

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 17

AUGUST 5, 1969, TO AUGUST 12, 1969
(PAGES 22197 TO 23658)

at this time is for the government to give banks a 3 percent "incentive payment" on each loan, over and above the regular 7 percent interest rate.

U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, in testimony before the House Special Subcommittee on Education, said the administration favors this method over simply raising the interest ceiling for several reasons.

For one thing, the government would assume any payment over 7 percent, thus relieving the student of additional financial burden. If the interest ceiling were simply raised, the student would be saddled with the entire amount.

Allen also pointed out that the incentive payment rate "may be adjusted accordingly. This avoids locking in both the government and the student to what may be artificially high interest rates."

In addition, he said, this plan is "the least expensive method of the alternatives we have examined."

But some congressmen are unlikely to be impressed. If the administration bill ever gets to the House floor, it may well be blocked by such men as Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., a longtime foe of federal subsidies to banks.

Patman testified against raising the interest ceiling from 6 to 7 percent last year to meet a similar prime rate rise (it was done anyway). "The banks are so heavily subsidized anyway," said a member of Patman's office, "he feels 7 percent is plenty."

The bill may encounter the same kind of opposition in the Senate. If the bill makes its way through the Senate Education subcommittee to the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee, chairman Ralph Yarborough of Texas, who agrees largely with Patman on the issue of bank subsidies, may block it.

"The idea of subsidies to the bank instead of the student doesn't especially appeal to us," a Yarborough staff member says.

Harry Hogan, counsel to the House special education subcommittee chaired by Rep. Edith Green of Oregon, notes another potential stumbling block to passage of the bill. Some liberal congressmen, faced with a further amendment to the Higher Education Act, may try to enact changes throughout, such as raising the \$1,500 limit on a single guaranteed loan, he says. Debate on such measures could slow things down.

But the bill may never progress even that far. Sen. Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., chairman of the Senate Education subcommittee, is reportedly not particularly enthused about the bill, and may take his time in sending it along to the full committee.

A first step towards alleviating the crisis took place today when the Green subcommittee reported out an amended version of the administration's bill, to the full Education and Labor Committee.

The major change, written in by Rep. John Erlenborn, R-Ill., would be to adjust the incentive rate every three months, instead of every six months as recommended by the administration.

The full committee is scheduled to meet Wednesday morning.

The subcommittee sent a recommendation along with the bill that the committee take steps to rush the bill to the floor.

Banks are repeating their policy of last year and making loan commitments in anticipation of federal action, Vanderstaay says.

"The banks (last year) had every expectation that something was going to be done and went ahead and made the commitments. But they didn't make disbursements (before action was taken). So we're not sure how many of these present commitments will become disbursements," he said.

Is the situation as bad as it looks? Vanderstaay thinks so. "I'm hard put to prove it today," he says, "and I'm afraid we won't be able to prove it until it's a bit too late."

INDIAN EDUCATION AND SENATOR MONDALE AT ROUGH ROCK

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of the *Twin Citian* magazine contains a fascinating account of Senator WALTER MONDALE's visit earlier this year to Indian schools in the Southwest.

As a member of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Senator MONDALE has been particularly concerned about the need for greater control by the Indian people over the schools that are intended to educate their children.

The article is written by Gerald Vizenor, an American Indian and one of Minnesota's most talented journalists.

Because of this article's significance, I am taking this opportunity to have it reprinted in the RECORD:

INDIAN EDUCATION AND SENATOR MONDALE AT ROUGH ROCK

(By Gerald Vizenor)

"You damage a child still more when you destroy his first stone of identity, when you tell him his language is no good, when you tell him that his color is not right or imply it by surrounding him with people of a different color, habits, and status. You tell him that what his parents have taught him is no good, that he should not do so and so, or be what he is."—Karl Menninger, psychiatrist and chairman of the board, Menninger Foundation, in testimony before the Senate subcommittee on Indian Education.)

"These children aren't as unhappy as people say they are . . . they're only lonely for about a month." The principal of the Tuba City, Arizona, Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school was speaking, first brushing the ubiquitous Arizona dust off his desk.

