UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 27

NOVEMBER 26, 1969, TO DECEMBER 4, 1969

(PAGES 35895 TO 37182)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1969

The Geneva protocol is now binding on 62 nations, including every nuclear power, and member of the NATO and Warsaw pacts except the United States. The United States has continually been discredited at international discussions for our failure to ratify this treaty.

I would hope that the Senate would listen to the President and would support him by ratifying the Geneva protocol.

Americans are continually talking about man's humane treatment to his fellow man; yet we alone of the major powers have refused to sign a document which asks nations of the world not to engage in the horrors of a chemical and biological war. It is time we take a right and responsible position for ourselves and for the world and ratify this treaty.

CHEMICAL-BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the announcement by President Nixon that the United States will bar germ warfare and destroy its stockpile of bacteriological weapons deserves our sincere praise and the thanksgiving of the American people. His further proposal that our Government commit itself against the first use of lethal gas—as well as incapacitating chemicals—places the responsibility squarely upon the Senate to take up the Geneva Protocol without delay upon resubmission by the administration.

The President's decision to limit American bacteriological warfare programs to research on defensive measures offers the promise that this gruesome anachronism is on the way to being eliminated. The President rightly described such weapons as being "repugnant to the conscience of mankind." The global consequences of the employment of bacteriological agents bear no relationship to the objectives of military conflict and clearly demonstrate the ultimate insanity of war.

It remains to be seen what interpretation will be given by the Defense Department to "defensive measures." Our Government has long held that CBW programs were solely for defensive purposes. Moreover, clarification is needed of a statement of Col. Lucien Winegar, deputy commanding officer at Fort Detrick, Md., that it would be "fair to assume" that Detrick will continue to produce dangerous organisms that could be used offensively, since any defense against biological weapons involves production of harmful agents that are potentially available to an enemy—Washington Post, November 26, 1969.

With regard to chemical warfare, the Senate must investigate whether the present use by U.S. forces in Vietnam of a concentrated form of tear gas and defoliants would be in violation of the 1925 Geneva Agreement. A statement by a White House source that it would not be necessary to relinquish these agents reportedly has been strongly disputed by many of the present 88 signatories of this protocol.

Almost 4 months ago I joined Senate colleagues in offering a resolution—Senate Resolution 228— urging the President to resubmit the 1925 Geneva Protocol against CBW for the Senate's advice and consent to ratification. I said then that the United States must put itself on record, formally and through the proper international documents, as opposing the first use of these terrible weapons. The then-current viewpoint of the Secretary of Defense, which I strongly opposed, was that the United States must continue to develop its CBW forces simply to keep up with other nations. The same logic has been applied to our nuclear forces, most recently to defend the development of ABM and MIRV—which could result in an uncontrolled arms race that will threaten the continued existence of mankind.

Let us hope that the President's announcement reflects a deeper insight, a new wisdom that can start the nations of the world on the road to a genuine peace. The control and reduction of the weapons of our mass destruction is the all-important first step, and requires that calculated initiatives be taken by the United States, possessing the greatest military power the world has known.

VETO POWER OF GOVERNORS OVER THE OEO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on November 13, 1969, more than 80 deans of law schools throughout the United States signed a statement in opposition to the Senate amendment giving Governors a veto over OEO's legal services program. It is their fear that this amendment would not only interfere with traditional independence of the legal profession, but would also have a detrimental effect on legal education.

I am particularly proud of the fact that the organizer of this petition was Dean William B. Lockhart, of the University of Minneosta Law School. Dean Lockhart, who is serving as president of the Association of American Law Schools, has been one of the most outspoken advocates of quality legal services for the poor.

Since law school deans play such a major role in the training of future lawyers, I think that Senators should know of their strong opposition to any effort to cripple the legal services program. I therefore ask unanimous consent that their petition and names be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF LAW SCHOOL DEANS

We concur with the resolution adopted on October 18, 1969, by the Board of Governors of the American Bar Assocation and the action of the Judicial Conference of the United States at its meeting on November 1, 1969, and voice our opposition to the amendment to S. 3016 which would give State governors a veto over legal services programs.

As law school deans we are concerned with the possibility of interference with the attorney-client relationship and the traditional independence of the legal profession. We are especially concerned with the effect that this amendment may have on legal education and the development of a sense of professional responsibility among law students to participate in programs providing meaningful legal services to the disadvantaged.

NOVEMBER 13, 1969.

Samuel H. Hesson, Albany Law School, Union University.

B. J. Tennery, Washington College of Law, American University.

Willard H. Pedrick, Arizona State University College of Law.

Ralph C. Barnhart, University of Arkansas School of Law.

Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Boston College Law School.

Paul M. Siskind, Boston University School of Law.

Edward C. Halbach, Jr., Univ. of California School of Law, Berkeley.

