

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 8

APRIL 22, 1969, TO MAY 1, 1969

(PAGES 9827 TO 11208)

eight to 10 inquiries a day about jobs for the hardcore, says Mr. Kozelski, but now the problem has been eliminated.

The bank is also bringing more positive benefits for employers. "When we need people," says a Bethlehem Steel Corp. spokesman, "we just go to the job bank."

**PRINCE SIHANOUK OF CAMBODIA**

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia is a leader who has led his country on a tightrope policy of neutrality, more or less, shifting positions to accommodate the realities of power in Southeast Asia. He has been deft and sometimes exasperating, as Hedrick Smith observed Sunday in a column published in the New York Times. But he has been, through it all, a fairly good bellwether of the prevailing political winds in Asia. Thus, his move toward resumed relations with the United States last week is an encouraging sign that Sihanouk's opinion of the ultimate outcome in Southeast Asia has shifted considerably since he broke off relations with the United States in 1965.

Smith's column, which analyzes well the Sihanouk shift, deserves attention by Congress. I ask consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

**UNITED STATES AND CAMBODIA: THE SIHANOUK WEATHERVANE TURNS WEST**  
(By Hedrick Smith)

WASHINGTON.—To veteran diplomats, Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk has long been one of the most reliable bellwethers of prevailing political winds in Southeast Asia. With a skill that has often exasperated, occasionally entertained, and always impressed much larger powers, the mercurial Prince has pursued a zig-zag course, deftly playing off Peking, Washington, Hanoi and Saigon to suit his own needs.

His constant objective has been Cambodia's—and his own—survival. For Prince Sihanouk is haunted by the fear that his small kingdom will be engulfed by its more warlike neighbors in Vietnam or Thailand, or sacrificed in the ideological clash between Peking and Washington.

**AN INDICATOR**

Cambodia's survival has rested, in large measure, on Prince Sihanouk's ability to pick the likely winner in the mortal combat swirling around him. The twists and turns in his foreign policy thus reflect his appraisal of the fortunes of the region—and are hence taken as an indicator of what shrewd Asian neutrals think about the outcome of the Vietnam war.

Small wonder, then, that some American officials last week took comfort that Prince Sihanouk wanted to resume diplomatic relations with the United States and had sharp words of criticism for Hanoi and the Vietcong. Although the Prince stuck to his basic neutralist posture, his latest moves were taken as a sign that he evidently thought allied prospects were improving.

Back in 1965, the Sihanouk weathervane was pointing the other way. With the Vietcong then seemingly on the verge of victory over a faltering Saigon, the Prince broke diplomatic relations with the United States and proclaimed Communist China as Cambodia's "No. 1 friend."

He accused American forces in Vietnam of arrogantly violating Cambodia's frontiers and he disingenuously denied that the Vietcong were hiding troops on Cambodian soil.

By 1967 Prince Sihanouk was hedging his bets. Evidently it looked like a long war to him. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong were no longer as discreet and inconspicuous about using Cambodian territory. But his own armed forces were too weak to do anything about it; they had problems enough trying to cope with Cambodian Communist rebels stirring in the countryside.

In recent weeks, his tune has really changed. He has taken to warning that Communist "provocations will only push us into the other camp." Apparently very worried at the security threat posed by tens of thousands of North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops in Cambodia, Prince Sihanouk has told his people that these Communist forces have set up "staffs, bases, hospitals, depots and rest centers" in Cambodia.

**PASSED THE WORD**

Privately he passed the word to Washington through the Philippines Embassy that he understood that in wartime some allied incursions from Vietnam were inevitable. And he acknowledged that Cambodia's disputed border with Saigon was poorly marked in spots.

With Prince Sihanouk in such a mood, Washington saw advantages in improving relations: encouraging his new line would increase international pressures on Hanoi to pull its troops back home. The Nixon Administration decided to recognize publicly Cambodia's territorial integrity "within its present frontiers"—something the Prince had always wanted to bolster his territorial claims against Vietnam and Thailand.

These soothing words moved Prince Sihanouk to action. On Wednesday, he announced he would soon reopen relations with Washington and said this would let him "play a new card since Asian Communists are already attacking us before the end of the Vietnam war."

The Prince, however, still supports the Vietcong politically and has snubbed an effort from Saigon to discuss their longstanding border dispute. But his position is more genuinely neutral than previously.

The reasons are not hard to find. The outcome of the war evidently looks more uncertain than ever before, and in a real compromise settlement, Prince Sihanouk calculates that it would pay to have some credit in Washington.

