

UNITED STATES



U.S. CONGRESS

OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 30

NOVEMBER 2, 1971 TO NOVEMBER 8, 1971

(PAGES 38679 TO 40114)

than to 30 per cent of the regular budget, and more—rather than less, as the administration has itself proposed—to UN development programs.

Moreover, all the major UN programs to which we contribute are ones for which we voted—indeed, often ones we proposed and vigorously advocated on national as well as international grounds.

The overriding fact should be that it is clearly in the United States' national interest to strengthen rather than weaken the United Nations.

Because of Vietnam and our domestic pre-occupations, we are properly reducing our unilateral presence and commitments overseas. Yet the world remains as unstable and dangerous a place as ever, nor can it be reliably stabilized by some sort of Washington-Moscow-Peking troika.

A reinforced UN in which big, middle and small states all play a role in multilateral peacekeeping offers the best long-term prospect for world stability. It would be the height of folly for the United States to jeopardize that prospect because of pique over our failure to impose our ambiguous and ambivalent China policy on our allies and on the United Nations.

FORCED BUSING

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I was very much heartened by the action of the House of Representatives yesterday when it passed the Higher Education Act. Their action in writing strong antibusing provisions into the emergency school assistance program, which was adopted as an amendment to the Higher Education Act, was very important. First, it showed the large and growing sentiment in the country opposing forced busing in our public educational system. Secondly, it showed that we in the Congress are going to do everything that we can to see that the educationally devastating policy of court-ordered busing will not be allowed to continue.

Mr. President, the Washington Post of Monday, November 1, contains a Gallup poll sampling of the attitude of Americans toward busing. I ask unanimous consent that the results of that poll be presented at this point in the RECORD.

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

SEVENTY-SIX PERCENT OF PUBLIC OPPOSES BUSING

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., Oct. 31.—In the latest nationwide survey, three in every four persons, voice opposition to the busing of Negro and white children from one school district to another.

Although an increasing number of school districts, particularly in the South, have followed court orders to bus students to achieve a better racial balance, opposition has remained firm. Both the latest survey and the previous one in late August show only 18 per cent in favor of busing.

However, views on busing have softened somewhat since a still earlier survey in the spring of 1970, when 11 per cent of all adults interviewed expressed support of busing.

The latest survey is based on in person interviews with 1,506 adults, 18 and older, in approximately 300 scientifically selected localities across the nation. Interviewing for the latest survey was conducted Oct. 8-11.

All persons who said they had heard or read about the issue were asked this question:

In general, do you favor or oppose the busing of Negro and white school children from one school district to another?

As the following table shows, overwhelming opposition to busing is found in all four major regions of the nation, particularly the South.

Whites, both in the South and outside the South, oppose busing, while a fairly close division of opinion is found among Negroes.

The national results and results by key groups:

	[In percent]		
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
National.....	18	76	6
Whites.....	15	79	6
Negroes.....	45	47	8
East.....	22	71	7
Midwest.....	16	77	7
South.....	14	82	4
Far West.....	21	72	7

In a test election in which President Nixon is pitted against Sen. Edmund Muskie of Maine and Gov. George Wallace of Alabama, supporters of all three express overwhelming opposition to busing, as seen in the following table:

	[In percent]		
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Wallace supporters....	8	89	3
Nixon supporters....	10	85	5
Muskie supporters....	25	65	8

Among the reasons given by those who oppose busing (1) Children should go to school where they live—busing is not fair to them nor to their parents; (2) it's an unneeded expense—the money could be better spent improving the quality of education for both races; (3) the time spent on long bus trips is enervating and a waste of time.

The chief reasons given by those in favor of busing are that busing will upgrade the quality of education for Negroes and in the long run will improve race relations in the nation.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the results of that poll show that Americans overwhelmingly oppose the forced busing of schoolchildren. Nationwide, an astounding 76 percent are opposed to this policy. In every section of the Nation and among every minority group, busing is opposed. The more that this invidious policy spreads to other sections of the Nation, the more the opposition spreads. The cost in both economic and social terms is simply too high to allow us to continue busing our schoolchildren.

Mr. President, I was likewise heartened by another development in the House yesterday. Chairman CELLER, of the Judiciary Committee, has finally agreed to hold hearings in the near future on legislative measures concerned with the busing question. I believe that this will include hearings on the companion to the constitutional amendment introduced by myself, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Brock), and a number of other Senators. That will move this most important piece of legislation still another step closer to enactment. I, for one, shall continue to press for action until we have defeated once and for all the threat of forced busing in the Nation.

