

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 20

OCTOBER 13, 1966, TO OCTOBER 19, 1966

(PAGES 26445 TO 27878)

Only by the policy above outlined can the present canal at Panama, or any new canal built by our country, be saved from ultimate takeover by red power.

RESOLUTION NO. 547 OF THE 48TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, WASHINGTON

PANAMA CANAL

Whereas, in a joint statement on September 24, 1965, Presidents Johnson of the United States and Robles of Panama announced that the two countries were negotiating new treaties with respect to the existing Panama Canal and a new "sea-level" canal which might be constructed across Panama; and

Whereas, that statement made clear that the 1903 treaty "will be abrogated" and that its replacement "will terminate after a specified number of years or on the date of the opening of the sea-level canal whichever occurs first;" and

Whereas, there is no assurance at this time that the construction of a sea-level canal will be determined to be feasible, either in Panama or elsewhere in the area, or that a satisfactory treaty respecting such new canal can be secured so as to provide the United States with the necessary rights for its effective operation and protection; and

Whereas, in the interim, this situation places in serious jeopardy the rights of the United States respecting the existing canal; and

Whereas, the Congressionally authorized Commission currently studying the feasibility of constructing a new interoceanic canal is restricted to studies relative to a "sea-level" canal; and

Whereas, various proposals, such as one known as the "Terminal Lakes Plan," have been advanced for the modernization of the existing Panama Canal, based upon study by competent students of many years experience in maintaining and operating the Canal; and

Whereas, such proposals would not require a new treaty with the Republic of Panama and would not jeopardize the U.S. rights in the Canal Zone; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 30, 31-September 1, 1966, That The American Legion (1) reaffirms its support of the basic and still existing provisions of the 1903 treaty, and the continued, indispensable sovereign control by the United States over the Canal Zone; (2) urges the enactment of legislation (similar to the Anderson-Flood-Bow bills of the 89th Congress) to establish an independent, broadly-based "Interoceanic Canals Commission," having as its mandate the examination of all tangible possibilities for improving and increasing trans-Isthmian transit capacity, followed by appropriate recommendation, and (3) urges that, until such a commission is duly created and makes its report, all further negotiations with the Republic of Panama be deferred.

THE INTERNATIONAL BRAIN DRAIN ACT OF 1966

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce today H.R. 18350, the "International Brain Drain Act of

1966." This bill is identical to one that is being introduced in the other body by my colleague from Minnesota, Senator WALTER F. MONDALE. Senator MONDALE has taken the lead in Congress in focusing attention on what he has called one of our time, the brain drain which robs the developing countries of the professional and skilled manpower that they need to bring hope to their peoples.

In a major floor speech August 31, Senator MONDALE concluded that it is essential for the United States to consider the manpower needs of countries whose development is a goal of our national policy. He said:

In other words, what is needed is some way to strike a balance.

And a balance is what is needed in many other action areas I have discussed. Our people do need doctors, as our economy thirsts for more scientists and engineers. We prize the presence of foreign students on our campuses. We profit from the contribution of immigrants from all continents to our national life.

Yet, if we would build a world where our children can live in peace and freedom, development of poor nations must likewise receive high priority in our national policies.

And if we continue to neglect the brain drain, and present trends continue and accentuate, we may reap a grim harvest in the fulfillment of the Biblical prophecy:

"To him that hath, it shall be given; from him that hath not, it shall be taken away, even that which he hath."

The gap between rich and poor will continue to widen, and hopes for lasting peace will vanish for our century.

I hope and believe that this outcome can be avoided. With the combined efforts of our Nation and those in other lands, I believe that it can be.

The bill that I am introducing today as a companion to Senator MONDALE's proposal represents, I believe, a significant attempt to close the gap of which the Senator spoke. Following is a summary of the bill's provisions:

THE INTERNATIONAL BRAIN DRAIN ACT OF 1966

A. Purpose—The Congress finds that the large-scale drain of talented, trained persons from the developing countries is endangering world peace by accentuating the gap between rich and poor countries, and that the United States should establish a comprehensive program to help reduce the brain drain from those developing countries which: (1) suffer severe adverse effects from it; and (2) are taking strong steps to deal with it by providing rewarding professional opportunities and careers for their own nationals.

B. Grants for Special Foreign Student Programs—\$5 million is authorized for the Commissioner of Education to make pilot grants to institutions of higher education to support new programs of instruction, training, and counseling of foreign students aimed at relating their educational experiences in the country more closely to the needs of their homelands and occupational opportunities there.

C. Aid to Developing Countries to Increase Opportunities for Professional and Skilled Persons—\$5 million is authorized, in a new Title X which would be added to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to support experimental projects aimed at improved utilization of professional and skilled nationals in developing countries, and better opportunities for career development.