"Senator, look out here," he said, next brushing the dust from his hands, "do you see any lonesome, poorly kept children?"

Outside, a neat column of Navajo children moved past the window. The March wind tossed their hair. Nothing else seemed spontaneous.

One thousand Navajo children attend the Tuba City boarding school. Less than half speak English when they arrive, but their native language soon becomes secondary . . . something less than English. The Indian parents have no voice in the way their children are efficiently centralized, processed and alienated in a white school environment. Happiness and education are systematically measured by career bureaucrats, many of whom have no sensitivity or training in education. Cultural brutalization begins.

Minnesota's Senator Walter F. Mondale, a member of the special subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, had been told that the Tuba City school was one of the worst in the federal system. He went to Arizona specifically to compare federal schools to the Rough Rock Navajo Demonstration School which is entirely run by the people—that is, the Indians themselves.

The Tuba City principal, leading Mondale on a tour of the classrooms, pointed with pride to a plywood hogan built in the corner of one room. The *token* hogan, you might say. "You know," the principal ventured pleasantly, "it sure is interesting how the children first use the modern kitchen play things and then inevitably return to the hogan."

Later in the day Mondale flew over Black Mountain to meet with the all Navajo elected school board at Rough Rock. He was accompanied by a member of his staff, a reporter, and Dr. Robert L. Bergman, Public psychiatrist on the Navajo reservation.

Four of the five Navajo school board members at Rough Rock do not speak English and have never been to a formal school. Through an interpreter, Mondale learned about the people's school.

"When I travel here I see the mountains," said school board member John Dick, "and I cannot see what goes on in Washington . . . They have been operating schools for over one hundred years. We have never been part. The school here is open to everyone . . . you'll see the difference.

"We have four kinds of schools—long coats schools, Washington schools, white schools, and the people's schools . . . In our school here we talk about the identity, the Indian identity. Children knowing who they are, that's what's important. They will be better off in the world . . . This is good for the people."

Through the interpreter Mondale told John Dick that his description was the best he had heard. "Until parents feel it is *their* school we will not reach anyone. You have done us a favor showing America the truth about education. Your school is a symbol of quality in Indian education."

Mondale asked the school board members if they would trust the Bureau of Indian Affairs if the Bureau admitted it had been wrong about education and said it would change. The laughter needed no interpretation.

During the five hours the board and Mondale met, more than fifty parents and teachers gathered to listen. John Dick invited Mondale to continue the late hour discussion in a traditional sweat house. "We could both use it," Mondale said, slapping his stomach. But there wasn't room for an interpreter in the sweat house. Next day Mondale attended a sand painting ceremony at the hogan of John Dick held in honor of a child who had laughed for the first time.

Rough Rock was originally built by the Bureau of Indian Affairs but, before it opened, it was turned over to the Navajo in 1966. It had been operated by the people on an experimental basis for two years. Funds are provided by the Bureau, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and private foundations.

The curriculum is based on the people's language and heritage. The comforts of education are identity. Students are encouraged rather than punished for speaking their native language. The more than four hundred students at Rough Rock receive instruction in both Navajo and English, since in Arizona it is unlawful to teach in a foreign language unless it is a second language. The principal at the Bureau school at Rock Point, the third institution Mondale visited, said the Bureau attitude is that it does "not intend to be an ambulance for a dying language." Contrary to Bureau tradition, the principal has made an effort to teach Navajo in his school.

Medicine man and board member Ashie Tsosie said: "We like the older folks to teach our children philosophy." Medicine men can train students at the Rough Rock school. In every classroom there is a Navajo mother at a loom. While the women weave and tell the legends of the people, the children listen and learn in the Navajo tradition by watching.

At the Tuba City boarding school there are only two Navajo teachers. The Agency Superintendent, who is not an educator, said they have a problem getting qualified Navajo teachers "because they get the bright lights in their eyes and stay in the cities." At Rough Rock more than half of the teachers are qualified Navajos.

Board member Yazzie Begay told Mondale that the Navajo teachers came to Rough

Rock because "they don't have traditional things in other schools."