**SUPPORT FROM WEST**

In the long run, if the Paris negotiations succeed, Prince Sihanouk will want diplomatic support from the West for getting North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops to quit his territory.

**NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK**

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the 18th consecutive year, the last full week in April has been designated as Secretaries Week, with business, industry, education, government, and the professions joining in its observance. In 1969, Secretaries Week is April 20-26, with Wednesday, April 23, set aside as Secretaries Day. Under the sponsorship of the National Secretaries Association, International, the world's leading secretarial organization, the theme will again be "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business."

The week is acknowledged by Federal, State, and municipal governments and is observed with special NSA-sponsored activities. In the District of Columbia, Mayor Washington will sign a proclamation on April 21, urging recognition for all secretaries for the vital role they play. Deputy Mayor Fletcher will make the presentation for Mayor Washington.

Present at the ceremony will be Mrs. Sally Dankmyer and Miss Alice Tilson, chairman and cochairman, respectively, Secretaries Week Committee.

Washington's Capital chapter and District of Columbia chapter will join together in the activities of the week, beginning with a church service on Sunday, April 20, at the Georgetown Evangelical Lutheran Church. Other activities for the week will include a tour of the McCall Printing Co. in Glenn Dale, Md., and a tour of WRC-TV studios including watching of a taping of the program "Its Academic."

The highlight of the week will be Secretaries Day, April 23, with a reception and banquet being held in the evening at the Shoreham Hotel. The speaker will be Kurt Henschen, news commentator, WWDC radio, and entertainment will be provided by the Riverside Four, a barbershop quartet, members of the Fairfax Jubil-Aires.

**THE HEALTH AND NUTRITION NEEDS OF MIGRATORY FARMWORKERS**

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on April 9, 1969, Senator ALAN CRANSTON, of California, who is a member of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, delivered the keynote address at the Mid-Continent Migrant Health Conference in Albuquerque, N. Mex.

I would like to share his speech with my colleagues, for it is significant in several respects.

First, Senator CRANSTON correctly points out that both the immediate and long-range health care and nutrition needs of our Nation's 1 million migratory workers and their families are overwhelming, and must be given immediate attention. Yet, health services under the Migrant Health Act are available to only one of three migrants. And, how ironic it is that many farmworkers who pick our Nation's abundance of food are suffering from malnutrition.

Second, I fully agree with Senator CRANSTON that the Migrant Health Act should immediately be extended for 5 years with substantially increased appropriations. Furthermore, I share his conviction that health care, like education, must be made available as a matter of right to every American citizen.

And, finally, the theme repeated throughout my colleagues' eloquent speech was that our Nation's priorities must be reevaluated and reassessed. As he notes:

We casually expend billions on sophisticated programs for military defense and then nit-pick at the few dollars needed merely to investigate hunger and human need in our land.

The migrant health program is currently funded for \$9,000,000 a year. By doubling the appropriation we could at least reach 300,000 more human beings with minimum health care. Yet we spent \$560 billion for defense in the past 10 years, and expect to spend \$100 billion to \$115 billion in the year 1970.

I am not a romantic—I think this Nation needs a defense. But one of the key

issues facing this country is the necessity to realize that just because an idea is proposed by someone with stars on his shoulders, that does not put it above criticism. We have other problems too, and meeting the health and nutrition needs of our migratory farmworkers and rural impoverished is just one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRANSTON's address, entitled "Better Health Services for All Rural Families" be printed in the RECORD.

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

**BETTER HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL RURAL FAMILIES**

(Speech by Senator ALAN CRANSTON Before the Mid-Continent Migrant Health Conference in Albuquerque, N. Mex., on April 9, 1969)

I'm sure that you know the health problems of migrant and seasonal farm workers better than anyone else—better, really, than those who suffer the ills and pains and loss of energy that afflicts so many poor Americans.

Many of you have stood before other audiences and spoken with the eloquence of compassion about the disease, the hunger, the poverty which sap the strength and stifle the aspirations of the forgotten men of our countryside: the rural poor.

Many of you here are giving your careers, your very lives, to that forlorn cry for help that touches your hearts when you tend the babies and treat the mothers of the families who pick our crops.

It is because of your dedication that you have come to this Mid-continent Migrant Health Conference—looking for new ideas, better cooperation, and improved programs.

But most of all you come seeking hope—hope to surmount the anger and discouragement which come with knowledge of rural poverty—anger with a society that has the blind temerity to suggest to the rural poor that poverty can be overcome by hard work and initiative, when farm workers probably work harder for less money than anyone else in our society.