Edward L. Barrett, Univ. of California School of Law, Davis.

Arthur M. Sammis, Univ. of California, Hastings College of Law.

Robert K. Castetter, California Western School of Law of the U.S. International University.

Clinton E. Bamberger, Jr., Catholic University of America School of Law.

Phil C. Neal, University of Chicago Law School.

William F. Zacharias, Chicago-Kent College of Law.

Samuel S. Wilson, University of Cincinnati College of Law.

James K. Gaynor, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Cleveland State University.

Howard R. Sacks, University of Connecticut School of Law.

James A. Doyle, Creighton University School of Law.

Robert B. Yegge, University of Denver College of Law.

Robert G. Weclew, De Paul University College of Law.

Brian G. Brockway, University of Detroit School of Law.

A. Kenneth Pye, Duke University School of Law.

Ben F. Johnson, Emory University School of Law.

William Hughes Mulligan, Fordham University School of Law.

Adrian S. Fisher, Georgetown University Law Center.

Robert Kramer, National Law Center, George Washington University.

Lindsey Cowen, University of Georgia School of Law.

Lewis H. Orland, Gonzaga University School of Law.

Derek C. Bok, Harvard University Law School.

Malachy T. Mahon, Hofstra University School of Law.

Paul E. Miller, Howard University School of Law.

Albert R. Menard, Jr., University of Idaho College of Law.

John E. Cribbet, University of Illinois College of Law.

Cleon H. Foust, Indiana University, Indianapolis Law School.

David H. Vernon, University of Iowa College of Law.

Lawrence E. Blades, University of Kansas School of Law.

William Lewis Matthews, Jr., University of Kentucky College of Law.

William L. Lamey, Loyola University School of Law, Chicago.

Leo J. O'Brien, Loyola University School of Law, Los Angeles.

Marcel Garsaud, Jr., Loyola University School of Law, New Orleans.

Edward S. Godfrey, University of Maine School of Law.

Robert F. Boden, Marquette University Law School.

William P. Cunningham, University of Maryland School of Law.

Frederick D. Lewis, University of Miami School of Law.

William B. Lockhart, University of Minnesota Law School.
Patrick D. Kelly, University of Missouri—Kansas City, School of Law.
Robert E. Sullivan, University of Montana School of Law.
Henry M. Grether, Jr., University of Nebraska College of Law.
Thomas W. Christopher, University of New Mexico School of Law
William H. Angus, State University of New York at Buffalo School of Law.
Robert B. McKay, New York University School of Law.
DeJarman LeMarquis, North Carolina Central University School of Law.
Robert K. Rushing, University of North Dakota School of Law.
John Ritchie, Northwestern University School of Law.
Eugene N. Hanson, Ohio Northern University College of Law.
Ivan C. Rutledge, Ohio State University College of Law.
Ted Foster, Oklahoma City University Law School.
Eugene F. Scoles, University of Oregon School of Law.
Jefferson B. Fordham, University of Pennsylvania Law School.
John J. Murphy, St. John's University School of Law.
Richard J. Childress, St. Louis University School of Law.
Joseph A. Sinclitico, Jr., University of San Diego School of Law
William J. Riegger, University of San Francisco School of Law.
Leo A. Huard, University of Santa Clara School of Law.
John P. Loftus, Seton Hall University School of Law.
James B. Adams, University of South Dakota School of Law.
Dorothy W. Nelson, University of Southern California Law Center.
Bayless A. Manning, Stanford University School of Law.
Richard T. Dillon, Stetson University College of Law.
Robert W. Miller, Syracuse University College of Law.
Harold C. Warner, University of Tennessee College of Law.
W. Page Keeton, University of Texas School of Law.
Richard B. Amandes, Texas Tech University School of Law.
Karl Krastin, University of Toledo College of Law.
Samuel D. Thurman, University of Utah College of Law.
John W. Wade, Vanderbilt University School of Law.
Harold G. Reuschlein, Villanova University School of Law.
Monrad G. Paulsen, University of Virginia School of Law.
John E. Howe, Washburn University of Law.
Hiram H. Lesar, Washington University School of Law.
Charles W. Joiner, Wayne State University Law School.
Paul L. Selby, Jr., West Virginia University College of Law.
Spencer L. Kimball, University of Wisconsin Law School.
Frank J. Trelease, University of Wyoming College of Law.
Louis H. Pollak, Yale Law School.

HOUSING NEEDS OF SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) recently spoke to the convention of the American Association of Homes for the Aging in St. Louis. His address included a thorough analysis of the housing needs of our senior citizens, the problems encountered in meeting these needs, the inadequacy of government programs in this area, and suggestions for future constructive action by private groups and government officials to meet the housing, health and welfare requirements of our senior citizens.

