

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)

POWER ON A LEASH

Our first chance to win the war quickly came in February 1965, when we started bombing the north. At once, we should have launched a sustained, maximum-effort attack on all of the enemy's war-supporting industries, transportation facilities, military complexes, petroleum-storage depots. At that time, the enemy had no Soviet surface-to-air missile (SAM) sites installed, and his anti-aircraft capability was practically nil. He could not have opposed us in any significant way, and we could have quickly broken North Vietnam's resistance.

If we had launched a maximum-effort air campaign—coupled with heavy pressure on the enemy's troops in South Vietnam—it would not have been long before he would have been forced to ask for negotiations. And it is important to note that these negotiations would have been conducted on terms favorable to us—instead of, as it turned out, our having to coax him to the negotiating table, more or less on his terms. It's also possible that under this extreme pressure the enemy's aggression in the south might just have faded away. Either way, it would have been a victory for us.

But what happened? From the start, our air power was kept on a tight leash. At first, when we sent even a reconnaissance plane over the north, Washington would tell us what route and altitude to fly. We started our operations close to the Demilitarized Zone and worked gradually northward about 30 miles at a time, always under Washington's close control. It was obvious to anybody plotting the course of events that the enemy could expect us eventually to move on up to the heartland of the country. Thus, the vital military elements of surprise and maximum impact were lost.

We also lost valuable time. Our policy of gradualism enabled North Vietnam to mount the most formidable air-defense system that has ever been used in combat history. The North Vietnamese began building SAM sites in 1965, and during that year were able to fire only 125 missiles. Eventually, the North Vietnamese had about 40 SAM battalions, and during 1967 they fired nearly 3500 missiles at our aircraft. The result is that we have lost nearly 1000 planes over North Vietnam. Many of the pilots were killed or captured. Not only did we suffer this needless loss of men and aircraft, but the North Vietnamese were given time to disperse their factories and military installations. This made it all the more difficult to go after them later, and hence prolonged the war.

HAVEN IN HAIPHONG

Of all the things we should have done but did not do, the most important was to neutralize the port of Haiphong. During 1967, some 80 percent of North Vietnam's imports came in by sea, mostly through Haiphong. This included arms, ammunition, oil, trucks, generators, machinery, spare parts, steel and cement—all vital to the war. We should have blocked the approaches to the harbor with mines laid by aircraft. Closing an enemy harbor is customary and logical in warfare. This was the simplest and most effective measure we could have taken.

All along, our military leaders recommended that the port be neutralized. The recommendation was always vetoed. It was claimed that closing Haiphong would not affect the enemy's capability of waging the war in South Vietnam—that North Vietnam could sustain the war at the same level by means of rail, road and coastal shipments from China. But a reasonable evaluation of our intelligence convinced us that it was next to impossible to move that amount of matériel over North Vietnam's exceedingly limited transportation network. In my opinion, closing Haiphong would have shortened the war by many months.

Along with mining the approaches to the harbor, we should have destroyed the ene-

my's stockpiles of matériel on the docks at Haiphong and in the centers of the cities of Haiphong and Hanoi. The stockpiles were easy targets there—but the Defense Department ruled that we had to wait until the enemy moved this matériel away from the cities and scattered it for 300 to 400 miles along the trails into South Vietnam. Then it was extremely difficult to find, and much of it, including vast amounts of ammunition, reached South Vietnam, where it was used to kill American and other Allied soldiers.

LOST TARGETS

Much earlier in the conflict, we should have gone after North Vietnam's most important bridge, the Paul Doumer span in Hanoi, which handles all rail traffic between Hanoi and Red China and Hanoi and Haiphong. We hit a lot of minor bridges in North Vietnam before we finally were allowed to go after the Doumer. Even then, we were allowed to hit it only for limited periods of time. Then it would be taken off the list, and the North Vietnamese were given time to build it up again! Whenever we struck anywhere close to Hanoi, people in Washington would complain that we were causing too much disruption in the city—which was exactly what we were trying to do.

We were never permitted to hit the docks along the Red River in Hanoi. We should have kept the Hanoi power station out of commission. We hit it several times. Inexplicably, after each strike it was taken off the target list, and the enemy would put it back into commission. Eventually, we were prohibited from making any more attacks on it—and this was long before the Johnson Administration ended all bombing of the north.

We also should have hit the Hanoi waterworks, which was next door to the power station, but we were never allowed to do it. We hit the railroad yard close to the town of Hongai once; then we were pulled off that. This is another thing that is hard to understand: we were allowed to do something, then two months later it would be off limits—and it stayed off limits—and it stayed off limits for the rest of the air war.

PRIVILEGED SANCTUARY

But even with the restrictions, the air campaign was effective as far as it went. By early 1967, we had destroyed or disrupted about 50 percent of North Vietnam's war-supporting industry. The North Vietnamese were hurting far more than most people realized. We had intelligence reports that their morale was suffering. Their whole effort was weakened by the fact that they had to have more than 500,000 people working to rebuild their transportation network—plus 125,000 to man their anti-aircraft defenses. Thus, despite all the restrictions, we really had the enemy on the ropes by late 1967. If we had hit his war-making resources harder all along, he would have been knocked out by then. In my judgment, the war would have been over.