D. Limited Programs to Take Account of Needs of Developing Countries in our Immigration Policy, in Addition to Our Own

Needs—The President is authorized to enter bilateral agreements with particular developing countries which are themselves making substantial efforts to attack the causes of the brain drain. Such agreement shall relate to such categories of needed professional and skilled persons as he deems advisable, and provide one or more of the following:

(1) That some or all students from such country come to the United States for studying purposes under visas which require them to return to their homelands for two years before becoming eligible for permanent residence in the United States, subject to waiver in hardship and other special cases;

(2) That immigration of certain professional or skilled persons to the United States be restricted, in cases where their home country has a very severe need for their services, where there is substantial evidence that these services will be effectively utilized, and those affected will have good opportunities for career development;

(3) That the United States will support contracts entered into between developing countries and their nationals imposing reasonable conditions relating to their return home after a stay in the United States, by denying immigrant visas to those who violate reasonable conditions in such contracts;

(4) That there be established an immigration review panel composed of appropriate officials of the United States and the contracting country to consult on matters relating to the administration of such agreements and to advise on individual cases which may arise.

In all cases, special consideration would have to be given to political refugees barred from return due to the character of their home government.

It has long disturbed me that the number of Asian students who move here permanently is at least equal to the number that we give advanced training in our aid program. This effectively cancels out one major part of our foreign assistance effort. Another disturbing part of the world where the brain drain is being felt is South America. This is reflected in the following report in the October 10 Minneapolis Tribune:

"BRAIN DRAIN" IS GROWING CONCERN IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By David Mazie)

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA.—South America slowly is being sapped of its most valuable resource—educated, skilled manpower.

In growing numbers, scientists, technicians, engineers, teachers and professional people are leaving their countries. Most of them are headed for the United States.

This is the "brain drain" that is causing growing concern in both North and South America.

The Organization of American States (OAS) has scored the exodus of talent, pointing out that it was something development countries could not afford.

Sen. WALTER F. MONDALE, D-Minn., recently noted the paradox of America's sending aid to underdeveloped nations and then taking back their skilled workers.

Officials of the Alliance for Progress have said one of the major roadblocks in the path of the Alliance was the lack of human resources in Latin American nations—the shortage of men and women who could carry out projects.

But the "brain drain" is proving easier to point out than to plug, as experience in Argentina shows.

Argentina, with its well developed system of higher education, probably is the hardest hit South American country in terms of numerical losses. U.S. Department of Justice

figures show that, in the last 15 years, 15,937 specialists emigrated from Argentina to the United States alone. (It's thought that up to 10,000 more have gone to Europe and elsewhere.)

Approximately 45 per cent of those were technicians and professional people, 40 per cent skilled workers and 15 per cent high-level administrators.

More specifically, studies in other countries indicated that the greatest exodus has been by engineers, doctors and nurses, economists, electronic experts and mechanics.

The drain is increasing. In 1950 fewer than 200 Argentine technicians emigrated to the United States, while last year the figure was 2,133.

In Argentina there has been some offsetting "brain gain"—immigration from other countries. But, in recent years, the losses considerably have outnumbered the gains.

Putting a price tag on this is difficult. But it's estimated that Argentina loses \$10,000 to \$20,000 on each emigrant in cost of government-financed schooling alone.

More important, and far more expensive in the long run is the loss of highly skilled people on whom Latin America's future depends.

Why does a doctor decide to stay in the United States after originally going for only a year or two? Why does a young mathematician prefer to teach in a North American university or an engineer want to work for a U.S. firm?

One of the most obvious reasons is higher wages. A beginning engineer can double the \$4,000 annual salary he might get in Argentina. A professor can make considerably more than the \$400 a month he earns there.

Another factor is working conditions. Research facilities are better in the United States, and there is an opportunity to work alongside a greater number of outstanding men in specific fields.

The feeling of stability and the noninvolvement of U.S. schools and institutions in political fights is an important lure in Argentina today. Government interference with Argentina universities drove out hundreds of faculty members during the dictatorship of Juan Peron and is threatening to do the same now.

Even cupid is a culprit. Many persons who leave home with the intention of returning marry an American and stay in the United States.

But of all the causes the most important is an "intangible" one, according to Manuel Sadosky, director of the Institute of Calculus and former vice-dean of the University of Buenos Aires School of Exact Sciences.

"Certainly, part of the problem is economic," says Sadosky. "But that's not the most important reason. What matters more is personal and intellectual satisfaction. We must give our young people a chance to apply what they've learned and to do work with dignity."

To lure emigrants back, Argentina has been offering fellowships and generous tax exemptions, such as the right to bring in a \$4,000 car.

A few hundred people have returned but prospects of reclaiming large numbers are not good.

To keep students from leaving, other tactics are being used.