Senator Moss has served with distinction on the Special Committee on Aging and is currently chairman of the Subcommittee on Long-Term Care. Thus this message merits serious attention by all of us concerned with the well-being of our senior citizens. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

(By Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah)

FUTURE TRENDS IN LONG-TERM CARE

My friends of the American Association of Homes for the Aging. It is a pleasure for me to be here at this Eighth Annual Convention and Meeting. As you know, I have participated in your programs before but I feel particularly honored to be asked to be your keynote speaker.

At this convention today we turn our attention to the future. We hope to identify problems and consider solutions. We seek to improve the programs and institutions serving our senior citizens.

The primary emphasis of my speech today will be problems in the area of long-term care. That these problems are important is obvious from the facts.

The National Council of Senior Citizens reports that there are some 25 thousand nursing homes in this country. Ninety percent of these homes are operated for profit and they house about a million Americans.

Since the inception of medicare's extended care provisions there has been a tremendous expansion of these facilities. Medicaid paid for $1.1 billion in nursing home care last year and medicare added another $500 million.

Two out of every three dollars received by nursing homes reportedly comes from state or federal taxes.

Nursing homes are a recent development in the field of medical care. There are some excellent homes such as the St. Joseph's Manor in Trumbull, Connecticut, and Golden Acres in Dallas, Texas. Nursing homes, however, have a bad image, possibly because statistically 25 percent of their patients die within six months after admissions.

Nursing homes have become big business. They provide emploment for thousands of people. They merit the solicitous concern of shareholders, doctors, druggists, ambulance drivers, and food and linen services.

I am here to tell you of the government's interest. Simply stated it is: the highest standard of care for the elderly at the lowest possible cost.

RESTORATION OF THE 202 DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM

Before proceeding with my discussion of the needs in the area of long-term care, I would like to spend a few moments discussing the section 202 program. As you know, this section provides direct loans at low rates of interest to non-profit organizations providing homes for the elderly.

There has been some difference of opinion as to the status of this program and I will give you a report in some detail.

Early in the year the administration indicated its policy against direct loans by the Government. It was said that these loan programs place the Government into competition with private money-lending establishments.

But the 202 program had been one of our most effective and efficient housing programs. Non-profit sponsors had learned the procedures and had begun to develop a sizable volume of projects until the program was sharply interrupted by a housing and urban development policy which in effect required conversion of all 202 projects to section 236 financing upon completion. This abrupt termination was the result of a misunderstanding of the 1968 legislation which authorized section 202 sponsors to convert to section 236 on a *voluntary* basis, not on a *mandatory* basis.

Little if any accurate information was given about the deletion of the 202 program. An inquiry to housing and urban development still brings the response that the program is alive but that the use of section 236 is *encouraged* because the appropriations for section 202 have been extinguished. Significantly, in the recently announced reorganization of that department, the 235 and 236 programs were cited as coming under the jurisdiction of the assistant secretary for housing production and mortgage credit, but no mention was made of the 202 program.

Congress responded to the public outcry that followed the decision to delete the 202 program. Congress reaffirmed and clarified its support of the direct loan program in the strongest language possible in the 1969 housing bill. The conferees have not yet reached agreement but the house bill authorized $150 million for the coming year while $80 million a year for three years was authorized in the Senate for the 202 program.

I count this as an important victory even though we must still work hard to insure that Congress follows up on its authorization with the requisite appropriations.

So much for 202. If my address seems fragmented it is because I wish to touch several points without unduly extending the length of my talk.

MODEL CITIES FUNDS CUT AND THE NEED FOR DEMONSTRATION NURSING HOMES

I very much regret the $215 million dollar cut in model cities funds this year. The New York Times reported this cut in terms of a slow-down and stretch-out of the program.

In our recent hearings on the usefulness of the model cities program to the elderly, I questioned the administration's representative about the cuts. Mr. Robert Baida, deputy for model cities and Government relations had this to say:

"I believe that the cut is really more apparent than real . . . Now with respect to the charge that there has been a slow-down or stretch-out of the program, the administration must take a certain responsibility for the length of time in reviewing the model cities program."

I suggest that the cut in model cities funds was both apparent *and* real. I firmly believe that State and local officials should be able to rely on the information and commitments that they receive from the Federal Government without equivocation.

Let me also suggest that the innovation that has been the hallmark of the model cities program should be utilized to advantage within the sphere of long-term care.

Private and non-profit homes have always been the leaders in the field of providing improvements in the care of the aged. I would hope that it is possible to build a number of demonstration or model nursing homes to develop techniques that can be employed in future homes.

NEED FOR PROPER REGULATIONS FOR HIGHER STANDARDS OF SKILLED CARE

As we continue to list the needs that exist in the area of long-term care, I would immediately ask for effective regulations in implementation of my amendment to Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

As you will recall, last June the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced their so-called interim standards,