About half of the employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs are of Indian descent. Only sixteen percent of the teachers are Indian. Less than five percent of those teachers are assigned to teach in their own tribal groups. Federal civil service requires efficient random placement of teachers.

At Rough Rock the parents take an active part in the school and work in the dormitories. The principal at Tuba City said some parents visit. "We have an open door policy, but they don't often stay over night because they want to get back to the sheep. . ."

When Mondale left, the Tuba City boarding school classes were over for the day. The recreation room was closed and the playground was empty. The only children in sight on a warm Spring day were those doing exercises in front of a dormitory.

Two weeks later, during a session of the sub-committee on Indian Education, Mondale told the Commissioner of Indian Affairs what he saw and felt at Tuba City and Rough Rock.

"It was the difference between a semi-military setting and a setting which was the kind that one would want to educate his own children in," Mondale told Commissioner Robert L. Bennett.

"In the Bureau of Indian Affairs system I found only two Navajo teachers . . . In the smaller Rough Rock school, I found ten Navajo teachers . . . in the dormitories in Tuba City, I found cold, really humaneless structures for these children . . . at Rough Rock . . . they used the mothers and parents of the community to live with the children so that they had a friend, a supporter, counsellor and adult, just like every child needs at that age.

"They have a permissive environment . . . the parents were encouraged to sleep over night with the kids. Wherever you went, Navajos were moving freely in and out of the classrooms. I didn't see any of that at the Tuba City school.

"I saw an exciting bi-lingual program at Rough Rock . . . Navajo textbooks developed by Navajo illustrators and under the supervision of Navajo leadership. I saw the creative use of local Navajo talents, so that side by side with the white teacher or with the Navajo teacher there was a mother teaching arts and crafts and telling the traditional stories of Navajo lore.

"I saw exciting adult education systems at Rough Rock, not at Tuba City.

"I saw a system at Rough Rock where they hired and fired the teacher, where the school board determined the policy, what I hear at the Tuba City school was all to the contrary.

"More than all of that and in an indefinable way, I saw a spirit and pride and excitement of people, who realized for the first time they had something to say about their own lives.

"I think the difference was the difference between night and day. I am not an expert in the field, but I think I know how to assess human feeling. I came away from Rough Rock committed to doing the best I could to tell the American people what I saw."

Commissioner Bennett quickly agreed with Mondale, but in the same sentence he defended the Bureau and testified that the sub-committee should also look at public schools where Indian children are educated and supply the Bureau with more money to do the job right.

"I don't have any argument at all . . . because this is the same goal to which we are working as far as the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools are concerned," Bennett testified.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, which operates through Division of Land Management under the Department of the Interior, has been laying the quoin of an inflexible bureaucracy for more than a century. Indians expect to see the day when there will be

more Bureau employees than Indians. Indians frequently contend that if all the Indians left the United States it would take the Bureau a century to phase itself out of existence.

The total annual budget of the Bureau next year will be \$265 million. To operate 72 boarding schools, 18 boarding dormitories and 175 day schools on or near reservations, the Bureau will spend \$110 million of the total budget. The total budget does not reflect building funds. The tradition of the Bureau has been to build large efficient schools and ship children thousands of miles from their homes for a centralized education.

Bennett said he graduated from a federal boarding school and has worked for the Bureau for thirty-six years. He is of Indian descent. In a speech in Minneapolis three years ago, shortly after he became Commissioner, he was not critical of the Indian policies of the past because, he said then, he thought the "policies of the past were well intentioned."

"The motivation was good and so were all the people. There is no question that the decisions which were made many years ago were the best that could be made at that point in history."

The Commissioner probably did not intentionally mean to include the autonomous authority of Indian agents on the reservation, inhuman tribal relocations, exploitation of Indian land, suppression of Indian language and religion, and cultural genocide.

Now that the dominant society seems bored with suppressing Indians and making them white, the Bureau stands between the people and their ambition to run their own lives. The burdens of the people are many, but Rough Rock is a symbol that Indians are alive and breathing on at least one reservation.

