for civil rights and full opportunity. No doubt there will always be significant cultural and social differences among us. But that does not excuse us from the struggle to achieve the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all. To accept anything less would be a violation of the ideals that gave birth to our country.

#### CANCELLATION OF U.S. AID TO BANGLADESH

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, after telling Congress and the American people that "all of us can be proud of the administration's record" in committing \$158 million in aid to the Bengali people, the administration has reluctantly revealed that \$97 million of those commitments were canceled. These statistics confirm earlier findings of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees.

But what pride can there be in a record of nondeliveries, bureaucratic delays, and inefficiency in allocating humanitarian assistance for the Bengali people, whose needs were—and remain—great?

Mr. President, the administration has a sorry record in responding to human needs in Bangladesh. They have oversold

and overannounced their program. A look at the record reveals a clear contrast between rhetoric and performance. Whether this is double talk, incompetence, or both, the administration has seriously misled the Congress and the American people on the release of humanitarian aid to the people of Bangladesh.

The record is clear that there remain today massive humanitarian needs in Bangladesh, and that three international appeals for relief assistance have not been answered in any meaningful way by this administration. The Congress has appropriated \$200 million for Bangladesh relief needs, yet we read dispatches from the field that tell us that relief programs of the United Nations have been canceled and stymied because of the lack of American contribution. And so in desperation, the Bangladesh Government is turning instead to the Soviet Union. Should we be proud of the fact that the Russians are proving themselves to be more responsive and efficient in humanitarian assistance than the United States?

It becomes clearer every day that America's failure to recognize Bangladesh is standing in the way of America's ability to respond to the human needs of the Bengali people. The Congress recognized these needs months ago, and has provided funds that this administration must use now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD recent press and academic articles on the crisis in Bangladesh and America's response to it.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1972]  
WEST HESITATES, DACCA GIVES PORT JOB TO SOVIETS

(By William J. Drummond)

DACCA.—The Soviet navy has taken a major step toward extending its influence in the waters surrounding the Indian subcontinent, taking advantage of the inability of Western countries to come up with \$6 million to finance salvage operations.

After waiting for more than two months for the West, acting through the United Nations, to clear sunken vessels from the ports of Chalna and Chittagong, Bangladesh Prime Minister Sheikh Mujibur Rahman gave the Russians permission to do the work.

Thirty hours later, United Nations headquarters in New York came through with approval for its representatives here to accept bids for the work. By then, it was too late.

The Soviet vessels were already under sail, and although it is understood that the Sheikh would like to cancel the invitation, he cannot, for diplomatic reasons.

Some neutral diplomatic sources here think that the Russian salvage fleet is the precursor of an extensive Russian naval presence in the Bay of Bengal.

The Russians will be able to chart every mile of the vast waterways of Bangladesh and will gain an important supply foothold to complement the growing Soviet naval presence in the Indian Ocean, according to these sources.

Other sources dispute this contention, pointing out that the larger of the two ports, Chittagong, cannot accommodate a vessel larger than a destroyer and would require extensive work before it could become a useful facility for ships of the line of the Soviet fleet.

Furthermore, these sources say, it seems unlikely that Mujib would tolerate full-fledged Soviet bases since the prime minister has proclaimed his country to be "The Switzerland of Asia."

In addition, India, the Soviet Union's major ally in the region, is committed to keeping the area free of the navies of the big powers.

Whether or not the Soviet Union gains a base, diplomatic sources of all persuasions say, its undertaking of the salvage operation is a significant step that will further heighten its political influence in Bangladesh.

The granting of the salvage job to the Soviet Union was a natural outgrowth of the delays characterizing Western relief operations in Bangladesh, most of which are channeled through the United Nations Relief Operations Dacca (UNROD).

In early January, UNROD informed headquarters in New York that clearing the ports of vessels sunk during the December war was an item of the highest priority. Even in the best of times Bangladesh imports more than a million tons of foodgrains a year, and with the ports blocked to normal shipping, a food shortage in the hinterland was bound to develop, UNROD said.

A Singapore firm was asked to provide a cost estimate for the work and the figure came to \$6 million, which UNROD asked New York to supply.

Each day the food shortage upcountry became more severe. Rahman went to Moscow for an official visit, during which the Russians offered to clear the ports. Mujib did not give an answer immediately.

Mujib returned to Dacca on March 6, inquiring immediately whether the ports would be cleared by the U.N.

No approval had come. He waited until March 9 before accepting the Soviet offer to do the salvage job.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 17, 1972]

#### FOOD CRISIS GROWS IN BANGLADESH

DACCA, BANGLADESH.—The head of the United Nations relief program in Bangladesh said yesterday that the country is "heading for disaster" because of a food shortage and lack of response to a U.N. money appeal. He forecast food riots "a few weeks from now."

"Bangladesh has been a playground for charitable hobbies," said Toni Hagen, the Swiss director for U.N. relief operations in Dacca.

"You can't build bridges with baby food and you can't transport food with blankets," he told a news conference.

Bottlenecks in Bangladesh ports receiving rice and wheat shipments from abroad are so great that the shipments have virtually halted. The distribution delay stems from congestion in port warehouses, according to U.N. officials.

Erna Seiliver, Austria's ambassador to India and head of a special U.N. team surveying relief, said she had cabled the U.N.'s secretary-general, Kurt Waldheim, requesting \$100 million worth of Red Cross goods to combat supply bottlenecks.

United Nations officials report that 229,000 tons of food grain—a six-week supply—is backed up in the ports, unable to move inland because of disrupted communications and lack of transport. Another 66,000 tons of grain is in government warehouses in the interior, where the bulk of the new nation's 75 million people live.

The relief officials say 11,143 tons of wheat from Switzerland and the United States, and 18,300 tons of rice from the U.S. is all that is scheduled to arrive in the ports of Chittagong and Chalna in the next 90 days. With the officials hoping to keep at least 150,000 tons of grain moving each month, this 29,443 tons will amount to only a 10 days' supply. There has been slow response to a worldwide appeal three weeks ago for \$626 million in aid for Bangladesh.

Mr. Hagen has met Prime Minister Mujibur