ADDRESS BY J. IRWIN MILLER,
CHAIRMAN, CUMMINS ENGINE CO.,
COLUMBUS, OHIO

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, amid the din of seemingly endless prescriptions to help a deeply troubled America, it is increasingly difficult to find good sense—let alone cause for hope.

But every so often, a speech or an article appears which jolts us out of our discouragement—and forces us to think and hope anew about the future of our country.

I have just read such a speech. Its author is J. Irwin Miller, a leading industrialist who has spent the better part of his life fighting against social and economic injustice.

Mr. Miller is no dissident, and he can hardly be described as a radical. According to his own description, he is "a favored member of society, a capitalist, an owner, a person certainly not anxious to lose his present favorable position in the economy."

But his privileged position in no way narrows or obscures his vision.

He gives a clearheaded and sensitive view of where we are going and how we can still refind our way.

As Mr. Miller observes:

We appear to be headed for some kind of national dead end—unless we act. Discretion alone says that we should be willing to experiment as boldly with our social institutions as we have with our science and technology, and the sooner the better.

I urge Senators to read this remarkable and thoughtful speech and to consider its basic recommendations for reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that J. Irwin Miller's speech entitled, "Access to Affluence for All—Or a National Dead End," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Oct. 31, 1971]

ACCESS TO AFFLUENCE FOR ALL—OR A NATIONAL DEAD END

(From a recent speech in Columbus, Ind., by industrialist J. Irwin Miller, chairman of the Cummins Engine Co. of Columbus)

Until very recently the human race has known only the condition of scarcity. From the dawn of history, life on this planet has been a struggle to provide food for all, shelter for all, medicine for all, personal security for all. Famine, natural disasters and disease have been our constant and unconquered enemies. It is not surprising, therefore, that in all our thinking we still are accustomed to think in terms of scarcity, of not enough to go round. This thinking lies at the root of our economic decisions, of our forms of government, and it conditions all our national choices.

Now, by a remarkable series of achievements, we have within a few generations changed the human condition more dramatically than at any time in the past 5,000 years. We can grow more than enough food. Our technology makes each man and woman fantastically productive. We know more about health, and we have the medical knowledge to prolong life and to control plagues. I could go on, but, as viewed by any previous generation, our condition is one of actual or potential abundance—and it is certainly no longer one of scarcity. This is the

first time—and we are the first people—for whom such a claim could be made.

St. Paul once said, "I know how to be abased, and I know how to abound." Of the two, the latter has always proved more difficult for humans to handle. We are having trouble dealing with abundance.

Today there is no longer any physical reason why any single baby born in America should not have access to a healthful diet, to needed medicine and adequate health care or to an education individually suited to his or her capacities. But our reaction is still conditioned by our habits of scarcity. It will cost too much. You can't do everything at once. Taxes are too high now—and so on.

WHY NOT FULL EMPLOYMENT?

There is no longer any physical reason why every American willing and able to work should not have access to useful and gainful employment—at all times—and not just at the peak of the business cycle. But our reaction is still the reaction of people plagued with scarcity. Full employment has always meant inflation; we cannot have stable costs unless jobs are reasonably scarce. But while the good things that we want and demand for ourselves and our children are for the first time available to the very large majority of all Americans, there remains a substantial and undiminished core of our people in the inner city, in the deep South, in Appalachia. In the Southwest, for whom these things, under present arrangements, are still quite simply out of reach.

In earlier times, when their possession was not a reasonable possibility, families suffered these conditions not gladly, but at least with a sense of resignation to the inevitable, and they did so with the knowledge that all classes to a degree suffered them, too. If your baby got smallpox, you sorrowed, but you became resigned because there was no cure. If your baby, however, gets smallpox today, and you cannot gain access to the vaccine or medicine you know will cure him, there are no lengths—legal or illegal—to which you will not go to get that vaccine for him. Clearly, under a generally admitted condition of affluence, all will demand, and all will finally gain access to that affluence.

It will be taken by pressure or force from those who control society, if it is not made available as rapidly as changing conditions and desire justify. You and I have only to read our history books to know that this is the way of human beings—and that there is no stopping them. The affluent majority is indeed in great peril, unless it can change its ways and begin to think in terms of plenty, rather than in terms of scarcity.

In times of scarcity it was realistic to say to those on the bottom of the pile, "Don't ask for a bigger slice of the cake. The cake itself isn't big enough for the needs of everybody. Join us in promoting growth, and everybody's slice will be bigger." But things are quite different when it becomes possible to make the cake big enough for everybody. Under such conditions, if some are prevented access to a just portion, all hell will finally break loose.