Once North Vietnam gave up, the Vietcong in the south would have had no choice but to follow suit. The Vietcong are directed and supplied by Hanoi. Vietcong combat units are now two-thirds North Vietnamese; they cannot fight without North Vietnamese regular forces in close proximity, and could not have continued on their own.

If there is no progress in the negotiations with the communists in Paris, and if the communists continue to wage their aggression in South Vietnam at either present or increased intensity, then we should resume the airwar. If they are going to continue to fight, I don't think they should be granted the luxury of being able to conduct their aggressions from a privileged sanctuary. We should resume the air war, moreover, on an all-out basis and not in piecemeal fashion. We should finish the whole Vietnam war quickly.

Vietnam is a classic example of how not to fight a war. The "gradual" approach re-

quires the expenditure of much more of one's manpower, resources and prestige than is necessary. Our prestige is by no means as high now as it would have been if we had gone in, cleaned the thing up and made our exit.

If we had fought World War II as we have fought the Vietnam war, we would still be fighting it—if we hadn't lost it.

MIGRANTS IN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, since my boyhood days I have been particularly aware of the large numbers of migrant farmworkers that each year come to my home State of Minnesota. It is estimated that this year more than 18,000 migrants are in Minnesota, predominantly Mexican-Americans from Texas, working mostly in the sugar beet fields in the Red River Valley and southern Minnesota.

Two St. Paul Pioneer Press reporters, Bob Goligoski and Ann Baker, recently completed a five-part series discussing the living and working conditions of these migrant farmworkers. Their report is based on visits to migrant camps, and talks with dozens of migrants and farmers.

The series of articles on the Minnesota migrants describes many of the same kinds of problems that I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, have found to exist around the country. Inadequate pay, irregularity of employment, poor housing, racial discrimination, are too often the rule, not the exception. State facilities for the education or health care of migrants are understaffed and underfunded. Regulations and laws affecting migrants are often not enforced. Predictions that mechanization will eliminate the need for migrants are heard—yet more migrants are in Minnesota this year than ever before. The list of grievances, unfortunately, seems endless.

The various problems existing in Minnesota associated with the recruitment and presence of migrants are not too dissimilar from the problems present in most so-called user States, where migrant farmworkers meet peak season harvesting demands. These problems stand as a constant reminder that efforts in finding long term, comprehensive solutions to the problems of migrant and seasonal farmworkers must extend not only to the home base States of Florida, Texas, Arizona, and California where there is a concentration of migrants during the off season, but also to the northern user States such as Minnesota. The Migratory Labor Subcommittee is concerned with all aspects of these problems, in all States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the St. Paul Pioneer Press' series of articles on "Migrants in Minnesota" be printed in the RECORD.

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

MIGRANTS: FARM WORK BRINGS 18,000 TO MINNESOTA

(By Bob Goligoski)

Every year they come with the spring, trickling northward from a hundred Texas towns, heading for the Minnesota farm fields where the soil is rich and the sugar beet is king.

This year, some 18,000 Mexican-American migrants have made the annual pilgrimage. Ninety per cent of them live in the lush Red River Valley, along the hundreds of dusty back-country roads that criss-cross the valley from Breckenridge to the Canadian border.

The rest settle in migrant camps that dot the countryside south and west of the Twin Cities.

Some of these temporary Minnesotans live rent-free in two-story houses with carpeting, television and a room for every child. Others sleep and cook in the filthy shacks described decades ago in "The Grapes of Wrath."

The vast majority are housed in neither squalor nor opulence.

About 90 per cent of the migrants work only in the sugar beet fields, thinning out the unwanted beet plants with a hoe and hacking at the weeds that litter the landscape. The other transplanted Texans toil in the asparagus fields around Owatonna and other southern Minnesota towns.

The Hollandale area is a hot-bed of agricultural activity with the growing of sugar beets, onions, corn, asparagus and other crops. Migrants help harvest potatoes in many parts of the state, work in turkey processing plants in places like Litchfield and Fairbault and help with the production of trees and bushes at Bailey Nurseries in nearby Newport.

But the migrants come mostly to work the 195,000 acres of beets on the Minnesota and North Dakota sides of the valley and the 35,000 acres of beets in southern Minnesota. More than 2,300 farmers grow beets in those areas and about 95 per cent of the crop is sent to the American Crystal Sugar Co. processing plants in Drayton, N.D. and Chaska, Crookston, Moorhead and East Grand Forks.

When the migrants are through weeding the beet fields in mid-July, some head home for Texas while many others push on to Michigan and Wisconsin for the cucumber harvest or work the tomato fields in Illinois, Ohio and Iowa. A few stay in Minnesota until the snows come to help their employers with general farm work.

About 11,000 of the migrants work in the fields. The rest are either too young or too old for field labor.

Their number has increased slightly during the last five years despite many predictions the migrants would be replaced by 1970 by the mechanical weeding and thinning machine. But the device, according to many farmers has not been perfected yet and only about 3 farmers in the state have invested in the \$6,000 to \$7,000 machines.

So the migrants hoe on for six weeks every summer, often working for 10 and 12 hours every day, for what one farmer called "damn good wages, considering we give 'em free housing."