Testifying before the sub-committee last March, Bennett said he believed "there had been" an attitude of paternalism by the Bureau, but he stated that "this was one of the attitudes which had to be eliminated . . . and for three years I have worked on it. . ."

"We are performing to the maximum of our ability with the resources that are available," he testified, adding that he believes the Bureau can manage the problems of Indian people.

Before the sub-committee Bennett took credit for creating a full division of education within the Bureau; he was agreeable to criticism of the Bureau from members of the sub-committee, but blamed everything on the "various winds" and unthinking critics.

"Indian needs are so many and varied one scarcely knows where to begin . . . we get swept around by the various winds and currents of the national policy," he told the sub-committee.

Bennett himself is symbolically the best measure of the Bureau (as Rough Rock is of what Indians can do) and its relationship to Indians. He side steps criticism, speaks like a bureaucrat carrying out policy directives on the one hand, and pretends that Indians are planning and making the decisions for the Bureau on the other. He is not unkind, but defensive, confused, inconsistent and difficult to follow. Indians educated by and working for the Bureau strongly support him, others want to believe him because he is an Indian, but Bennett is unclear. His language shows his own identity problem.

He refers to the "profoundness" of the Indian in his testimony, but it would take more than a profound Indian to unravel the policies and guidelines of the Bureau.

Bennett does not question the intentions of his administrators and seems to believe that the Bureau has never made mistakes. He testified that "The current critics in Indian affairs tend to blame the education programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for all the social, economic and political ills of Indian people that, in actuality, are the

cumulative results of a century of neglect, misunderstanding, prejudice and paternalism."

"I am not very profound in Indian affairs," the Commissioner of Indian Affairs told the subcommittee, "because I have been associated with them too long and that during this period of association I have developed a great respect for their profoundness."

But Bennett has not demonstrated his respect for the "profoundness" by allowing the people to run their own schools. He testified that it is the policy of the Bureau to move toward local control only if the tribe requests it.

Mondale, pointing out that last year President Johnson directed the Secretary of the Interior to establish Indian school boards for federal Indian schools, asked Bennett how many school boards have been established.

Bennett: "So far, there have been two established because of the guidelines necessary to implement the President's message. . ."

Mondale: "One of them is at Rough Rock. Where is the other one?"

Bennett: "Blackwater on the Plima Reservation."

Mondale: "At the present rate of establishing the school boards. . . How long will it be before the President's directive is fully carried out?"

Bennett: ". . . we leave this up to the Indian people. We don't believe that we should go out and force them into school boards."

Mondale: "Are the Indians resisting local control?"

Bennett: "There are a variety of reactions . . . our policy is not to force this upon them. They have the guidelines and the appropriate requirements for applying for the administration of their schools. . ."

Mondale: "Is it the intention of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the so-called advisory boards come within the meaning of the President's directive?"

Bennett: "No sir; it is not. These are strictly people selected at large from the Indian community that advise us in the development of our educational policies and also our school operations. . ."

Mondale: "I was very impressed by the pride and the involvement of the board of education at Rough Rock and the parents in the community. If there is anything I heard from everyone I talked to, it was their pride and delight for the first time in their history of having something to say about the quality and direction and sensitivity in the education of their own children, something which every other American has had for generations."

"What is it about Indians that makes them any less desirous of local control and having something to say about the education of their children than anyone else in this country?"

Bennett: "I don't think there is any difference. I think they have wanted to do this for a long time. This is why we have the present policy."

Mondale: "Why has a century gone by and yet there are only two systems in the country where that is true?"

Bennett: "It might be because of the fact for many years American Indians did not accept an education program of any kind."

Mondale: "Is it your testimony that the Indians didn't want their children educated?"

Bennett: "My testimony is they evidently weren't satisfied with the education they were getting because they weren't sending them to school."

Mondale: "I think that is right. I agree with that. . ."

Bennett testified that when the Bureau tried to bring Indian heritage and bi-lingual education into the educational system "there was an uproar in education circles about the fact that we were trying to teach Indians to be Indians . . . we get swept around by the various winds. . ."

Mondale: "Right. As long as it is federally

controlled, it will continue to be, won't it? In other words, if the Indian children of this country are going to be educated pursuant to the notions of the current white power structure that controls Washington, you are going to have winds of change for the next century. . . .

