

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 12

JUNE 12, 1967, TO JUNE 20, 1967

(PAGES 15309 TO 16558)

their own citizens or of the citizens of other nations.

I cannot overemphasize the inescapable fact that human rights must be recognized by all men and by all governments before a state of peace and tranquillity can descend upon the earth.

In April of 1966 the Security Council adopted a resolution proposed by the United Kingdom and joined by the United States which called the situation resulting from the threatened landing of oil in Mozambique for transmittal to Rhodesia a "threat to the peace."

Yes, Mr. President, the Security Council officially determined that a human rights problem within the borders of one geographical area was a threat to the peace. The resolution concluded: "Needless to say, a threat to the peace is a most urgent matter of international concern."

I call the attention of the Senate to the five international human rights conventions that are presently before the Foreign Relations Committee. There is a Convention To Protect Freedom of Association. And there is one designed to prevent and punish the crime of genocide. A Convention on the Political Rights of Woman, one on slavery, and one on forced labor have recently been studied by an ad hoc subcommittee and reported favorably to the full committee.

Mr. President, I think the crises throughout the world compel us to accept the fact that the rights of all men everywhere must be protected, if world peace is to become a world reality. Let us all bring about one significant step on the road to world peace. Let us ratify these human rights conventions.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MONDALE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last week at the commencement exercises of the Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Kans., the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] had the honor to address the 1,200 graduates, their families, and friends.

Senator MONDALE's speech was scholarly and stimulating—and of special moment to us in the Senate. His subject was "Education and Public Responsibility"—a topic high in my own concern.

In the course of the address he had praised for our colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his brilliant leadership in advancing the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

The address of Senator MONDALE has such merit and meaning as to deserve a permanent place in the records of Congress where so much of this public responsibility resides.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent for the insertion of Senator MONDALE's commencement address in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

President Budd, distinguished members of the faculty, graduates, students, and friends of Kansas State College of Pittsburg. I know this is a wonderful school, because it is headed by an old friend of mine from Minnesota, President Budd.

It's always a pleasure to be allowed to speak at a commencement, especially a college commencement. Somehow it is a sign of dreams and promises that have come true, and it is truly so in our Great Middle West. Graduates and families are to be congratulated.

The 1,200 or so of you who are receiving degrees today represent a tremendous investment, and not only in terms of your money and your effort and the material and nonmaterial resources that have been gathered together on this campus to make this day possible for all of you.

Somewhere back there, in the founding of this college and the many others like it that mark the landscape of this region, there was an investment of faith.

I like to think that some of your leaders of the past had at least an inkling that what they were starting would turn into what Kansas State College of Pittsburg has become. I admit it is hard to believe that they foresaw that thousands of people would be gathered here today as witnesses to this annual ceremony of graduation.

But whatever the size of their conception, there was one. And it was based on faith—faith in the future of people, faith in a system that demands education for its business, for its government, and for its quality of life.

It is impossible to overestimate the magnitude of the vision and its accomplishment that is Kansas State College of Pittsburg. For their investment has brought a huge profit.

And education itself has become almost an organic being itself, feeding on the knowledge of the past, giving birth to new knowledge at an astonishing rate, increasing itself in almost geometric proportions, and giving unbelievable benefits to the human beings who nurture it and are nurtured by it in its never-ending life.

And this being exists not only at Pittsburg, Kansas, but at St. Cloud, Minnesota, and Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania, and Berkeley, California, everywhere that the investment has been made and continues to be made.

New colleges and new kinds of colleges spring up everywhere alongside the old ones, and the old ones continue to grow. They also change, as the needs of the nation require more of its people and new things of its people.

And the colleges contribute to the conception of the nation as the nation contributes to the conception of the colleges, in a continuous interaction between the people and those who would change them.

For change is what education is all about. It is a cliché to mention it, but it is easy to forget.

I remember a controversy not very long ago in my home state of Minnesota, when claims were being made that its great university should be investigated because it was subversive. The fears of many, I believe, were made eloquent by the mother of a University sophomore. "I sent my daughter away to the University," she lamented, "and when she came back she just wasn't the same anymore." We are bound to be worried by change, but it is the price of growth.

Like the pioneers of this great region who made a great experiment with state support of public higher education, we are pioneering today on the national level. Some of the experiments being undertaken today may one day be judged as bold and visionary and magnificent as we now judge the great attempts of the past.