Scholarships for overseas study limit the students' time abroad and require their return to Argentina. The difficulty is that many make contacts while abroad and return to the United States as emigrants after putting in their mandatory time back.

The drain of talent could be halted at the other end of the pipe—in the United States, but that seems unlikely to happen at present. In fact, United States laws have been liberalized to facilitate immigration of technicians.

And the problem is interpreted on an even broader scale in this October 7 column in the Minneapolis Star:

"BRAIN DRAIN" HURTS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS
(By Carl T. Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—If you wonder why the Alliance for Progress hasn't gone very far in Latin America, you'll find one answer in a report just given to the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO).

Too many talented and highly-trained Latin Americans are rushing to the greener pastures and freer atmosphere of North America, according to a report prepared for PAHO's advisory committee on medical research.

This PAHO report documents dramatically how the "pull" of U.S. wealth and opportunity and the "push" of political strife, low pay and nepotism are depriving Latin America of some of its most able and vitally needed citizens.

The report points out that:

Over the past five years, some 3,000 university-educated Latin Americans have migrated permanently to the United States.

Each year, about 300 physicians migrate from Latin America to the United States, a number equal to the annual output of three large U.S. medical schools: "The value of the physicians coming to the United States is roughly equal to that of all U.S. medical assistance to Latin America."

Apart from Cuba, with its special political problem, the two countries hardest hit numerically are Argentina and Colombia, which are losing 900 to 1,000 professional and technical workers a year. But the effect is three times as devastating in Colombia, where the gross national product is only a third that of Argentina and the need for talented people is critical. In terms of destructive impact, the countries hardest hit by this migration are Ecuador, Colombia and Argentina, followed a level down by Mexico, Chile and Venezuela.

I hasten to point out that the numerical dimension of the "brain drain" from Latin America is not as great as from the Philippines, India, Turkey, Korea, Iran—or even portions of Western Europe.

But what makes the Latin American situation most urgent is that the continent is already wracked with political turmoil; it has been singled out as a prime Communist target for "wars of liberation"; thus it can ill afford the economic, cultural and political stagnation that threatens to result from the loss of its ablest, most imaginative people.

The report to PAHO does not recommend that the United States erect new barriers to migration. The report emphasizes that the training of about 9,000 Latin Americans a year in U.S. institutions is important to the total education scheme in Latin America. But PAHO does urge that this training program not be permitted to become "the first stage of migration to the United States."

The report endorses a proposal, made last August by President Johnson in a speech marking the fifth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, that multinational institutions for advanced training in science and technology be developed as one way of slowing the brain drain.

Brazil and Uruguay already plan to establish special funds for such institutions and have expressed a wish that the United States will provide matching funds.

They hope this will be a first break in the vicious cycle where good people leave Latin America because life is impoverished and barren of opportunity but life remains meager and short of hope because the people who might change it are fleeing.

The following editorial from the September 3 Minneapolis Tribune expresses

support for Senator MONDALE's ideal idea:

UNITED STATES "STEALS" FOREIGN TALENT

Sen. WALTER F. MONDALE, D-Minn., charged in a Senate speech Wednesday that the United States is hurting the developing nations by draining off their scientists and technicians. Passage of the liberalized immigration act speeded up the "brain drain," he said.

The July issue of Foreign Affairs magazine carried an article in similar vein by Dr. James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University and chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs. Perkins was especially critical of the way the student exchange plan worked out—too many of the foreigners stay here after their university training.

According to a United Nations report, 43,000 scientists emigrated to the United States between 1949 and 1961, many from the less developed countries. In 1964-65, Perkins noted, 28 percent of the internships and 26 percent of the residencies in American hospitals were filled by foreigners. A big share never go home.

The United States has jobs for these people, but this domestic need conflicts with our foreign aid policy, which supposedly is aimed at helping the developing nations make faster progress. How can they when we absorb their educated people who are best able to administer affairs at home and educate their fellow countrymen?

Last year's immigration legislation resulted from a sort of stampede in Congress. It increased the total flow of immigrants—a questionable way of relieving population pressures elsewhere—and then singled out for VIP treatment the individuals other nations could least spare. Maybe Congress should start over. And obviously our foreign aid programs need improvement in regard to the brain drain.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 18350 is a bill that deserves careful consideration by the House. It is the product of much thought, especially by Senator MONDALE, and it is my hope that the bill will be enacted into law. The gap created by the brain drain is growing, not shrinking. We cannot afford to waste time in closing it.

AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, with permission I wish to insert in the Record my testimony before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on my bill and similar proposals to control and abate aircraft noise.

Congress should provide the authority and the mandate for an attack on this problem which grows more tremendous each day. I am pleased the committee is holding hearings and I hope the Congress will act before the adjournment of this session.