BASIC GOALS FOR ALL

What then does this mean for us who sit in the catbird seat of affluence? I think it means that this high standard of personal living which most Americans, and all of us in this room, enjoy is a fine thing, only provided some other things come first:

Access to a healthy diet for every American baby comes first.

Access to needed health care for every American comes first.

Access to an education suited to each American's capacities comes first.

Access to equal justice without regard to race or the amount of money you have comes first.

Access to meaningful employment for every able-bodied, willing citizen comes first.

Decent living conditions and a healthy, attractive environment for all comes first.

These are not goals to be aimed at provided my present standard of living is not impaired, or provided my taxes are not raised. Your and my standards of private living will be what remains to be gained after all Americans—especially the newly born—have equal access to the abundance of our new society.

In a society of abundance, the survival of those on top of the pile will very probably hang upon their ability to accomplish changes in systems and equitable redistribution of our new wealth, such that no doors of opportunity are closed to any American simply by reason of where he was born, or how much money his parents had, or because of his race, or his religion.

There is no longer excuse not to make America in truth the land of equal opportunity, and this task now comes first—and most especially is it the responsibility of those of us who find themselves most favored.

THE NEW AMERICAN DREAM

May I suggest how we might set about achieving the new American dream? We have attacked the last hundred years with a spirit which has been usefully described as technological radicalism and social conservatism. It is in good part due to the unbridled growth of technology that we have gained our age of abundance and affluence. We are, however, not wholly at ease in Zion. The plastic bottles in which everything arrives are great, but what do we do when we are finished with them? The automobile is great, but what about the growing yellow smog that first hung over Los Angeles, then Phoenix, then Rome, then Tokyo, and now Indianapolis? And what will that smog be with 50 million more cars when they are ready to be junked?

The young sometimes say that we must blow the whistle on technology, as if man can ever really be stopped inventing and exploring. I do not find that desirable or realistic. But it may indeed be appropriate to reverse our emphases in the last third of the century—and become technological conservatives and social radicals.

What might it mean to become technologically conservative? Well, the age-old warning of the conservative is: "Look before you leap. Take account of all consequences of your action before you take the action." For example, the decision to build 15 million cars a year instead of 8 million would involve the same decisions as now on necessary working capital, required capital expansion, new debt, return on investment and the rest—but we must in the future also solve the problems of maintaining clean air for all with the new, increased population of cars before we build the cars.

We ought to provide adequate roads and traffic systems for the new amount of cars before they hit the road, and we should provide and implement adequate plans for their ultimate disposal before we build them. Technological conservatism would mean closing the loop on each new technical innovation before turning it loose for production—all with the aim of realizing its benefits and preventing its evils before they occurred.

REALISM ABOUT TAXES

Technological conservatism is not too difficult to accept, but social radicalism sounds like something else. And, if there is anything good in the notion, the burden of proof is surely on me.

I stand here (along with you) as a favored member of society, a capitalist, an owner, a person certainly not anxious to lose his present favorable position in the economy. But you and I have also to be realists. Most of the established systems through which the society functions and through which it

maintains order and stability are not working very well today. The tax system is not working well. Education in this state is financed mainly by the property tax, and that tax bears heaviest on families whose savings are mostly invested in a house. The property tax is seriously regressive. So we patch it up with a sales tax, which also bears heaviest on those least able to pay—as also do the federal excise taxes and the Social Security tax, under which the man who earns \$7,000 a year pays as much as the man who earns \$40,000.

The tax system has now become so inequitable that it has caused what has been termed the taxpayers' revolt. Desperately needed bond issues for hospitals and appropriations for adequate school budgets are voted down, not because people don't want the hospitals and schools, but because today's tax system is a mess. So almost any thoughtful change in it has at least a 50-50 chance of being an improvement. That is why we should risk radical change in our search to correct thoroughly bad conditions.

In a nation that strongly prides itself on "equal justice under law," it makes a substantial difference in the judicial or police treatment you receive and the length of time you are held in jail pending trial, whether you are a youth or an adult, have long hair or short hair, whether you are black or white, rich or poor. Our ancestors came to this country to escape this kind of inequality in the application of the law, and they did not always reject violence and revolution in their determination to gain equal justice for themselves and their children.