And discouragement with a nation that can casually expend billions on sophisticated programs for military defense and then nit-pick at the few dollars needed merely to investigate hunger and human need in our land.

I wish that I could tell you that Congress and the nation are finally awakening to the desperate needs of the poor, in our cities and on our farms.

But you and I know that I cannot.

The indifference and apathy of our national attitude toward poverty are now being supplemented by our economic problems.

The dark clouds of an anti-inflationary economic policy threaten to blot out the fragile rays of aid and assistance which have brightened at least a few lives during the 1960's.

I do want to say to you that there are many members of the United States Senate who understand and care about rural poverty. Their number is increasing.

And I promise you that I will be in the thick of the fight to make a full and meaningful life possible for every American.

The immediate health needs of our migrants are well known to you.

The proposed 5-year extension of the Migrant Health Act—from 1970 to 1975—is essential for our nation.

Those of you whose devotion and hard work have developed and expanded migrant health services since the Act was adopted 7 years ago know all too well the sad reality:

Of the estimated one million migratory

workers in the United States, only 31 percent were in counties served by migrant health projects last year.

Every American county with an annual migrant influx should have personal health and sanitation services available.

Yet for every one that does, two do not. I say we must continue and expand migrant health services.

We must make it possible for the traveling farm worker's family to achieve some continuity of health care along the migration routes.

Further we must emphasize that the migratory family's needs are only a specialized version of the general deficiency of health services among the rural poor in our nation.

Even where the farm worker meets the residency requirements in his home-base county, he seldom has access to a comprehensive and effective health care program.

We must reach more of the rural poor, be they migrant or not, with better programs to treat and immunize, to supply needed vitamins, to improve sanitation, to educate in health and nutrition, and to provide hospitalization.

We must likewise face up to the problem of hunger in America.

The tragic findings of Senator McGovern and his colleagues on the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs should finally end the senseless prohibition against free distribution of food stamps for family units whose income is below a minimum level.

Food stamps should be used as tools to help solve the hunger problem.

There is, of course, no shortage of food in this country.

When children and adults are weakened and stunted by inadequate diets, we—and I mean our nation—are guilty of a meaningless and needless waste of our human resources.

As Americans we pride ourselves on our ingenuity—and surely a nation which can meet the challenge of outer space can figure out how to distribute surplus food to hungry children.

Meanwhile, we must end the exclusion of farm workers from the laws which regulate and protect other American working men.

Farm workers should be included under the National Labor Relations Act. I've joined with other Senators in sponsoring legislation to this end.

Compulsory workmen's compensation, and unemployment insurance, should be extended to farm workers in every state in our nation.

We must end the discriminatory residence requirements which deny to migrants federally supported public assistance programs and other benefits.

We must be alert to the understandable political tendency to concentrate limited poverty funds in the cities.

In no way would I suggest that the conditions of life in urban poverty neighborhoods are less than deplorable.

Nevertheless, I have seen rural slums in California which are as atrocious, as degrading to their inhabitants, as any core-city ghetto.

Yet as the turmoil of the cities seethes and bursts open through the long hot summers, the rural poor stand by silent and impassive, enduring the hardship of their kind of poverty—virtually unnoticed by the headlines and television cameras.

We must make sure that rural poverty-stricken Americans are not ignored in our struggle for economic justice.

None of these proposals are new.

You have called for them in your conferences.

The Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor has called for them.

Churches and other concerned organizations have called for them.

Political conventions have called for them. And I fear that the conferences, the conventions, the Congressional committees of next year and the next decade will say again and again what we say now and have said before:

Families still live in the disease and pestilence of poverty.

Worms still infest the bodies of little children.

The inadequate diets of pregnant mothers still condemn their unborn babies to deficient or retarded lives.

Migrants still die sooner from both disease and accident than their middle class brothers.

I believe this will be true—that is—unless we change our sense of national priorities.

Why should every dollar we spend on government health care programs and other plans to ease and improve the lives of the poor require such a battle in Congress and in our State Legislatures?

I think the answer is obvious:

Look at the 1970 budget now before Congress:

We are asked to spend \$81.5 billion for national defense, \$25 billion of which will be spent in Southeast Asia alone.

In contrast we can expect to spend about \$13 billion for our entire federal health program, one half of which will be self-financed by medicare trust funds.

We are asked to spend almost \$2 billion to land an American on the moon, while our entire food and nutrition budget is estimated at \$720 million.