We have learned to think of education as a national resource rather than a purely private one or local one. And along with that change in our conception has come a parallel change in our method of support.

Among the graduates here today are many with bachelor's degrees, a good proportion with master's degrees, and some with specialist's certificates beyond that level of attain-

ment. Every single one of you has been directly affected by the new federal involvement in higher education.

Many of you have had federal loans, and look forward with more or less enthusiasm to repaying all or part of them. Many have contributed to your own educations and to the college as well through the college work-study program, where 90 per cent of the money you have earned has come through federal grants.

Many have used library materials which federal support made possible. Federal support has contributed to particular programs in which students and faculty have been involved, and the list goes on, and it will grow longer.

And more than half of the graduates at this commencement will teach in schools where the federal involvement continues to grow. Many of the buildings were constructed with Federal assistance. More than \$4 billion in programs were administered by the U.S. Office of Education during the current fiscal year, and contributions came from many other agencies as well.

Public funds have always gone to education, of course. But we are beginning to see a growing federal involvement as we continue to see education as a part of the Public Responsibility. Education is now fully established as a public, national effort.

And the Public Responsibility for education is taking other forms as well. As a nation we are coming to realize that powerful educational forces exist outside the classroom and outside the formal educational institution.

We have always known that experience was a teacher of sorts, whether the best or something less than that. Now we are beginning to consider seriously the quality of the experiences that make up education outside the classroom.

One of these experiences, and my principal topic today, is the experience of television. It always comes as a shock to me to realize that most of you who are graduating today have lived virtually all of your lives with television.

That is a benchmark that separates us as generations, and it is also a sign of the growth and change that has characterized our lives. The founders of this college may have had a vision of 1,200 graduates in a single year of Kansas State College of Pittsburg, but I cannot imagine that they saw how pervasive a part of your lives television would be.

Because television has always been a part of your lives, you may view it somewhat differently from the way those of my generation do. The fact that the average American spends about 3½ hours a day watching television may not be a matter of concern or importance to you.

It may seem perfectly normal and acceptable to you that one and one-half billion man hours per week are spent in this country watching television. You may not be at all surprised by the phenomenal growth of television as a medium of communication and entertainment within the span of your lifetime, nor troubled by television's impact on this country's citizens.

Indeed, you may simply view television as one of the great advances in civilization which your predecessors are proudly passing on to you.

To some considerable extent such a reaction would be quite understandable and would have some basis in fact. The technology which has made television possible is truly indicative of the means now available to weld together the people of this nation and the people of the world—to bridge areas of misunderstanding and make possible direct communication among cultures of various types. The technological capability, however, is clearly not being used entirely for these objectives.

Of the billion and a half man hours a week spent with television in this country, only the smallest fraction is devoted to enlightening the human mind or bettering the human condition. This magnificent medium has been used in this country primarily to titillate rather than teach, to entertain rather than educate.

Our failure to exploit the full potentiality of television provides the background for what may turn out to be one of the most important federal ventures in education of our time—the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

In his State of the Union message to the current Congress, the President declared that "we should develop educational television into a vital public resource." The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 has now passed the Senate, in a measure to provide for continued development of educational broadcasting to serve the needs of our people more completely.

This proposal is a clear recognition by the President and the Senate that television should be as much a part of our public concern as the highways upon which we drive, the lakes upon which we fish and in which we swim, the forests in which we hunt and hike, the air—hopefully pure—which we breathe.

We are concerned about our safety on the highways, our happiness in the outdoors, our health in our atmosphere. We also have—and are now recognizing—a public responsibility to assure the wisest and most beneficial use of the broadcast frequencies over which radio and television programs are disseminated.

The Radio Act of 1927 and the Communications Act of 1934 clearly established that the airwaves over which radio and television programs are transmitted into our homes belong to the people.

Stations which broadcast on assigned frequencies—or airwaves—do so by the consent of the people. Only so long as they fulfill their obligations and maintain their operations in the public interest are they eligible to continue such transmissions.

The very basis upon which radio and television broadcasting exist—the airwaves over which the programs are transmitted—are a public resource belonging to all the citizens of this country. It is indeed time to more fully develop that resource to meet the highest aspirations of the citizenry.

Important progress can be made in that direction by developing educational television into a vital, dynamic force in our society—by helping it become a service truly alternative to the dulling diversions to which we have for the most part been submitted.

