

July 27, 1968

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 7031

pricing higher education once again out of the reach of many who find themselves financially hard pressed even at today's fees. Furthermore, if schools continue to raise tuitions, more and more student aid programs would be needed as more and more students, at higher educational costs, found that they needed aid. The government already operates six such programs and they are cumbersome to administer. Politically, of course, it would be difficult to limit such help to only the poor, who too often do not vote, without raising storms of protest from many middle and upper class families, ones that vote regularly, who are also clamoring for relief from ever rising college costs.

Most important, however, in this respect is the problem of restricting any funds, regardless of the approach used, to the educational process. Either the schools or the students might use the grants simply to replace other funds that would have been used anyway, in the absence of grants, in the educational process. The government might well end up subsidizing the non-educational expenses of the schools, such as the construction of fancy but little used "show place" facilities; or of the students, who would be free to use their own funds for more parties, entertainment, cars, etc. In either case, the government would not be using its education dollar for education; and in that case, both education and the nation would be the losers.

Direct-to-institution and through-State funding however, as used in this bill, eliminates most of the problems just cited above in connection with the student aid approach. Such aid can be more easily directed to those institutions which have the best talent, to those institutions in which we are trying to develop that talent, or to both. Administratively such a system is easier and more efficient, having to deal with only a few thousand schools and fifty-five States and territories, instead of with millions of individual students and their families. Qualitatively it allows for better evaluation, by the States and by the Federal government, on which schools are making the most and best use of the funds, and which are making less, allowing for wiser distribution of funds in subsequent years.

Such an approach would also lessen, more than would a direct-to-student approach, the possibilities that the money would be used to subsidize non-educational costs. For universities and colleges, in the great majority of cases, never have enough money; and even with increased federal aid, it is doubtful that they would ever be so caught up with their legitimate needs as not to have something worthwhile on which to use the funds. The need is really that great. Even those schools which now receive the most federal funds, or which are famous as being wealthy and well-endowed and would be thought to have few financial needs, are often the most active in seeking funds from alumni, other private funds and business, not to mention from the government. When Stanford, for instance, one of these schools, finds it necessary to launch a fund drive with a goal of \$100-million, how much more money could be used by those schools less successful than Stanford at obtaining the federal money, let alone the private money, that schools like Stanford have been receiving now for years? It is really difficult to see how the presently financially-starved institutions, which this bill would help the most, could become so rehabilitated that they would have money left over to spend on non-educational items; thus there is much less chance that the government would ever end up subsidizing non-educational costs of the schools than there is that it might end up doing so for students under a direct-to-student approach.

I hope that these observations on my part will have been of some help to the subcommittee. It has been my purpose not so much to emphasize my support for this legislation as to clear up, if I could, some of the mis-

conceptions and undeserved criticisms which have become attached to the bill in previous testimony. This legislation is needed because it promises, justly, to go a long way toward rectifying the imbalance of effort which now characterizes our present system of federal funding for higher education, and to do this in a most efficient and a most needed manner. If I may conclude with a quote which appeared in an article by Mr. Harold L. Enaisson, Academic Vice President of the University of New Mexico, in the June, 1965 issue of *College and University Business*:

"Collectively the federal agencies contribute significantly to the piling up of federal dollars, federally funded buildings, and faculty talent in the big, powerful institutions . . . federal education programs tend to concentrate academic wealth in existing centers of excellence. No federal agency deliberately sets forth to favor the already strong. But the consequences . . . are no less harmful for being unintended."

It is now time to set about undoing this harm. It is now time for a federal program which deliberately sets forth to favor those institutions which have been neglected for so long. The bill before you would take the first step in this direction, a step that must be taken. Thank you.

*Cuba*

## THE REAL CUBA

## HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, actual conditions prevailing in Cuba at this time are less than attractive and certainly incompatible with freedom as we know it in the United States. Of interest in this connection is the report of John Lofton, Jr., appearing in the *Manchester, N.H., Union Leader* earlier this month.

This column should be read by all who deplore the continuance of Communist control in this country so close to our shores:

APOLOGISTS FOR CUBA STILL "SELLING" CASTRO  
(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Every so often, a student revolutionary or a black powerite or sometimes even an executive editor of the *New York Times*, flies off to Cuba, takes the Potemkin Village tour and returns to tell us that life under Castro isn't really that bad and that, well, it certainly beats things as they were under Batista.

Timesman James Reston gave such a verdict last summer after a trip to Red Cuba when he told readers that there seems to be a "sense of common life and purpose" on the island and that Castro has "got the support of his people."

Not to be outdone in the praise of Castro and the conditions in Cuba under the bearded tyrant, the National Education Television network put together a most tendentious piece of propaganda, the implication of which was that everything that has gone wrong in Cuba is directly attributable to the legacy of Uncle Sam.