The U.S. Sugar Act sets \$25.50 as the minimum wage for one thinning and one weeding of an acre of beets. A fast worker, aided by effective usage or herbicides, can go through three acres a day, but most migrants average only an acre or two a day.

A survey of 372 migrant families (3.4 workers per family) was made last summer in the valley by Migrants, Inc., a St. Paul based organization that helps finance and organize education and counseling programs for migrants around the state.

The survey found that the annual income from all sources for each family was \$2,431.

This figure is disputed by many farmers who resent the "do-gooders" trying to help the "poor, abused" migrant. Most of the farmers echo the sentiments expressed by R. V. McWalter, a muscular, sun-burned farmer with a 1,600-acre "spread" just east of East Grand Forks.

"When I hear all these stories" he said, "about how bad off the poor migrant is, I

think of how much I pay them and I see how wrong these stories are.

"There are 12 workers in the two families that work for me, and they will take about \$6,000 from me for three weeks work. At the wages they are getting, they should be able to furnish their own housing."

Archie Johnson, a migrant labor specialist who works for the Minnesota State Employment Service out of a small office in Hollandale, says he knows some industrious families that earn \$10,000 to \$20,000 a year for three to five months of farm work.

Migrants interviewed in the fields gave lower estimates of the wages they expect to make this summer:

Salvador Garza, Edinburg, Texas—"There are six working in my family and we'll maybe make \$2,000 in six weeks here."

Paul Gill, Lampasas, Texas—"I have my daughter and wife Anita working with me and we'll get \$1,200, maybe \$1,400 in the six weeks if it ever quits raining and we can get out in the field."

Rene Gorena, Donna, Texas—"Just my wife and I are working, the kids are too young. I usually get here in April and stay until November. We should make about \$3,500."

Gorena, a genial 29-year-old who just bought an \$8,300 two-ton truck said his money doesn't go very far in Minnesota "because prices are very high around the Crookston area. I think the prices are higher around here when the migrants come."

That feeling is shared by Louis Martinez, a former migrant who works as coordinator of the Migrants Inc., Opportunity Center in East Grand Forks. Martinez has talked with hundreds of migrants during his 26 years in the valley.

Martinez, who broadcasts a news-music-information program in Spanish five mornings a week from radio station KRAD in East Grand Forks, asserts unequivocally that "prices go up in this area when the migrants come in."

He explained that many migrants have to do their food shopping on Sunday and have to go to the few stores in the valley open on that day.

"Why there is one guy in East Grand Forks who spends all Saturday night in his store marking up prices for the migrants who come in Sunday," he said.

Martinez claimed that another store owner in Warren, Minn., urged migrants to shop in his store on Sunday for "specials" and then raised the price on items that he knew the workers would buy such as lunch meats.

Mrs. McWalter said that from her shopping experience, food prices were not raised in the East Grand Forks area when the migrants arrived.

Farmers in sugar beet areas usually advance their migrants small amounts of cash and open credit accounts with stores, gas stations and doctors so their employees can obtain goods and services before they are paid a lump sum when the beet work is completed. The bills run up by the migrants then are deducted from the worker's final check.

This arrangement puts the migrant at a disadvantage according to James Fish, executive director of Migrants, Inc.

Fish explained that the migrant often never sees "the bill that gets deducted from his paycheck. Everywhere you find the unwarranted paternalistic assumption that the migrant can't handle his own affairs."

Most of the migrants interviewed did not object to this "paternalistic" relationship, a bond that ties the migrant to the farmer long after the worker has left for Texas.

"There is a tendency for migrants to want to please. They are very polite and are a very non-complaining people," according to Charles Moates, camp sanitarian at the state Health Department.

Moates, who has talked with hundreds of migrants during his many inspections of labor camps, explained that "if you ask a migrant his opinion about camp conditions,

the answer is always everything is OK. They have remarkable loyalty to growers and often won't leave some growers who operate very poor and unsanitary camps.

Fish said that "we often believe that because the migrants do not gripe much, that nothing is wrong. But that does not mean they are satisfied with their housing.

"Many of them think if they are impolite and complain that will either, one, lose their job or two, get hit."

Migrant families, many of whom have been coming back to Minnesota for more than 10 years to work for the same farmer, often request and receive money from the farmer during the winter to cover some of their expenses in Texas. The migrant is then obligated to come back in the spring to "work off the debt."

Unlike most state residents, the migrant is not covered by unemployment compensation, according to Charles Routh, chief of the Farm Labor Service of the Minnesota State Employment Service.

"But the migrants are covered under the minimum federal wage law of the Sugar Beet Act," he stressed, "and there are child labor laws in Minnesota for agricultural workers."

Under the act, it is illegal for children under 14 to work in the beet fields. There are a small, but undetermined, number of migrants under 14 working in the beet fields but none of the persons interviewed could recall instances where violators were penalized under the act.

An undetermined number of migrants are paid under the required minimum of \$25.50 an acre, according to Martinez.

"Sometimes," he said, "the migrants are conned into accepting as little as \$18 an acre by the farmer."