We have a well laid foundation upon which to build a growing and dynamic educational television service in this country. In 1951, 242 channels were reserved by the Federal Communications Commission for such educational television stations. By May of 1962, 82 ETV stations were on the air broadcasting on these assigned frequencies.

In 1962 the Congress enacted the Educational Television Facilities Program and for the first time support was available from the Federal Government to assist in the construction of new ETV stations.

That program is due to expire in July of this year, and so it is possible at this point to assess its success. When the program expires there will be 183 ETV stations on the air or under construction, more than doubling the number of such stations since the program was initiated.

The number of people served by these educational television stations will have increased from 105 to 155 million people. However, to achieve our goal of serving 95% of the people of each state with educational television, at least 200 more stations will be required.

At the same time that this growth in broad-

cast facilities has been taking place, ETV's impact on the society at large has also been increasing.

In 1962 for example, approximately 2½ million viewed an ETV station at least once a week. By 1966 that figure had more than doubled; ETV today is reaching more than 6 million American homes once a week.

It is possible to estimate that during any given week-day evening hour ETV is being viewed by 700,000 to 1 million people in this country. In addition, about 6½ million students from kindergarten to the 12th grade during the 1965-66 school year received some of their classroom instruction by way of those same educational television stations.

The quality of the programs presented on ETV has also shown some improvement. National Educational Television has perhaps dramatized this improvement of quality most.

The President's State of the Union message last January, for example, marked the first time that a live interconnection was established on a nationwide basis among educational television stations. Wide critical acclaim accrued to NET for the quality of its coverage of that speech and the commentary that preceded and followed it. This program and the discernible increase in regular program quality present clear evidence of ETV's potential.

Despite this progress, however, it is still accurate to say that ETV is merely on the threshold of the development needed to provide the service the nation requires.

Individual ETV stations suffer from a condition close to poverty as they attempt to meet the needs of their communities. NET's resources for programs of national significance and importance are in no way equal to the needs that are apparent. It has become quite clear that additional support is required for ETV to assure the growth required.

The Senate has already passed, under the brilliant leadership of Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island, The Public Broadcasting Act. It is currently under consideration by the House of Representatives.

The Act will continue the educational television facilities program which was enacted in 1962 to assist in the construction of new educational broadcasting stations.

It will establish a Corporation for Public Broadcasting along lines generally proposed by the Carnegie Commission. And it will authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study of instructional television to recommend the support and organization required to utilize television most effectively in formal instruction.

It can indeed be said that this has been and continues to be educational broadcasting's year. Public awareness of the potential of educational broadcasting has probably never been higher.

But the public's expectations of educational broadcasting also have increased. The challenge to make significant progress, therefore, is that much greater.

The significance of television to the growth and change—to the education—of young people cannot be overemphasized. Research indicates that children begin school with greater vocabulary, greater reading skills, greater awareness of the world as a result of television. They can, for example, read with ease most of the billboards advertising beer and soap.

In schools, of course, a strengthened television effort would have vast potential to improve the effectiveness of instruction. Given proper support for the development of excellence in quality, television can be used to demonstrate, to present specific learning experiences, to motivate independent performance, and, of course, to bring the events of the world into the classroom for analysis and discussion.

Really good television can help schools

keep up with the rapidly changing face of our society, the rapidly changing skills and knowledge which we require, and the urgently changing requirements of peaceful and productive relationships with the variety of cultures and countries with which we share this planet.

To meet needs of these dimensions we need to enlist every resource at our disposal, not the least of which are the newest and most comprehensive means of communication.

But public television as envisioned in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 has potentialities far beyond classroom applications.

In a letter to the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, E. B. White spoke of the opportunity of noncommercial television in these words:

"Noncommercial television should address itself to the ideal of excellence, not the idea of acceptability—which is what keeps commercial television from climbing the staircase. I think television should be the visual counterpart of the literary essay, should arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the woods and the hills. It should be our Lyceum, our Chautauqua, our Minsky's, and our Camelot. It should restate and clarify the social dilemma and the political pickle. Once in a while it does, and you get a quick glimpse of its potential."

Imagine public service broadcasting unconfined by the need to sell products, by the need to reach the largest total audience with commercial messages that all too often emphasize quantity of sales and not quality of product.