SOCIAL SERVICES BANKRUPT

There is little reason to believe that the groups who today have less than complete access to equal justice in our society will be less determined to obtain it than were those revolutionary ancestors whom we revere so greatly, or that they will in the end use less-threatening methods if all else seems to fail. Prudence would therefore seem to be on the side of radical overhaul of the machinery of justice to make the application of justice truly equal.

A simple person would assume that one of the very first fruits of a general condition of affluence would be the provision of the basic social services at new standards of quality to more and more people. A fellow might even wonder what is affluence for—if not for this. Yet every major service institution today is close to bankruptcy. The universities and colleges, public and private, are close to bankruptcy. Some have folded, and all have cut back on quality and quantity of service. Local government is generally near bankruptcy. Garbage collection, police protection, street maintenance are deteriorating before our eyes—and are nowhere perceived to be reaching new standards of excellence.

Health care for the average citizen is declining, while health costs are rising faster than any other cost in the society. I could go on—but these are samples familiar enough to each of us to suggest that in these vital respects we will not somehow muddle through, that things will not somehow naturally get better.

GROUPS BLOCKING PROGRESS

The systems of our society, designed for other people in other times, are failing in services to us all, and we need to set about changing them. Alas, this also means change in the attitudes of people, and especially the people most deeply imbedded in these same systems—people who, through fear and through inertia, now too often stand in the way of seriously needed changes.

Business and labor are both obstacles to achieving genuine low-cost housing. From one or the other comes resistance to new programs for land-planning and zoning, for

public housing, revision of building codes or the introduction of new technology.

The medical profession has been a chief obstacle to increasing the numbers of doctors, introducing paramedical personnel into the system, comprehensive care or establishing meaningful incentives to reduce costs.

The legal profession has been an obstacle to the reduction of the cost of legal services, the extension of services to the poor and reform of the courts.

The welfare bureaucracy has often become an adversary of the people it exists to serve.

The political process has recently become a means of stifling dissent and denying total participation.

We appear to be headed for some kind of national dead end—unless we act. Discretion alone says that we should be willing to experiment as boldly with our social institutions as we have with our science and technology, and the sooner the better.

Last week at the International Synod of Catholic Bishops in Rome, Cardinal John Heenan, archbishop of Westminster, proposed that the art treasures of the Vatican Museum be sold and that the proceeds be given to the poor of the world. Understandably, this remarkable suggestion met immediate opposition.

Cardinal Joseph Slipyi, the exiled archbishop of Lwow, who has spent 18 years in Soviet prisons, spoke sharply against the proposal of the English cardinal. Slipyi maintained that the art treasures of the Vatican are, in the eyes of faithful Christians, an important graphic endorsement of the authenticity of the Christian message.

According to this line of reasoning, the theological claims of the Catholic Church are more credible because the church owns an impressive collection of masterpieces, mostly of Greek or Western European origin. I seriously doubt the validity of this position.

Any church, because it outlives its individual members, is likely over a long period of time to inherit impressive holdings of different kinds. The Roman Catholic Church, as the oldest and original Christian community, has, for almost 2,000 years, been the recipient, in Rome and around the world, of gifts and legacies from its devoted and faithful members. The same process goes on all the time in all the churches. It has simply gone on for a longer period of time in the Catholic Church than in any other Christian community.

Consequently the Vatican Museum today houses one of the most impressive collections in the world. This museum is, in fact, a cluster of galleries, each of which could be famous in its own right.

The Belvedere is one section, housing some of the rarest of classical antiquities, including the statues of Apollo Belvedere, the Torso of Hercules and the magnificent Greek Laocoon. The Egyptian, Etruscan and Renaissance collections, taken with their handsomely designed individual settings, are probably the most impressive collection in the world.

Cardinal Slipyi's esteem, both for this collection and for the role of the church in preserving it, is well-placed. An institution that protects such treasures for posterity deserves the appreciation of all men who cherish human genius.

Cardinal Heenan's proposal, however, should be examined from the point of view of those outside the Catholic community. If the Vatican should start to disperse its collections, with or without compensation, what response might there be from other Christians, from Jews, Moslems and Buddhists, and from the art centers of the world?

Cardinal Slipyi sees the Vatican collection as an indirect validation of Catholic doctrine. What kind of validation of the Christian message would result if the Vatican masterpieces were given to different national galleries, with the understanding that the re-

ceiving countries would in turn give to their own poor the value of the donated art work? Might the response from New Delhi, Cairo, Tel Aviv, Peking, Lima, Warsaw, Moscow, London, Paris somehow lessen world esteem for the Catholic Church? I think not.