The film, according to Paul Bethel's highly authoritative "Latin American Report," was co-produced by a man who once worked with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee which was partially financed by Fidel Castro himself.

All of which brings us to a local program recently broadcast, in Spanish, to residents of Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic. The program entitled, "You Be the Jury," featured an interview with several Cubans who had fled Castro's Island Paradise and the conversation went like this:

Question: You say you had decided to flee because of the regime's oppression. Just how did you feel that oppression?

Answer: We felt it because in a country where there is no democracy, no freedom, where everything is expropriated and all property is closed, the Cuban feels this is his own flesh.

Question: But I understand human rights were not respected under Batista, yet you did not flee then and yet you flee now from Fidel Castro?

Answer: Under Batista's dictatorship, one could have his beliefs, and own property—since no peasant has his own land taken away. Under Fidel's regime, despite what he says about the peasants, it is not so. Things are not the same as he tells the peasants. There is no clothing, no shoes, no nutrition, no entertainment. Then what does it matter if we get a good wage if there is no freedom and nowhere to spend the money?

Question: What about freedom of religion there?

Answer: As for religious freedom, we can say there is none. For I think religious freedom is when any pastor or missionary of any sect can go anywhere to talk of God, without anyone meddling in his ideals. In Cuba, one can only preach the gospel in the churches on Sunday. One cannot go out on any religious mission anywhere. That is part of the freedom that is there.

Question: It is understood, because the Cuban regime has declared it, that the revolution is by and for the peasants? As peasants, have you experienced any improvement in the peasant's previous situation?

Answer: That is Castro's main policy; to announce to the world that the Cuban revolution is by and for the peasant. But that is not so, for we see the exploitation of the peasant, since he is not given the right to own what is his. For example, in regard to human respect under Batista's regime, every citizen owned what was his, he could have a right to it. But under Castro's regime, no peasant can say he owns anything, for everything belongs to the regime, and everything that is harvested must automatically be turned over to the regime. This goes even for small amounts. Products are sold, but for money that is worthless. And even if it has value, one must invest it.

And there you have it. A verbatim testimony of life under Fidel Castro by those who lived it. A story that gibes perfectly with an editorial which appeared recently in the national business and financial weekly, *Barron's*:

"Pro-Castro Cuba ranked among the leading three Latin American nations in various indices of well-being. Since 1959, however, it has been down hill all the way. Coffee and sugar, which the Pearl of the Antilles used to export in vast quantities, now are rationed. Fruit, meats and milk are virtually unobtainable. The most devastating commentary of life in Cuba today comes from the hordes of refugees, nearly half a million of whom already have opted for penniless freedom abroad and who continue to leave their native land at the rate of 4,000 per month. Many who cannot gain permission to go—younger, more productive people—risk their lives to escape."

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS; DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTION BUILDING  
IN LATIN AMERICA

## HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Alliance for Progress is definitely on

its way toward ultimate success in the achievement of its goals—because I am confident that we in the United States will live up to the expectations of our neighbors in Latin America.

As we know, the Alliance requires close cooperative effort, not only from our neighbors, but from us as well. The Alliance rests upon the traditional American belief that free men, given the right tools, can build their own societies, peacefully, without violence and bloodshed.

As we move forward from the organization and mobilization phase of the Alliance into the reform and institution-building phase, more and more Latin governments today are becoming truly committed to Alliance methods and goals. All sectors are beginning to contribute their fair share to national development efforts. The atmosphere of desperate poverty is being replaced by hope and expectation.

The enlightened leaders of the Americas know that good government dedicated to change and development cannot by itself alone insure lasting improvement in the lives of all its citizens. And these leaders know that such improvement cannot be imposed or controlled from the top.

They realize they must be able to count on the active support of the great mass of people whom they represent if the changes they would introduce are to flourish.

Before a government can adapt itself to the needs and the desires of the people, the people must first be able to identify and then communicate those requirements to their leaders. This democratic function cannot take place until all citizens have an economic and political stake in their society and until they have learned to protect this stake for the benefit of all.

Our contributions to the Alliance for Progress have helped to establish institutions comprised of men and women determined to fulfill a common goal—to achieve the objectives of the Alliance, all designed to raise the standards of their people.

Let us not forget that, after all, the final end of our Alliance for Progress is to improve the lives of people, not simply to increase the wealth of nations.

We have come a long way on the road toward development. The seeds of democratic institutions have been planted in most Alliance nations. To withdraw or diminish U.S. participation now would result in sharply reduced growth rates. We in this country must be prepared to continue our help. We are vitally concerned with the outcome of their endeavors.