"No other parents have that problem. If you told the school district where I was educated that we had to have a handy-dandy new national policy which was going to be controlled from Washington, complete in every detail—hiring, firing, curriculum and the rest—and that the budget bureau in Washington was going to determine through some unknown bureaucrat the nature of our education, you would have a *revolution, you would have a war, and I think it would be a justified one.* Yet, this has been going on for a century in Indian education."

A CANCER SURVIVOR'S WARNING

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is now faced with important decisions regarding its responsibility to the American public in the area of protection from the dangers of cigarette smoking. Only the most naive still argue that cigarette smoking can be indulged in without serious danger to the human body.

If the danger is recognized, then the Congress should act to protect the public interest. First, by bringing an end to Government subsidization of tobacco crops which encourage the production of this harmful material. Second, by seeing that Federal agencies and the State governments are given the means and the freedom to take all steps necessary to adequately warn the public of the dangers. Both these proposals have my complete and unswerving support.

The best and most remarkable statement in support of this position that I have ever read was written by State Senator Edward J. Speno, of New York. He is a man who was given up for dead by his doctors because he was afflicted by what they thought was an incurable cancer. He survived, and has become a true champion in the struggle against the dread disease of cancer.

He speaks as one who has come from the valley of the shadow of death, with an earnest message for his fellow Americans. An important part of that message is to avoid the horrible danger of smoking, and a call to his fellow legislators to protect the American people.

His story should be read by all, and it follows:

A CANCER SURVIVOR'S WARNING

(By Edward J. Speno)

Ten years ago doctors at the Mayo Clinic advised me to put my personal and business affairs in order because I would be dead of cancer within a few weeks.

I make my living using words—written words when I prepare a brief at my law firm, spoken words when I address my colleagues on the New York Senate floor. But in a personal crisis words may be inadequate for communicating special thoughts and special feelings, as when I tried to impart to my wife and four children during those remaining few days all the things I should have said to them before, but didn't and all the

things I would have said to them in the future, but now couldn't.

My weight dropped 60 pounds from 198 to 138. It was decided to try daily maximum-dosage radiation treatment but it was essentially a token effort because neither the doctors nor I held out much hope. But the weeks mysteriously stretched into months and then, quite unexpectedly—some said miraculously—the radiation therapy seemed to show results. And then, complete recovery—which still baffles the specialists who had all but written me off. Although my cancer was abdominal and probably had no cause-and-effect relationship with the pack or more of cigarettes I had been smoking every day, I promptly gave them up, for I had now seen firsthand the pathetic effects of tobacco on the human body.

The first reaction most people have to being told they are going to die of cancer is usually "Why me?" And if the patient dies, the question, unanswered, is buried with him. If he recovers, the rhetorical question gradually fades away. But in my case, the question persisted. "Why me?" And to it was added another: "Why was I allowed to recover?" I am not ashamed to admit that I sincerely feel I was stricken and then spared for a reason. And so I have dedicated my life to waging a legislative battle against cancer, especially cancer caused by smoking and other critical health problems.

As one of the very few who went to cancer country and returned to tell about it, almost daily I think about needless deaths caused by smoking. Recently I thought about cancer caused by smoking as I watched my son wash his car. He began with a brand-new, beige colored sponge and as it got dirtier he would rinse it out again and again until the dirt became so deeply imbedded in the sacs of the sponge that he gave up trying to rinse it out, threw it away and got a new one. I understand the human lung is a beige, sponge-like mass about the size of that plastic sponge. It occurred to me that when it gets clogged with dirt, we can't rinse it out, we can't casually throw it away—and we cannot get a new one!