Bear in mind that such munificence on the part of the Vatican would leave untouched such enduring architectural treasures as St. Peter's Basilica, Bernini's colonnade, the Sistine Chapel, Michelangelo's frescoes, the Sala Regia (with frescoes by Vasari, Salvati and Zucari), the tomb of St. Peter, the Vatican gardens and the entire Vatican Library collection of books, manuscripts, maps, music and prints.

The positions of Cardinals Heenan and Slipyi are not really contradictory. One stresses what might be done with an enormously valuable collection if it were shared more widely. The other stresses the merit of holding and displaying this collection in the future as it has been held for centuries.

The gospel of Jesus Christ never did and cannot now depend on the possessions, mundane or artistic, of those who preach it. Quite the contrary, Christ Himself promised that those who speak in His name would be identified by their modest possessions and the degree of their generosity.

Undoubtedly Cardinal Heenan's radical proposal raises a cloud of questions about how to disperse the Vatican collection equitably to the world. None of these practical problems, however, lessens the value of his imaginative and healing gesture. It could be one of those uniquely eloquent acts in human history that benefit the donor and the recipient in equal degree and leave no pain of loss in the one who is the giver.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION AND MENTAL HARM

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, one of the acts prohibited by the Genocide Convention is "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group." The fear has been expressed that this section will include any action that upsets or inconveniences a member of a minority group.

This point of view is contrary to the intent and purpose of the Genocide Convention. The framers of the convention, in their debates, stated that they desired to prevent the permanent impairment of mental faculties such as caused by electric shocks or narcotic drugs. The Committee on Foreign Relations has offered a reservation to the Treaty saying:

That the U.S. Government understands and construes the words "mental harm" appearing in article II(b) of this convention to mean permanent impairment of mental faculties.

With this understanding of the intent of the framers is clear that genocide does not include those acts which merely antagonize or inconvenience a minority group. Rather, genocide includes only those actions taken to destroy a racial, ethnic, or religious group.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to ratify the Genocide Convention without delay.

THE NEW HALLOWEEN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Halloween and its joys and excitement for young Americans again has been marked by irrational and cruel incidents: razor blades hidden in apples which are given to

young children—damaging drugs mixed into pieces of candy.

This was not the first Halloween when these incredible actions have been reported in the press. Jesse O. Gray, of Kalamazoo, Mich., may have pointed to a way where the choice of trick and treating is less apt to be marked by tragedy. He has outlined in a very brief message a system for the "New Halloween."

Because I believe the idea has merit, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gray's description be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, so that as the Nation plans for Halloween 1972, consideration may be given to such a proposal.

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

LET'S SAVE "HALLOWEEN"

Halloween is one of the most fascinating days of the year, when neighborhood children and parents are supposed to be brought together through the goodness of giving and receiving. Children devastating in their own ways are full of laughter, jokes and tricks to perform in order to receive treats. These are some of the things that make Halloween such an enjoyable day.

But these few sentences that are written above really cannot explain the true feelings and thoughts of Halloween, this is something that has to be experienced. Awful as it may seem, there are demons and tricksters that are not children who are determined to destroy the fun of Halloween for children with their dastardly tricks with the use of hazardous products. This is something that has happened before and it is a chance that we cannot gamble on again. The leaders of our future world who are now children would be the ones subjected to things that had been put into the little goodies that could not be realistically examined.

Although evil things have happened before this doesn't mean that Halloween could and can not still be enjoyed. I believe that I've thought of a system in which to make Halloween, if not the same, more enjoyable than before. If instead of children going to homes and receiving candy, etc., they can receive scrip which would be worth what ever the home owner would want to give away to each child. This scrip could be prepaid, so that on Halloween the children can receive scrip instead of the candy and exchange the scrip at certain grocery market for selected Halloween items which they would want. We've just made Halloween enjoyable once again and also taken the danger away. Here you've just read the proposed new system for the "New Halloween."

THE CANNIKIN TEST

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the countdown is rapidly proceeding on the Atomic Energy Commission's Cannikin test, scheduled to take place on Amchitka Island this Saturday.

If the warnings of environmental experts are confirmed, Cannikin would be a tragedy for our Nation. It could become a synonym for human arrogance or catastrophic folly.

If the AEC's assurances prove valid, the mounting wave of opposition may quickly dissolve. I doubt that it will vanish from our thoughts.

For with or without any irreparable environmental destruction, if the test does go on, a valid question will linger on in the minds of many Americans. Why were our doubts never answered by our Government?