Many farmers pay their migrants "a dollar or two above the minimum" as a reward for a job well done, emphasized Virgil Mellies, president of the Southern Minnesota Beet Growers Association. Mellies farms on 2,000 acres near Hector in Renville County.

Besides the alleged cases of price and wage discrimination against migrants in Minnesota, the brown-skinned Texans face a certain amount of racial discrimination.

Rene Gorena, who works on a farm 10 miles west of Crookston, recalled the evening he dropped into a Crookston bar with a brother. After the two had downed three beers each, Gorena asked the bartender for another bottle.

"The bartender," said Gorena, "shook his head and said 'only three beers to Mexicans.' I asked him why and he said it was the policy of the manager."

Gorena said he complained about the incident to the Crookston police and the Polk County sheriff but nothing was done. He got in touch with the State Human Rights Department, a department employe talked with the bar owner and Gorena received an apology.

"I don't know of any other situations like that around here," he added, "and I don't think there is much discrimination around here."

Last summer in Litchfield, voters went to the polls and over-ruled their own City Council to prevent the Farmers Produce Co. from locating trailer housing for 32 single Mexican-Americans inside the city limits.

Stan Roser, editor of the local Independent Review, told a Pioneer Press reporter who visited Litchfield during the controversy that "the issue is partly racial."

Opponents of the firm's housing plans for migrants said that "housing 32 transient single men living in a camp within the city was just asking for trouble."

Farmers Produce later bought land just outside the city limits where it is housing 48 migrants this summer.

Police officers and county sheriffs in areas where migrants are quartered generally agree that migrants pose no unusual law enforcement problems.

When the company indicated last year that it might want to buy the old Atwater Hotel in Atwater for housing migrants, 30 local businessmen got together and bought the hotel themselves.

Harold Berg, secretary of the businessmen's organization, said the group's decision to buy the hotel was not racially motivated. "We just wanted to keep the only hotel in town for the use of local people," he explained.

MIGRANT CAMP CONDITIONS VARY

(By Bob Goligoski)

Just outside Hollandale in Freeborn county, 23 children and adults live in a small, dilapidated, three-room shack. They cook in a bedroom, sleep on six beds and inhabit quarters grossly in violation of state Health Department regulations for migrant housing.

To the northwest in Renville County, a migrant family of 13 is comfortably ensconced in a 10-room two-story house on Delwood Wolff's farm outside Hector. The house is clean, boasts two stoves and has such conveniences as a bathtub and a shower.

The two dwellings are not representative of migrant housing in Minnesota.

They show only the wide diversity of such housing in the state and indicate the futility of generalizing about the condition of the 760 migrant camps in Minnesota.

The job of inspecting these camps to see if they comply with the state migrant housing code is attempted each summer by the environmental sanitation division of the Minnesota Health Department.

The division is under staffed, according to camp sanitarian Charles Moates. Statistics bear him out.

A Health Department report covering migrant camp inspections last summer reveals that "at least 120" camps were not checked because the three camp inspectors and Moates did not have time to do the job.

Of the 640 camps inspected, 342 had no defects, three were disapproved for occupancy and 295 camps were found to have between one and "more than six violations" of the state health regulations.

Two inspectors were added this summer. Moates believes that with five men his division can check every camp at least once every summer.

Two Pioneer Press reporters visited about 25 migrant camps this month, talked with dozens of migrants, farmers and health inspectors. Their findings indicated:

Nearly every camp has electricity, a refrigerator (many in poor condition) and an oven.

Very few camps have showers, and bathtubs are nearly non-existent.

Most toilet facilities consist of outdoor privies, many in violation of state health codes.

Of 109 camp water wells checked last summer by one inspector, 106 were in violation of the health regulations.

Improper garbage disposal is the "biggest headache" for the inspectors.

Very few camps have fire extinguishers.

Moates believes there has been a "vast improvement in the condition of migrant camps in the last three years. We don't have the real poverty migrant camps in Minnesota when you compare them with those in other states."

He said the worst camps in the state probably are in Renville and Redwood counties.

Health inspectors said about 10 camps have been closed by farmers in the last 10 years after the Health Department threatened legal action if the camps were not brought up to state standards.

Many of the camps are allowed to operate with minimal violations of the code if the farmers "keep chipping away with improvements from year to year," according to Moates.

When asked why they operated their

camps in violation of the health regulations, farmers gave some of the following reasons:

1. The migrants, who do not pay rent, will only occupy the camp for about six weeks so why should the farmer spend money to improve facilities that receive only minimum usage. (Nearly every farmer invests much more money in machinery and equipment that is used even a shorter time than his labor camp.)

2. Migrants, either deliberately or through ignorance, destroy facilities provided. (Enough incidents occur annually to confirm these convictions, yet they are the exception rather than the rule.)

3. Hand labor soon will be replaced by machines. (This prediction has been made often around the state in the last five years but has yet to be fulfilled.)

The state inspectors report incidents of migrants cutting out screen windows so they can throw garbage and dishwasher out the open window. Springs are removed from house and privy doors so the migrant children can use the springs as toys.

The result is a procession of germ-carrying flies and other insects moving freely between the privies and the kitchen and bedrooms in the camp.

Jim Fish, executive director of Migrants, Inc., explained that migrants sometimes don't understand the necessity of having screens on doors and windows or springs on doors because they have never received much in the way of health education.