Imagine programming which could base its judgments about content on esthetic grounds or service to the citizen, enthusiastically rather than grudgingly.

Imagine television offerings which could be directed to special audiences without the necessity of considering whether such audiences are massive, without worrying about whether only 16.3 million watch the program compared to the 17.2 million watching another station.

Imagine, in short, a powerful communicative tool which is perceived as a means of enriching the lives of the American people rather than the bank accounts of American corporations.

Imagine having a real choice.

That is what may be in our future under the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

The Act and its authorization of \$9 million is only a first step toward these goals. But James Reston has hailed it as possibly "one of the transforming occasions of American life," comparing it to the Morrill Act which established land-grant universities in 1862, and quietly transformed American public higher education. It is a recognition on the part of the Congress and the President that this powerful medium of education is also a part of the Public Responsibility.

As public television develops, the investment will be large. Both the instructional aspects of television and the general educational aspects will require many times this year's proposed appropriation.

Public television will never be self-supporting, just as Kansas State College at Pittsburg will never be self-supporting and was never intended to be. It will require a continuing commitment of common treasures in the interest of growth and change—in the interest of education, which today may be the single great requirement for the preservation of our way of life.

This is a world of international and domestic tension. This is a world of technology which is outstripping our capacity to deal with it as human beings. This is a world which requires sensitivity and powers of

judgment among its citizens in proportions unmatched in any place or time.

This is a world which requires the marshalling of all of our resources of education. The power of television is one of those resources, and it must be used so that the spirit of the individual is not suppressed but is allowed to flourish and grow.

Our goal is simply stated: we want to achieve the betterment of man through the proper application of man's knowledge. It will tax our wisdom, our strength, our purpose, our resources, to achieve that goal. It is the goal of education, in and out of institutions of learning.

That is the Public Responsibility.

RUSSIA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there has, I feel, been some confusion and misunderstanding concerning the position of the Soviet Union in the Middle East crisis.

A provocative and intelligent column by Roscoe Drummond in the June 15 Washington Post cuts through the confusion and I believe gets to the truth about the dangerous game Russia has played in the Middle East as in other parts of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Drummond's column be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

RUSSIA AND MIDEAST: EFFORTS FOR PEACE OR WAR?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is this theory on the Middle East crisis: the Soviets certainly helped avoid war at this time.

This, I am convinced, is dangerous and wishful fiction that will get us in trouble if we don't watch out.

The premise on which this wishful idea is being built is that the Soviets deliberately decided that they would rather work with the United States to contain the conflict than to help Nasser win.

The hope behind this view of Moscow's role in the Middle East crisis is that the Soviet government will join with the West in encouraging the Arabs to adopt a policy of peaceful coexistence with Israel.

It seems to me that what has happened thus far does not bear out this premise or give much substance to this hope.

I believe that the controlling facts are these:

1—By every device at its command, massive military aid, substantial economic assistance, plus total diplomatic support for the Arabs and total hostility to Israel—Moscow gave Nasser the go-ahead in his announced plan to destroy Israel. Was this detente? Was this Moscow's way of cutting back the cold war? Hardly. It was the most dangerous cold war venture since Khrushchev tried to secrete missiles in Cuba.

2—Was the Soviet Union holding any checkrein on Nasser and on what he would do with the help he was getting from Moscow? Was the Soviet Union thinking all along on how well it could cooperate with the United States to avert war or to contain it if it broke out? There is no such evidence. The evidence, as reported by Robert H. Estabrook, United Nations correspondent of The Washington Post, is that Soviet military equipment, especially spare parts, was being poured into Cairo on the very eve of the war, thus seeking to make sure that the Arabs would not run out of supplies as the fighting progressed.

3—Numerous news stories suggest that because Premier Kosygin told President John-

son over the Hot Line on the day the fighting started that he wanted to cooperate with the United States in restraining the belligerents, this meant that the Soviets put the highest premium on keeping the peace.

It is wiser to judge Soviet policy on the basis of its actions rather than on its words. The Soviets did not restrain the Arabs; only Israel restrained the Arabs.

Some suggest that because Moscow finally supported a U.N. call for a cease-fire without any Israeli pullback, this meant that the Soviets were acting with great prudence and eagerness to avert a spreading conflict.

This conclusion is unproved because the Soviets opposed the U.N. call for a cease-fire in the earliest stages of the war when it appeared that Nasser could win and accepted it only when it became clear that Nasser was losing.

