

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 19

SEPTEMBER 11, 1967, TO SEPTEMBER 20, 1967

(PAGES 24929 TO 26292)

problem of low farm incomes as well as relieve the pressure on metropolitan centers.

"Maybe a Rural Coalition is needed to supplement the work just begun by the Urban Coalition."

And Farmland paid tribute to a measure sponsored by a Kansas Senator, which predated the GOP Task Force report:

"On an allied front at the Capitol, meanwhile, two Senators are pushing a new bill designed to do something concrete about providing job openings in rural areas. The bill by Senators James Pearson of Kansas and Fred R. Harris of Oklahoma would offer new tax incentives to private industries which locate in low-income rural areas.

"Pearson is a Republican and Harris is a Democrat. Their bipartisan plan is based on the theory that the nation as a whole would gain from the economic revival of rural areas and should be willing to invest in the effort through a tax subsidy.

"But in the long run, the Senators maintain this investment would pay a cash profit to the federal treasury. Exact predictions are impossible, they conceded, but the taxes which would be paid by new industries and newly-employed people would be in the long run add up to more than the government would give up in tax concessions.

"... The crisis of the cities looms so large today precisely because we have been so ineffective in the past in dealing with the basic problems of non-metropolitan areas... the great challenge is not simply to make the cities more livable for more and more people, but how to keep more and more people from crowding into them," says Pearson."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1967]
RURAL MIGRANTS

Two witnesses before the Presidential Commission of Urban Problems last week suggested that the tide of immigration from rural to urban areas be reversed. Paul N. Ylvisaker, New Jersey Commissioner of Community Affairs, called for a national migration policy to halt the flow of the rural poor into urban slums. Jack E. Wood of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing recommended steps to open opportunities for citizens migrating from city centers to suburbs.

This is a healthy sign that the country is awakening to a crisis that long has concerned many rural experts. There has been an historic movement from farm to city areas that the country has come to regard as normal and inevitable. In the earlier decades of this century it was a migration of representative rural folk, including some of the most gifted people. An annual flow of some 250,000 high school graduates into cities has been a great contribution to urban progress. But the migrants have increasingly come from disadvantaged areas. The rural counties lost 8 per cent of their population to the cities between 1950 and 1960. And many of these migrants were people driven from rural areas by a technological revolution in agriculture. Their emigration to the cities simply transformed rural wretchedness into urban wretchedness.

A democratic society cannot stop such population movements by ukase or decree. (Some totalitarian systems are trying to stop similar shifts by such means.) Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has defined the only democratic means of reversing this tide. He told a population conference in 1966: "When meaningful alternatives give Americans real freedom of choice... the population movement from country to city will level off, and even go into reverse."

The President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber has pointed out that the 1959 annual median income of urban families was \$6166 compared with \$4750 for rural non-farm families and \$3228 for rural farm families. It recommended a broad program of rural help—fuller use

of rural manpower, investment to increase the skills of rural people, assurance to the rural poor of a decent living standard. The Commission urged a whole program of action to "encourage economic development within reach of rural people."

The Commission concluded that "economic development of the rural areas must be the answer," in the long run. It urged guaranteed minimum incomes to take up the slack in the short run. Whatever the precise means, we need to cease moving people from impoverished rural areas into impoverished urban areas. This unwise, unplanned and unprofitable migration can be reversed only by making rural life more remunerative economically and more rewarding culturally.

POVERTY—A PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, most discussions of poverty in our affluent society are full of statistical arrays depicting such generalized items as income levels, units of housing, and health status. Such statistics are, of course, vitally necessary, for they inform us of conditions which must be remedied.

But statistics are abstracts of reality, only indicators of the circumstances in which millions of our fellow citizens really live each day. The danger of such abstract grappling with the problems of poverty is the peril of losing sight of persons in the jumble of numbers.

Losing sight of people, even while trying to improve their situation, will cause the antipoverty effort to fail more certainly than anything else. The human being is the target of our effort. We must not forget that individual men, women, and children, living with little hope for a better tomorrow, are the only reason for the Economic Opportunity Act.

Recently, the Meeker-Wright County, Minn., Community Action News carried a column by the Reverend Oliver Dufresne, pastor of Our Lady of Manannah Church in Grove City, Minn. Mr. President, this unusual column discusses poverty from a personal perspective. Pastor Dufresne parallels the nationwide anti-poverty effort with communitywide efforts to fight serious flooding, or to search for a lost child, or to rebuild a farm building damaged by fire. In Pastor Dufresne's view, the Office of Economic Opportunity is but an organized and institutionalized effort to extend the hand of help—so much a part of the American tradition—to the millions of our countrymen living in poverty.

Mr. President, I commend this excellent column to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

OEO WAY OF BEING BROTHER'S KEEPER

(By the Reverend Oliver Dufresne, pastor, Our Lady of Manannah Church, Grove City, Minn.)

A tremendous outpouring of manpower occurs, searching fields and woods, when it's reported a child has been lost. When rivers reach flood stage, many hands offer help in stacking sand bags and in rescuing victims. When a farmer's home burns out, we hear of many helping hands, as the people of a community give their prompt and generous aid.

What accounts for man's response to his

fellowman's need? Isn't it the bond of brotherhood, the fact that, in some way, we are all part of each other? Isn't it this that motivates us, promptly, to aid a distressed fellow human being?

Oh yes, there are always the shortcomings, when human nature fails to respond, as the 30 people who only watched, but didn't help, when a girl was raped and stabbed to death. However, such lack of response shocked us, because, normally, we somehow feel a strong tendency to assist another in a crisis.

OEO (The Office of Economic Opportunity) (or; also called the Anti-Poverty Program) is simply this.

"The man who can, is helping his fellowman." A lost child, a flood or a fire, take many people to give effective help. The larger problems of unemployment, slums, sub-standard incomes, widespread illiteracy, much-needed health care all the more need the help of many more people. Bigger problems need bigger solutions.

In other words, there are so many, many poverty-category U.S. citizens that a big and organized program like OEO is the only way effective help can be given to the many in real need.

Sure, here too, we don't have perfection. Lazy citizens, social parasites, always exist. But who are you and I to say that all, or most, poverty plagued people are lazy and good for nothing? It has never been proved that more than a very small minority are lazy.

I believe most people want dignity and self respect. But I do believe many are caught in a bind, due to such things as: no talent; no education; no opportunity to break the poverty cycle; no example of a stable and industrious family to imitate.

To me, it seems cruel and harsh for someone to say: "Let them work as I did"; "Let them pull themselves up by their bootstraps." Does one who speaks this way have the facts he judges so rashly? Such wild generalizations are not in the tradition of American fairplay and patriotism, to say nothing of Christian charity.

I wonder if we have Cain's blood in our veins, when we become testy and tight fisted with our income? The very talents that may have brought some success to us, are really God's gifts. He expects a return, by our generosity to our fellowman. We are our brother's keeper!

Surely, the American genius can see the good in the Anti-Poverty Program, can work out its bugs, and can loyally cooperate in the tradition that has made our country so great. A good start has been made by the Meeker-Wright Community Action Council. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, has had good results. The Farm Management program is active and received favorably. The Project-Headstart Program is doing well too. . . .

Would that the American dream would evolve into an ideal society, where all men help each other, patient with those who are frail, and in this way, proving that love is greatest when it is compassionate and merciful.

Who amongst us wants to forget that spirit of America, surely inspired by God, and so well summed up by the inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

McGEORGE BUNDY'S ANALYSIS OF REPORT OF PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains a communication of great importance and wis-