He said the state Health Department should exert a greater effort in this area "because it is obviously the department's job to do so."

Moates countered that his department is too understaffed to provide the health information. He suggested that Migrants, Inc., which runs education and counseling programs for migrants in 16 Minnesota towns, should supply the health data because the organization has the money and manpower for such work.

The Minnesota State Board of Health recently approved a new set of migrant labor camp regulations designed to toughen and raise the present standards. The new regulations, which farmers and growers will have to comply with starting next summer, require, among other things, that all camps have showers and hot and cold running water.

Those who want to operate a migrant camp will have to apply for a free permit each year from the Health Department.

Farmers generally oppose some of the provisions in the new health code. A typical reaction was that offered by Virgil Mellies, owner of a 2,000-acre farm in the Hector area and president of the Southern Minnesota Beet Growers Association:

"It is going to be almost impossible for us to conform to the new regulations. An awful lot of our own farm houses will not pass the regulations. For example, the Health Department says that for a two-story house we have to have two exits from the second floor to the ground.

"These things in the new code are just not justified. There isn't one well in 100 that will meet the well specifications.

"I think these new regulations are going to take us right out of migrant labor and put us right into the thinning machines."

MIGRANT INCOME SHAKY AT BEST

(By Ann Baker)

"People drive along and see Mexicans in the fields. They say, 'Look at them. Don't they look funny!' If THEY were Mexicans they'd know how funny it was.

"I hate to see anybody go through what I went through. You drive 2,000 miles. Don't know when you're going to break down, or if you're going to make your destination . . ."

Pedro Flores, 31, one of the 70 or so heads of migrant families who have settled in Minnesota recently, was recalling his life on the road three summers ago.

"Eleven of us came together," said his wife, Olga. "Us, our children, my mother, sister and brothers, and a dog. We had \$1.60 when we got here."

The family worked for six weeks in the potato fields, sometimes 18 hours a day, with their three children beside them, the youngest in diapers. They earned \$2,000 which they put down on a small cafe in Oslo, Minn.

For 19 months they struggled with the cafe, but it failed. Last July they moved to St. Paul.

Most of the migrants who come to Minnesota each June move on to other states by the middle of July.

Most of them work a fairly regular day, from 7 or 8 a.m. to 5 or 6 p.m. and in Minnesota they work mainly in sugar beet fields, living in disused farm houses, shacks or chicken coops on the land of the farmer who hires them.

Usually they are hired, by letter, before they come. If not, chances are they might not get work, like Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Garcia from McAllen, Tex., and their nine children who ended up stranded in St. Paul last week.

Everybody over 14 works in the sugar beets, weeding them, thinning them—parents, grandparents, teenagers, whether sick, well, pregnant or nursing mothers.

"If you have a big family with lots of older children, you make money," says Pedro Flores. "If you're a young couple like us . . ." he shakes his head.

Sometimes three or four families travel together, in separate cars or maybe in a big truck, like the one Ramon Zapata drove from Laredo, Tex., to Hector, Minn.

The Zapatas and their eight children stay in a two-room shack on a farm near Hector. Half a dozen other families live in nearby shacks. Ramon, Thomasa and their eldest son, Alberto, 15, work in the fields, while Julie, 13, cooks the meals and keeps house.

The younger children, ranging down to Marianna, 4, play around the shacks during the day.

They play baseball, "touch" (tag), "baby latch" (hopscotch—the markings drawn with a stick in the ground) and "Going to California" (everybody circling round a child in the center who acts the part of a hip-swinging West Coast "senorita").

In the evening the families assemble before the two TV sets in their camp. Occasionally there is a Spanish dance at Hector or Olivia or a social after Sunday afternoon's Spanish Mass at Bird Island. Movies are a rare treat. They cost money, and the reason for coming up here is to make money.

You hear tales (usually from the farmers) of rich migrants, who have well-paying jobs in Texas and come here for the summer as a kind of working vacation, a chance for the whole family to be together in the fresh air and sunshine.

Most of the families you meet say the summer migration is what provides nearly all their yearly income.

Pedro Flores says back in Texas he was lucky to get a job earning 75 cents an hour. Others earn 50 or 60 cents an hour picking grapefruit or working as busboys and busgirls in hotels, jobs that are part time or temporary. Clergy and educators in close contact with the migrants agree that jobs in Texas are very scarce indeed.

Relatively few migrants seem to have given serious thought to settling in one of the northern states where jobs are more plentiful.

Yet a spot survey of two dozen families showed none of them want their children to be migrants.

Instead, they dream of the children finding careers as teachers, mechanics, farmers, dentists, grocers, clerks . . .

The churches, particularly the Catholic Church, have been concerned for the migrants for the past 20 years.

Migrants are very devout people, priests say, though they express their devotion differently than northern Catholics.

"They set a good example for our people," says Father John Siebenand, pastor of St. John's Church, Hector. "They go up to the front of the church and stretch out their arms and really pray."

Nearly every family, whatever else they may bring with them, always bring their collection of "santos" pictures, which they set up around their shack, maybe lighting vigil lamps before them.