These strange priorities put the war in Vietnam ahead of the health of our own people.

A man on the moon is somehow more important in our scheme of values than feeding hungry children.

I believe it is time to reconsider these priorities. I believe the American people, and their Congress, are about to do exactly this.

Somehow in the maze of our political complexities we have lost sight of human values. Perhaps we are about to rediscover them.

It is on one specific aspect of these forgotten human values that I wish to place particular emphasis today.

As we call for specific programs and more adequate funding, let those of us concerned with health continue to demand that we reconsider and revise the priorities which shower funds on armaments and space exploration at the expense of poor people.

Our nation has long adhered to the principle of public education, insisting that every American has the right to attend a free public school.

We say that democracy must have enlightened, educated citizens if it is to remain a free society.

Our economy promises rewards based on hard work and education.

We tell our young people that if they stay in school and concentrate on studies, they will be able to get ahead.

Historically the philosophers of an egalitarian society have always insisted on the individual's right to an education as essential to giving every man an equal opportunity.

Isn't it time that we realized that exactly the same arguments apply to health?

It is an impudent mockery to say "all men are created equal" to a boy whose body or mind never developed properly because his migrant mother had a deficient pre-natal diet.

How can we seriously tell the child, whose health has been weakened by years of slum neglect, that because he lives in a free society he must stand on his own two feet and compete with his healthy middle class contemporaries for a job?

For our democracy to work, every person must have an opportunity to achieve a decent life for himself and his family.

Yet poor health is just as much of a barrier as a lack of education for the poor person—perhaps even more of a barrier, for disease and malnutrition feed on the strength and the spirit of a man, sucking him into despair and lethargy.

To fight their way out of poverty, poor Americans need all of their strength, all of their mental and physical resources.

Yet they have less access to national medical and other health services than anyone else in our society.

I believe it is time to give new substance to the promise of our democratic society to the poor people of our nation.

Let us declare that among the inalienable rights of every man, woman, and child in America is the right to be healthy. Let us declare that the right to be healthy is as essential a part of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as is the right to an education.

And then, having avowed this commitment, let us assert and achieve the right to be healthy in every slum, at every cross roads, in every labor camp in our nation.

We must demand that every child has access to health services, that every family can get medical assistance when it needs it. The United States can do this.

Once the threats to our national health have been recognized for what they are, we will rise to fight them with the courage and determination with which we have met other threats to our security and freedoms.

We have the knowledge, we have the people, we have the resources.

The right to health will add a shining new star to the panoply of America's promise.

Let each of us do all we can in the battle to make the right to be healthy an American reality.

#### FLIGHTS OF RECONNAISSANCE PLANES TO CONTINUE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the decision to continue the flights of reconnaissance planes in the Sea of Japan to send armed escorts with them is a decision only the President should have made.

Since that was his decision I support it. I am sure North Korea received a much stronger warning than has been made public. A more emotional response might have been more satisfying initially, but I doubt if it would have improved chances for world peace.

From all evidence the shooting down of the unarmed plane was an aggressive act of war and while President Nixon made only a temporary decision, I think he made it crystal clear that he—and the United States—will not tolerate such incidents in the future. I support that policy.

#### A COMMITMENT TO EXCELLENCE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on April 11, Dr. L. D. Loftsgard was inaugurated as president of North Dakota State University in Fargo, N. Dak.

I believe his excellent inaugural address, entitled "A Commitment to Excellence," covered many of the problems and hopes in higher education today. His thoughts would be of interest to anyone concerned with the future development and growth of higher education. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A COMMITMENT TO EXCELLENCE

(An address by Dr. L. D. Loftsgard, delivered on the occasion of his inauguration as the 10th President of North Dakota State University, Friday, April 11, 1969, at Fargo, N. Dak.)

I recall reading in the paper last spring about a Commencement address that our esteemed neighbor Dr. Malcolm Moos was slated to give at the University of Minnesota.

It seems that the exercises had been scheduled out-of-doors and, at the last minute, had to be cancelled because of rain. Dr. Moos, being an adaptable fellow as well as a public speaker of no mean accomplishment, decided, in preference to letting his speech go to waste, to deliver it to the family dog which had that day been graduated from obedience school. He later reported the dog, in the manner of students nowadays, had howled piteously at several points, but at least Dr. Moos had had the satisfaction of feeling the day was not completely in vain.