This year 300,000 Americans will die painfully and prematurely because they smoke. The Public Health Service has reported that cigaret smoking is the main cause of 50,000 lung cancer deaths annually plus 25,000 deaths from respiratory diseases. They further state that a third of all deaths of men between 35 and 60 are related to smoking. And so this "invited killer," the cigaret, continues its campaign of mass murder. Seventy million Americans now smoke. Suicide-on-the-installment-plan continues unabated and as the years go by, the number of people who sign on the dotted line increases and the age of those who sign up gets lower and lower. In one study of 11-year-olds, 50 per cent of the little boys and 25 per cent of the little girls smoked regularly. Literally nothing else kills so many Americans—and that includes war and automobiles—as do cigarettes. About 1,000,000 productive young people now in our schools will die of lung cancer alone before they reach 65—to say nothing of emphysema, heart attacks, etc.—unless we do something about the cigaret menace.

When we think about the smoking problem, we see that three groups are involved: the smokers, the manufacturers (including advertisers and sellers) and the legislators who make laws governing the sale and distribution of cigarettes.

THE SMOKERS

Regarding the smokers, there are none so deaf as those who will not hear. A mountain of statistical evidence based upon 13,000 scientific studies in 20 years of investigation in nations all around the world cites the causal relationship between smoking and cancer and other diseases. But proof, like beauty, is often in the eye of the beholder.

So, when we recognize the smoker's re-

fusal to acknowledge the facts about smoking, we must consider fresh ways to effect his rehabilitation. Coupled with this effort must be a program of prevention for those who are about to begin smoking.

Where do we begin with rehabilitation? Of the 200,000,000 Americans now alive, 70,000,000 smoke regularly; some are heavy smokers, others light smokers. But I think the numbers are so formidable that for the time being, at least, we will almost have to write off the heavy smokers. When I was in a cancer ward I saw men whose mouth, cheeks, tongue, larynx and esophagus had been cut away surgically because of cancer caused by smoking. A few were still smoking, holding the cigaret to the hole that led into their windpipe!

But with the light smoker there could still be hope. By the logical route, we must continue to barrage him with statistical evidence that smoking causes cancer and other illness until he recognizes the inevitability of the proof. By the emotional route we must find appropriate psychological means of tapping those human drives, wants and insecurities which prompt many to smoke, not to smoke or at least not to smoke too much. We must seek ways to make the ashtray as obsolete—and its use so aesthetically repulsive—as we have the spittoon!

It is in the area of prevention through education that we can most profitably expend our energies. I look to our educational leaders to develop effective school instruction in the health sciences by teachers who can communicate with our youngsters and who are professionally prepared in the health area. It is my personal belief that antismoking education should start early in the elementary grades before the child is confronted with the decision of whether to smoke.

But our educational efforts should not be confined to school programs. In two years, half of the American population will be under 25 years of age. We must seek to touch the right psychological nerve in the teenager of the "now generation." Maybe our anti-smoking TV commercials are too bland. Maybe detailed descriptions of the grim experiences of stars who finally "made it" but then died of lung cancer—stars such as Nat King Cole, Dick Powell, William Tallman, Edward R. Murrow, Franchot Tone, Judy Holliday, etc.—might impress them; or of those who are still alive but live in the shadow of recurring lung cancer, like Arthur Godfrey or John Wayne. Or maybe it takes more to frighten them. Maybe such commercials should include an "on location" TV spot showing a cancer ward like the one I was in where noses, cheeks, jaws, tongues, larynxes, throats were cut away because of cancer caused by cigarettes.

Maybe fear is no longer a motivating force for young people. Maybe the "now generation," which presumably trusts no one over 30, no one of the "establishment," can be reached by pointing out that cigaret manufacturers and advertisers are part of the "establishment," a part that is duping them into believing it is "cool," it is "in," to smoke. Maybe the social need to smoke, which so many adults feel, might be one of the "adult" values the teenagers choose to reject. Maybe they can be made to feel proud about being the "unhooked" generation.

THE SELLERS

There are none so blind as those who will not see. Thus far, the manufacturers, advertisers and sellers of cigarettes have chosen not to see that they literally are engaged in an industry that deals in death, an industry no less morbid or morally suspect than munitions making. At least the munitions makers can take some refuge in the notion that their products are also used for defense. But profit is all the cigaret manufacturers can point to. They must be made to see that they are dealing in a kind of genocide whose victims are well on their way to equal in number those of the Nazi holocaust. Maybe someday