"Their approach to religion is not institutionalized," says Father Eugene Hackert, pastor of St. Clara's, Clara City. "Church attendance is not their standard of faithfulness. It's strictly a person-to-person thing. Wonderful, really. What we're saying nowadays the church should aim for. But it can drive an institutionalized priest out of his skin."

Father Hackert admits the Catholic Church originally concentrated on making sure the children were baptized and the marriages blessed.

Four years ago the Crookston Catholic diocese applied for federal funds to start a welfare program. From that request grew Migrants Inc., which now runs classes for children and adults throughout Minnesota and North Dakota.

The churches now work together. Father Hackert, as chairman of the Minnesota (and North Dakota) Catholic Council for the Spanish Speaking, meets frequently with the Rev. George Tjaden, who heads the Minnesota Council of Churches' Migrant Ministry, as well as with representatives of churches not in the Council.

"Our main effort today is to back Migrants Inc.," says Father Hackert. "We try to have Masses in Spanish and furnish volunteers, especially for religion classes." In Hector four nuns and two C of C volunteers run afternoon religion lessons together.

Next week Bishop Humberto Madeiros of Brownsville, Tex., will visit migrant camps throughout Minnesota to try to co-ordinate religious instruction given here with that given in Texas.

The Rev. Harry Sheets, pastor of the Church of God of the Abrahamic Faith in Hector, heads the local clergy committee there.

"All our churches collect clothing, especially for children, and blankets. The migrants aren't used to the cold weather," he says.

"And we're trying to get local radio stations to put on Spanish music. You see, the farmers tell me what happens is the migrants listen to Spanish music from Cuba on their short wave radios.

"And mixed in with music is propaganda . . . It's all right for those over 40. They're perfectly satisfied with their wages and conditions. But with the 20 to 25-year-olds, you have trouble."

AID TO MIGRANT WORKERS GROWS (By Ann Baker)

Migrants don't live as long as other people. Their average life expectancy is 49. More migrant children die before they are one. More mothers die giving birth. Migrants have twice as much flu and pneumonia as other people, two and a half times as much TB, three times as many accidents. . . .

So says a sheet of statistics compiled by the U.S. Labor Department and other federal agencies.

In the past few years, efforts to improve the life of migrants have mushroomed around Minnesota.

The state Department of Health has six sanitation inspectors, 12 nurses aided by half a dozen Spanish-speaking women, seven family health centers and two dental clinics scattered throughout Minnesota, providing examinations and, as much as possible, care.

That project, headed by Dr. D. S. Fleming, is in its seventh year.

The biggest attempt to help migrants is by organization called Migrants, Inc., which developed four years ago as a result of various churches' efforts.

This year Migrants, Inc., has 520 paid and volunteer workers running six-week educational projects in 16 Minnesota and North Dakota towns. There are classes for the children, "opportunity centers" furnishing conveniences like home town Texas newspapers and vocational counselling, for adults.

At one town, Hector, 50 teachers applied for 19 positions in the school.

More than 200 children attend the school daily while their parents work in the fields. Mrs. Judy Smith, who has directed that area's school for the last four years, notes that for the first time parents have taken such an interest in the lessons that even when it rains, they send the children to school, and they pop around themselves to look in on the classes.

Originally, to most migrants the classes seemed mainly a baby-sitting service. They appreciated that, in itself, for when left at home alone the children often had accidents, especially burns from overturned kettles and pans. Taking toddlers and babies to the fields was no picnic for working parents.

Many farmers, and consequently townspeople, viewed the school as a mixed blessing. They didn't mind classes, in English or anything else, but they disliked having young women recruited from their labor crews to serve as classroom aides. And they suspected that behind the lessons might be an effort to organize the workers into some kind of union.

As a result, Migrants, Inc., staff members in Hector act very cautious. Last year they moved the school to Olivia. This year it's back in Hector, but when reporters visited last week the staff refused to take them around the migrant camps for fear of alienating the farmers once again.

"We feel Migrants, Inc., should be working down in Texas instead of here," Delwood Wolff, a Hector farmer, told the reporters.

At the school, 38 babies play in the nursery headed by Mrs. Muriel Baumgartner, R.N. Local families furnish clothes, cribs, play pens, toys. Mexican women help local women bathe, dress and play with the babies.

Another 75 youngsters, aged 3 to 5, are in Head Start classes, local children as well as migrants.

Older children study everything, math, reading, English.

"They do a very nice job of working together," says fifth grade teacher Duane Stoez. "I'm enjoying these children tremendously and would like to have them coming into my fifth grade here next fall."

But few, if any, will. Of the migrants who settle in Minnesota, most of them move to a city where they can find jobs in factories.

"There's no reason they couldn't settle here if we had any industry," says Mrs. Joseph Ginsburg, chairman of Hector's human relations committee.

The Hector school costs Migrants, Inc., \$43,000 to run. Most of the money goes to salaries, for teachers, aides, and nurses. The rest goes for school buses that carry the children from a 20-mile radius daily, school dinners and to doctor and dentist care.

Migrants, Inc.'s total budget this year is \$736,000 for its 16 projects.

"But before we can get the \$302,000 from the welfare departments, we need \$75,000 in cash to match," says James Fish, Migrants, Inc., director.