In addition, there is still much to be done for the Alliance nations if they are to achieve and maintain political stability. Many of Latin America's basic structures still need to be reformed.

It is encouraging that a growing number of Latin American leaders today have gathered under them, to give shape and substance to the Alliance for Progress, men of vision and intelligence, unswervingly dedicated to the basic changes called for in the Alliance Charter: to bring to all men in the hemisphere "max-

imum levels of well-being, with equal opportunities for all, in democratic societies adapted to their own needs and desires." These leaders are also convinced that such a tremendous job can be done in peace, and without violence.

Many, however, are sincerely troubled by what they regard as the relatively slow pace of progress brought about in the first 7 years of the Alliance. Some of these men and women have learned at firsthand the complexities and vastness of the problems that stand in the way of a better life for the poor of Latin America, and they have become pessimistic.

It is up to us to prove the doubters wrong and to allay the fears of the pessimists by providing the assistance which will help accelerate the pace of development.

This is a crucial period of reform and institution building in Latin America. We must remind ourselves that we and our neighbors to the south are involved in total hemispheric development. Our nations have agreed on the goals for which we are striving.

This is the time to demonstrate the courage of our mutual conviction that democracy, not tyranny, is the true potential of Latin America.

#### ON THE NONPROLIFERATION TREATY: ONE MAN'S VOICE

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question but that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty now before the other body for ratification has serious ramifications for the future security and defense of the United States. There is, however, considerable disagreement among the experts and so-called experts as to whether these implications are beneficial or detrimental. It has long been my judgment that the people and organizations within the administration responsible for the treaty have never performed an impartial analysis of this issue.

I have spoken out on 22 occasions during the course of the 89th and 90th Congresses, trying to spur those in responsible positions to consider both sides of the issue before they commit the United States to something which may prove unwise. As the Speaker can tell, I am still trying.

For the benefit of those Members of this and the other body who are attempting to research this vital national security issue, particularly those who must soon vote "yea" or "nay" on its ratification, I have compiled a bibliography of the statements I have made on the subject of the Nonproliferation Treaty during the past two Congresses. I also hope it will prove useful to those students of the subject who are undertaking research projects on the history of the Nonproliferation Treaty. The list follows:

July 24, 1968, E6881: "On the Nonproliferation Treaty Amen, Brother."

July 22, 1968, E6777: "Testimony Regarding Nonproliferation Treaty."

July 2, 1968, E6057: "Another View of the Nonproliferation Treaty."

May 7, 1968, H3340: "Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Assessed."

May 1, 1968, H3193: "Nonproliferation Treaty Safeguards Costs Staggering."

January 24, 1968, H325: "Nonproliferation Treaty Hoax."

September 14, 1967, H11935: "Nonproliferation Treaty Is No Bargain."

August 25, 1967, H11224: "Nonproliferation Treaty Will Endanger National Security."

March 2, 1967, H2090: "One if by Land, Two if by Sea, and Three if by Treaty."

March 1, 1967, H1982: "Boozers and Teetotalers and Nonproliferation."

February 28, 1967, H1876: "Schizophrenic Nuclear Pacifists Try Uninventing the Wheel."

February 27, 1967, H1776: "Nonproliferation Treaty—A Nuclear Yalta?"

February 23, 1967, H1707: "Treaty Will Not Stop Spread or Enhance Security."

February 21, 1967, H1614: "The Nonproliferation Treaty Cheating Cannot Be Inspected or Verified." H1642: "Nonproliferation Treaty Flunks Cost-Effect Test." A780: "President Accepts GOP Proposals Relating to Plowshare Sharing."

February 20, 1967, H1559: "Disarmers Substituting Pact Pledges for Military Muscle."

February 16, 1967, H1426: "Proliferation Consequences Exaggerated."

February 15, 1967, H1351: "The Nonproliferation Treaty Toax."

February 13, 1967, H1281: "Plowshare Program Victim of Disarmament Zeal."

October 11, 1966, 25114: "Warning on Nonproliferation Treaty Talk."

March 31, 1966, A1869: "GOP Report and Proposal on Nonproliferation."

February 7, 1966, A545: "Nuclear Nonproliferation Resolution."

#### DR. V. D. MATTIA HAILED FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding constituent of mine was recently accorded a signal honor by the Essex County Chapter of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame. Dr. Virginus D. Mattia, of Upper Montclair, N.J., received the Distinguished American Award, presented annually "to a former player who has carried the lessons learned on the football field into a life of service to the community."

On July 18 the Nutley Sun described this unique man and the occasion, and I am delighted to commend it to my colleagues' reading, as follows:

ESSEX SPORTS CHAPTER PRESENTS DR. MATTIA WITH DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN AWARD HONORS

Dr. Virginus D. Mattia, president of Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc., Nutley, received the