We have a very nice dog at our house. But I must say, it pleases me greatly that the Jonahs among my associates, who have been predicting for the past three months that the mighty Red would have swollen its banks with pride by now and inundated us all, have been confounded and I'm not having to give this talk to Red, our family's Irish Setter.

We are indeed pleased, and, speaking in behalf of the University as well as myself, flattered, to have such a distinguished group of friends present for this occasion.

A university is like a human being in many respects. And this is not really so surprising if you stop to think about it—being the brainchild of human beings and made up of people. It has character, a personality, an aggregate intellect, standing in its community, status among its peers and a social role that constantly changes in some respects, but remains rigidly constant in others.

I have the impression that, during its early years, NDSU, or the Agricultural College as it was known as in those days, was rather a brash, young, no-nonsense kind of institution, with its shirtsleeves rolled up and a determination to do everything it could to help the North Dakotans of that day survive in an oftentimes hostile environment. The work of such people as Edwin Ladd, the Waldron brothers, H. L. Boyley and others will attest to that.

In the years to follow, science and technology became the watchwords of the institution's education philosophy, equipping its people with the tools and skills they would need to cope with an increasingly technology-oriented society.

NDSU's official designation as a university nine years ago, portended another change in its philosophical role, a change which, in keeping with its growing maturity as an institution, reflects not only the realization that science and technology alone cannot solve humanity's problems but society's changing values as well.

I think John Quincy Adams summed all of this up rather succinctly more than 150 years ago, when he said, "we must learn the arts of war and independence so that our children can learn engineering and architecture, so that their grandchildren can learn fine arts and painting." Ironically, visionary though he was, John Quincy Adams apparently could not foresee the extent to which it would be necessary for us still to be learning the arts of war, simultaneous with engineering and architecture, while we continue the search for the elusive keys to human behavior that will allow us, one day, to get off this frightening roller coaster ride to self destruction.

This is a very exciting time to be involved with higher education. I wouldn't trade my

role in it for anything. But it's also a very sobering time.

Recently, a prominent educator who has long been involved with educational planning on a global scale, published a report which he called a systems analysis of the world crisis in education. In it, he identifies five major forces at work in education today. They include the great flood of students we all have been experiencing in the past couple of decades; the alarming rise in the costs of education which has accompanied this expansion; the scarcity of resources—both human and economic—to cope with these increased demands; the unsuitability of the output of higher education today; and, finally, the inertia and inefficiency we are experiencing in adapting ourselves to cope with these problems.

Although each one of these factors is menu for extensive deliberation, I'm going to dwell for a moment on only the last two.

This one about the unsuitability of our output should particularly concern us today. As we watch our young people stride across the Commencement platforms here, and at other institutions this spring, I think we would do well to ask ourselves just what kind of creature is this that we have produced? I suppose there are some slightly Frankensteinian connotations to that statement, but I do think some rather deep soul searching is in order at this particular point in time.

When we speak of such things as quality or suitability, we are not talking about a given person's technical qualifications for a particular profession. I'm as fully confident as you are that when one of those bright, clear-eyed engineers or pharmacists or home economists steps up to receive a diploma with his "graduation-with-honors" ribbon fluttering in the breeze, he's as technically well qualified for his profession as any graduate in the world today.

But the word technology has two lines of origin. The "Techné" part carries the connotations of artifice and invention. The "Logos" part, the connotation of wisdom. The question then that we need to ask ourselves as educators, is whether or not these young engineers and chemists and agriculturalists we are educating are wise as well as skilled in their professions? I don't know, but I like to think that they are. Or at least that we have had some part in laying the groundwork that will help them to grow in wisdom as the years go by.

We in higher education are sometimes charged, most often of late by our own students, with producing not well-rounded, reasoning, feeling, civilized members of society, but rather technical automatons, custom styled to fit the needs of a mindless technological society, serving violence and war, and into which they fit as faceless interchangeable parts. Robert Hutchins leveled the latter charge at American education 30 years ago and has continued to reiterate it since then, including at the time of his visit here a couple years back. It is a very serious charge.

But I don't buy it. At least not completely. Granted, there is some very convincing evidence that our current society is more interested in machines than it is in people. But I am not at all convinced that the fault lies wholly with the kind of people we have been producing through our educational system. Rather, I would prefer to believe that this is, as John Quincy Adams suggested, one step in the evolution of mankind. Now that science and technology have given us the tools for true civilization, the challenge to us is to learn to employ them for humane and positive ends.

In looking back over the history of this institution and that of the others like it, one cannot help but be profoundly impressed by the extent to which they have succeeded in harnessing science and technology for hu-