"So far we've been promised about \$7,000, half from the Polk County Migrants Council, half from a group of migrants in Grafton, N.D."

Migrants belong to the planning committees that meet weekly at the schools. Eventually, Fish hopes, migrants may take over administration of his whole program.

"That would put me out of a job," he says, "but it's what ought to happen."

MACHINES MAY OUST MIGRANTS

(By Bob Goligoski)

The Renville County farmer took a long look at a family of migrant workers hoeing in his sugar beet field and then turned to tinker with a shiny, new red and green machine sitting in one corner of his barn.

"This, my friend," he said, "is the new thinning machine. It works fine. So good, in fact, that I don't plan to have any migrant labor on this farm next year."

The farmer is just one of the 30 or so Minnesota growers who have invested \$6,000 to \$7,000 for new sugar beet thinning machines in the last two years. When enough of their neighbors become convinced that the new machines actually will do everything the manufacturers claim, many of the 18,000 migrants now living in the state will no longer make their annual pilgrimage to the beet fields of Minnesota.

That day may come next year, in 1975 or 1980, the time span of predictions being made by farmers, sugar companies and the several state agencies dealing with migrant laborers in Minnesota.

Some farmers were predicting five years ago that they would no longer need migrant workers. Many of the growers used their prognostications as a rationale for not improving their migrant labor camps, hundreds of which were and still are, being operated in violation of state health department regulations.

But now the farmers have added reason to replace their migrants with machines.

The Minnesota State Board of Health has adopted a series of tougher regulations, slated to go into effect next summer, which, if enforced, will compel farmers to spend hundreds of dollars improving conditions in many of the 760 migrant camps in Minnesota.

R. V. McWalter, who farms 1,600 acres near East Grand Forks, plans to "get into mechanical thinning as fast as I can because of these new regulations. I know a lot of other growers will do the same."

One of the most pessimistic predictions about the advent of the mechanical beet thinners comes from a migrant labor report issued six months ago by the state health department:

"Although technical breakthroughs could speed up the process, most forecasts now expect widespread mechanization no sooner than 10 to 15 years, and many farmers feel that chemicals and machines will always be more sensitive than hand labor to the vagaries of Minnesota climate.

"There has actually been a sizable increase in demand for migrant labor in Minnesota, and delay in the application of more strict migrant labor camp regulations cannot be justified by assumptions that the need for hand labor is disappearing."

Some farmers who have bought the machines complain that they will not work properly on a wet field or on acreage with rolling terrain.

The migrants have to contend with better herbicides that, if weather conditions are right, will remove the weeds from a field almost as well as a migrant with a hoe can.

Farmers also are hiring more youngsters from nearby communities to supplement the machines and herbicides. It is this combination of mechanical thinners, herbicides and "back-up youth labor" that will eventually replace the migrant workers.

According to the State Department of Employment Security, some 750 to 800 Minnesota youngsters have signed up this summer to work in the beet fields under a "youth sugar beet program." More than 400 of these high school students are working in the Red River Valley.

A department spokesman said that "growers are becoming more cordial toward hiring the youngsters this year." The student workers generally return home every night, and

the farmers do not have to worry about housing them in labor camps.

About 90 per cent of the workers who migrate to Minnesota each spring from Texas work in the beet fields. Nearly three-fourths of them toil on the 195,000 acres of beets in the valley.

Growers and migrants say there is a surplus of migrant workers in the valley this summer. They attribute this over-supply of labor, in part, to more migrants leaving the beet fields in Oregon and Washington for Minnesota because mechanical thinners are being used successfully in those two states.

Sugar beet production in Minnesota soared to 2,152,000 tons last year, up from 1,422,000 tons in 1967. There are indications this year's crop may exceed the 1968 production.

But these statistics do not necessarily bode well for the migrants, some of whom say that the cool, drizzly weather in the valley this spring and summer has kept them out of the fields for as long as 10 days at a time.

The several thousand migrants who work in other agricultural operations, ranging from picking asparagus to tasks in turkey processing plants and nurseries, face a more certain future in Minnesota. They apparently do not face the fate of the beet workers.

A small number of migrants have stayed in Minnesota in recent years.

PLAN FOR THE GHETTO

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Jack Lough, editor of the *Albion*, Nebr., News and president of the National Newspaper Association, recently wrote to Secretary Romney of Housing and Urban Development suggesting a program to alleviate the problems of our Nation's ghettos. Under Mr. Lough's proposals, selected ghetto youths would be put in smalltown American homes for their senior year in high school.

With reference to the ghetto program, Jack Lough stated in his letter to Secretary Romney:

It has been my conviction for many years that the problems of the American ghetto will not be solved in the ghetto.

I do not know whether Jack Lough's proposal will work, but I do know that his suggested approach to the problem shows a commitment to come to grips with one of the old problems of our society in a new way.

Simply improving the incomes of America's ghetto residents is not enough because as President Nixon stated on August 8:

Poverty is not only a state of income. It is also a state of mind and a state of health.

Mr. President, in order to give this proposal the wide publication it deserves, I ask unanimous consent that Jack Lough's letter to Secretary Romney be printed in the *RECORD*. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial, entitled "Jack Lough's Example," from the *Omaha World-Herald* dated July 20, 1969, and an editorial, entitled "Plan for the Ghetto," from the *Lincoln Journal-Star* dated July 13, 1969, be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1969.