The conclusion that Moscow was ready to work with the United States to contain the fighting is unproved because the necessity for doing so never arose. Israel won the war so quickly that the danger of the United States and the U.S.S.R. being drawn into it never developed and therefore the events of the past week cast little light on how prudently Moscow would have acted under different circumstances.

Obviously the Soviet Union wants no direct military confrontation with the United States and most certainly does not want world war. But the truth is that it helped start a war between Egypt and Israel, did nothing to contain it until Egypt was at the point of collapse, and therein showed that it was prepared to take the most perilous risk of starting a conflict it could not stop.

It would be a welcome dividend if Moscow decided to work for peace instead of conflict in the Middle East. But the record shows we had better not count on it.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FEDERAL LAND BANK OF NEW ORLEANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on June 6 I had occasion to address the officials, membership, and staff of the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans as the bank celebrated its 50th anniversary. Chartered by the Congress on March 8, 1917, the bank made its first loan early in June, 50 years ago.

I was very happy to take part in this golden anniversary celebration. The Federal land bank system is one of the most successful creations of the Federal Government, and has served our farmers and the Nation well over the years.

Under the changing agricultural conditions of the country, I sincerely believe that the land banks and allied agriculture credit agencies are destined to fill an even more important role in the production of our food and fiber. The demand for agricultural credit will increase materially in the future, and the records indicate that our agricultural production will become increasingly dependent on the continued availability of credit assistance. To fill this need such institutions as our Federal land banks will continue to be absolutely essential.

We have already seen a rapid increase in the amount of farm mortgages and debts. I am proud that the record also shows that our farmers have the ability to manage their increasing credit requirements safely and wisely. Farm debt delinquencies are insignificant, foreclosures are practically nonexistent and the record of repayment is very good.

In an address delivered at the golden anniversary meeting, I went into the history of our farm credit system and the role which the system will be called upon to fill in the future. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at the 50th anniversary celebration of the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER BEFORE THE FEDERAL LAND BANK OF NEW ORLEANS, NEW ORLEANS, LA., JUNE 6, 1967

I wish to congratulate the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans and its officials and workers on your 50th anniversary. You were chartered on March 8th, 1917 and your first loan was made in the first week of June, fifty years ago.

Our unsurpassed agricultural production is one of the marvels of the world. Many factors are responsible. Research is one. Ingenuity and intelligence of farmers in adapting to changes have also made substantial contributions. Most important, however, has been the contribution made by a steady, adequate and understanding source of credit. Without adequate capital little progress could have been achieved.

The creation by Congress in 1916 of the Federal Land Bank was a legislative landmark in the history of our nation's agriculture. From this modest beginning there has developed a source of dependable, responsive and sympathetic credit for our farmers, unmatched in any other country of the world. This first step took great vision, but I doubt that those responsible for the original Act of 1916 actually envisioned the efficient and progressive system that has evolved through the years.

The Farm Credit Administration as we know it today developed rather slowly. It was about six years after the Federal Land Banks and National Farm Loan Associations began operations that the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank was established. Production Credit Corporations and Associations and Banks for Cooperatives were not authorized until 1933. And in 1933 the various farm credit institutions and associations in operation were transferred by an Executive Order of the President to the newly created Farm Credit Administration. Additional changes were made and today we have in action an efficient and effective line of credit for farmers.

I think it is important to emphasize that the effectiveness of the Farm Credit Administration and the lack of real controversy over its operation can be traced directly to the sound principle of securing loan funds in the open market, at market rates. Originally backed with Federal capital, the Farm Credit system today is almost wholly farmer-owned. And all of you can be proud of the fact that the Federal Land Banks are wholly farmer-owned.

Splendid leadership and sound business management at every level must be credited with a considerable share for this achievement. This is especially so since agriculture is not static, but rather a dynamic, ever-growing, ever-changing institution of many parts and of great complexity. It is beset with unpredictable weather, wide variations in prices and ever-changing demands. This is well illustrated by the situation we have witnessed in the past ten months. Early in 1966 there began a gradual price rise for agriculture generally. All commodities did not share alike but the price trend was up. There were high hopes among our farmers across the country that good days were ahead. Since August of last year, however, farm prices have decreased by almost ten percent.

While this set-back is temporary, the fact remains that the lack of stability in the pro-