HON. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban
Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It will be my privilege to introduce you at the National Newspaper

Association convention in Atlantic City on the evening of Thursday, June 26.

However, the burden of this letter does not concern the National Newspaper Association in any way.

It has been my conviction for many years that the problems of the American ghetto will not be solved in the ghetto. I am very eager to present to you or to the proper person in your department a plan to alleviate and begin a solution to the ghetto problem.

Ghetto residents, I believe, must somehow be removed from their impoverished environment and placed in other localities where they can see and experience a different way of life.

The format for this idea actually has been operational for several years. To illustrate, the American Field Service has conducted for many years an exchange program in which foreign students have been brought into American homes to spend their senior year in high school. These foreign students, by and large, come from the most affluent homes in their native lands, and their parents can afford to send them to American schools without the help of the American Field Service program.

What I am suggesting is that we might, with considerably more benefit to the nation, encourage a program of removing ghetto youngsters from their present environment and placing them in small town American homes during their senior year in high school. During this period all efforts should be bent toward placing these individuals in situations where they can begin to learn a vocational skill.

As you know, Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin is from Nebraska. I am acquainted with Secretary Hardin, and it occurs to me that if some sort of coordination and cooperation can be developed between your two departments, we may be able to implement such a domestic exchange program.

It seems obvious that this program will have to be a unilateral one for most rural white parents would be reluctant to send their children to live under ghetto conditions for an entire year or even shorter period.

I have lived in both New York and Chicago. I know something of ghetto conditions in both places as well as in the near north side of Omaha.

I reiterate that I don't believe the answer to the American ghetto can ever be found in the ghetto.

Will you please give me the benefit of your opinion about this critical matter?

Cordially,

JACK LOUGH,
Acting President, National Newspaper
Association.

[From the *Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald*,
July 20, 1969]

JACK LOUGH'S EXAMPLE

Jack Lough, editor of the *Albion News* and president of the National Newspaper Association, has proposed that the administration sponsor a plan to put ghetto youths in smalltown American homes for their senior year in high school.

The Nebraska newspaperman believes young people so exposed would have wider horizons and might be motivated to have a similar kind of life. That may be a practical idea. Or it may not.

But Lough's proposal demonstrates that some small town people are deeply concerned about the problems of the cities and are willing to make proposals about how their communities can help.

Such proposals should be an inspiration to those who live in the cities, but whose concern about inner city problems seems to wax and wane according to the degree of danger. When violence threatens or is in progress, the majority is mightily concerned about putting down the violence, and it talks a

great deal about doing what's necessary to break down racial barriers.

But as time goes on, as hatreds continue and racial lines harden, men of good will seem to have fewer ideas as to what to do about it.

We should help neighborhoods initiate and carry through programs of their own. What else should we do?

Work through church organizations?

Certainly.

Continue good programs such as Head Start and Project Chance?

By all means. We dare not slacken on any educational program that has demonstrated its value.

Push for open housing and other civil rights measures at both the state and community level? Certainly, push hard and use legislation once it is on the books.

Open the door to industrial and craft jobs, union and nonunion? Absolutely.

Train and hire more people for office and sales jobs? Sure enough.

Encourage more young people to continue education after high school and learn special skills? Let's do that.

However, it is one thing to make general statements and another to put them into concrete form.

Gov. Tiemann has proposed a vocational-technical school so located that it can give special attention to young people on Omaha's Near North Side. This is an excellent idea and we endorse it fully.

What might such a school teach that would catch the imaginations of those it is trying to reach? How could it build enthusiasm for technical training?

Peter Drucker, in his recent book, "The Age of Discontinuity," says that a great challenge the world around is to make poor people productive to fit them to new skills in a time when brainpower is almost everything. He tears away some of the mystique about new era jobs.

For example, he says that the requirements for a computer programmer are mastery of junior high school math, three months training and six months experience.

The number of people who could qualify for such job if they had the desire and were guided toward them is obviously greater than the number now seeking them. We could be a more productive society, and we don't need miracles to bring that about.

What we do need is more of the "What-can-I-do?" approach indicated by Jack Lough. For every workable proposal there may be a hundred that are not quite suitable.

But what of that? The important thing is that we make a personal commitment, and keep on working.

Someday, if we work hard enough, we're going to solve the problems of the cities.

[From the *Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal and Star*,
July 13, 1969]

PLAN FOR THE GHETTO

As president of the National Newspaper Association, Nebraska publisher Jack Lough of the *Albion News* has advanced an intriguing plan to help alleviate ghetto problems over the country.

Lough's proposal, put forth in a letter to George Romney, secretary of Housing and Urban Development, would provide for youngsters from the big city ghettos to spend their senior year of high school in small town homes.

There is little doubt that such an experience, handled properly could be decidedly constructive for many boys and girls from the slum areas. Aside from being introduced to a different way of life, the young people might realize the opportunities that exist outside the ghetto.

The experience could be a two-way street. Small town residents might come to appreciate a little more the severity of the problems of the cities.

For such a program to work, the small